HUMANUS DISCOURSE Vol. 4. NO 1. 2024
ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

An Expository Study of Philosophy Concerning the Potential Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Human Individuality

Ojo, Peter Abiodun
Department of Philosophy
Ladoke Akintola University of Technology
Ogbomoso, Oyo State
Nigeria

Abstract

The emergence and swift progress of artificial intelligence (AI) have raised significant queries about the conventional notion of human identity and individual distinctiveness. This abstract explores the ethical, intellectual, and sociological concerns that AI technologies raise as it digs into the nuances of this changing relationship. The idea of personhood is no longer exclusive to humans in a future where artificial intelligence (AI) systems are connecting people more and more. AI-driven creatures are challenging our basic assumptions about what it means to be a person as they become more advanced. The ethical aspect of AI's effects on human identity is one major worry. Authenticity and true human distinctiveness are called into doubt as AI systems get better at simulating human emotions, actions, and even creative thought processes. The thesis looks at the ways that AI technologies pose a challenge to our conceptions of human consciousness and uniqueness. It also looks at the moral conundrums that can arise from developing AI systems that mimic or even exceed human capabilities. In addition, the impact of AI on the concept of human personhood and its societal ramifications are examined. The integration of AI into several domains of society, such as healthcare, education, and employment, necessitates a reevaluation of established norms and principles. Ultimately, it aims to stimulate critical discourse and deliberate study of the transformative role AI plays in molding our sense of what it means to be human in an increasingly AI-infused world by analyzing the ethical, philosophical, and sociological components.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Personhood, Human Identity, Ethical implications, Societal Impact

Introduction

People are thought to be special and distinct from other living things. The basis for the uniqueness is the rationality of the human being. It means that every human being is a rational being with the capacity to act morally and religiously, make conscious decisions, and engage in conscious behavior. But technological progress has created a desire to build machines that mimic the structure and functions of the human brain, so that an observer could understand the actions of such a computer. This gave rise to the new discipline of cybernetics, whose main goal is to create artificial intelligence. Scientists have now made a stronger claim. It is asserted that a machine is real. "The Turing Machine," which is capable of displaying intellect beyond what man may ever be able to. They contend that man is nothing more than an extremely complex machine, easily predictable because the causes of his behaviors are known.

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

It follows that if machines are intelligent; they at the very least behave rationally. And in the event that machines are rational, what really separates a machine from a human being? It goes without saying that philosophy in the past has maintained that man has the exclusive right to reason. According to St. Augustine, a person's soul is spiritual since rationality can only exist in the human soul. Descartes maintains that although other species have souls, these souls simply exist as principles that give life, as souls are not spiritual or logical. Thus, the idea that only man is rational came to be accepted as true in philosophy. It is essential to investigate and reconsider the assertion that only humans possess reason in light of the development of cybernetics, the debate around artificial intelligence, and the existence of the Turing machine. Maybe this kind of reexamination is the only way we can truly see how special we are as humans.

A few academics and philosophers are even advocating and supporting the idea that artificial minds, like computers, and human minds are interchangeable. John Pallock is one such thinker. Pallock promotes the idea that "mental events are just physical events that can be perceived by our internal sense" in his articles "My brother, the machines." According to him, human awareness is a physical phenomenon and the human mind is something tangible. I submit that man and artificial intelligence are not the same thing. Without a question, they have improved our quality of life in every way. However, it is untrue that they would be seen as equal to or superior to humans in the present or the future. As Omoregbe correctly points out, "a work of art remains an imitation of nature regardless of its degree of sophistication." Since an artifact can never be as excellent or identical to the human mind, it can only ever be an imitation of the human mind (nature). It is a human invention. The purpose of this essay is to offer a philosophical defense of human intellect over artificial intelligence. However, the proponents of artificial intelligence attempted to downplay reason, a crucial aspect of humanity. Nevertheless, our goal will be to understand and defend the sanctity and meaning of human existence. Furthermore, a work addressing the very component of man that gives him prestige is obviously very pertinent in a world that he is gradually losing.

What is Artificial Intelligence (AI?)

Artificial Intelligence (AI) can be defined as computer systems or algorithms that mimic the cognitive processes and intelligence of humans. It includes a broad spectrum of technologies that let machines digest information, spot patterns, come to conclusions, and gain experience. AI systems are becoming more autonomous in their ability to carry out tasks like image recognition, problem solving, and natural language processing. Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming how we engage with technology with its wide range of applications in sectors such as healthcare, finance, transportation, and entertainment. Although it can improve productivity, automate procedures, and offer insights from large databases, it also brings up moral and societal concerns regarding prejudice, privacy, and the coexistence of humans and AI. My goal is to demonstrate how artificial intelligence, like computers, is limited in what it can accomplish. For example, it cannot think, reason, or be conscious. Because of this, artificial intelligence is debatable. Taking into account the moral or ethical matter and then the religious question is my main interest. Here, I

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

contend that there are some areas in which computers have no business being there at all. These are the sectors where these incursions constitute an assault on life itself, with irreparable consequences. These are settings where the suggestion is made to replace human functions involving respect, love, understanding, and interpersonal relationships with a computer system. This is the nature of Joseph Weizenbaum's criticism. He argues that,

> *We have embraced the machine metaphor as a description of ourselves and our institutions much too readily, that in this embrace we're in acute danger of yielding what is essentially human-our dignity our love, our trust, to ideas and artifacts that don't deserve it and that may destroy us.*[1]

He contends that we already live as slaves to our devices and that we devalue ourselves when we give up our independence. This devaluation has extremely negative effects for humanity. Weizenbaum appears to attribute the issues to people's devotion to machines, such as computers, violins, organs, and autos. With a tinge of arrogance, the computer operator now consults the machine rather than using it. Man's intellect and creativity are completely superfluous when reality is reduced to machines. It is noteworthy that J. Weizenbaum raised the ethical concern with Kenneth Colby's "counselor Machine," Eliza, or Doctor, in the first place. We have recently heard a great deal about the disruptive effects of computing machines on our social and economic institutions. In industries, computers mean automation, and automation is supposed to mean unemployment. Some countries with their investment in computers are plagued by unemployment for unskilled workers. Already, the computers have begun to displace workers tasks are simple and repetitive[2]. The less educated find that with each new generation of computers, they become less useful to society. It not only leaves them without jobs, but surrounds them with the sight and sound of prosperity, increasing their isolation and despair. While almost everyone around him is succeeding, he is failing, often for reasons that are a mystery to him[3].The shock of unemployment is so profound that it damages the victim is will to recover. Several instances are cited where unskilled workers in America have been deprived of the very means of their livelihood[4]. The variety of jobs formerly done only by humans that the machines can perform more rapidly, accurately and economically increases with each new generation of computers. If we extrapolate this trend, we are faced with the prospect of mass unemployment for all, but a handful of highly trained, highly intelligent professionals who will then be even more influential than they are at present.

The crux of the matter is that the degree of power man has gained through his science and technology must be matched by an equal degree of control. If this is not done, we will be faced with the problem that arises when a moral power falls into the hands of moral men. But today, this problem is central to our very survival as a species. Already, the computer is setting up industrial strife as

---

[1] McCorduck, P. 1940. *Machine Who Think.* San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Co. P. 308
[2] Nicklaieff, G. 1950. *Computers & Society.* New York: H. W. Wilson Co. P. 144

[3] Ibid
[4] Ibid

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

management desires it, while labour resists the effect of automation. Great masses of people will be unemployed and "the devil will surely find work for their idle hands". The gap between advanced and developing countries will widen the more this heightening international tension and global unrest. People will become demoralized when the personal identification and self-respect that work confers is suddenly withdrawn.

One prevailing theme in Nigeria's response to the issue of poverty is that the right to consume is correlated with one's role in producing. Through full employment, our society is trying to end poverty. By doing this, we attempt to validate an individual's entitlement to partake in the products of their labor. Whose fruit will be eaten when a machine kicks him out of his job? There is currently a perception that effectiveness serves as the primary motivator. As a result, it takes the place of all human thought. No matter how miserable the worker's condition, the productive machine shouldn't take his place. We advance technologically in a way that will ultimately destroy us directly or indirectly e.g. Nuclear weapons, Pesticides, various forms of environmental pollution and genetic and personality control. These might be used malevolently. Now, some philosophers have defined human person as a rational being. However, rationality according to Omoregbe implies morality, for one cannot be said to be a moral being, which is not a rational being. In other words, man is by nature, a moral being[5]. This implies that man is bound by moral obligations and laws to the extent that he is still a free and rational being. It also suggests that every regular person is accountable for his or her acts on a moral level. This essentially indicates that he is accountable for his deeds. He might receive recognition, condemnation, retribution, or rewards for his deeds. "Moral conceptions deal with dictating the proper treatment of specific beings. To ascribe moral personhood to an individual is to say that the individual has moral rights or that I (or we) have moral obligations to the individual.[6] consequently, human person is seeing as a free being because "being rational and moral implies that a person is free[7]. However, he has freedom of choice and of making decision.

Given what has been said about humans as moral beings, is it possible to conclude that a machine or computer is also a moral being? This raises ethical concerns about artificial intelligence. "No" is the obvious response to the query. Therefore, from a moral or ethical standpoint, equating man with a machine implies that since a machine is a moral being, it must obey moral laws or bear moral responsibility for its deeds. For example, can a machine that amputates a person's hand be brought to court to get the right ruling? Or can it go to jail for what it did? However, it should be assumed that the person engaging in this type of behavior—that is, bringing machines to court or locking them up—is not logical. since it is an impractical action. Machines are incapable of determining the morality of their actions, in contrast to humans who can be prosecuted for physically harming or even just insulting another person. Consequently,

[5] Omoregbe J. 1993. *Ethics. A Systematic and Historical Study.* Lagos: Joja Press Ltd. P.6

[6] Uduigwomen, A. F. 1998/99. "Concept of Personhood: Reconcilling Ontological and Moral Notions". In *The Nigerian Journal of Philosophy,* Vol. 17, Nos. 1 & 2. P. 24

[7] Ibid

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

Slucking said, "Machines have no ethical sentiments and no effective attitude. In no situation are machine expected to pass moral judgment"[8].

Furthermore, comparing a machine to a human would suggest that a machine is capable of free will and decision-making. But as far as we know, machines are programmed to know what to do and what not to do. This implies that while humans have free will, machines are not capable of making independent decisions or choices. For example, once a machine is designed to accomplish a certain task, it cannot be found doing anything else, provided it is operating properly. Any other action indicates a machine malfunction. Man is nonetheless, nevertheless, active, adaptable, and inventive. He is able to quickly and effortlessly adapt to various circumstances without experiencing any negative effects on his efficiency. Immanuel Kant, the most influential proponent of the moral notion of personhood considers person as "rational autonomous being whose nature means to an end"[9]. This is why he made the distinction between persons and non-persons when he argued that,

> *A person is a subject whose actions are capable of being imputed (i.e one who can act responsibly). Accordingly, moral personality is nothing but freedom of a rationality being under moral laws (whereas psychological personality is merely the capacity to be conscious of the identity of one's self in the various conditions of one's existence) … I, contrast, a thing is that which is not capable of any imputation (that is, of acting responsibly)[10].*

This Kantian argument implies that human beings have a moral dignity that cannot be acquired by anything else. They shouldn't be viewed like machines because machines aren't moral beings. The question that now needs to be asked is not whether or not we will have machines or computers, but rather, how can we use them in the most considerate and wise way possible given that they will undoubtedly exist? Lastly, a device known as Apache II is employed to decide when life should end. At the George Washington University Medical Center in Washinton, D. C., the doctor will make a decision regarding life termination only after consulting this computer"[11]. Apache II makes prediction of survival at least as accurately as the best doctors. According to Dr. Williams Knaus, the Director of Intensive Care Unit, George Washington University Medical Center:

> *Apache predicted that 20% of 850 critically ill patients in The unit would fail to survive, thirteen experienced doctors more Gloomy and predicted that 25% of the patients would die. The Patient's survival death rate was 21%[12].*

---

[8] OyeshileOlatunji A. *A Compendium of Philosophical and Political Quotation.* P. 146, No. 985.

[9] Uduigwomen A. I. *Ibid* P. 24

[10] Ibid

[11] Nowak, Rachael. "A Matter of life and Death". *New Scientist.* Washington D. C. P. 12

[12] Ibid

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

Now, the question is, "Would doctors have a moral obligation to follow Apache's recommendation if the machine's predictive ability turns out to be better than the doctor's? And would the majority of patients' wish to defer decision-making to a compassionate doctor be enough justification to reject Apache? Advocates of Apache's use contend that because it experiences no emotional stress, it is more effective than any doctor. It is merely immoral to consider entrusting a patient's destiny to a machine. The patient's death may be accelerated by learning of such a resignation, and others may be scared away from the hospital by the brutal way in which his prophecy was delivered. Now, the question is, "If the machine's predictive power proves to be superior to the doctor's, would clinicians have a moral duty to heed Apache's advice? And would it be sufficient to reject Apache on the grounds that most patients would want to leave the making of decisions to a caring physician? Proponents of using Apache claim that it is more successful than any doctor because it doesn't go through emotional stress. Just thinking about giving a machine control over a patient's fate is unethical. Hearing of such a resignation might hasten the patient's demise, and the severity of the hospital's delivery of his forecast might terrify others into staying away. The religious implications of artificial intelligence on our understanding of human individuals, or personhood, will now be the center of our attention.

Religious Implication

Understanding the role of the "whole man" in relation to God would be revealed by an intellectual investigation of the human condition. We hold that God is the creator of the earth, heavens, and everything in them. But because he possesses the ability to think, man is regarded as the greatest of everything that God has created. As a result, man created machines or artificial intelligence for his own use by using this reasoning ability. Some, on the other hand, chose to place this human-made machine on par with humans. It should be mentioned that some people have taken the extreme stance that machines are more powerful and superior to humans.

This has two implications: first, that God and man are equal in the creation of things since man is the greatest thing that God has ever created; second, that man is capable of creating things that are equal to himself, the greatest thing that God has ever created. As a result, the bold assertion that a computer is superior than a human being and stronger than both could lead to the second consequence. According to this viewpoint, man is capable of creating things that God is unable to make or that surpass the best things that God has ever produced. But this also demonstrates how little we value our creator and how we're attempting to put God and ourselves on an equal footing. However, it is undeniable that everything in heaven and on earth, whether acknowledged or not, originated from a higher power.

This is confirmed or suggested by the hierarchical structuralization of beings in various religions and metaphysics, which demonstrates the order of existence and supremacy of beings. This reality may help to explain why religious worship and sacrifice are necessary for man to turn to the Supreme Being in an effort to find fulfillment and happiness. This implies that, although artificial

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

intelligence (AI) refers to machines or computers that solely perform physical tasks even though they may appear to be mental tasks, humans are capable of combining physical and mental tasks. Consequently, given that man engages in both the physical and spiritual realms, it is also possible to infer from the above that he is superior to machines, In contrast, Artificial Intelligence engages in physical activities. According to several thinkers, a person is made up of a body and a soul, with the body representing the physical and the soul the spiritual. As a result, the soul forces him to engage with the spiritual world. However, Descartes sees man as mind, which has body by mere chance. As it could be seen in his metaphysics concerning human nature, that "although, man has a body, it is nevertheless not part of his nature as a thinking being"[13].This phrase implies that a person's mind, which is their spiritual component, rather than their body, which is their physical element, is what gives them the ability to think. Thus, we comprehend that a machine or computer is a collection of material components that lacks a spiritual core. Since thinking is a mental activity (thinking is an activity in the spiritual realm), we are unable to discuss about thinking machines. To do this (i.e. talk of thinking machine) would be illogical. This is why, distinguishing between mental and physical states, Jaegwon Kim argued that:

> *If a mental state is to identical with a physical state, the two must share all properties in common. But there is one property,* spatial localizability, that is not so shared; that is, physical states and *events are located in space, whereas mental events and states are not. Hence, mental events and states are different from physical ones*[14]

The Worth and Individuality of the Human Being

I have maintained that although some intelligent machines carry out some tasks that are like to those done by humans, these machines are nevertheless limited in what they can accomplish, and it is these limitations that distinguish humans from robots. It is these distinctions that set man apart. Therefore, it would be incorrect, as held by the Artificial Intelligentsias, to compare men to machines. This suggests that treating people like machines will cause them to lose their sense of dignity. Concerning the claims by workers in Artificial Intelligence and the impossible formalization of human behaviour, Jonathan Cohen notes that it is argued by scientists that there is nothing in the constitution, construction and behavior of the human being which is essentially impossible for science to duplicate or synthesise[15],However, it appears that some things are crucial and should never be applied to machines. Researchers in the field of artificial intelligence have attempted to construct computers using a model of the human brain. While it is true that there are some parallels between how electronic computers function and the human brain, I would like to make the following argument. However, the jobs that machines perform are of the most basic kind,

[13] Omoregbe, J. *Metaphysics Without Tears*. Pp. 38-39
[14] OyeshileOlatunji, A. *A Compendium of Philosophical and Political Quotation,* P. 144, No. 972

[15] Cohen, J. 1955. ": Can there be Artificial Mind?" in *Analysis. Vol. 16*

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

and their knowledge and skills remain quite restricted, including only a small portion of the vast human experience.

But one crucial aspect of these AI-related actions that is quite evident to us is that they were created at specific periods by identifiable individuals. All of the artificial intelligence that exists today is not created by machines. Men are the ones who start things. Because of this, Cohen observes that computer "life" is regimented and that it is unable to operate outside of its constraints or undertake new activities[16]. The argument being made is that intelligent machines cannot function on their own unless they have been designed by humans. Essentially, the only intellect that machines can display is that of their programmers. Their ideas do not come from them. It follows that the information or intelligence possessed by these machines is an extension of that of their creators or programmers. Mankind is distinguished from machines by another attribute: machines are limited to understanding only that which is intended for them. While it is feasible for intelligent machines to have predetermined goals, it is unlikely that they will be able to replicate the intelligence and desire that underpin so much of what humans think and do. At best, they can only replicate what is stored in their databases. Actually, since these robots are powered by energy, they don't need to be inquisitive about anything beyond what they already know.

Curiosity is one of the rarest human qualities that can be simulated into intelligent machines according to Morton Hunt[17]. According to him, “curiosity”, “restlessness” or the “creation of new goals” is the sole task of human being not amenable to computer. He also sees computers as passive systems whose goals and the strength of their drive to reach them are those given them by their designers[18], unlike humans. Consciousness is the most unique and irreducible quality of man which machines, however complex, are yet to possess[19].The awareness of the human mind and its identity, as well as the capacity to reflect on and analyze one's own ideas and respond to them, are all parts of consciousness. It goes beyond the mental internalization of the external world in symbolic forms. It is possible to program machines to have goals, but it is not possible to say that these goals are aware to the robots. It is impossible to say that such robots are living or conscious like human beings, even if they do make mistakes and fix them because their creators planned and programmed these error repairs into them. Moreover, humans possess the ability to adjust to their surroundings, both social and physical. Man's manner of life is influenced by his surroundings, particularly by his socio-cultural worldview. Language serves as a conduit for communicating these different worldviews. It is therefore absurd to simulate language in robots in order to enable them to converse, comprehend theater, and appreciate poetry, as both language and knowledge are byproducts of human civilization. Even while computers are capable of storing a greater

[16] Sincliar, J. 1983. “The Hardware of the brain” in *Physchology Today.* New York Free Press. P. 12

[17] Ibid
[18] Ibid
[19] *Ibid* P. 42

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

amount of data, it is impossible to say that they have a feeling of or experience with their own past, nor can they understand that the data they store in their memory is merely a reflection of something outside of themselves.

It is also worth noting that human beings are rational beings who make choices. The ability to make choices is human qualities which computers don't have. Man also has the freedom to make different choices among his thoughts[20].However, machines have limiting capabilities. In addition to the aforementioned special traits, humans are also capable of experiencing pain and pleasure, anxiety and hope, goodness and excitement, and loving and being loved. On the other hand, computers are indifferent to hope, fear, or admiration. According to Hunt, nothing about this reality is "perhaps computer writing music and poetry have been unimpressive because the computer itself was neither pleased nor displeased by its own product, as every creative artist is"[21].Although they have not proven successful, artificial intelligence researchers have been attempting to imitate some of these human characteristics in robots. It is important to acknowledge that Artificial Intelligence cannot provide us with the same level of knowledge about theater and poetry that human language can. Most notably, since speech acts are a type of intellectual action, computers cannot use language to affirm, inquire, or make commitments. As a result, it permits no intelligent behavior of any kind to be displayed by "intelligent machines."For example, they are unable to lie since lying implies the intention to deceive, and they are unable to attempt to avoid making mistakes because doing so implies attempting to follow certain goal-oriented guidelines. Because of this, intelligent machines cannot be "blamed" for mistakes they make. Instead, the responsibility is with their operators or users. Put differently, moral agents are not intelligent machines.

Defensible reasoning is not a skill that intelligent robots possess. Defensible reasoning is a kind of thinking or reasoning that is developed when someone has reasoned to a conclusion and then, through more reasoning, finds that the initial reasoning was incorrect and retracts it in favor of a new one. This kind of thinking is exhibited by humans since they possess the ability to perceive their own thought processes. However, since intelligent robots only have content that their designers have programmed into them, they are unable to sense their own thought processes. Also, intelligent systems such as "expert systems" are not capable of re – identification, the process which will enable them to know whether they have acquired enough knowledge in one area or not. This explains why they cannot detect whether any knowledge programmed into them is faulty or not. Human know when they have got enough knowledge and even examine the knowledge they have got. Moreover, if we grant that machines could be conscious, the question that follows is whether machine – knowledge could be equated with human knowledge, that is, whether Artificial Intelligent is the same as natural intelligence. In my own thinking, it is not possible to equate machine-knowledge with human knowledge because of the epistemological

[20] *Ibid* P. 50
[21] Weszenbaum, J. 1976. *Computer Power and Human Reason.* Sam Francisco: W. H. Freeman P. 338

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

limitations of artificial knowledge. Joseph Weizenbaum recognizes this and argues that:

> *It is not obvious that human knowledge is encodable in "information structures" however complex. A human may know, for example, just what kind of emotional impact touching another person's hand will have both on the other person and on himself. The acquisition of that knowledge is certainly not a function of the brain alone. It cannot be simply a process in which an information structure from some source in the world is transmitted to some destination in the brain. The knowledge involves is in part Kinesthetic; its acquisition involves having a hand, to say the very least*[22].

Stated differently, Weizenbaum asserts that certain knowledge is inherent to humans simply because of their physical makeup. In addition, there are human conscious and unconscious behaviors that cannot be explained or communicated by words. These activities include appreciating beautiful works of art, discussing morals, and expressing emotions such as love, grief, and wonder. It is not possible to train computers to express these "in-expressible" feelings using words because language cannot fully convey or capture these feelings. This implies that information, even that which on the surface seems to be transferable via language from one person to another, is not entirely transferable. It is believed that this is the case since a message's information content depends critically not only on the message itself but also on the recipient's expectations and level of background knowledge.

I have advocated and investigated the idea that there are fundamental qualities that distinguish humans from artificial intelligence, whether it is in the form of robots of any kind, and give them dignity. But before we wrap up this job, let's take a moment to consider or pose the question: What is the future of artificial intelligence in the modern era? We cannot adequately end our work without discussing this point.

The Future of Artificial Intelligence

About thirty-four years ago, engineers attempted to fully automate the typical manually operated desk calculator. This marked the beginning of the history of contemporary dignity computers. When using this machine by hand, the operator starts with numerical data and inserts it into a formula. The operator establishes a necessary flow of actions based on the formula. Ultimately, the operator gathers his result after carrying out the entire set of instructions. Because key punching and copying are laborious and slow processes, one could naturally assume that the computer could perform these tasks on its own. This was the underlying concept of the initial fully autonomous computers. Development did not stop here; the next project was to model a computer with

[22] Miller, G. 1956. *Psychology of Communication.* San Francisco: W. H. Freeman P. 101

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

a larger capacity for storing information. This is what we now call the Automatic Filling Machine Cabinet[23].

It seems that the new generation of machines will be modeled along the lines of which Miller calls "Public Utility"[24]. Just as we can plug our electrical appliances into the wall to draw power from a central station, so in the future, we shall be able to plug our Typewriters, computer systems and other soft wares into a Tele-system, and draw intelligence from a central computer. This is the kind of prospect Nicklaieff George anticipates:

> *Because of this technetronic ability of man to organize and retrieve data so quickly, some see as one possibility for the future, a word civilization possessing a computer network, the equivalent* of a 'global brain', one which knows all, re-calls all and tells all"[25]

Extremely optimistic experts who want to proclaim the entire planet computerized have the same point of view. Miller, Nicklaieff, and associates have obviously moved categories quickly. They have not acknowledged the clear distinction between what is factually and logically conceivable. A logical possibility, according to philosophy, is something that can be imagined. However, logical possibilities are constrained by physical factual possibilities. In theory, for example, there may be no reason why an elephant shouldn't have wings, and we don't all live as long as Methuselah. However, there can be significant physical restrictions. Mechanical, temporal, and spatial constraints having a universal Mechanical Intelligence may only remain in the domain of speculation. Engineers are already finding that there is an optimum, limit to the size of computing machines[26]. L, Mumfort point out:

> *Certain machines have already reached their limit of their development, for instance, the printing press, the water turbine, and even the Telephone system, the only gain is one of cheapness and universality[27].*

This implies that the physical world places restrictions on the advancement of science and technology, in contrast to the hopes of sanguine computer specialists. Lastly, not much has been accomplished in fields like the arts. Experts in computers envision poems written by computers, as well as drawings, paintings, and sculptures executed flawlessly by machinery. It might be best to hold off on passing judgment and keep an eye out for these relics in the near future.

[23] Ibid
[24] Nicklaieff, G. *Ibid* P. 142
[25] Scriven, M. 1953. "The Mechanical Concept of Mind". *Mind* Vol. 62. P. 12
[26] Mumfort, L. 1934. *Techniques and Civilization.*Routledge Publishers. P. 424.
[27] Miller, G. *Ibid.* P. 102

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

Conclusion

It is important to note right away that unless we have more knowledge about the brain and the principles guiding its functions, we cannot be certain that advancements in computer technology will elevate the status of those who pioneer artificial intelligence. As a matter of fact, many who have conducted genuine comparisons between the brain and computers are more impressed by the differences than the similarities. Because adding machines and filing cabinets are very simple technologies that we can comprehend because we invented them, one can construct a computer in a similar manner. When discussing the human brain, who's functioning is still completely unknown to science and technology, the situation is different. Until the general principles of the brain are understood, it is vain to talk of building computers based on them. Also, one of the things that that are imperative to our knowledge of what this essay is discussing is the fact that no matter how competent and efficient machine or computer may be in performing the human activities, no machine is capable of having feelings and emotions, as it is found in human beings[28]. People have a variety of ways to communicate their emotions, depending on the circumstances and their attitude. Because humans are social creatures who communicate verbally, they can interact with each other. However, is it possible for a society composed entirely of machines to function as a governing body and security apparatus while still maintaining the same level of consciousness, morality, and reason as humans?

Furthermore, it should be remembered that equating life with operation would imply that humans are nothing more than a collection of accidents because operations fall under the category of accident rather than substance. However, it is evident that man is a substance, and substance cannot be created by a series of accidents. Furthermore, as man endures, operations come and go and start and stop. Man must be something more than the things he performs. As we've seen, the artificial intelligentsia contends that machines can rule over any area of human cognition. They assumed that a machine was capable of thinking in the same ways as a psychiatrist conversing with a patient. They maintained that when a machine is well-programmed, it can anticipate outcomes more accurately than even the most skilled medical professionals. This step is incorrect philosophically because the brain's reach surpasses that of even the most sophisticated computer. Since these machines lack the fundamental ability to counsel or anticipate, it is ethically amoral.

The pertinent questions are ethical rather than mathematical or technological. Actually, the better question to ask is "should machines think?" rather than "can machines think?" We won't be able to change our plans for the future unless we respond to this query. Tools are more than just aids in human development; they mold who we are and how we perceive the world, having a surprising and profound effect on people's imaginations. Instead of trying to completely transform the world, computers should be utilized to improve already-existing

[28] Royce, J. E. 1961. "Philosophical Psychology" in *Man and His Nature.* New York: McGraw – Hill Books Co., inc. P. 258.

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me

ISSN 2787-0308 (ONLINE)

institutions like banking, government assistance, healthcare, education, and so on. Without computers, these systems would have crumbled under their own weight. As a result, humans and machines are not distinct species within the same genus. Based on this claim, I emphasize that computers have restrictions imposed by nature that prevent them from performing some jobs, particularly those that are intended only for humans.

In conclusion, our ethical and philosophical discourse places a great deal of weight on the ideas of human dignity and individuality. Respect and equitable treatment are required for each and every individual, since human dignity emphasizes their inherent value and rights. Ensuring the preservation of individual characteristics and qualities is contingent upon acknowledging and maintaining this dignity. All of us benefit from our societies' enrichment and sense of belonging when we embrace and celebrate the diversity of human individuality. It is more important than ever to defend these principles in an era of technological innovation and changing social norms, so that our ethical frameworks and human rights considerations continue to center around the dignity and uniqueness of the human person.

© humanusdiscourse@gmail.com , http://humanusdiscourse.website2.me