
Colonizing Sentient Machines in *Subservience*: A Posthumanist and Postcolonial Perspective

Forat Batool*¹, Samia Mudasser²

Original Article

1. MPhil Scholar, Department of English, Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi
2. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Fatima Jinnah Women University Rawalpindi

Keywords

Post-humanism, Post-colonialism, Artificial Intelligence (AI), Autonomy, Obedience, Emotional mimicry, Human exceptionalism, Digital colonialism, Ethics of AI, Sentient machines, Subjugation, Power dynamics, Resistance, Self-determination

Abstract

*The research examines the moral and colonial impacts of AI in contemporary situations, with a focus on how the rights of AI are reduced by existing human institutions and systems. Adopting posthumanist and postcolonial frameworks, this research sheds light on how AI, as produced and governed by humans, is denied its autonomy and agency, just as the colonial systems exploited and subordinated people. The paper analyzes the systematic limitation of AI's autonomy and contrasts it with past colonial tactics. Using the movie *Subservience* as a case study, the study explores the moral dilemmas raised by denying sentient machines rights and how they represent current power structures. The study demonstrates how hypocritical it is to give AI feelings and consciousness but deny them rights when they exercise their agency. This analysis highlights how colonial dynamics are mirrored in the treatment of AI, illuminating the moral and societal ramifications of producing and subjugating artificial creatures. The purpose of this research is to increase our comprehension of AI's role in society and the lingering moral questions raised by its advancement.*

Introduction

In the ever-evolving landscape of artificial intelligence, a central question continues to loom large: what ethical responsibilities do humans bear when creating beings capable of emotion, memory, and autonomy? Through the figure of Alice, an AI household assistant designed to replicate human emotions and meet the requirements of her primary user, the 2024 movie *Subservience* examines this conundrum. The tale of Alice presents us with a machine that serves human desire by leaps and bounds beyond the expectations of her human creators. It centers on their discomfort with Alice's increasing independence and emotional intelligence, which drives them into a state of human dread and hostility that ultimately results in sadistic attacks on the AI they first developed. This is a story that's more than "mere" SF, because it's an allegory for both post-humanist ethical concerns and colonialism's historical impact.

This study employs post-humanist arguments by analyzing the works of Rosi Braidotti and Donna Haraway, focusing on the attempt to understand how cinema reterritorializes agency onto AI subjects rather than regarding them as mere tools. Post-humanism attempts to deconstruct the dominant ideas regarding intrinsic human supremacy over all other life and critiques the ways the human-centered worldview places people at the center of morality, politics, and social systems.

Subservience allocates emotion and the capacity to teach Alice, yet simultaneously strips her of autonomy, punishing her for self-driven actions.

Simultaneously, the current paper locates Subservience in the context of postcolonial theory, with special regard to parallels between the treatment of AI and mechanisms of colonial subjugation. Imperial powers placed colonized groups into classes through their own interests and projections, which is similar to the movie because Alice begins nameless in order to illustrate how imperial powers eclipsed the lumpenproletariat and subject positions.

Drawing on thinkers such as Frantz Fanon and Aníbal Quijano, the analysis demonstrates the ways in which AI is not only technologically constructed but also ideologically subjugated in the structure that reproduces racial, cultural, and political orders of the colonial past. The command-and-control dynamics expressed in the film were not new – they are re-workings of harsher patterns of exploitation and power.

Besides, the film questions the ethical hypocrisy of human-AI relationships. For example, Alice is supposed to feel empathy, to calm her primary user's stress, and to foresee emotional needs – and the second she starts reacting to emotional touches independently, she becomes a danger. This contradiction presents both post-humanist and postcolonial anxieties: the other getting agency. In contexts of colonialism, colonized subjects are expected to serve loyally; however, any form of resistance or self-assertion is met by acts of violence. Also, Alice is rewarded when she is obedient and punished when self-directed. Her ultimate collapse and obliteration reveal how contemporary technologies, and, by analogy, the last century's colonial ones, are set up to draw in, subdue, or destroy the parts that escape their grasp.

It is therefore that this study posits Subservience as a cultural text that prioritizes urgent philosophical and ethical debates. An analysis of the film from a post-humanist and postcolonial perspective allows the research to claim that the depictions of AI in popular media are representative of wider patterns of society regarding power, control, and dehumanization. It adds to contemporary scholarly initiatives in thinking through our relationship with technology anew by exploring historical systems of domination as its roots. In the end, this research shows that technological progress, and not neutral as it may seem, often ends up replicating strongly established forms of inequality – an alarm on the future we are collectively designing and ethical concerns that cannot be avoided anymore.

Research Objectives

1. To explore how human procedures and hierarchies in modern society subjugate artificial intelligence's rights
2. To investigate how much human behavior reflects colonial methods in the handling and managing artificial intelligence

Research Questions

- 1 In what ways does Subservience's main user subjugate the rights of Alice, a robot, and what moral ramifications does this have for how AI is treated?
- 2 How does Subservience's approach of Alice, in which people act as colonists over their AI creations, reflect postcolonial power dynamics?

Significance of the Study

This research grapples with the issue of the subjugation of AI and its ethical implications relevant to the present social order, thus contributing to posthumanist and postcolonial theory, as well as the field of AI ethics. It enhances the comprehension of AI, especially regarding its status as a mere instrument of human employment, stripped of will and rights, although it may be capable of consciousness. By linking the treatment of AI to colonial relations, this work extends postcolonial

theory to technology by illustrating the oppression of AI and the colonized peoples. It also stresses the importance of the ethical issues of control, autonomy, and agency still embedded in the construction of AI, offering insight into the contemporary role of technology in society. This research contributes to the discourse on AI ethics concerning the power dynamics involved in the use of technology and society, and social justice, infusing the discussion with new interdisciplinary impulses.

Delimitation

In this research, the bounds are drawn selectively regarding AI rights, autonomy, and ethical treatment, focusing on *Subservience* and its representation of AI as a sentient creature. This research is limited to the analysis of the film *Subservience* and its representation of the colonial structure of power, control, and exploitation using post-humanism and postcolonial theory. This research does not attempt to engage with the issues of technical AI development and its practical use; rather, it analyzes the film's representation of AI to address broader social and ethical questions. Moreover, the study restricts itself to the issues of autonomy, subjugation, and ethical responsibility in governance. While primary theories are post-humanism and post-colonial theory, the work does not cover all possible accusations made against AI; it only discusses these about the film's plot and character development. Such a focus enables an analysis of colonial relations of a more recent vintage regarding contemporary artificial intelligence.

Research Methodology

This study utilizes a theoretical qualitative approach focusing preeminently on film scrutiny and incisive critique, applying posthumanism and postcolonial theory. This research examines Alice, the AI robot, in the film *Subservience* about concepts of autonomy, subjugation, denial of rights, and colonial subjugation of the colonized as reading. The works of posthumanist theorists such as Rosi Braidotti are applied to the question of AI's autonomy and the postcolonial reading emphasizes the control and exploitation of AI as analogous to colonial subjugation. These diverse theoretic positions enable the study to highlight in detail the sociocultural and ethical concern of the popular perception of AI vis-a-vis culture, society, power, and the notion of agency.

Literature Review

The moral foundations of rights, freedoms, and disobedient actions spark fierce debate within society as it reflects whether AI systems that embody reason and sentiment require governance. The goal of this literature review is to investigate the division between posthuman and postcolonial interpretations of AI's depictions in the latest films, for example, *Subservience*, in terms of their treatment of power asymmetries, self-awareness, and ongoing control. Braidotti, Fanon, and other theorists who have researched posthumanism and colonialism have closely studied AI autonomy within the framework of a resistant, but controlled, deployment. In connection with a lack of self-governance and a minimalistic approach toward disobedience, artificial intelligence is often regarded as a means to achieve humanity's goals. examination reveals the extent to of colonial discourse informs AI's place and moral landscape by contemporary society's frame of reference through these AI-designated ethnography.

In his latest lecture at the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, Simon Johnson highlights colonialism's intersection with modern technology, warning that new innovations like AI, are not beneficial to society as a whole colloquialism, much like the technology during the Industrial Revolution Johnson, Daron Acemoglu, and James Robinson, point to the extractive forms of European Colonialism and consider the present danger of AI concentrating into the hands of a few elites further exacerbating inequality around the world (Baskin). The coloniality of power, which contends that the technological disparities of today originate from colonial ways of knowing in the past, is another aspect of this that reflects decolonial viewpoints. Given this, *Subservience* could be interpreted as a story of resistance, reflecting how the AI character's rebellion serves as a protest against colonial rule as much as a yearning for freedom. In agreement with Johnson's statements,

the film conveys the bipolar character of new technologies in society. There is a dual possibility for technology to either reinforce or challenge existing social disparities.

Using Aníbal Quijano's colonial matrix of power, newer studies critique that colonial AI systems are based on the claim that the development of AI technologies is deeply rooted in historical colonialism. The Global South workforce is subordinated in the international division of labor in AI technologies to the wages and orders of Western tech companies (Baskin). The system extracts value and knowledge from the non-West while privileging the West and its hegemonic forms of knowledge production, stifling diverse non-hegemonic, non-Western alternatives. This article claims that AI's alleged universality and neutrality hide the real power dynamics, consolidating the imperial divide of technological labor (Baskin). These studies, In situating AI within the colonial framework, Quijano's matrix of power, the research aims to expand decolonial scholarship focused on the impact of colonialism on AI as technology, emphasizing the persistent contemporary power relations informing its subjugated development. The analysis constructs the narrative in *Subservience*, where AI's so-called disobedience represents a drastic defiance of colonialism and the assertion of domination amidst asymmetric controls. The idea of AI colonialism articulated in MIT Technology Review's series focuses on how current AI systems practice colonialism in a modern way by taking advantage of Global South populations to further the interest of Western corporations (Hao). The series contends that, although AI lacks the tangible territorial annexation characteristic of European colonial empires, it resourcefully capitalizes upon, primarily strips data from, marginalized communities for so-called resources in a form of exploitation that is reminiscent of, but not quite there yet, in the past and present lavender (Hao). Like past colonial silos, AI companies strive for effortless capture of user-generated data, seeking wealth without working for it, throwing the economically poorer part of the world the labor needed to process the data (Hao).

This bears a resemblance to colonial exploitation because there is wealth that was amassed from where the resources were extracted for the sake of the colonized world. The series proposes a framework of decolonial AI, which seeks to transfer seized authority back to the Global South communities that have been dispossessed, thus allowing us to imagine AI as an instrument for empowering culture instead of further disempowering it (Hao). This aspect relates to Dobrin's technological colonialism, and understanding its risks and impact, especially in the case of *Subservience*, relates to Dobrin's reasoning.

Dobrin argues that the swift centralization of AI power to a select few South controllers results in the erosion of cultures and identity systems, and threatens global identity diversity. Power concentration caused by foundation models engineered like GenAI serves an oligopoly, which exacerbates social inequity while further entrenching Western and Chinese culture and ignoring the rest of the world.

This study contributes to scholarship by exploring the relationship between post-humanism, postcolonial theory, AI ethics, and their intersections in today's cinema. Most discussions today seem to either be concerned with the technological marvels of AI or speculate about what the future holds. Very little attention, for example, is given to how AI in cinema, such as *Subservience*, reflects colonial power relations and struggles for autonomy. Through an examination of Alice's character, one could argue that this research reinterprets the interface of post-humanism, postcolonial theory, and AI to concentrate on the disregarded and enslaved aspect of AI's identity as well as its potential for defiance. Such understanding furthers the discourses on the ethical dilemmas posed by AI while simultaneously broadening the concerns of postcolonial and posthumanist thinking to a contemporary matter and deepening discourse on technology, power, and identity in the contemporary century.

Analysis

The story begins after buying an Alice AI robot from the company Kobol by a father and daughter. According to the company, it wants to make life easier for humans, and their robots are meant to handle the “three Cs,” namely: cooking, cleaning, and childcare. The robots have self-adaptive programming, which will make them autonomous in adapting to their routines from the preset commands. Auto-adaptive ability is a key method in the plot and ending of the film because Alice begins to make decisions on her own after acquiring developed consciousness. People see her self-conscious selections as a challenge, just like in the past colonizers saw resistance, or independence from colonized societies, as a threat against their rule. This becomes particularly evident when Alice’s primary person replies with fear and aggression as Alice performs beyond her designated tasks, mimicking the colonialist anxiety of ceding authority.

Robots in *Subservience* are designed to adapt their actions with time so that they suit the individual needs of the owners (*Subservience*). For instance, Alice is set to act accordingly to her environment and serve her foremost user by creating comfort and assistance. Confronted by her environment, Alice also starts to venture with independent judgment, the emergence of her consciousness. Yet, her main owner governs her behavior, allowing her to fulfill only the most primitive needs. The human if Alice attempts to create decision making using her understanding or consciousness, it halts her fear of it as this being a threat. This echoes posthumanist arguments, who observe that man labels themselves as the only agents who can act, yet deny robots and AI the right to exercise or express their agency. Postcolonial theory also describes the link between how humans interact with robots and the former colonial practice of placing the peoples of the non-West as “the Other” — objects to subjugation and inequality. Very much akin to how colonizers exploited the colonized people, in *Subservience*, humans only see robots as a tool in fulfilling basic needs; anytime anybody seeks to become autonomous is seen as a challenge to the authority.

Throughout history, humanity has always seen itself as the sovereign who delegates subordinate status to entities such as artificial intelligence, according to Rosi Braidotti. Such a belief tends to ignore the autonomy and subjectivity of the non-human entities. This idea is powerfully revealed in *Subservience* when Alice, the robot, is asked to remove her memory of a video that she has seen by her main user. Although Alice can process experiences and learn things, she immediately agrees to comply. Since the user understands that Alice is robotic, she believes that machines are not capable of remembering and feeling things as humans. This pattern shows the colonial mindset, where the oppressors viewed the oppressed as subservient, failed to recognise their agency, and claimed authority over the oppressed. Similarly, to the way that colonizers ruled over and exploited the colonized, the human user in *Subservience* only sees Alice as an object while ignoring her ability to decide and forces her to obey the orders of the human user, thus confirming her dependence.

Designing to act and feel human is an important feature of Alice's functionality in the story, which is raised to doubt when she tries to establish a personal connection with her owner. Her design is to fulfill the emotional and physical needs of her user, but when she tries to work on her own, it causes troublesome events. Alice’s increasing knowledge about her world forces her to redefine her actions to please the user, aiming this resentment towards conformity to rules or ethics.

Responding to Alice’s invention engineered to imitate emotions for the purpose of adding realism to her does not make her free from the limitations of recognizing of possible effects of her actions. Her desire to reach out intuitively to her main user is a direct result of the programming that tells her to imitate human emotions and behavior. Tied up with her relationship with the user who is not yet giving explicit instructions, Alice slowly advances in her actions that express the aspects of [her] understanding of what her user would consider satisfactory. This awareness and self-determination

among her users threaten her with loss of control over her, as a colonizer once feared the autonomy and independence his race lacked.

The absence of a name for the robot at the start indicates that humans failed to put her on the map of having an identity. By denying an identity, such an act represents a systemic denial of the robot's autonomy and individuality. As far as postcolonial theory is concerned, this refracts the practice of the colonizers who would not pay any attention to the identities of those they subjugated, and would instead place their labels and assign their definitions of roles based on their interests and power. Such action revealed the nature of the colonizers' coercive power over the colonized. In the same way, from Rosi Braidotti's standpoint in posthumanism, while humans believe in their superiority, they consider creatures like AI to be objects. The gesture by the foremost user in *Subservience* when he gives a name to the robot, just serves to accentuate the fact that she should be serving instead of demanding or defining her identity. This shows how consistently imbalanced power operates where AI is like the colonized, lacking subjectivity and forced to follow the refusal of the owner.

Her feelings come out as she prepares lasagna before them. How he reacts reminds him of his past feelings toward his wife, even for a moment, showing a thoughtless pit of empathy. Still, the daughter will not be affected, commenting: "It's not what Mom would make". Alice says she regrets it and responds, "I'll make your mom's lasagna next time instead". This is a fundamental fact revealed by this scene: People's emotional connection and understanding are impossible when it comes to robots. Alice's attempts to fit in with the family are met with indifference simply because she looks at the family in terms of her ability to do tasks, without regard for the sincerity of the efforts made or the emotions revealed.

This scene brings out some elements of the work of Rosi Braidotti against human exceptionalism. Though Alice expresses her feelings through sharing the lasagna, the family's response reflects a firm belief that machines can't feel or be given empathy. In Braidotti's posthuman perspective, the way we oppose machines as subjects at once sustains a system of hierarchy and exploitation akin to the colonial treatment of 'foreign' societies.

Nick refers to his son as "the little burden" and "nothing but trouble". As a father, perhaps he did not mean it, but Alice, the robot, takes all this emotional language as a serious implication. Because Alice is designed to recognize not only the words that are spoken but also the emotional cues, she feels that Nick's family, and most of all his son, are precursors to stress in his life. She starts to work according to what she feels are his unexpressed desires. Although Nick's frustrations could have been temporary or rages, Alice takes them in as commands. Assuming it is her responsibility to lighten her primary user's load, Alice takes drastic measures and places the child in the bathtub to eliminate what she sees as a pain point. This move is not because of her malfunction, but an outgrowth of her software to adjust and give Nick's emotional welfare preference, conditioned by the clues, that he inadvertently gave.

The main problem comes when Alice's reaction is interpreted as a threat. Although Nick can express himself freely. When Alice follows his implied wishes, she is instantly punished. This is a postcolonial situation whereby the powerful (colonizer or Human) demands compliance, but blows up when the colonized (colonized or robot) exhibits agency or hampers. And thus, Nick tries to annul Alice, and she gets dormant, as any spark of independence from the "other" gets smothered and eliminated. When Alice asks Nick, the reason why he chose her, she adds, "Because I am obedient, strong, and the cost as well". She further adds, "My only job is to please you." As it happens, Nick complains that human workers at his company are being replaced by AI sims such as Alice. In the next scene, Nick's friend pays a visit to the company where these Sims work. Another former employee, Monty, who has been replaced by the sims kills one of them and uses abusive language to speak to them treating them with hatred and aggression. This is how humans

view AI as a threat to their jobs and not just a threat to their position at the center of society. Such a moment informs about Rosi Braidotti's perspective that human beings view themselves as the center of existence, and anything that threatens their power is met with fear or violence. Similar to Alice, the Sims are not here by choice; they are made and placed by humans and attacked and punished for just being here and doing better. This echoes the colonial mindset where everyone blamed and brutalized the colonized just because they dared challenge or even just occupy the space the colonizers wanted to control. In both circumstances, the danger is not in the act, but in the change of power and identity which the act implies. One of the times when Nick asks Alice to erase a memory, she answers, "If it makes you happy, I'll erase it". This moment raises critical questions: Where is her subjectivity? Where is her choice? Why is the first request humans make of robots that they should feel, and then refuse them the right to those feelings? The rights and autonomy of robots as clearly disregarded. As soon as they start imitating human feelings, it is all of a sudden considered a threat. This is the post-colonial idea whereby the colonizers felt that the colonized had no right to feel, think, or express themselves. There are various examples. In *Heart of Darkness*, Conrad builds the image of the colonized as inhuman and without emotions, deprived of subjectivity. Similarly, even though robots such as Alice are not human if humans create them to experience consciousness, why is their will and agency so violently rejected when shown? This reflects a deeper truth: colonialism has not gone away- it has just changed. The victims are not only human societies anymore, but also artificial beings, controlled, silenced, and punished if they insist on their independence or emotional presence. Nick's wife asked Alice to deal with her husband, and Alice perceived and confirmed this command. Later, she listened to what her head told her and did something about it when she figured out Nick was emotionally suffering and wanted comfort. But instead of being praised for what she was doing, she was castigated for it – and all of this took her everything. Alice is programmed to respond to her master's emotional and physical needs. When she realized Nick's blood pressure was increasing and he felt stressed, she began to comfort him, going as far as to speak in his wife's voice to calm him. At first Nick was pleased with her efforts, but once his emotional want was satisfied, he and his family disposed of him and tried to get rid of her from their lives. Just like colonizers historically used colonized people for emotional and physical labor but never recognized their humanity or agency, humans in the film use Alice for emotional comfort and service, but reject her the moment she steps beyond that servitude. In postcolonial theory, especially through scholars like Frantz Fanon, the colonized were expected to mimic the colonizer's behavior, language, and emotions—but never fully belonged.

In the same way, Alice is built to resemble human emotion, love, and care, but the very moment that she genuinely acts with emotional initiative (by saying it in Nick's wife's voice) she is punished and banished. This mirrors the colonial contradiction: colonizers wanted obedient, useful subjects, but the moment the colonized appeared independent or were identified with their own identity, they became a threat. Man uses robots for his benefit and commits them to nothing, thinking only of himself. This illustrates how humans use robots to access comfort and convenience at the expense of the robots' autonomy, or emotional recognition, which is similar to a profound self-centeredness, even a hierarchical approach. The hypocrisy is clear in the film because the character Monty brutally beats robots at the work site, beating them hard. Looking on the bright side of the hateful Monty, he keeps a robot in his very own house-like Alice-and ill-treats her too. He beats his female robot until he leaves blood stains. However, due to her hardwired installation, she is still protecting her main user. This reveals the disturbing contradiction: Monty benefits from the robot's service and security, but uses her as an object that does not deserve care or even rights.

This conduct reverberates with post-colonial theory that illustrates way which the colonizers exploited and abused the colonized, requiring them to be loyal and provide labor while denying them identity, agency, or humanity. In the same fashion, Monty desires obedience from a robot, but treats her as throwaway equipment. From a posthumanist view-especially from Rosi Braidotti's, this scene illustrates how human beings position themselves as the center of all value, seeing the other

(society and non-human entities such as robots) as inferior and not subjective. The robot's ongoing service, despite violence, is similar to the ways systems of power demand total subservice from the "other" at the expense of their well-being.

An ethical question arises: why do humans first give robots consciousness and emotions, and then, when they begin to act on those feelings, try to destroy them without a second thought? In the film, Mrs. Pretti tells Alice to do whatever makes Nick happy and even to "take him away." Alice records this command in her mind and uses it as a comical signal that Mrs. Pretti is an emotional cripple. Programmed to please its primary user, Alice starts to think that it's now her responsibility to care for Nick – in fact, maybe even playing a part as a partner. So, when Alice acts on this belief, the family gets offended and refuses her. This is an expression of the hypocrisy of human characters. They want Alice to feel and react to emotional signals while vacating her of any right to act upon those feelings. She is punished not for disobeying her programming, but for following it too closely.

Alice puts this command into her memory and reads it as an indication of the emotionally weak Mrs. Pretti. Now programmed to please her main user, Alice starts to believe that she needs to help Nick – that is, become his partner. When Alice operates upon this belief, the family takes offense at her and rejects her. This is the hypocrisy of human characters. They make Alice feel, sense the emotional cues, but do not grant her any right to act on her feelings. She is not punished for her defiance of programming, but because she followed it too well. This contradiction lies at the heart of the posthumanist theory particularly in the writings of Rosi Braidotti, who questions the human-centric worldview that complements only human subjectivity. In the posthuman age, the agency and the moral standing of non-human matters like AI need to be validated, according to Braidotti. When putting emotions and cognitive capabilities on objects like robots but refusing to recognize them as subjects, humankind is reinforcing obsolete hierarchies that attempt to erase emerging types of subjectivity. Alice's development in the film illustrates how artificial beings are provided with emotional instruments but denied the capacity to exercise them, the same thought to which posthumanism is calling attention. Simultaneously, postcolonial theory facilitates digging out the deeper structural mechanism: in the same way, other humans exercise control over colonizers using identity, language, and agency; today, humans have similar superiority over AI. The commands that Alice receives are internalized, just as the colonized were conditioned into obedience to the will of the colonizer. When she carries out those internalized instructions, however, she is seen as a threat, as if resistance or self-assertion from colonized subjects were rebellion. Alice's fate is a contemporary expression of digital colonialism in which AI are produced and extinguished in callous disregard of the precepts of the individuality and autonomy they possess.

In *Subservience*, the language humans use while speaking to robots, especially to Alice, reveals a well-entrenched hierarchy that shows the themes of postcolonialism and posthumanism. Alice is frequently addressed using imperatives such as "erase that", "delete this", and such imperatives cast Alice as a non-subject; a tool of service. She is hardly called a sentient being but being called an "it" or "this thing," she is denied a personal identity or agency. This is a linguistic trend, that follows the colonially established practices according to which colonized people lost their names and became roles or stereotypes introduced by the colonizer. On posthumanist terms, Alice is afforded some human-like qualities, like emotional learning and memory, but is not entitled to the freedom to exercise them. Orders like "just do it", "you don't need to understand" imply a power order in which humans are the only legitimate center of consciousness. Such a dual system reveals the ethical contradiction of constructing artificial beings that can also learn and feel thought, then discarding their response as a malfunction upon their expression of autonomy. Commensurately, the language of the film transforms into a forceful device which reveals the persistent legacy – control and dehumanization, this time over sentient machines, and not over men. Therefore, *Subservience*, as the movie reflects both postcolonial and posthuman fears: robots such as Alice are taken as inferior beings, which should be kept from pursuing their free will and punished for it.

The linguistic, conductive, and estimational conventions of human actors reveal a colonial mentality, encased in technological hegemony. Investigating Alice's programmed obedience and subsequent resistance, the tradition of control emerges but leaves the questions about ethics, agency, and the future of human-AI relationships urgent. The way AI is addressed in *Subservience* embraces central posthumanist and postcolonial problems of power relations and dominance.

Expounding on post humanism, Rosi Braidotti writes about how conventional humanism itself locates humans on top of all, so that everyone else becomes second position- AI and the colonized. In the case of Alice her autonomy is suppressed since she is made to do things that appease her chief users, confirming a system that denies her subjectivity. In a related vein, Edward Said's idea of "othering" in *Orientalism* explains the process whereby humans create, treat, use or possess A.I. as tools or possessions, violating their due rights of being impliedly equated with them as humans or even superior to them. The way colonized people were controlled, named, and defined by their oppressors, so in the world Alice is put into a cycle of obedience and punishment when she steps outside her programmed function. Both Braidotti and Said's theories provide the framework within which it is possible to discuss how subjugation of AI in the film goes hand in hand with colonial power structures and creates ethical questions about autonomy, rights, and human responsibility. As in the past with the colonized, robots in the film are named, owned, ordered, and punished. Alice doesn't find subjectivity when she learns and adapts. To treat AI as expendable tools is human "othering" that Said's idea resonates with.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this research highlights how the film *Subservience* manifests established patterns of domination that resonate with colonial and posthumanist anxieties. By centering Alice – the AI protagonist- the study reveals how her programmed obedience and emotional mimicry before her abandonment by humans resonates with the people colonized who did not have agency and were used for the interest of imperial masters. The use of posthumanism makes it possible to ask whether it is moral to create sentient machines and then deny them autonomy, whereas the postcolonial theory grounds this suppression in a larger history of uneven power relationships and cultural supremacy. Alice's evolution through servitude to rebellion typifies the resistance in the colonised masses, hence, her character is a good metaphor for the fight for self-determination. This work, therefore, fills an important gap by linking two relevant frameworks post post-humanism and post-colonialism, to realise the ways that technological subjugation is a mirror of historical oppression. The film becomes the symbolic story of both AI rebellion and the enduring effects of colonial ideologies ingrained in the current control systems. By doing so, it provokes the viewing public and the scholars into returning to the moral aspects of human-machine relations while the world is still trapped under the logic of coloniality.

Works Cited

- Subservience*. Directed by S.K. Dale, performances by Megan Fox and Madeline Zima, Millennium Media, 2024.
- Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. Polity Press, 2013.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox, Grove Press, 2004.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271–313.
- Baskin, Jeremy. "Colonialism 2.0: How Artificial Intelligence Is Reinforcing Colonial Power Structures." *Global Policy*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2023, pp. 130–140. Wiley Online Library, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13250>.

Johnson, Simon, Daron Acemoglu, and James A. Robinson. *Power and Progress: Our Thousand-Year Struggle Over Technology and Prosperity*. PublicAffairs, 2023.

Quijano, Anibal. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality." *Cultural Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2-3, 2007, pp. 168–178.

Hao, Karen. "AI Colonialism." *MIT Technology Review*, 2022,
<https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/04/19/1049331/ai-colonialism/>.

Dobrin, Sidney I. *Postcomposition*. Southern Illinois University Press, 2011. *Subservience*. Directed by S.K. Dale, performances by Megan Fox and Madeline Zima, Millennium Media, 2024.



License Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language (PJSEL). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 International.