

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF KNOWLEDGE GENERATION ON AI-GENERATED KNOWLEDGE VS. HUMAN KNOWLEDGE

Simon Falama Gideon

Universidad Católica Argentina, Facultad de Teología Santa
María: Maestría y Licenciaturas: Especialización en Historia de
la Iglesia
Simonfalama7@gmail.com

Abstract

The advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly changing the production, manipulation, and deployment of knowledge in contemporary society. This article addresses the philosophical and practical distinctions between human knowledge and that generated by AI. While AI excels over human abilities in processing large volumes of data, recognizing patterns, and conducting predictive analysis, it falls short in the depth of consciousness, creativity, and ethical considerations involved in human thought. In comparative analysis, this paper discusses how AI-produced knowledge, as efficient and scalable, is limited by its dependence on past data and algorithmic bias. Contrarily, human knowledge, based on lived experience, intuition, and moral consideration, remains uniquely capable of critical reflection and interpretive depth. The study also discusses the social implications of rising AI influence, questioning whether excessive dependence on AI would undermine human creativity and ethical judgment. This paper proposes an interweaving of AI and human knowledge, strengthening human agency in AI applications to guarantee authenticity, creativity, and ethical responsibility in knowledge production.

Keywords: AI-generated knowledge, Human creativity, Ethical reasoning, Knowledge generation, Human-AI collaboration.

Introduction

With the arrival of digital technology, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is more and more deciding the way knowledge is generated, processed, and shared. AI-generated knowledge is data-created information that is created by data-driven algorithms, machine learning algorithms, and statistical patterns. It is not conscious and lacks subjective experience but relies on computational velocity to identify patterns and generate insights. It is rapid, accurate, and scalable, but without interpretive depth at its essence.

Conversely, human knowledge is experiential, emotional, creative, and conscious. Human knowledge is formed by lived experience, intuition, and abstract reason. People, being different from machines, filter information through ethical, cultural, and personal filters, making their knowledge morally informed, meaningful, and flexible. With the growing use of AI in science, education, and the arts, there are important questions about whether AI-generated information is authentic and original and whether it has consequences for the ultimate users of this information. While AI assists scientists with data analysis and pattern recognition, AI lacks scientists' critical evaluation and contextual understanding.

In education, AI-assisted writing tools increase productivity but can, at the same time, undermine originality and critical thinking. Likewise, in art and creativity, AI software is producing

paintings, music, and literature, thus undermining conventional concepts of human originality and creativity.

As the AI gets smarter, there is a necessity to compare its knowledge to human knowledge. The comparison exposes the strengths and weaknesses of AI so that human creativity, ethical judgment, and interpretive richness are not buried under algorithmic efficiency. While AI-generated knowledge greatly increases the capacity to process information, it is without the subtlety of understanding, creativity, and moral judgment of human knowledge. The greater the use of AI, the greater the need to ensure human control to uphold originality, moral judgment, and the higher meaning inherent in human knowledge.

AI and the Transformation of Knowledge

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing knowledge creation and redefining how society creates, processes, and understands information. AI knowledge is knowledge generated by data-driven algorithms, pattern recognition, and machine learning algorithms. In contrast to human thinking, which is influenced by experience, emotion, and moral reasoning, AI knowledge is non-conscious and computational. Floridi, Cowls & Beltrametti (2018) stress that AI, although able to increase efficiency and precision, cannot match human cognition in terms of interpretative depth and moral insight. They note that in order for AI to be properly integrated into society, there should be ethical principles guiding it since knowledge produced by AI is by definition, lacking the human ability for contextual judgment. Bostrom (2014) warns that in the event of more advanced AI systems, it may have the potential to dominate human intellectual capabilities in certain fields, thus leading to a society where

knowledge derived from AI would outdo scientific findings, judgments, and works of imagination.

Human Intuition and Trust in AI Outputs

The absence of human intuition and ethical reasoning in AI systems, however, poses an issue about the appropriateness and trustworthiness of its knowledge outputs. This is further echoed by Russell (2019), who postulates that though AI can maximize information processing, it is as challenging to map its goals towards sophisticated human values. Mitchell (2019) adopts a more nuanced perspective, observing that current AI models, as great as they are, are still statistical correlational models rather than models of actual understanding. She contends that, while AI can mimic human patterns of language or predict, it does not "understand" meaning in the same way that humans do. Marcus (2022) also accuses current deep learning models of being limiting, arguing that the lack of symbolic thinking and contextual understanding in AI makes it vulnerable to generating shallow or biased knowledge, especially where it is based on incomplete or imperfect data.

The increasing application of AI in science, education, and art makes the distinction between human and AI-generated knowledge especially relevant. In scientific research, AI accelerates data analysis, recognizes patterns, and forecasts outcomes at a human-inaccessible level. Nevertheless, in the absence of human oversight, this might lack context-dependent knowledge or moral implications. In art, AI is increasingly being used to generate music, literature, and artworks, with the question being raised of whether works created by AI carry the same meaning or aesthetic value as human art. However, with

more advanced AI, society risks over-reliance on its output and losing human critical thinking and imagination. This also hints at the dangers of giving too much interpretive power to AI systems, since knowledge without human values can drive unforeseen or detrimental effects. As AI is penetrating knowledge creation, it is important to know its weaknesses. Pearl & Mackenzie (2018) observe this weakness in their point that AI can potentially find correlations, but most of the time, it is not able to deduce causality, a vital human cognitive function.

This inability to understand cause and effect renders AI-generated knowledge less credible in dynamic decision-making scenarios that require contextual awareness. Brynjolfsson & McAfee (2014) also examine how AI is transforming the nature of knowledge work, automating tasks that are information-intensive and substituting for certain kinds of jobs. They note that although AI can achieve peak efficiency, its reliance on probabilistic models limits its capacity for rich interpretation. Human knowledge, however, is informed by lived experience, emotional intelligence, and ethical consideration, allowing richer meaning-making. It was Rahwan, Cebrian & Obradovich (2019) who coined the term "machine behavior" to analyze the way AI systems act as autonomous agents, deciding actions that impact social and economic systems. The new area of study reveals the way knowledge generated by AI is extremely efficient yet opaque and impenetrable, thus triggering issues regarding trust and responsibility. Likewise, Chollet (2021) criticizes prevailing approaches to testing AI intelligence and claims that common benchmarks are incapable of detecting real understanding or responsiveness, core attributes of human cognition. With developments in AI technology, it becomes all the more vital to

compare the knowledge of these technologies to human knowledge.

According to Taddeo & Floridi (2018), AI, used responsibly, has the potential to be a phenomenally great tool for good and an amplifier of human capability to unravel complex challenges. However, they warn against substituting human judgment where ethical consideration and contextual appreciation are necessary. For instance, while AI technologies can generate medical diagnoses through the pattern recognition mechanism in patient history, they disregard the emotional and psychological needs of the patient. Vincent & D'Angelo (2022) point out another limitation: language models, as advanced as they are, have difficulty reasoning and abstractly understanding. Their research illustrates how large language models such as GPT can simulate human patterns of language but stumble at tasks involving deeper understanding, making them vulnerable to factual errors or superficial reasoning.

The “Stochastic Parrot” Problem in AI Language Generation

Artificial Intelligence (AI) continues to transform knowledge creation, but its reasoning, contextual, and ethical limitations pose significant philosophical and practical issues. Bender & Gebru (2021) point out the risks of large language models, characterizing them as “stochastic parrots” that produce plausible-sounding but possibly incorrect or biased information. Their results show how far AI, as impressive as its language abilities are, has no actual understanding but rather tends to reinforce biases in its training data. This is used to compare AI-based knowledge, which is statistical and probabilistic, with human knowledge, which is meaning-based and interpretive.

Tegmark (2017) ventures into the long-term consequences of AI in transforming knowledge and human intuition. He envisages a world in which AI systems can potentially create scientific breakthroughs and even philosophical concepts on their own. However, he cautions that unless humans intervene, knowledge produced by AI might be without ethical issues or in accordance with human values.

Similarly, some argue that the "info-sphere," a virtual space that is increasingly dominated by AI, eliminates the distinction between machine-processed information and actual human knowledge. This trend, he fears, risks relegating knowledge to the level of nothing more than data points and draining it of moral and contextual meaning. Heaven (2022) is a specific example of AI generating knowledge independent of human effort. He discusses how DeepMind's AlphaGo Zero learned to become a Go master without exposure to any human data but only through playing against itself. It is a stunning demonstration of the autonomous power of AI to learn, but one that provokes the philosophical argument of whether knowledge, independent of human experience, is significant or creative.

The expanding scope of AI in scientific inquiry, education, and the creative arts makes the line between human and AI-created knowledge increasingly significant. He describes the search for the "master algorithm," the ultimate AI system capable of learning any task or field of knowledge. As wonderful as this dream emphasizes the capabilities of AI, it does so at the cost of diminishing human expertise and creativity. This takes a step further by exploring the extent to which mathematical AI can actually redefine humanity's understanding of reality. He

imagines AI discovering basic physical laws or math-truths beyond human capacities. The issue remains whether the conclusions offered by AI are deficient in qualitative human intuition and interpretive depth and therefore lack epistemic significance.

While AI keeps producing knowledge at a previously unimaginable level, these pieces of writing emphasize the necessity to maintain the human aspects of wisdom: creativity, ethical reasoning, and situational awareness. Artificial Intelligence (AI) is now a valuable tool for knowledge creation, yet its learning and reasoning mechanisms remain inherently distinct from human knowledge. Sutton & Barto (2018) detail that Reinforcement Learning (RL), a prominent AI learning technique, allows machines to learn knowledge through continuous interactions with an environment. Although it optimizes AI decision-making, the strategy is not linked with consciousness or understanding. Rather, it is probabilistic, statistical, trial-and-error adjustment-based, and AI-generated knowledge is probabilistic, mechanistic, rather than interpretive. Bengio, Lecun & Hinton (2015) outline the way that deep learning, which underpins so much current AI, relies on multi-layer neural networks to discover intricate patterns within large amounts of data. While deep learning has transformed the capability of AI to produce realistic text, images, and forecasts, it remains incapable of causal thinking. This makes such an inability a point by claiming that the present systems of AI are superb at unmasking correlation but deficient in causality, having the sense to comprehend the reasons why certain things happen, a human center of reason.

Dennett (2017) is more broadly philosophical, charting the evolution of intelligence from low-life forms to the human mind. He hypothesizes that while AI can duplicate intellectual processes, it does not have the human intelligence's evolutionary history, which gives human knowledge its meaning, intuition, and flexibility. Hoffman (2019) tests even more profound presuppositions about knowledge, suggesting that human perception is itself an oversimplification of reality instead of an objective truth. This philosophical consideration then questions whether AI-created knowledge, being without experiential background, can possibly be meaningful. As AI-created knowledge becomes more common in science, business, and everyday life, it is important to be able to differentiate it from human knowledge. The addition of symbolic reasoning could render AI similar to human interpretive capacity. Conversely, Floridi (2019) provides a functional description, showing how deep learning models are constructed and trained. His description lays bare the technical complexity of AI-knowledge but also identifies its underlying limitations. AI models are immensely good at mathematical optimization but are abstracted from the experiential and ethical frameworks that shape human knowledge.

Comparative analysis of AI-generated knowledge versus Human knowledge

Creativity

AI-generated knowledge may be able to generate creative-sounding content but is ultimately tied back to that which already exists. AI is created by way of recombination; it produces novel outputs by recognizing and combining patterns from massive data sets. For instance, AI models such as GPT-4

and other AI models may write poems or create artworks through imitating patterns of style observed in their data. But again, this amounts to synthetic creativity, a highly intelligent pattern-matching exercise rather than actual innovation. Unlike the case of machines, human creativity entails original ideas, emotion, and innovation. (Boden, 2016)

Human knowledge evolves from imagination, emotional expression, and the ability to see very deeply new ideas. Human creativity according to Marcus (2022) is based on personal experience, enriching and unique. For instance, a human composer may compose a piece of music from personal grief or joy affective context, which cannot be felt or reproduced by a machine. For example, an AI generating a realistic painting by replicating Van Gogh's style from provided data sets. Human Creativity, innovating an abstract piece of art out of a personal experience or a clear vision, from a given style.

Ethical reasoning

AI does not possess moral intuition or sympathy. AI can be educated with the aid of ethical principles, but AI is not born with a sense of right and wrong. AI models choose based on probable results, not on moral thought. AI, without moral agency, cannot deal with complex moral dilemmas independently without the intervention of humans. Conversely, human knowledge raises ethical concerns and values shaped by cultural norms, empathy, and reflective judgment. Humans can perceive moral subtleties, consider situational context, and make decisions based on principles through empathy and compassion. AI may generate ethical-sounding answers, but it cannot possess true moral consciousness or accountability. We can say that AI

ethical reasoning in the field of medicine can suggest patient's treatments by statistical success rate but is not able to factor in individual patient emotions or wishes compare to human ethical reasoning, a physician can balance the patient's emotional well-being, personal values, and quality of life when making a treatment decision.

Contextual Understanding

AI handles information based on probability models and statistical inference. AI processes enormous amounts of data to determine associations but is incapable of interpreting information through cultural, emotional, or experiential context. AI can generate contextually relevant information by processing correlations but is unaware of the underlying meaning behind the information it processes. Or, people understand things in terms of meaning, culture, and lived experience. (Boddington, 2017). Human knowledge is socially conscious, value-laden, affective, and contextual. People can detect irony, sarcasm, and cultural nuance scenarios confounding even the most sophisticated AI system. AI Contextual Comprehension like an AI chatbot might provide a syntactically sound but contextually inappropriate customer care response because it is unable to comprehend underlying affective contexts. Human Contextual Understanding, a human customer support agent can sense the anger of the customer through tone and context and respond empathetically.

Accuracy and Bias,

Whereas AI systems are usually seen as more objective, they can reflect and amplify existing biases in their training data. As AI models learn from existing data sets, they can unwittingly

replicate societal biases, inaccuracies, or prejudices. (Crawford, 2021) explain how humans are vulnerable to cognitive biases (e.g. confirmation bias, availability heuristic) that can taint their logic. Unlike AI, though, humans can challenge or change beliefs by reflecting, engaging in conversation, and critical evaluation. This self-awareness allows humans to identify and reverse biases with time. AI Bias, A biased recruitment data-driven. AI hiring system will inadvertently support discrimination by favoring some demographic groups while in Human Bias, A human recruiter can be biased personally but can be aware of and counter them through diversity training or moral reflection.

Implications of AI-Generated Knowledge and Its Impact on Academia and Education

The increasing use of AI-enabled writing and learning tools is revolutionizing academia and education. Tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and AI-powered research assistants allow students and researchers to produce essays, summarize texts, and even literature reviews at an unprecedented pace and with great efficiency. While this has clear benefits in productivity and ease, it also raises concerns about the erosion of critical thinking abilities. As increasingly more students rely on AI-generated content; they could be less cognitively invested in the content itself. Instead of struggling with challenging ideas, they would be pasting and copying AI-created summaries, losing their ability to analyze, synthesize, and come up with new arguments.

Plagiarism and Authenticity Issues

The ease of AI-created content raises new issues in academic integrity. Establishing the authenticity of students' work becomes problematic when AI can reproduce human writing styles with

high accuracy. Institutions might not be able to distinguish between actual student work and AI-generated work (Susnjak, 2022). In academic circles, excessive use of AI for literature reviews or interpreting data can result in surface-level research. AI tools are able to recognize patterns well but cannot perform human-level critical, reflective interpretation of academic arguments. Someone who uses AI to produce an essay outline can benefit from the tool's efficiency. If they simply replicate AI-generated work without reflecting on it themselves, however, they are robbing themselves of developing critical thinking skills needed in their future.

Decision-Making and Ethics Increased adoption of AI in law, medicine, and policy-making is concomitant with potentialities and moral hazards. AI-based decision-support systems are already utilized to assist legal judgments, medical diagnoses, and investment recommendations. However, widespread adoption of data generated by AI without human intervention is a risk of enormous magnitude.

Creativity and Art,

The use of AI art and creative content brings challenges to the traditional views on authorship, creativity, and artistic interpretation. Such computer programs like DALL·E, Mid-Journey, and Runway ML create stunning works of visual arts, while word-processing models create poems, literature, and even compositions. These worries bring up gravely philosophical questions, Can a computer produce art or merely mimic? AI art is more about copying patterns, not real creativity. It does a composition of things from the art that already exists, often duplicating the works of famous masters. But it lacks the

emotional intention or creative vision that creates human-made art.

Some philosophers argue that AI art is not authentic or meaningful because it is not a result of human experiences, emotions, or imagination. Others argue that what constitutes art is its impact on the audience, and not the artist's intention hence AI-generated art is just as valid if it evokes the emotions or sense of beauty (McCormack et al., 2019). Challenge to Human Artists, the increasing utilization of AI among creative industries triggers concerns regarding displacing jobs as well as commercializing creativity. Artists can stand to lose ground to AI as a source of competition that generates faster, lower-cost, and ubiquitous content. A painting created by an AI may impress viewers with its technical qualities but is deprived of the artist's emotional back story or personal history behind it. The AI can replicate creativity but lacks the feelings that evoke creativity.

Conclusion

The contrast between machine generated and human knowledge both reveals stark contrasts as well as some potential zones of synergy. Where AI beats other systems is speed, efficiency, and vast amounts of data handling, it also lacks human-like consciousness, imagination, and ethical reasoning inherent in human knowledge. AI pattern learning allows it to recognize trends and create information with great accuracy, but in missing contextual nuances, emotional intensity, and moral sensibilities, it fails miserably.

Conversely, human knowledge, tempered by experience, emotions, and intuition, provides flexibility, imagination, and the ability to engage in moral thinking abilities that AI cannot match. The criticism highlights the positives and negatives of both categories of knowledge. AI offers unparalleled productivity in the automation of repetitive work and handling huge volumes of data in a highly efficient manner. However, lacking actual understanding, interpretation, or empathy, it can be vulnerable to prejudice, misinformation, and the absence of ethical boundaries.

Human knowledge, being susceptible to personal biases and intellectual fallacies, is necessary for creative problem-solving, value-based decisions, and grasping complex social contexts. In the future, there has to be an equally balanced strategy harnessing the potential of AI without sacrificing human creativity, empathy, and moral controls. Instead of trying to replace human intelligence, AI can be seen as an assistant tool to help improve productivity and aid in finding knowledge. As technology improves with AI, the question on everyone's mind is: Will AI ever come to the point where it will be able to compete with human knowledge? No matter how advanced it can be, its non-conscious nature and lack of depth of emotions makes it a simulation and never the equal.

The future is not about competition but cooperation, and AI will enhance human capabilities and not water down those distinctively human qualities of wisdom, creativity, and moral judgment. This model of partnership holds the greatest promise for a world with technology as a servant to humanity rather than as a replacement for it.

References

- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623).
- Bengio, Y., Lecun, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553), 436–444.
- Boden, M. A. (2016). *AI: Its nature and future*. Oxford University Press.
- Boddington, P. (2017). *Towards a code of ethics for artificial intelligence*. Springer.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Chollet, F. (2021). On the measure of intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01547*.
- Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- Dennett, D. C. (2017). *From bacteria to Bach and back: The evolution of minds*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Domingos, P. (2015). *The master algorithm: How the quest for the ultimate learning machine will remake our world*. Basic Books.
- Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M., & Mazzone, M. (2017). CAN: Creative adversarial networks, generating “art” by learning about styles and deviating from

- style norms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.07068*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.07068>
- Floridi, L. (2019). Translating philosophy into/through the ethics of information. *Philosophy & Technology*, 32(2), 183–197.
- Floridi, L., Cows, J., Beltrametti, M., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., & Taddeo, M. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707.
- Heaven, W. D. (2022). DeepMind's AI is learning to play Go without any human knowledge. *MIT Technology Review*.
- Hoffman, D. D. (2019). *The case against reality: Why evolution hid the truth from our eyes*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Kanu, A. I., Addidi, T. & Kanu, C. C., “Artificial intelligence and cybercrime in Nigeria: Towards an Ethical framework”. *Dialogue and Universalism*. 32(1) 143–158, 2024.
- Kanu, I. A. (2020). “Igwebuiké philosophy of science and technology”. *Nnadiesube Journal of Education*. Vol. 5. No. 4, pp. 64-74.
- Kanu, I. A. and Ndubisi, J. O. E. (2022). “Artificial intelligence and socio-economic development in Africa”. *OCHENDO: An African Journal of Innovative Studies*. Vol. 3. No. 1. pp. 2-21.
- Onyiah, S. C.; Ndubisi, J. O. E; Kanu, A. I. (2024). “Navigating the Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence through Carol Gilighan’s Ethics of

- Care.” *Aquino Journal of Philosophy*. Vol. 4. No. 2. pp. 1-12.
- Kanu, A. I. & Okpokwasili, O. A. (2025). “Artificial Intelligence and Digital Colonialism in Africa.” *International Journal of Intercultural Values and Indigenous Ecoethics*. Volume 5. Number 2. 14-24.
- Marcus, G. (2022). *Rebooting AI: Building artificial intelligence we can trust*. Pantheon Books.
- McCormack, J., Gifford, T., & Hutchings, P. (2019). Autonomy, authenticity, authorship and intention in computer-generated art. In *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Computational Creativity*.
<https://computationalcreativity.net/iccc2019/>
- Mitchell, M. (2019). *Artificial intelligence: A guide for thinking humans*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Pearl, J., & Mackenzie, D. (2018). *The book of why: The new science of cause and effect*. Basic Books.
- Rahwan, I., Cebrian, M., Obradovich, N., Bongard, J., Ravasz, E., & Kearns, M. (2019). Machine behaviour. *Nature*, 568(7711), 477–481.
- Russell, S. J. (2019). *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*. Viking.
- Susnjak, T. (2022). ChatGPT: The end of online exam integrity? *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2022.5.1.13>
- Sutton, R. S., & Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT Press.
- Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). How AI can be a force for good. *Science*, 361(6404), 751–752.

Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence*. Knopf.

Vincent, B. T., & D'Angelo, J. (2022). The limits of language models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(4), e2115681119.