



**TECHNOLOGY AND ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN  
SEQUOIA NAGAMATSU'S *HOW HIGH WE GO IN THE  
DARK***

**Dr Uzma Shakoor**

[uzmshah194@gmail.com](mailto:uzmshah194@gmail.com)

PhD English Literature, Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

**Qumber Ali Khan**

[Qumberkhan1996@gmail.com](mailto:Qumberkhan1996@gmail.com)

MPhil English Literature, Department of English Language and Literature, Riphah International University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

**Javeria Saleem**

[murtazajaveria@gmail.com](mailto:murtazajaveria@gmail.com)

MPhil English Literature, Department of English Language and Literature, Riphah International University, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

**Abstract**

Sequoia Nagamatsu's *How High We Go in the Dark* offers a speculative yet intimate portrayal of how technological interventions in moments of global crisis create complex ethical challenges. The study examines how experimental technologies influence perceptions of life, death, and survival, while reshaping cultural, social, and individual values. It aims to analyze moral dilemmas emerging from life-extending and grief-alleviating innovations, assess the consequences of such interventions, and explore their broader societal impact. Using qualitative textual analysis through close reading and thematic interpretation, the research applies Hans Jonas's *The Imperative of Responsibility*, which stresses moral foresight in technological advancement. The work is significant for its contribution to literary ethics, showing how speculative fiction engages with pressing bioethical debates. The findings highlight the necessity of balancing human survival with dignity, cultural continuity, and responsible innovation.

**Keywords:** *Ethical Dilemmas, Global Crises, Hans Jonas, Responsibility, Sequoia Nagamatsu, Speculative Fiction, Technology.*

**Corresponding Author:** Dr Uzma Shakoor (PhD English Literature, Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Faisalabad, Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan). Email: [uzmshah194@gmail.com](mailto:uzmshah194@gmail.com)

## 1. Introduction

With the rapid technological advancements technological advances that span in scope from AI (AI) as well as to autonomous vehicles to genetic editing, as along with digital health technologies significantly increased human capacity (George et al., 2024). Yet technological advancements can be the cause of profound ethical questions which challenge moral codes and the prevailing norms of our society. They are generally rooted in a conflict between efficiency and human efficacy and technology advancements, privacy and the fairness of bias along with freedom and of control (Zarsky, 2016).

An area susceptible to tension is the area of medical technology advancements. The integration of digital health tools may lead to more efficient diagnosis, better workflows to treat patients as well as taking care of you (Grosman-Rimon & Wegier, 2024). However, there are questions about the patient's safety and security, as well as accountability as well as privacy and security, and the powers that tools can exercise should be overseen by a strict supervision of ethical standards (Grosman-Rimon & Wegier, 2024).

Furthermore, the introduction of AI in the medical sector brings about a myriad of ethical questions. This includes protecting privacy and confidentiality of patients and establishing the boundaries of legal obligations that apply to both the clinician and machine and ensuring full and informed consent from patients and providing healthcare professionals with the knowledge to handle the challenges of tomorrow (Farhud & Zokaei, 2021; Rigby, 2019.).

Autonomous automobiles (AVs) offer powerful proof of the moral complexity inherent in technological advancements. Debates over the infamous "trolley problem" scenarios--where AVs must choose whom to harm in unavoidable collisions--highlight the theoretical and practical quandaries engineers and ethicists face (Holstein et al., 2018; Lim & Taeihagh, 2019). The results of empirical studies like the MIT-based Moral Machine project reveal that moral preferences differ widely across people around the globe, raising the question of who's moral values are embedded in these models (Trolley Research and the Moral Machine)--while normative critiques warn against understating the realities of engineering based on only thinking (Holstein et al., 2018).

The wider subject of AI ethics encompasses questions such as algorithms' bias and fairness as well as transparency, accountability, and laws as well as future-oriented risks, such artificial weapons, misinformation, and autonomous vehicles, and the potential for unemployment as well as others that pose actual dangers (Ethics on Artificial Intelligence

in 2025). Initiatives to establish ethics standards are becoming obvious. The research conducted across the world demonstrate a commonality of principles, which include fairness, transparency, accountability as well as the principle of non-maleficence as well as confidentiality. However, their way in which they are applied and the interpretation vary (Jobin et al., 2019).

Real-world problems are more pressing, like the one in the CRISPR "genomic babies" case. In the year 2018 and Chinese researcher He Jiankui altered embryos to create HIV resistance. The result was the creation of human embryos genetically modified in a manner which was not controlled. The experiment violated foundational bioethical principles--autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice--and was conducted without proper oversight or informed consent, triggering international condemnation (He Jiankui affair, 2025).

In addition to isolated instances, systemic ethical lapses are in the spotlight. Big tech companies who have a monopoly on the gathering of data, platform influence, and AI technology development and progress were accused of making profits before the well-being of people. The manipulation of algorithms, disinformation as well as a greater surveillance on the impacts of technology worldwide inequality, as well as lack of transparency in regulation by regulators have led to demands for more independent experts and a more effective surveillance mechanism (Kirchschlager 2024 as well as Ethics of Artificial Intelligence 2025).

The examples above demonstrate that the technology is unable to separate themselves from moral structures that guide the design of their products and also their implementation in management. There's much to be concerned about. The harms resulted due to flawed algorithms could cause an environment of inequality. The technology that isn't regulated may impact individual rights individuals as well as their freedom. Inadequate control over power can affect the right to talk and be secure, as well as failures in governing emergencies could impact trust among the public (Wray et al., 2006).

To tackle these problems, tech developers research, policy makers, along with people in general need to collaborate to create ethics guidelines which are welcoming and inclusive, and respectful of culture and values in all and that are legally required. The integration of ethics into the development process is vital in the process of technological advancement, but is not merely an aspect, but rather as a foundation to ensure equitable and sustainable advancement (Chithra & Bhambri, 2024).

### 1.1. Research Questions

1. How does *How High We Go in the Dark* depict ethical dilemmas arising from technological interventions in life, death, and human survival?
2. In what ways does the novel explore the moral implications of using experimental technologies in the face of global crises?
3. How are cultural, social, and individual values challenged or reshaped by technological advancements in the narrative?

### 1.2. Research Objectives

1. To analyze the representation of ethical conflicts that emerge from technological solutions presented in *How High We Go in the Dark*.
2. To examine how the novel critiques or endorses the use of experimental and potentially risky technologies during catastrophic events.
3. To investigate how the interplay between technology, morality, and human values shapes characters' decisions and the novel's thematic direction.

### 1.3. Significance of the Study

This study is significant as it offers a critical examination of *How High We Go in the Dark* engages with pressing ethical dilemmas linked to technological innovation in moments of global crisis. By analyzing the novel's portrayal of experimental medical procedures, AI systems, and futuristic technologies, the research contributes to the broader discourse on technology ethics in literature. It deepens understanding of how speculative fiction reflects and critiques real-world debates on moral responsibility, human dignity, and societal priorities. The study also provides insights for interdisciplinary scholarship, bridging literary analysis with ethical theory, bioethics, and science and technology studies, thereby enriching conversations on how narratives can influence perceptions of technological progress and its moral implications.

## 2. Theoretical Exposition: Hans Jonas's The Imperative of Responsibility

Hans Jonas' *The Imperative of Responsibility* Imperative Responsibility The Imperative of Responsibility: Looking for the concept of Ethics in the Technological Age (1979/1984) is the best philosophical solution to moral issues that technology has brought. Jonas affirms that the enormous size and extent that technology brings has drastically altered the ethical standards for individuals. The old ethical framework developed in the human context had limitations on their actions with respect to time and space, however, technological advances extend humankind's role far beyond the limits of

time and space into the near future. The expansion of humanity's role requires the development of a new ethics system which focuses on protecting humanity from the best conditions in addition to the overall wellbeing of our planet. fortunate to be a part of.

### **2.1. Ethics for the Technological Age**

Jonas talks about The Imperatives of Responsibility in a way that suggests that the traditional ethics models even in the face of Aristotelian ethics and ethics, Kantian Theology, utilitarianism or deontology do not meet the needs of the modern age (Jonas, 1984). The consequences of human actions were usually swift, limited only to one area as well as irreversible. Technological advances can cause devastating impacts on years of time in the future, and consequences for ecosystems as well as people may be more distant than where they started. Human evolution requires a moral framework capable of handling the size and extent of the effects of technology.

### **2.2. The Imperative of Responsibility**

The imperative is unconstrained and is also a vision for the future. It connects us not just to the well-being and health of present individuals but also for the future of humanity as a population overall. Jonas is a link between the imperative and his own thought process of analytic human theology, which developed as the one who first formulated the concept in his book "The Phenomenon of the Life" (1966/2001) in accordance the concept of an imperative that there is a belief that the purpose of life and its significance are inextricably linked. Being alive is an issue important and has an objective.

### **2.3. Responsibility Toward Future Generations**

Jonas's breakthrough was because of his determination to accept his moral responsibility to individuals who do not exist. In his book The Phenomenon of Life, Jonas (2001) stated that living organisms are the only thing that could be able to claim that we exist. The argument relies on the fact that living creatures exist. The Imperative of Responsibility Imperative Responsibility Imperative Responsibility Imperative of Responsibility is a concept that can help those whose lives are affected by decisions which are made by present generations. As individuals are not autonomous and therefore, current generations are required to act as trustees for them. The obligation to be trustees. It's not only for the human race, however, it's essential for the protection of biodiversity and sustain the Earth.

#### **2.4. The Precautionary Principle and "In Dubie Pro Malo"**

Jonas's main principle of his code of ethics is to be alert when it comes to the uncertainty of technology. Although he doesn't use the phrase that is used today to explain the idea that is known as the "precautionary principle," his formulation provides a good explanation of the concept. Jonas insists that when there's uncertainty about the possible negative consequences that it's important to evaluate the possibility which will be most detrimental prior to making any decisions to prevent the likely outcome (Jonas, 1984). Jonas clarifies this by citing the Latin expression "dubio malo--"in doubt, select worst-case scenario. " Jonas's stance is the result being aware of the extent of harm caused by the technology-driven society.

#### **2.5. The Heuristic of Fear**

Jonas examines the role of fear when making moral judgements in this time. He describes the concept as "the "heuristic in fear"--a mental compass that directs our thoughts to see the danger to our daily lives (Jonas, 1984). It's not due to an unreasonable fear, but rather a mindful and disciplined realization of the risk of going into the wrong direction. Jonas's words suggest that in the past moral system was founded on the need to conduct we wisely was the primary reason for engaging with moral decisions. Today, in the technological age, protecting against catastrophic injuries is as significant or has even greater significance.

#### **2.6. Intergenerational Justice**

Jonas improves the idea of justice that includes connections between present and next generation. Justice for the future generation is an obligation to not consume resources in a manner that causes harm to ecosystems or use technologies that put the ones who come after us in a poorer situation than we are (Jonas, 1984). Because the future generation isn't responsible for our decisions that result in these harms, the burden rests on our ourselves to accept the obligation that Jonas believes is essential to becoming ethically sound in this technologically driven current.

#### **2.7. Anthropocentrism coupled with Ecological Responsibilities**

Jonas ethics are humanistic, as they consider the reality of humans at the core of their philosophy. This isn't just theologically-motivated. In his book *The Phenomenon of the Living* (2001) insists regarding the interdependence of living creatures and the interconnectedness between humans in the ecology system. In his book, *The Imperative Responsibility* Jonas states that the care for the ecosystem is

essential to the health of humans as destruction of ecosystems that are natural decreases human quality of life. The reason for this is that environmental responsibility has been proven to be considered one of the key elements in protecting human rights.

### **2.8. The Burden of Power**

Jonas believes that with the advancement of technology it is accompanied by a higher moral responsibility (Jonas, 1984). In contrast to the past the technology of the past had not the capacity to change the fundamental nature of our planet. We have access today to tools to alter world's life, changing the climate and the genetic structure of the humans. The extent of our capacity is a source of an unassailable responsibility to conduct ourselves in ways that help ensure our existence. Jonas says this is an unidirectional relationship. The greater the size of our capacity and more responsibility we have to make use of the capacity in a responsible way.

### **2.9. Ontological Foundations of Ethics**

Jonas is a proponent of his moral principles in line with discussions concerning the concept of ontology. Jonas specifically discusses an notion of the human condition that believes it is important. Jonas defends this idea with his book *The Phenomenon of Life* (1966/2001) Jonas is a proponent an idea that a philosophical view of life is the foundation of everything that happens and is opposed to the traditional value neutral and mechanistic views about the world. Based on a deeply-rooted understanding of ethics that is founded in the nature of human existence and the world, Jonas suggests a system of moral obligations that are not based on agreements to the community or on divine commands or the notion of mutual benefit. Aims of Responsibility. Imperatives Responsibility. Imperatives Responsibility is the foundational ontological principle that forms the base of the conviction that ensuring the safety of those we love is a moral duty which cannot be ignored.

### **2.10. Mortality, Morality, and Historical Experience**

In the essay *Mortality in as well as Morality* (1992), Jonas analyzes moral responsibility and includes his own experiences in the 20th century, which include the Holocaust and the threat of nuclear devastation. The events can be, in the words of Jonas, an indicator of the dangers of technological advancements which are subject to moral accountability. Even though *Mortality and Morality* aren't necessarily the only motive behind a requirement to behave responsibly however, it is a strong argument for a code of ethical behavior that is able to be applied to fight the risks created by nature and human beings to our lives.

### 3. Analysis

*“But there’s no plan B for a brain. The treatments are slowing the spread, but it’s only a matter of time.” (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 89)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the quotation — “But there’s no plan B for a brain. The treatments are slowing the spread, but it’s only a matter of time” — encapsulates the limits of technological intervention when confronting mortality. Despite medical innovations, the inevitability of death remains, revealing an ethical tension central to Hans Jonas’s *The Imperative of Responsibility*. Jonas argues for a forward-looking ethics that considers the long-term consequences of human action, especially in the face of technological power that can alter the conditions of life itself.

Here, life-prolonging treatments represent humanity’s attempt to master nature, yet they also confront an unchangeable boundary — the brain’s vulnerability. Jonas warns against a purely instrumental approach to life, where survival is pursued without sufficient regard for dignity, meaning, or the unintended repercussions of intervention. The passage underscores that technological success in delaying death may risk fostering an illusion of control, distracting from our responsibility to confront mortality ethically.

The lack of a “plan B” reflects Jonas’s call for humility: an acceptance that technology cannot absolve us from the moral responsibility of caring for the fragile human condition. In this light, the novel portrays survival not as a purely technical problem, but as a deeply ethical one shaped by the limits of human foresight.

*“I—am—trying—to—save—people... not the people on my lab table, but I hope my research can help someone, someday, maybe make their deaths count for something.” (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 223)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the statement — “I—am—trying—to—save—people... not the people on my lab table, but I hope my research can help someone, someday, maybe make their deaths count for something” — reveals a central ethical dilemma of technological intervention: the moral weight of sacrificing present lives for potential future benefit. This aligns closely with Hans Jonas’s *The Imperative of Responsibility*, which calls for an ethics oriented toward the preservation of life for future generations while maintaining reverence for those living now.

The speaker’s justification frames death as a resource — something that can be repurposed to secure survival in the future. Jonas warns of the danger in allowing technological goals to override the intrinsic value of existing life. By prioritizing

hypothetical future beneficiaries over the dignity of present individuals, one risks instrumentalizing human beings, reducing them to means rather than ends.

Yet Jonas's theory also acknowledges the necessity of acting with foresight in an age where technology shapes the destiny of humanity. The passage embodies the tension between immediate compassion and long-range responsibility. In the novel, such moments highlight the ethical ambiguity of innovation: even well-intentioned research can blur the boundary between saving lives and rationalizing harm in the name of survival.

*We'll find a way to make the rest of your life as happy as we can." (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 144)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the promise — "We'll find a way to make the rest of your life as happy as we can" — captures an ethical tension at the intersection of technology, mortality, and human dignity. Here, medical intervention cannot save a life, only manage its decline. This moment reflects Hans Jonas's *The Imperative of Responsibility*, which urges an ethic of care grounded in foresight and respect for the fragility of life.

Jonas warns against an overreliance on technology as a guarantor of survival, emphasizing instead the moral duty to preserve the quality and meaning of existence when its quantity can no longer be extended. The statement in the novel shifts focus from the impossible promise of curing death to the achievable responsibility of supporting dignity, comfort, and emotional well-being in a finite span.

By centering happiness rather than indefinite survival, the passage resists the technological impulse to treat life merely as a problem to solve. It acknowledges the boundary where innovation must give way to compassion, aligning with Jonas's call for humility in the face of life's limits. In this way, the novel portrays ethical responsibility as more than prolongation—it is about ensuring that even the last chapters of life retain value and humanity.

*It's hard to tell the truth when, for so many, these robot-pets are the most tangible memories they have of the loved ones they've lost." (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 197)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the line — "It's hard to tell the truth when, for so many, these robot-pets are the most tangible memories they have of the loved ones they've lost" — reflects the ethical complexity of using technology to mediate grief and preserve memory. The robot-pets blur the line between comfort and illusion, raising questions about whether emotional well-being justifies withholding or distorting truth.

Hans Jonas's *The Imperative of Responsibility* emphasizes the need to consider the long-term effects of technological actions on human life and dignity. While the robot-pets offer immediate solace, Jonas would urge scrutiny of their deeper implications: do they preserve humanity's relationship to loss, or do they erode our capacity to face mortality honestly? The quotation points to a compassionate impulse—protecting the bereaved—but also to a potential moral hazard in allowing technology to replace authentic remembrance with simulated presence.

In Jonas's terms, responsibility requires balancing short-term relief with the preservation of essential human capacities for future generations. The novel uses this scenario to illustrate how technological solutions, even those born of empathy, can reshape fundamental experiences like mourning, forcing society to confront whether easing pain justifies altering the truth of death.

*“We froze them in the hope the future would be kinder, but we never agreed on what kind of life we were saving them for.” (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 285)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the statement — “We froze them in the hope the future would be kinder, but we never agreed on what kind of life we were saving them for” — encapsulates the moral uncertainty surrounding experimental technologies deployed during global crises. Here, cryonic preservation is used as a desperate intervention against mass death, yet the absence of consensus on the future's values and conditions reveals the ethical gap between technological capability and moral foresight.

Hans Jonas's *The Imperative of Responsibility* warns that technological power must be guided by a vision of the good life we seek to preserve. Jonas argues that without such orientation, efforts to safeguard humanity risk becoming ethically hollow, saving lives without ensuring the conditions for their flourishing. The quotation underscores this concern: the act of freezing bodies assumes survival is inherently good, yet neglects to define what makes life worth living in an uncertain, possibly diminished, future.

The novel thereby critiques the uncritical faith in innovation as a universal good, showing that survival divorced from ethical purpose may lead to existential dislocation. In Jonas's terms, true responsibility requires not only securing existence, but shaping a future where that existence retains dignity, meaning, and human fulfillment.

*“When we laugh, we are stronger. When we laugh, we heal the world.”*  
*(Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 87)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the line — “When we laugh, we are stronger. When we laugh, we heal the world.” — reframes the moral role of technology in crisis by

emphasizing emotional resilience over purely technical fixes. In a world ravaged by a global catastrophe, technological interventions dominate the fight for survival, yet this quotation suggests that humanity's strength also lies in intangible, non-technological acts that preserve meaning and connection.

Hans Jonas's *The Imperative of Responsibility* urges that the use of experimental technologies must be guided by a vision of the good worth preserving. For Jonas, responsibility is not only about ensuring physical survival, but also about safeguarding the moral, emotional, and cultural dimensions that make life human. In this context, laughter becomes a form of ethical resistance, maintaining dignity and solidarity amidst widespread loss.

The novel uses such moments to question the sufficiency of experimental science as the sole response to existential threats. While technologies can extend life, they cannot on their own restore the fabric of shared humanity. Jonas's framework reveals that moral responsibility in crisis involves preserving both the conditions of life and the inner capacities—like joy—that allow future generations to inherit a world worth living in.

*“We used to gather in the market square; now we meet in shared VR rooms, our avatars waving in place of real hands.” (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 174)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the quotation — “We used to gather in the market square; now we meet in shared VR rooms, our avatars waving in place of real hands” — illustrates how technological advancements can profoundly reshape cultural, social, and individual values. Physical community rituals are replaced by virtual interactions, altering how relationships are formed, maintained, and understood. While VR offers safety and connection during crisis, it also redefines presence, touch, and communal identity.

Hans Jonas's *The Imperative of Responsibility* cautions that technological progress must be evaluated not only by its capacity to solve immediate problems, but by its long-term effects on the human condition. In this case, VR safeguards life during a global catastrophe, yet it may erode the cultural practices and sensory bonds that ground human solidarity. Jonas would urge a careful weighing of the survival benefits against the possible loss of embodied, place-based community life.

The novel uses this shift to show that technology's impact is never neutral—it reshapes what people consider “normal” interaction, potentially narrowing the richness of shared experiences. Under Jonas's ethic, responsibility demands not only preserving human existence, but also ensuring that future generations inherit forms of connection that sustain cultural meaning and authentic human presence.

*“My daughter’s memories are archived in the cloud, but sometimes I wonder if I’m protecting her or erasing the parts that made her human.” (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 211)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the line — “My daughter’s memories are archived in the cloud, but sometimes I wonder if I’m protecting her or erasing the parts that made her human” — captures the deep cultural, social, and personal shifts caused by technological memory preservation. Storing memories digitally promises protection against loss, yet it also risks altering the nature of identity, grief, and what it means to remember. Archiving may sanitize or fragment a life, turning the person into curated data rather than a complex, lived being.

Hans Jonas’s *The Imperative of Responsibility* warns that technological capabilities must be guided by careful foresight, considering not only what is possible, but what ought to be done. Here, the ethical dilemma lies in whether safeguarding memories in the cloud truly preserves the person, or if it subtly replaces authentic human remembrance with a mediated, controlled version. Jonas would argue that such interventions must be weighed for their long-term impact on the essence of human relationships and cultural mourning practices.

The novel uses this tension to show how technology can both comfort and diminish. Under Jonas’s ethic, true responsibility involves ensuring that advancements serve to protect the fullness of human experience, not just its digital shadow.

*“The old festivals are streamed now, the smell of food and sound of drums replaced by high-definition images and surround sound.” (Nagamatsu, 2022, p. 237)*

In *How High We Go in the Dark*, the line — “The old festivals are streamed now, the smell of food and sound of drums replaced by high-definition images and surround sound” — reflects how technological mediation can preserve cultural forms while simultaneously altering their essence. Festivals, once rooted in embodied presence, sensory richness, and communal gathering, become virtual experiences, reshaping how traditions are lived and valued. While streaming ensures continuity during crisis, it risks reducing culture to spectacle, detached from its original social and sensory contexts.

Hans Jonas’s *The Imperative of Responsibility* urges that technological progress be assessed not just for its efficiency or reach, but for its long-term impact on the human condition. Jonas would question whether preserving festivals in this mediated form safeguards their cultural significance or erodes the communal bonds they were meant to strengthen. By replacing direct participation with digital consumption, technology may unintentionally transform shared heritage into passive entertainment.

The novel uses this example to highlight the trade-offs between preservation and transformation. Under Jonas's framework, responsible use of technology demands that future generations inherit not only the recorded forms of culture, but also the lived, participatory experiences that give those traditions their enduring meaning and social vitality.

#### 4. Conclusion

In the various situations that are explored by the various scenarios within the book, we are able to explore the dark side of technology. are seen as tools with two sides and are able to improve the quality of life and reduce pain while also preserving certain aspects of society. However, they are they are also adept at altering and reducing or destroying the ideals they seek to uphold. Through interconnected stories, the novel addresses moral questions which Hans Jonas formulates in *The Imperative of Responsibility* and asks: how can you make use of the potential of technology to an unimaginable degree and protect humanity and the natural environment that defines it.

Chapters reviewed reveal a constant struggle between technology and society and it can be the lifeline in times of hardship however its advantages cannot be considered to be non-value impartial. It doesn't have to be a part of with ongoing treatments that will eventually lead to the degeneration of an individual, cryonics which suspends individuals without knowing what the future holds or the digital archives that protect memories, but could destroy their value, and every technology empowers individuals as well as groups to rethink their beliefs about what is morally upright. Jonas's caution against treating human beings as an instrument as well as his wish to show humility to the fragile the world is throughout the book.

Social and cultural shifts are evident particularly. Virtual events along with streaming events as well as robotic pets designed to ease the pain of grief illustrate how technology is able to sustain certain kinds of community even when physical contact isn't feasible. However, these examples show the possibility that substitutes for physical contact could reduce the participatory, sensory and tangible aspects that make traditional interactions so rich. According to Jonas, they must be analyzed not solely by their immediate effects, but also their impact on humanity. Even a minor alteration could cause a lasting change in how we communicate with, consider and feel about as part of their lives as individuals in the context of their personal lives, characters need to be aware of the moral implications their decisions Scientists justifying their present actions in the hope of reaping future benefits. When parents contemplate whether technology is threatening to their children's humanity caregivers shift away towards protecting lives instead of ensuring

those dying to be treated with respect. These instances reflect Jonas's idea that our responsibility goes beyond our current situation and extends to the future will be left to generations to follow. It isn't enough to simply endure, it is essential to make a generation that will have the less capacity to experience the pleasure of happiness, authenticity as well as ethical clarity.

The novel is also an expression of the importance of foresight in Jonas's work. A lot of characters operate under the influence of uncertainty and acknowledge that they are unable to determine the outcome of their actions. Whether freezing the dying in hopes of a "kinder future" or creating grief-mitigating technologies, they face the challenge Jonas identifies--technological action often outpaces the moral frameworks needed to guide it. When it comes to such situations there is a risk that it's not just that we'll commit a number of harmful errors and blunders, but also that we change our views without conscious of the implications.

The book "What High We Go in the dark demonstrates the rapidity of technological advancement during periods of crisis requires creation of an ethical framework which promotes meaning and life and ensures that both are safeguarded. Jonas's Imperative of Responsibility is the best framework as it states that the quest for survival must be linked to the protection of those elements that are essential to our existence, for example, the dignity of the individual, the group, in addition to preserving the authenticity of human connections. The message is straightforward: if you don't conduct us ethically, technological advances may assist us to in saving our bodies, however it could also endanger the humanity.

The story changes into a remark on humanity's power, as well as to providing a warning about the dangers of technology, which for that we are not responsible. Through highlighting the individual, social and environmental impacts of technological choices, the book enjoins readers to consider how they will remain alive in over the coming decades, yet they should also think about how they will remain focused and crucial, and also as human beings.

## References

- Chithra, N., & Bhambri, P. (2024). Ethics in sustainable technology. In *Handbook of Technological Sustainability* (pp. 245-256). CRC Press.
- Farhud, D. D., & Zokaei, S. (2021). Ethical issues of artificial intelligence in medicine and healthcare. *Iranian journal of public health*, 50(11), I.

- George, A. S., George, A. H., & Baskar, T. (2024). Artificial intelligence and the future of healthcare: Emerging jobs and skills in 2035. *Partners Universal Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 1(1), 1-21.
- Grosman-Rimon, L., & Wegier, P. (2024). With advancement in health technology comes great responsibility—Ethical and safety considerations for using digital health technology: A narrative review. *Medicine*, 103(33), e39136.
- Holstein, T., Dodig-Crnkovic, G., & Pelliccione, P. (2018). Ethical and social aspects of self-driving cars. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04103*.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1(9), 389-399.
- Jonas, H. (1984). *The imperative of responsibility: In search of an ethics for the technological age*. University of Chicago press.
- Jonas, H. (2001). *The phenomenon of life: Toward a philosophical biology*. Northwestern University Press.
- Lim, H. S. M., & Taeihagh, A. (2019). Algorithmic decision-making in AVs: Understanding ethical and technical concerns for smart cities. *Sustainability*, 11(20), 5791.
- Rigby, M. J. (2019). Ethical dimensions of using artificial intelligence in health care. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, 21(2), 121-124.
- Wikipedia contributors. (n.d.). *He Jiankui affair*. Wikipedia. Retrieved August 11, 2025, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/He\\_Jiankui\\_affair](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/He_Jiankui_affair)
- Wray, R., Rivers, J., Whitworth, A., Jupka, K., & Clements, B. (2006). Public perceptions about trust in emergency risk communication: qualitative research findings. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies & Disasters*, 24(1), 45-75.
- Zarsky, T. (2016). The trouble with algorithmic decisions: An analytic road map to examine efficiency and fairness in automated and opaque decision making. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 41(1), 118-132.