

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND RATIONALITY OF THE HUMAN PERSON

Izuchukwu kizito Okoli*

Abstract

The debate on the rationality of the human person and its challenging artificial intelligence has taken the centre stage in recent times. Philosophical Anthropology which captures the science of man, his consciousness, destiny and origin, appears to be handicapped in explaining *strictu sensu*, the role of machines in cognitive processes. While human intelligence seeks to adapt to new system and environment by utilizing both self-consciousness and cognition, artificial intelligence on another hand aims to create machines that can solely behave humanly and perform human-like actions. Considering the analytic method, the thrust of this research therefore is to compare in details, the relationship and parallel lines between human and machine intelligence, the problem that surrounds the both and the way forward for their existential continuity. It intends to establish the findings that it was the human rationality that paved way for artificial intelligence therefore, it is certainly limited in knowledge of all things but instead, it can only perform an assigned role and in essence, never a challenge to its maker. The study will be of great importance to all interested in the human project and will afford an insight as well as enhance fundamental knowledge of artificial intelligence.

Keywords: Human, Artificial Intelligence, Consciousness, Knowledge, Existentialism.

Introduction

The study of the human person as the centre of existence, the fulcrum and focal point of all things has since the wisdom of the old Philosophers notable in St Augustine of Hippo, Max Scheller, Gehlen and other important figures, returned serious concerns to this contemporary dispensation. It appears to be a research that should be done continually since man is a being that is capable of evolving. Philosophical Anthropology maintains its ground as the discipline that deals with the questions on the nature of Man, his identity and his place in the universe. It helps humans to understand themselves better through the filter and lens of Philosophical reflection. Above all, it seeks to attempt all empirical investigations on the natural and scientific nature of Man with utmost effort to portray Man as not just creatures of their environment but creators of their own values, customs and all things that promote their existential importance.

For Michel De Montaigne in his complete essays titled, *The human beings in process*, human capacities are not generally specified or unraveled but emerge within processes of ontogenetic development and it appears that the circumstances of this development are continually shaped through the human activities. Whether this significantly implies that a human person can be anything it pleases it to be or whether it appears that the

human person can be created in another existential format, calls for serious Philosophical concerns and reflection. Hence, It suffices to say that man is not all that he is, he maybe also everything that multiplies himself to be. For Maria Teresa therefore, human beings have always constructed images of themselves out of the need to know their nature and give a sense to their existence. Looking at this, the thrust of this paper resurfaces in a much more pragmatic question: could those scientific images in machines created by man himself become threat to his existential significance? Or more succinctly queried, can Machine intelligence outpace the human intelligence that made its creation possible?

In the 20th century, the need was felt to reconsider and understand the human being in its entirety; synthesizing, integrating and harmonizing the results of the scientific investigations in order to recompose in a unity, the multiple aspects investigated and thus achieve a corresponding global image. The picture of the human that has always been brought to study and matched to that of AI is that which is focused on the brain but this is simply discussing the human person as a part to the whole. Since the Advent of this inquiry, philosophical anthropology cum metaphysics has faced more queries and problematic stands on the nature of human person and it wishes to provide defense on the critical and methodological functions of Man. Taking cognizance of the fact that the human person is a composite of biological, spiritual, social, political, religious, economic and linguistic functions. It is confronted with questions like why do people differ in beliefs and behaviors? What is the meaning and purpose of life? Can man be subjected to a Systematic and Scientific enquiry? And to ask the least, why is artificial intelligence almost championing the course of existential rationality? What should really be there: Man or Artificial intelligent machines? This question and assumptions like others have triggered many to use their philosophical lens on providing answers as to whether the above as it glares on the face is solely the interest of Philosophical anthropology to study. As though the issues on grounds are not enough, Man extended his imagery and duplicated its functions in AI which renewed more fundamental questions for the discipline on the comparison of the rationality of human person and that of AI. Many at this point would suggest that we shift our focus from Philosophical Anthropology to Philosophy of technology to answer this technical questions as they come up but the AI was made by man and objectively, it worries the universal man of the outcome and the future therefore it only becomes more problematic to set a side that which poses a threat to man with the intention of analyzing the issue from a tech perspective. Anthropology here maintains its relevance as it sits at the hem of human and artificial intelligence. This opens more vistas of learning as the next sub-chapter seeks to look into it proper.

Rationality in Relation to Human and Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence has moved from the fiction of ones imagination to reality. These terms can be used for intelligent machines or computers that have similar features to that of the human being. This may by this century include ability to think, make decisions and of course ease productivity while we consider human intelligence to the individuals very unique, natural, biological composition of genetics, experience and maybe exposure to different environments. By this definition, it shows the importance

of keeping man above other things. Subjecting the two to critical inquiry is basically to reduce it to its fundamental basis of man versus machine. Kromann (2016) observed that there are of course notable differences between man and machine, as the human race experiences similar physical features whereas machine takes various shapes and forms.

We may at once, take a definition from Pavani Vadapalli who believes that AI as a branch of data science focuses on building smart machines capable of performing a wide range of tasks that usually require human intelligence. These intelligent machines are imbued with learning from experience and historical data, analysing to their surrounding environments and performing befitting actions while human intelligence refers to the human intellectual capacity that allows us to think, learn from different experiences, understand complex concepts; apply logic and reason, solve problems, recognize patterns, make decisions, inferences and communicate with fellow human beings in more comfortable and *dialogics* way. A closer look at this makes it clear that human intelligence is different and unique as it is backed by abstract emotions like passions and motivation that aids humans accomplish complex cognitive tasks. Although recently, there are enough instances to prove that AI can as well do so but human intelligence is not constricted to a particular pattern of cognition but can be changed depending on the problems that arise. Pavani Vadapalli moves a bit further to distinguish between AI and Human intelligence and in his own understanding, while human intelligence aims to adapt to new environment by utilizing a combination of different cognitive processes, artificial intelligence aims to build machines that can mimic human behaviour. In him we can simply understand that the human brain is analogous but machines are digital. AI aims to provide a style of work efficiency that will help solve problems at a blink while human intelligence would accustom to the mechanisms with a considerable amount of time. Another point of divergence is that humans use the brains computing power, memory and natural ability to think whereas AI-powered machines rely on data and specific instructions fed into the system. Human intelligence learns from various incidents and experiences of the past. They do better from mistakes from trials and error approach but in AI, machines can only act but cannot think at all.

At this point, a curious mind may entertain some posers which boggles the mind and calls for attention. What then is the relationship between Human and artificial intelligence? How accurate is AI compare to Humans? What is the difference between thinking rationally and acting rationally approach to AI? What are the similarities for both and which one is better? The more we research on this discourse, the more questions begs for itself, become endless and new frontiers opened. Of course, it is no longer a debate that recent advances in information and technology may subtly give room for the coordination and integration of humans and commensurate technology and this may be the reasons why attention is shifted to another angle for the development of an AI- machines that are Human-aware which is simply AI that can maintain team membership to cognitive possibilities and limitations of the human team. In collaboration, metaphors like alter, mutual understanding and buddy showcases similarities and equality to this machine teams. This enables them through

creation to be able to sense, react, understand, create, plan and even argue. To further expose this view, Kurzweil (2013) asserts that there is a strong trend by recent centuries toward a merger of human thinking with machine intelligence which the human species initially created. One cannot get any precise demarcation between humans and computers any longer because most conscious entities do not have a permanent or stable physical presence. He further asserts:

Most of the Machine-based intelligences which are derived from extended models of human intelligence claim to be human too and most of these intelligences are not tied to a specific computational processing unit. The number of software-based humans vastly exceeds those still using native neuron-cell-based computation.

Therefore, all these partners to human functionality must be endowed with low level of human consciousness to serve its purpose but this has raised some scholastic eyebrows and argument to the tune that most philosophers and psychologists would say that such machine awareness is simply electronic sensibility and not a focus one itself and how his action, thoughts or emotions do or do not align with his internal standards but from the points of Shelley Drivel, it appears AI partners cannot evaluate itself and manage its emotions if there is any at all.

J. E Hans et al (2021) opined that no matter how intelligent and autonomous AI agents become in certain aspects, at least for the foreseeable future, they will remain unconscious machines or special-purpose devices that support humans in specific, complex tasks. They are therefore digital and not biologically equipped with corresponding different operative cognitive qualities than biological creatures like human and other animals. In general, one can understand here that digital reasoning and problem-solving agents can only compete but never represent superficially. Rida Nasir (2021) made a fantastic summary on the discourse. For her therefore, Human intelligence is based on a Systematic duality:

(a) perception of patterns (b) Rational and structural decisions. Both properties are distinct yet complementary to each other and run parallel in the decision-making process of humans. A machine learning (ML) based system also has two similar structures:(a) AI uses deep learning to interpret patterns in the input data to make the final decision. This behaviour is also similar to human perception intelligence (b) computer uses standard instructions on code or program to work out it's logic and rationale similar to human rational intelligence.

Recently, automation is the leading AI application which is fast spreading and penetrating in the industrial sector. World Economic Forum in 2018 released a report that by 2022, AI would displace 75 million jobs globally and create additional 133 million jobs. These sensibilities engineered some witty comments from global thinkers and economic influencers. We saw an eye-opening remark by Mark Zuckerberg,

C.E.O of *Facebook* who said that AI would surpass human capabilities in computer vision and speech recognition areas in the next five years. It is rather more worrisome to hear from Stephen Hawking's that AI could spell the end of humanity.

Ray Kurzweil (1992) in his outstanding book titled: *The Age of intelligent machines*, surveys the Philosophical, mathematical and technological roots of Artificial intelligence; stating that the advanced computer program could exhibit human-level intelligence. He argues that creation of humans through evolution can only suggest that humans should be able to build something more Intelligent than themselves. As though that was not enough, in his book: *How to create a mind; the secret of the Human thought revealed*, he describes a series of thought experiments which suggests to him that the brain contains a hierarchy of pattern recognizers. To this he opined that neocortex contains 300 million general pattern recognition circuits and argues that they are responsible for most aspects of human thought. Critiques like Raulersoj, Josh, Ridley Matt and De Silver Drew, first admired his impressed scholastic records saying that his thoughts brought lucid discussions and opened new vistas of learning in computing history however, the sub-title of the book, over promises the impossibility; it limited the human person to a part in a whole of what it should be. To them, the pattern of his recognition does not explain the depth and nuance of the mind. It did not capture elements like emotions and concrete imaginations therefore, his ideas might be right but not original of the human person. Our next sub-title becomes very important at this juncture to underscore these issues and provide a way forward because these remarks are thought-advancing and by implication shows that the human person will be outlived by AI machines.

Existing Fears and Possible Reflections

The positions of Mark, Kurzweil and Hawking's above, seem to have created conscious fears on humanity. It predicts the annihilation of man in the society or simply put, the end of his relevance but often times, people pay close attention to things they should not ordinarily. They entertain the issues that they should be far from. Bruno and Maria (2014), queried: when did reality stars become this invaluable and powerful? When did people's happiness determine by their amount of *Instagram* followers and *Facebook* likes? When exactly did we lose the existential sense and values? What is known from antiquity creation stages to be troubling man, seems not to be posing issues any more; the basic needs of man like food, clothing and shelter is no longer a cause for concern. If really humanity is following this trend of computation and scientific *datafication*, artificial intelligence and technologies, this is seemingly where the biggest fears lie and not even existential usurpation.

Looking at this, it appears that man lost the direction of his phobia; humanity is doubtful of its continuous relevance since it appears that AI is constantly releasing machines that's are capable of doing everything that humans do but in understanding the goal, there ought to be fear more in the humans misuse, paradigm shift of concentration and abuse of AI machine technologies. One may get worried over the kind of society that we will have when we shift values from what concerns us as humans to the happiness derive from what AI machines can do for us. However, Kromann (2016) asserts:

I do not fear a robot taking over *per se*. I do not believe they will even turn evil and destroy us. Instead, I fear we will simply destroy ourselves trying to reach a maximum level of a seemingly carefree and comfortable lifestyle.

Humans are existential beings who are actually participating in existence. Human beings need to reflect on what makes them and propagates their relevance. They need to care and develop themselves optimally by themselves. Human beings raise concerns on how AI machines are taking over but I think that the fear should be channelled to the fact that they have lost the conceived grip of reality trying to achieve some reasonable ease of life. We should think of and determine of a certain limitation to the employment and satisfaction technologies. This solely represents why Kromann (2016) opined that we have in our society today, many different actors with different agenda with different powers unintelligibly composing the digital space. He would prefer some transparency, originality and guidelines but who should be held responsible for that then?

Recurrent Issues and Way Forward

Perhaps, the greatest fear as highlighted before now is that AI will replace humans and outsmart them in few years to come. This phobia was worsened in the Philosophy of Ray who taught it wise to predict the handover of the intelligence baton to the AI by Human intelligence. Ray is confident that once a computer achieves a human level of intelligence which he believes it has, it will necessarily and immediately roar past it. For Leith and Colville (2016), AI is pragmatically the next big thing to see. By this, they are confident that the world is waiting for the takeover of AI machines which will be the biggest development since creation of this universe. Since the beginning, computers have significantly exceeded human mental capacities in that very ability to remember and process information. It is no longer a new thing that computers can remember billions or even trillions of information and facts perfectly well while humans are hard pressed to remember just a handful of phone numbers. A computer within a speed of light can quickly search a database with multiplicity of records and readily available at all times to share their knowledge bases. The combination of human-level intelligence in a machine with a computer's inherent superiority in the speed, accuracy, and sharing ability of its memory will be definitely be formidable.

Alan Turning who is known for his contributions and insights to the field of AI, invented and imagined the conceptualization of a machine that can be universal in nature; a computer with such an infinite memory tape can be *equiperated* with the human mind in his own believe but long since the 1950 he made such abstract mathematical propositions, we have not arrived there yet. Turning smartly replaced the all-encompassing question: can such machine think? With another: can machine simulate human thinking? But one may as well be quick to ask about the originality of thought enshrined in simulation. Applied artificial intelligence (AAI) has become possible today as is focused only on limited or restricted task. In the personal

conviction of Lucas, what the world see and what is already in use in this contemporary dispensation is AAI. The artificial general intelligence AGI which is foundationally intended to behave and perform everything same as a human including amongst all ability, display emotions and think critically, a complete sentient being able to perform at least the same range of cognitive abilities as human beings is for now out of reach. Maybe used by the data giant companies as Google and Microsoft but only in the secret.

The dialectics of understanding the obvious scientific and philosophical speculations of man versus machine would continue even in ages to come but the solution to the debate is simply a careful synthesis and scrutiny of the excesses of AI. This conclusively corresponds with the thoughts of Lamer (2013) who opined that:

There is certainly no spiritual or magical AI because one cannot annihilate the human actor behind the curtain. That very computer that performs the automatic translation certainly has no idea what it is actually doing.

For truth therefore, AI machines till tomorrow will remain important only if the human-creator or operator remains behind the veil still. Lucas therefore made a powerful conclusion that AI is not much further in development than what the human behind the curtain wants of it. Humans in his wisdom should not be afraid of robots taking over humanity; they simply do not have the brains to function independently and yet it seems too far away for him to even be sure that such will ever happen in a lifetime.

Furthermore, we may see also in the wisdom of Pavani Vadapalli, that although AI is highly advanced recently; now machines can learn from experience too and make decisions but AI cannot function optimally without relying on the innately human attributes like the human Intuition. There are some individuals who would argue that it is only unfair to debate on the relevance of the both stating that AI has helped with intelligent machines that can perform better than humans in most aspects of the work but a host of others begs to differ with the strong position that despite all this, AI powered machines are yet to go a very long way to match the human brains potentials. This gives birth to another fundamental question of what then does the future hold considering the fact that AI is still advancing in its skills?

Reasonably so, it suffices to say that this advancement is not an easy one. It requires high technological know-how and time which in itself cannot be possible without the human intervention or say the human behind the curtain. All of the sophisticated technologies rely solely on the intelligence of the human person to create them. Secondly, we may understand for sake of precision from an expert Pavani Vadapalli that AI totally depends upon the modifications of Man to introduce new features. The human person is the soul of AI Therefore, the age long debate on that which is more important is glaringly not necessary in the first instance. If we have something that cannot exist without another, it means that the capacity to take a decision on the

existence of the latter is at whims. Hence if it takes the human intelligence to make AI possible, it holds that humans can put a stop to that which is almost posing a threat to its essence, existence and relevance. The way to go therefore is that the human person whose wisdom is replicated in machines digitally should weigh and balance its agenda at all times to carefully understand when to start, when to stop, what to create and what not to do. The fear of AI from our study is simply summarized to be the fear of the excesses of man, the phobia of man's Intelligent Inhumanity to his own existence and self, the ontology of human engineering. There must be checks and balances of human AI imaginations and creations.

Conclusion

Scholars have credited the issues of this debate to be hanging around metaphysics and the Philosophy of informatics technology which explores more AI and its implications for knowledge but in all, Man is still at the centre of all study here. From the foregoing, there is no iota of doubt that AI is an invaluable tool in the industry for easy and fast work flow. It eases stress for humanity and it is a force to reckon with now and in the near future due to its high speed for task execution, operational skills and ability and of course, it's accuracy to significant and tedious jobs, improved medical imaging, new video communication technology to say the few. While it can master coding languages, behaviours and instructions well, it cannot possibly copy human natural endowments and thought processes. While Artificial intelligence strives to produce intelligible machines capable of performing human features and tasks, one may also think and ask; can such intelligence be sufficient largely in itself? If AI can only solve problems according to the provided interface, it then goes a long way to factor in the conclusion for Alexandrine Royer that it is lagging behind to competing with the human mind, consciousness and brain. Human intelligence is still very much in charge; masterminding which machine should stay or phase away or what are the basic features that should be removed or added. It continues to create different areas of stimulations and inputs that will be looked after in the AI and help in progressing the concept of machine learning.

Scientists have not succeeded in going through the metaphysics of the human thought processes and it is unlikely to think that they will create machines better than humans. This work is therefore not providing a complete and exquisite explanation of the better option in AI and human intelligence because I would rather argue that such distinction does not even exist in the first place and agree immediately with Lucas that the differences will become smaller and smaller and the duo will finally merge possibly until we achieve that very point of singularity.

To this, the future will at all times be controlled mainly by human abilities and can only be complemented by AI. If AI machines cannot comprehend the cause and effects concepts solely because they do not possess any sense, it still implies that humans hold the exclusive ability to understand such and augment that requisite knowledge and reasoning to that of AI. At this point, Royer may be right to suggest that Philosophical Anthropology can help as always to determine new avenues and

perspectives on how to expand the development of ethical Artificial intelligence and machine learning system. One who understands the efficiency of AI knows that it must be built with anthropology and hence, this research makes bold to rather suggest a course that reconciles the both which can be Philosophical Anthropology and Informatics.

***Izuchukwu kizito Okoli**

Department of Philosophy

Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

izk.okoli@unizik.edu.ng

References

- Alexandrine Royer, *The short Anthropological guide to the student of ethical AI*, maisi, 30-Aug-2022.
- Hans J. E et Al, *Humans-versus Artificial Intelligence*, front. Artif. intell, Doi-org/10.3389/frai.2021.622364
- Kurzweil Ray, *How to create a mind; the secret of human thought revealed*, Viking penguin press, 2013, p.79.
- Kurzweil Ray, 1992. *The age of Intelligent machines*, MIG press, United States, p. 104.
- Rida Nasir, 2021. *Human: a comparison of human perception with Artificial intelligence*, thinkml.ai/ai-vs-human-com
- Ridley Matt, *Why you should bet big on bionic brains*, the wall street journal, retrieved 2013-02-22.
- Rutschman. A, *Stephen Hawking: Artificial Intelligence apprehension and opportunities*, Information studies, 5(2), 19-22.
- Teresa Maria, *encyclopedia of life support systems*, Journal of Ethnology, Ethnography and cultural Anthropology, 30, August, 2022.
- Vadapalli Pavani, *AI vs Human Intelligence: Difference between AI and Human Intelligence*, upgrade.com/blog/ai-vs-human-intelligence/# 30, Aug, 2022
- Lukas Kromann, *Artificial Intelligence vs Human Intelligence*, (Man vs Machine), 2016, DOI: 10.131401RG.2.2.28050.35526.