Vidyankur
KNOWLEDGE FOR WISDOM

VIDYANKUR

Contents

Editorial

Losing the Race and Winning the Life!

We have heard it often of the "survival of the fittest" and the "struggle for existence." And even of the attitude of "flight or fight." Somehow it has become part of our present-day mentality that unless we compete, we cannot succeed and enjoy life.

In this context another perspective of the story of the Hare who lost the race, but won the life, which appears on the internet is relevant.

Let the hare himself explain: "Yes, I am the hare who lost. No, I did not get lazy or complacent."

"I was hopping over the meadows near the hills and looked back to realize that the tortoise was nowhere to be seen. Assured of my healthy lead, I decided to take a short nap under the large banyan tree near the pond.

"The anticipation of the race had kept me up all night. For days, that old silly tortoise had boasted about his ability to plod for hundreds

of miles without stopping. Life is a marathon, he said, not a sprint. I wanted to show him that I could run both far and fast.

The shade of the tree was like an umbrella. I found an almost oval rock, covered it with grass, and turned it into a makeshift pillow. I could hear the leaves rustling and the bees buzzing – it felt they were collaborating and even conspiring to put me to sleep. And it didn't take them long to succeed.

"I saw myself drifting on a log in a beautiful stream of water. As I came near the shore, I found an old man, with a flowing beard, sitting on a rock in a meditative pose. He opened his eyes, gave me an all-knowing smile, and asked: 'Who are you?' 'I am a hare. I am running a race.' 'Why?' 'To prove to all the creatures in the jungle that I am the fastest.'

"'Why do you want to prove that you are the fastest?' 'So that I get a medal which will give me status which will give me money which will get me food…' There is already so much food around.' He pointed to the forest in the distance. 'Look at all those trees laden with fruits and nuts, all those leafy branches.' 'I also want respect. I want to be remembered as the fastest hare who ever lived.'

"'Do you know the name of the fastest deer or the largest elephant or the strongest lion who lived a thousand years before you?' 'No.' 'Today you have been challenged by a tortoise. Tomorrow, it will be a snake. Then it will be a zebra. Will you keep racing all your life to prove that you are the fastest?'

"'Hmm. I didn't think about it. I don't want to race all my life.' 'What do you want to do?' 'I want to sleep under a banyan tree on a makeshift pillow while the leaves rustle and the bees buzz. …I want to hop over the meadows near the hills and swim in the pond.'

"'You can do all these things this very moment. Forget the race. You are here today but you will be gone tomorrow.'

"I woke up from my sleep. The ducks in the pond looked happy. I jumped into the pond, startling them for a moment. They looked at me quizzically. 'Weren't you supposed to be racing

with the tortoise today?' 'It's pointless. An exercise in futility. All I want is to be here. I lost the race but got back my life."

It was Martin Luther King Jr who said, We must learn to live together as brothers [and sister] or perish together as fools. Can we forget our competition and rat race and win life for all of us? Yes! We can. Together! We have not just the technology, but knowledge and wisdom for the survival of our life!

The last article of this article throws more light on this dimension of our life. We are confronted with the crucial choice of Death or Life. Collectively we can become prosocial and altruistic and thus save ourselves by serving the other.

The other articles in this issue of our journal focus on Artificial Intelligence, the Meaning of life, Freedom of human beings and the Depth of our own lives as an ongoing search for TRUTH.

The Editor

The Future and Artificial Intelligence: A Threat to Humanity?

Arokia Amalraj S
St Peter's Pontifical Seminary, Bangalore

Abstract: This paper will briefly review the history, the emergence and the use of Artificial Intelligence. It will also show that the research in AI, which has enhanced human capacity incredibly, has proved to be the height of human intelligence. We will go on pinpoint the serious implications of AI, showing how, on the one hand, it is a boon to society, while, on the other hand, it can turn out to be disastrous for human life and society. While exposing the ever-growing human need and desire for advancements in this area and also human limitations in preventing its further growth, we will point out the alarming controversies

involved therein and the havoc it can cause in different spheres like economic, political, social and cultural. However, it would discuss also the predictions it can make for the development of society admirably. Without fail, It will also expound as to how it can cause serious violations and invasion to human privacy, thus, alerting us, humans, to be realistic about all possible eventualities. Finally, the paper would end with a warning, or rather a personal note of caution that if we fail to address the challenges it brings with it with the seriousness it deserves, it would, no doubt, be at the risk of the existence of the humanity itself.

*Keywords***:** Artificial intelligence (AI), Cosmotheandric (God-Man-World) vision, HLMI (High-Level Machine Intelligence), Future of Humanity

Introduction

Indisputably, modern science and technology have brought marvellous advancements to society; they have caused fast movement of ideas, understanding and knowledge that have helped all the people of the world. They have created comfort and convenience for people. Human beings have become more capable of doing

This paper gives a short historical sketch of the pros and cons of Artificial Intelligence. It also serves a caution to the society about the possible dangers of the same!

amazing things with advanced technologies than ever before. And, yet, undeniably, they have also created havoc in society. They have created Artificial Intelligence (AI) for computers a decade ago. Now, humanity has gone completely dependent on Artificial Intelligence machines. Finding humans among humans has become so rare these days. They are working with

AI, sleeping with AI, interacting with AI and ultimately have miserably failed to do any of these activities with fellow human beings. Advancements in technology have made humans lose their sensitivity totally and forget who they really are. In short, in my point of view, being human in this present scenario is really an accomplishment in this world of AI.

Approaching Artificial Intelligence?

Merriam Webster's online dictionary defines Artificial Intelligence as "A branch of computer science, dealing with the simulation of intelligent behaviour in computers or the capability of the machine, to imitate intelligent human behaviour."

History of Artificial Intelligence

The field of AI research was born at a workshop at Dartmouth College in 1956, where the term "Artificial Intelligence" was coined by John McCarthy to distinguish the field from cybernetics and escape the influence of the cyberneticist Norbert Wiener. Attendees Allen Newell (CMU), Herbert Simon (CMU), John McCarthy (MIT), Marvin Minsky (MIT) and Arthur Samuel (IBM) are well-known founders and pioneers of AI research. They and their students produced programs that the press described as "astonishing." Computers were learning checkers strategies, solving word problems in algebra, proving logical theorems and speaking English. By the middle of the 1960s, research in the U.S. was heavily funded by the Department of Defence and laboratories were soon established around the world. AI's founders were optimistic about its future. Herbert Simon predicted: "Machines will be capable, within twenty years, of doing any work a man can do". Marvin Minsky said in a similar

vein: "Within a generation ... the problem of creating 'artificial intelligence' will substantially be solved".

But, they failed to recognize the difficulty of some of the remaining tasks. Progress slowed down and in 1974, in response to the criticism of Sir James Light hill and ongoing pressure from the US Congress to fund more productive projects, both the U.S. and British governments cut off exploratory research in AI. The next few years would later be called an "AI winter,"- a period when obtaining funding for AI projects, indeed, became a serious challenge.

In the early 1980s, AI research was revived by the commercial success of expert systems, a form of AI program that simulated the knowledge and analytical skills of human experts. By 1985, the market for AI had reached over a billion dollars. At the same time, Japan's fifth-generation computer project inspired the U.S and British governments to restore funding for academic research. However, beginning with the collapse of the Lisp Machine market in 1987, AI once again fell into disrepute, and a second, longer-lasting hiatus began.

In the late 1990s and early 21st century, AI began to be used for logistics, data mining, medical diagnosis and other areas. The success was due to increasing computational power (Moore's law and transistor count), greater emphasis on solving specific problems, new ties between AI and other fields (such as statistics, economics and mathematics), and a commitment by researchers to mathematical methods and scientific standards. Deep Blue became the first computer chess-playing system to beat a reigning world chess champion, Garry Kasparov, on 11 May 1997.

According to *Bloomberg's* Jack Clark, 2015 was a landmark year for artificial intelligence, with the number of software projects that use AI Google increased from a "sporadic usage" in 2012 to more than 2,700 projects. Clark also presents factual

data indicating the improvements of AI since 2012 supported by lower error rates in image processing tasks. Around 2016, China greatly accelerated its government funding; given its large supply of data and its rapidly increasing research output, some observers believe it may be on track to becoming an "AI superpower". However, it has been acknowledged that reports regarding artificial intelligence have tended to be exaggerated.

The Interesting Controversies in the Present

In the book *In Our Image: Artificial Intelligence* many controversial and alarming questions were raised. It is a really challenging one for all humanity to live happily at this moment of destruction. The further questions may explore and shed the light to be aware of this techno-ethic age. What sort of future do we want? What career advice would we give today's kids? Do we prefer new jobs replacing the old ones or a jobless society where everyone enjoys a life of leisure and machine product wealth? Will we be able to control intelligent machines or will they control us? What does it mean to be a human in the age of artificial intelligence? These are some of the thought-provoking questions we need to reflect on urgently.

The Desire for Artificial Intelligence

Genesis 1 states that human beings are created in the image of God. But God is not the only one to create in the creator's own image. As humans, we too have shown a perennial desire to create things in our image. We have created machines that mirror human activities through their own actions. While aware that these images are both partial and superficial, they still have exerted a tremendous influence on how we view ourselves and our place in the world. Despite this influence, most of us would not consider an artistic or literary image of the human being to

be an image of humankind in the way we are the image of God. The advent of the digital computer in the mid 20th century has given us a new medium with which to create images of ourselves. The field of artificial intelligence, in particular, explores the use of that medium to create an image of the human being in a way that extends far beyond the merely physical or the static. The potentiality of the computer to mimic human thought has opened the door for a new era of self – imaging.

In Our Image: A Culture's Hopes and Fears

Interest in creating an artificial human, a dynamic alter ego that makes decisions or engages in human activities, has been a part of Western culture from its beginnings. Artificial humans appear in western literature as early as Homer. In *Iliad*, robots appear both in the guise of mobile serving tripods and as the copper giant. Medieval Jewish folklore introduces the Golem, an artificial human-constructed item of clay, which comes to life through the inscription of a holy word on its forehead. Moving beyond myth and story, the actual design of machines that appear to talk, move independently, play chess, or compute sums interested some of the greatest thinkers of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.

Some Problems Related to Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence has impressive capabilities today but they are narrow. However, as researchers are fighting to widen up those capabilities to make it as general as possible, it seems that AI will eventually reach HLMI which then will facilitate machines the ability to solve any intellectual task which a human can solve. Looking into the future from here makes it difficult to figure out, how much benefit HLMI can bring to society and it is legitimate to ask, how much harm it could bring to society if we build or use it incorrectly. In the near term, automation of services is also going to impact

employment and AI is going to play a major role in making that possible which apparently seems to bring more benefits to big enterprises rather than to society as a whole.

Considering for a moment what will happen when, in the near term, we have a reliable driverless car system. Thinking about all the drivers -whether they are Uber drivers, train drivers, plane pilots or ship captains -- how long will those jobs be held by humans? Besides, our dependency on AI-based services like using navigation, voice assistance, etc. is also putting our privacy on the verge. There are many such issues that are connected to AI and its development which nowadays are in the debate.

End of Humanity?

Once AI reaches human-level intelligence, further development of self-optimizing AIs is unpredictable. The output will then no longer be approvable by humans for errors and conclusions drawn might be beyond human understanding capacities or even beyond human ethics. The main issues here are problems with the agency, where autonomous machines need to become a legal entity like companies at one point – independently of the question if a code (algorithm)[1] can be fined in the end. This connects to the possibility of failure and responsibility of such AIs. The second main issue is formed by moral implications, especially since machine learning does not necessarily include human teachers anymore and, if not asked to do so, AIs will not necessarily focus on learning what humans count as valuable acts. Prof. Stephen Hawking, one of Britain's prominent scientists, warns that our efforts of creating a thinking machine pose a threat to our very

---

[1] A process or set of rules to be followed in calculations or other problem-solving operations, especially by a computer.

existence. He said that the development of superhuman intelligence could spell the end of humanity.

Some Moral Issues

As soon as AI is able to compete with humans, it will not only lead to a fight for jobs on an economical level but it may even intrude into human relationships in the way that an AI-friend will only focus on its owner's needs, whereas a human relationship flourishes through the exchange of favours (e.g. portrayed in the movie "Her"). Another interesting scenario has been portrayed in the very recent movie called Ex-Machina, where a humanoid robot named Ava who already passed a simple Turing test and eventually shows how she can emotionally manipulate humans. Ultimately, the question that arises here is: What will happen when our computers get better than we are in different areas of our life?

Economic Impacts

A recent bid for the acquisition of a German robotic company Kuka by a Chinese company called Midea Group was $ 5 billion. Kuka is one of the world's largest robotic companies. China is famous for low-paid migrant labour and Chinese enterprises want to automate the manufacturing process because they do not see any point to rely on such a huge low-paid migrant labour. According to the International Federation of Robotics, China is the largest importer of robots. The IFR's[2] calculations show that China has 326 robots per 10000 workers while the US and South Korea have 164 and 478 robots respectively for the same number of workers. Thus, enterprises are seeing a lot of potential in the automation of their processes but it will have a negative impact on employment. The Figure

---

[2] Instrument flight rules (IFR) is one of two sets of regulations governing all aspects of civil aviation aircraft operations; the other is visual flight rules (VFR).

below statically explains the impact of technology on employment.

If not consciously planned, power structures especially the widening of the scissor between powerful and powerless will, in all likelihood, hurt the political and social freedom both locally and globally. Surveillance, intensification of economic power, etc. are some of the other issues of our serious concern. On the other hand, AI is delivering to humans what is suitable for them rather than what humans like, which will intensify their views and most likely lead to boost extremism in all directions.

Political and Social Issues

AI is helping us, on one hand, and creating really serious issues on another. Considering the scenario from Baidu and its web search and map services, Baidu has around 700 million users out of which around 300 million use its map services every month. Baidu's research indicates how digital footprints can be used to determine city dynamics. Baidu is mining its data for the city planners to suggest to them the right spot to put transportation, shop, and other facilities etc. On the other hand, such a kind of mining might also help the government to put control society. Baidu's researchers are training their machines to predict crowd problems based on the analysis of user's online map queries. They can predict three hours before when and where a huge number of people might gather. While Baidu claims that the data is anonymous, this could also be used towards destructive ends, such as doing malicious research etc. Some examples might include influencing elections based on data that reveals a lot about the behaviour, trend, interest of people, etc. This, in my opinion, is nothing but a serious threat to democracy.

Policies and Laws

Besides the general scepticism to new technologies, it is remarkable that drone usage is highly regulated, while big data is not – while it might be a bigger threat to privacy. Is it because the threat can be visualized? Another policy problem arises when errors committed by AI's fall under the range that would not have happened if done by a human – even if the total number of human errors avoided by the AI is still bigger. Yet, this emotional unbalance can even be reversed. If robots look anthropomorphic, people might feel like they deserve rights and some soldiers risked their lives to save the team robot. Would AIs claim rights or would humans start the first "AI rights" movement?

Considering that animals during the medieval ages were moral agents in front of the law to the extent that companies are today, it would be possible to see AIs confronted by law. This will bring further issues. There is a question as to whether individual learning machines will exchange in a cloud-like manner their knowledge and thus should be collectively law suited or individually. While this might be an issue to deal with in the remote future, coping mechanisms to handle job displacements and unequal capital access caused by the widening imbalance of labour and capital are going to be in dire need way earlier. The same applies to current bank algorithms using machine learning to evaluate creditability and, consequently, automatically judge on race etc. While child labour and other issues during the industrial revolution did not get solved by the market, but by politics, the same will likely be the case with current new technologies. Unfortunately, Silicon Valley is way faster than political bodies.

A Few Suggestions

It is vividly clear that it is too late for humanity to protect its nature and avoid artificial intelligence in use. However, we have a little hope to imbibe the relationship with others by following the possible solutions for all the problems we discussed throughout this essay:

a. We have to consciously define how we are going to use AI as well as when and where it will be used. At the moment, it is really difficult to predict when we can reach singularity although there are several predictions by some AI experts. However, if we reach that point in the future, then it is really important to have a centralized global governing body, laying down the framework for prioritizing the positive outcome over its own interest.

b. Initiatives like 'One hundred years study of Artificial Intelligence' by Stanford university is necessary to carry out long-term analysis of AI development. This can put us on our guard and thus help us to figure out the long term harm which AI might bring to society.

c. We need to also build a system of checks and balances with several AIs so that they can check on each other and, as a whole, can act as a dependency network for decision making.

d. As far as the ethics of AI is concerned, we certainly need an ethic charter for the further development of Robotic research and we need to set up operational ethics committees for robotic research advancements.

e. Public bodies have to speed up the decision-making policies regarding changing technology. As of now, they are way too slow to cope with the exponential growth of technological advancements and that could be a possible solution to mitigate the challenges of the impact of AI on employment and the economy.

Conclusion

It seems that we are standing at the point on the timeline where it is really difficult to foresee the future of humanity in the context of Artificial Intelligence. We always embrace new technologies which seemed to be changing our way of living. However, the important fact here is that the kind of change we are embracing must bring a positive outcome for the welfare of society and eventually of humanity. Artificial intelligence is the kind of change that we certainly should not take for granted. It is different from any other technology which humanity has ever developed and the fact which makes it unique is its ability to act autonomously. It is the change which not only starts exhibiting soon its positive impact on society but equally its severe negative impacts as well.

So, if we are embracing it as a change that is expected to change the way we live, then we should be prepared also to face the consequences in different realms such as employment, privacy, and eventually, the very existence of humanity itself is being put into serious risk. However, whatever be the case, we certainly need a legal policy framework that can respond to mitigate the challenges associated with AI and compensate the affected parties in case of a fatal error. Hence, let me conclude with a note of caution that if we ignore social bugs of AI, it could be a serious threat to humanity. When we overpower God's image by trying to make something superpower than him, everything gets into a destructive one. It is a caution for all humanity to have cosmotheandric vision rather than making intelligible power than God. We need to stop overpowering others, instead promote a loving, living, and vibrant relationship with everyone.

References

Banerji, R. (1980). *Artificial Intelligence: A Theoretical Approach*. New York: North Holland.

Bobrow, D. and A. Collins eds. (1975). *Representation and Understanding*. New York: Academic Press.

Boden, M. (1977). *Artificial Intelligence and Natural Man*. New York: Basic Books.

Dresner K. and P. Stone. (2008) "A Multiagent Approach To Autonomous Intersection Management", *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 31, pp. 591–656.

Zarkadakēs, G. (2015). *In Our Own Image: Will Artificial Intelligence Save or Destroy Us?* London: Rider.

Arokia Amalraj S. is a student of Theology (IV BTh), at St Peter's Pontifical Seminary, Bangalore. He belongs to the diocese of Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu. Email: aroamal1991@gmail.com.

A Futuristic Assessment of Being Human in the Age of AI

John Kennedy Philip SDB
Divyadaan: Salesian Institute of Philosophy, Nashik

*Abstract***:** In the past few decades, technology has been transforming human life at a faster pace than ever before. Technology has become part and parcel of our life and it has led the human race into the age of artificial intelligence (AI). It is impossible to separate human beings from the development of technology, especially from the development of AI. Through the development of AI, we are gifted with unlimited and unprecedented advancements as never before. Although humanity rejoices in being empowered by these AI developments, it is also worried about where they may be leading to. In addition, 'Artificial Intelligence' and 'human being' are two complex phenomena. The thoughts and trends of AI affect contemporary human lives both positively and negatively. In bringing together the positive and negative effects of AI

trends in the lives of contemporary human, this article also presents a better way to understand a way ahead.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Technology, Life 3.0, Symbolic AI, Connectionist AI, Situated Robotics, Superintelligence.

Introduction

"Technology development is giving the potential to flourish to human beings like never before or the potential to self-destruct" (Tegmark, 2017: 22) are eye-catching words of reminder from Future life Institute (FLI). It is impossible to separate human beings from the development of technology. Technology has become part and parcel of our life and it has led the human race into the age of artificial intelligence (AI). Humankind's scientific and technological progress, from the discovery of fire to the invention of AI, is full of amazing contribution that is made by a single individual or a community. However, what is AI? What is the purpose of AI? Can it be utilized to make human life better in the world? Is it possible to create a machine-like human being? If machine-like human beings are created, will they replace us on this earth? are some of the questions raised by contemporary intellectuals.

> This paper attempts to present the positive and negative impacts of AI and brings out the possible way ahead as a suggestion for human beings to integrate their future life with AI.

The field of AI is growing faster, what was once considered a possible distant future is now being tested and rolled out. Many new applications and autonomous robots are created in the human environment to help people as capable assistants or to work alongside people as

cooperative members of human-robot teams (Boden 2006). On the other hand, Stephen Hawking, a great physicist and cosmologist, warned his public audience that AI is going to replace human beings on this earth (Sulleyman, 2018). There are some events taking place in the world of technology to show that the relation chain between AI and human beings is breaking. In the year 2017, in Facebook Application, two AI bots created their own languages to communicate without the help of human beings (Beal and Jehring, 2017). If AI can think and communicate between themselves without the help of human beings, can they not replace human beings on this earth by becoming more intelligent than human beings? Several questions such as these have been constantly raised by the public, ethicists, and cosmologists in the debate on AI. Hence, the primary objective of this essay is to answer the aforementioned questions.

The queries that are related to the fundamental questions can be grouped under three major questions, which will be answered in the course of our investigation. The first question has to do with the definition, history and different methodologies of AI: What is AI? The second question pertains to the threats of AI: What are the threats created by AI? The third question explores the different solutions proposed by various philosophers to avoid these threats: What are the solutions to the threats of AI?

Defining Artificial Intelligence

AI is generally understood as the possession of intelligence by computers or machines (Boden 2006: 345). Although the whole of humanity rejoices in being empowered by AI, it is also worried about where AI might be leading us. Before embarking on an enquiry of such a philosophically overloaded issue, let us define AI in this sub-topic. Two terms that are inextricably associated with AI are 'artificial' and

'intelligence'. The definition of the term 'artificial' *prima facie* seems to be self-evident. The Oxford dictionary defines the term 'artificial' as "[t]hings that are made or produced by human beings to copy something natural." In the field of AI, the definition of the term 'artificial' refers only to 'machines' (Horen, 1984: 48).

In 2017, a symposium on AI was organized by the Swedish Nobel Foundation. A panel of leading AI researchers was asked to define intelligence. These leading researchers argued at length and failed to reach a consensus (Tegmark, 2017: 49). Max Tegmark narrates this incident in his book *life 3.0* and remarks that "[w]e found this quite funny: there's no agreement on what intelligence is even among intelligent intelligence researchers!" (Tegmark, 2017: 49). The reason why it is difficult to nail down a specific definition of intelligence is due to the blurred line between biological intelligence and mechanical intelligence. Tegmark defines intelligence as the "[a]bility to accomplish complex goals" (Tegmark, 2017: 49). Based on previous deliberations, the working definition of AI can be formulated as "[t]he capacity of a machine to imitate human intelligent behaviours" (McCollum: 2013: 2). After having enunciated the definition of AI, let us present the history of AI briefly in the following section.

History of Artificial Intelligence

In the history of scientific and technological development, AI is and will be a milestone. AI is the newest field in science and engineering. Though the work was started soon after the Second World War, (Garnham, 1988: 5) human beings' quest for AI goes back to the ancient Greeks over 2200 years.

The importance of Aristotle (384-322 BC) to the fields of technology and science should not be overestimated

(Feldman and Ford, 1979: 12). In his writings, on the field of human knowledge, he laid the foundation for modern scientific study and systemization of knowledge (Feldman and Ford, 1979: 12). Ancient Greeks were more technologically advanced than has often been assumed (Garnham, 1988: 4). The best example of their technological development is using of *Antikythera* mechanism in 80 BC. In addition to that, this *Antikythera* mechanism and the abacus are considered to be the ancestors of all the renaissance calculating devices. Around 1500, Leonardo da Vinci designed but did not build up the mechanical calculator (Cited in Boden, 2006: 345). In the modern world, calculating machines were first constructed by the philosophers Pascal and Leibniz (McCollum, 2013: 3). The first known and perfect calculating machine were constructed in 1623 by the Geneva scientist, Wilhelm (McCollum, 2013: 3). In the year 1651, Thomas Hobbes, in his book '*Leviathan*,' suggested the idea of 'artificial animal' (Garnham, 1988: 4). In 1830, Charles Babbage designed the first-ever digital computer (McCollum, 2013: 3) which was a kind of seed and opened a new door for today's AI. The term AI was first coined and used by John McCarthy in 1956 (Garnham, 1988: 4).

Four Major Methodologies of Artificial Intelligence

One can even broadly delineate the history of AI as the development of different methodologies of AI. According to Russell and Norvig, there are four major AI methodologies: Symbolic AI, connectionist AI, situated robotics, and evolutionary programming (Superintelligence) (Boden 2006: 345).

a. Symbolic Artificial Intelligence

Symbolic AI is also known as classical AI and 'Good Old Fashioned AI' (GOFAI) (Copeland, 1994: 122). These symbolic AI consist of sets of logical conditions of action (if-then), to achieve their purpose. For instance, in calculators, if

the condition is 2+2, the answer will be 4. These GOFAI methodologies are used to develop programs such as problem solvers, theorem-provers, data-mining systems, machine translators, expert system of many different kinds, chess players, semantic networks, question and answering programs, and analogy machines (Boden 2006: 345).

b. Connectionist Artificial Intelligence

In the 1980s, many AI scientists saw the revival of network theory or connectionism as a solution to the problems faced by GOFAI. The most common accepted definition of connectionism is, "an approach to modelling cognitive systems which utilizes networks of simple processing units that is inspired by the basic structure of the nervous system of the human being" (Bechtel, 1994: 200) Connectionist AI was inspired by modelling functions of the retina and brain of a human being.

c. Situated Robotics

Situated robotics is another and more recently enhanced AI methodology (Boden 2006: 347). Unlike GOFAI and connectionist AI, situated robots can act directly to environmental cues (Boden 2006: 345). Fire alarms and metal detectors are the best examples of situated robotics.

d. Superintelligence

Superintelligence, as defined by Bostrom, are "[i]ntellects that greatly outperform the best current human minds across many very general cognitive domains" (Bostrom, 2014: 63). In other words, superintelligence is the term that is used to refer to intellects especially the robots that greatly outperform the best current human minds, especially in general cognitive domains.

Some Positive Impacts of Artificial Intelligence

These AI agents are transforming our lives for the better in this world. As AI becomes more capable, our world becomes more efficient and consequently rich to live. Our devices are now connected with all the social media through which our personal digital assistants answer all the questions that we ask. Algorithms track our habits and make recommendations based on our likings from choosing the video on YouTube to choosing of wife in some matrimony applications. AI's advancements in medicine and the field of automobiles are remarking. There won't be any excitement to see cars will soon be driving themselves, and robots will be delivering our pizza, etc. Besides, humanoid robots are being developed to provide the elderly with assistance in their homes and in the same way Google Assistant is the best help for people who are feeling lonely. The deep learning algorithms are all around us, tracking us, prompting us, shaping our preferences and our behaviours (Boden 2006: 347).

Some Negative Impacts of AI

History shows that many new technologies have had unintended negative effects on the world. The scientific fictional movies such as 'Terminator' and 'Robot', novels such as *origin* depict the end of humanity by AI. The dangers of these movies are not that it would happen, but they distract us from seeing the real risks and opportunities presented by AI. These thoughts about the threats of the evolution of AI to the human civilization are shared not only by cineastes and novel writers, now, but famous ethicists and philosophers also focus on these AI threats (Farquhar et al, 2017: 9). Tech giants such as Alphabet, Google, Facebook, Microsoft, Twitter, and IBM as well as some individuals like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk believe that this is the right time to discuss and talk about AI. In a 2014 survey of AI experts, the Median experts

estimated that there is a 50% chance of creating human-level AI by 2040, and there is a 75% chance of creating superintelligence in the following hundred years (Farquhar et al, 2019: 9). If AI is invented to automate all the jobs, will it not be a threat to human beings who are working in those fields? For instance, look at trucking: it currently employs millions of individuals in the United States alone. What will happen to them if self-driving trucks become widely available in the market?

It is an interesting fact to note that in 2015, only 1,78,000 different robots were used in the field of business for different purposes in China. It is sad to note that in 2017, it was increased and resulted in 3,78,000 robots (Kappor, 2017: 18). If the ratio of using AI in the field of business is increasing, is it not a threat to people already employed in those fields? The modern economy has become more dependent on computers and AI. Thousands of workers have been displaced by these AI at present and many more will be in the future. If it is going to replace one by one in the field of work, is it not a cosmological threat to the human being?

The first word that usually comes to mind when we hear the word 'machine' is that they are unbiased (Kumar, 2015: 38). But are they really so? It is a question that is becoming more and more germane in the field of AI. There are so many incidents to indicate that AI is biased and these developments are not suitable for all. Once upon a time, Google's photo application automatically classified dark skin tones as gorillas (Kumar, 2016: 38). In an AI judged beauty contest, AI went through thousands of selfies and chose forty-four fair-skinned faces to be the winners of the contest not even one dark-skinned face was chosen as a winner (Kumar, 2016: 39). Microsoft's twitter-based chatbox 'Tay' was designed to learn from its

interactions with users. Within 24 hours it was shut down. The user community taught it some seriously offensive languages and it regurgitated it faithfully and the very public experiment wrecked up a disaster with aggressive spewing racist and sexist remarks by this application (Kumar, 2016: 39).

Another interesting threat of AI is that it may lead one to attack his/her enemy even without building any weapons of AI. Through cyberwar, one can hack and crush the enemy's self-driving cars, auto-piloted planes, nuclear reactors, industrial robots, communication systems and financial systems (Tegmark, 2017: 118). If it is done by an evil-minded individual to destroy the whole of humanity, will it not pronounce the end of whole humanity? Sexual relationships with robots may seem far-off now, but they are coming sooner than we think (Brown, 2018). As virtual reality evolves, a robotic partner will become more and more plausible, perhaps even become preferable to human beings. If it is becoming plausible and preferable, will it jeopardize the role of husband and wife in the family? If a human is marrying an AI, it will be an ethical threat.

Will AI replace human beings? The answer to this question is simple: No, AI machine or computer can ever perform the intellectual act of understanding and judging or determining itself freely, because they are material machines and cannot perform spiritual actions of understanding, judging and free self-determining acts. Computing enormous data at very rapid speeds which supercomputers can do, is not the same as understanding, judging and deciding freely, which only humans can do, although words like intelligence and learning are also used for AI machines. However, we must take some necessary steps to ensure that this technological development suits all.

Conclusion: A Way Ahead

"The saddest aspect of life right now is that science gathers knowledge faster than society gathers wisdom," (Cited in Tegmark, 2017: 316) are the words of Isaac Asimov. Hence, before building or developing AI, proper education and understanding have to be given to our young people to make technology robust and beneficial; the modernization of ethical laws is needed before technology makes them obsolete. Resolving all the international conflicts is more important before they escalate into an arms race in autonomous weapons. Creating an economy that ensures prosperity for all will avoid AI racism. Creating a society where AI – safety research get implemented rather than ignored is essential. Agreements on some basic ethical standards before teaching morality to powerful machines will be a great helping hand for human beings to create an unbiased AI. We need to remember that as we shape the age of AI, we are the guardians of our future because our future is not something that is written on stone and just waiting to happen to us. It is ours to create. Let us create a better and fascinating future for us and our children.

References

Aatif, Sulleyman. (Nov 2, 2017) "Stephen Hawking Warns Artificial Intelligence 'May Replace Humans Altogether,'" *Independent News*, November 2, 2017, http://www.independent.co. uk/life- style/ gadgets-and-tech/news/stephen-hawking-artificial-intelligence-fears-ai-will-replace-humans-virus-life-a8034341.html, accessed January 6, 2018.

Beal, James and Andy Jehring. (Aug 1, 2017), "Facebook Shuts Off AI Experiment After Two Robots Begin Speaking in Their own Language Only They Can Understand," The Sun, August 1, 2017, https://www. thesun.co.uk/tech /4141624/

facebook- robots- speak- in-their-own-language. html, accessed January 6, 2018).

Bechtel, William. (1994). "Connectionism." In *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Samuel Guttenplan. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 200-201.

Boden, Margaret A. (2006). "Artificial Intelligence." *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edited by Donald M. Borchert, Detroit: Gale Cengage Learning, 1: 345-359.

Bostrom, Nick. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies* (Oxford: University Press.

Copeland, Jack B. (1994). "Artificial Intelligence." In *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*, edited by Samuel Guttenplan. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 120-125.

Feldman, Antony and Peter Ford. eds. (1979). *Scientist and Inventors: The people who made Technology from Earliest Times to Present Day*. London: Aldus Books.

Garnham, Alan. (1988). *Artificial Intelligence: An Introduction*. London: Routledge & Kegar Paul Ltd.

Horen, Dennis J. (1984). "Artificial Intelligence." In *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*, edited by Richard L. Grecory. New York: Oxford University Press, , 48-51.

Kappor, Ketan. (Dec 6, 2017). "How to get those Top AI Jobs," *The Hindu*, Dec. 6, 2017, 18

Kumar, Ekta. (Sept. 16, 2016). "If Artificial Intelligence is taught to think like Humans, Then Are Machines Going to Be Sexist, Racist and Discriminatory." *Outlook*, 37-40.

McCollum, Aaron E.(2013). *The Transhumanism Pandemic: Sub-Humanity's Messiah; Humanity's Annihilation*. Stanhope Gardens: Pisceanesque Publishing.

Sebastian Farquhar et al., (2017). *Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance*. Oxford: Oxford Press.

Tegmark, Max. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.

John Kennedy Philip is a member of the Salesians of Don Bosco, belonging to the province of Chennai. He has completed his masters in philosophy in Divyadaan, Nashik. Currently, he is teaching philosophy in the same institution. His main interests are Philosophy of Science, Artificial Intelligence, Transhumanism and Philosophy of Technology. Email ID: johnkennedy842@gmail.com

'Being Human is Being Who You Are': The Being of Technology and the Becoming of Humans

Vysakh Titus SJ
Sacred Heart College, Satyanilayam, Chennai

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence is occupying an inevitable place in our lives. There is steady progress in research too. Machine learning, AI domains, and algorithms are taught even in schools. Knowingly or unknowingly we encounter AI in our everyday life. And the world is slowly becoming dependent on AI. The recent pandemic has highlighted the importance of search engines. At this juncture, there are many relevant questions. What does it mean to be human in the age of Artificial Intelligence? What does it mean to be with others in the age of Artificial Intelligence? What does mean to be unique? Are we losing our identity with the use of search engines? This paper addresses the very essence of

Being Human and the essence of Being who You Are in the age of Artificial Intelligence.

"You may not realize it, but Artificial Intelligence is all around us" – Judy Woodruff, American broadcast journalist

Introduction

We are surrounded by AI. It will not be alarming news for some but for others, it will be a shock. We all are netizens in the present world. Day after day we are influenced by the search engines, different sites, Tubes, etc. Through these virtual worlds, the AI algorithms learn a person's interest and accordingly they provide recommendations for the user. These recommendations of the AI algorithms can take us for a ride. The human being can turn out to be a machine. Therefore, it is important to understand and constantly clarify the meaning of being human in an AI world. So Carl Sagan, American astronomer, planetary scientist, and cosmologist, affirms: "Everyone is, in the cosmic perspective, precious. If a human disagrees with you, let him live. In a hundred billion galaxies, you will not find another" (Sagan 1980).

In this pale blue planet earth, dots, seconds, minutes, days, months, years and ages pass on. Who can claim that this is me, you are you and they are they? We, as who we are, can define what this is and several other intriguing questions. 'Being human in the age of Artificial Intelligence' turn

This article gives an idea about how to be a human in the age of Artificial Intelligence, that is, 'Being Human is Being As You Are'.

out to be the key question. What does it mean by 'Being who You are' in the age of Artificial Intelligence?

Who You Are

Carl Sagan says, in a cosmic perspective you are 'precious'; precious as human beings when compared with other beings and non-beings. I would certainly agree with him and say that we will not find such a complex being in a hundred billion galaxies; a being with complex neuron networks, brain activities, mental activities, emotional variations, thought patterns, physical structure, kinaesthetic activities and skin texture etc. and a being which is precious because of its uniqueness.

In the modern world, technology can define who you are. Technology has taken giant leaps over the years. First, in the manner of hand-writing, we were unique. Then with the coming of the typewriter, we all became the same with the one writing style of the instrument (Seargeant, 2019: 108). However, in this netizen world, we are unique; unique in the form of codes and numbers. With the help of deep learning mechanisms used by Google, YouTube and other companies we are defined with the Googling (searching) patterns. Therefore, a search history can be used to define who you are. As we all know, each person has certain combinations of interests. Accordingly, the person searches his or her areas of interest. With those Googling patterns we can easily identify the characteristics of a person.

Can a search engine history define who you are? I would say, not yet. The Artificial Intelligence algorithm and deep mechanisms or techniques, which we employ today, are in their premature stage (Tamboli 2020). At this stage, it can define some patterns, but not more. With the development of technology, it can reach a stage where it can predict 'you are 99.99 per cent the way you are'. However, as we see in the

Ludic fallacy[1], though we are clear of all the one hundred possible outcomes, yet a human can bring an outcome outside the possible sequels in hand.

The best example for the Ludic Fallacy would be the air crash investigation of US Flight 1549. According to the investigation officers with the help of computer flight simulations and outcomes, the flight would have crashed and no one on board would have survived the crash. However, in reality with the given scenario, i.e., the bird strike-induced loss of engines, Captain Chesley Sully Sullenberger and the co-pilot Jeffrey Skiles took an outcome outside the box. They landed the plane in New York's Hudson River. All people on board survived the accident. (Tikkanen 2009) It shows that a simulation or an AI can define who you are to an extent within its limited boundaries in the present stage.

This unique outcome is a precious entity to us. Every person has his/her uniqueness. The very essence of us can be used to define who 'You Are'. It is who 'You Are' in the very depths of being a human.

Human? What does it mean to be a human? How can I be a human?

Being Human is Being With

Rationality, existentiality, social relationships, etc., can be used to define what it means to be human. At the depths of being a human, we can maintain that we are humans from the unique aspect of relationships (Bidshahri 2017). We

---

[1] Assuming flawless statistical models apply to situations where they actually don't. This can result in the over-confidence in probability theory or simply not knowing exactly where it applies as opposed to chaotic situations or situations with external influences too subtle or numerous to predict.

relate to the other not only in one way but from various perspectives. In the relationship, we might end up saying, "I want to be as the other".

On a similar note, in the modern world, technology is allowing us to connect. The inter-personal relationships can be maintained with any person in the world, i.e., beyond the four walls of our rooms and meet a person at the other end of the world. Being connected to the other person allows us to explore and gain more data. However, from a certain viewpoint, a person can say 'I would like to be like him or her', 'I would like to have those things', etc.

In other words, as Heidegger would say, he or she can get lost in the other world (They-Self) (Heidegger 2010: 268). He or she might lose his or her own self and dissolve in the world of the other.

Here, Being Human means not be someone else but as Jesus says, Being perfect as the Heavenly Father is. In other words, Being perfect means being loving, compassionate, understanding. to others while being with them. Therefore, in worldly terms, Being Human is loving, compassionate, understanding of others while being with others without losing our uniqueness.

How can we learn to be as perfect as the Heavenly Father is? Being human in this world we are on the road to becoming fully netizens. Being netizens, the world is exposed to us. We get enough and more examples of good people on the internet or the people around us. The present AI used by the big search engines does not have any biases. Therefore, it can show the examples fairly and we can learn about them from any part of the world.

Similarly, Being with oneself is also important. In other words, how are we comfortable in using our own human capabilities? Years ago, the use of paper or brain to do a math calculation

was highly appreciated. However, in these recent times, we are into the use of calculators and computers to do the same. Similarly, in the field of cars, we are inclined into the use of automatic cars than the manual shift ones by which we are losing the hand-leg-brain coordination which was important once. It is not about the calculative power or coordination we lose but it is about losing the things we are good at as humans. As the old saying says, "use it or lose it." It is up to us to use what we have, that is, human actions or to lose it.

Nevertheless, Being Human netizens means not being another person but learning to Be Human in this complex world. By being 'As You Are', you are 'Being Human' in Being with others and Being with one's own human capabilities.

Being You

The basic structure of humane qualities allows us to act on our terms. In the sense of the modern world, I would say one should use mobile, hypertexts, social media, emoji and so on with the inalienable freedom to make the right choices.

In this day and age, the internet world or the AI world can give us a vast number of recommendations. As that it may, it does not mean that we should lose our own identity. In other words, one should be able to be 'As You Are', 'Being Human' and say 'I am who I am'. 'I am who I am' is the revelation received by Moses as he witnesses the burning bush described in the book of Genesis in the Bible. Similarly, as the creators and consumers of AI in this modern world, we are gods or demigods. We should be able to say that I have my own stand, identity, freedom, will, choice in our Googling patterns and I want to go beyond the AI recommendations.

The internet world gives us various possibilities to think and express, free from constraints and cultures which promote restrictions (Anderson and Rainie 2018). Therefore, in this modern world, there is a tendency for the user to explore other possibilities to escape into the safe zone of a private and friendly virtual reality.

AI digital world provides a user-friendly virtual world (Punjabi n.d.). It provides opportunities according to one's own taste. The best example in the current times is the YouTube site. Anyone can create a channel and post his or her own videos. Similarly, when you have seen a video it automatically provides you with related videos or recommendations. Here, you have to be yourself. In other words, you have to 'Be You' and you should have the will to go against the flow of the AI recommendations. Otherwise, these AI or AI algorithm recommendations in YouTube can rob our time for hours and hours. Therefore, 'Being You' means to be 'As You Are' and 'Being Human' means to be loving, compassionate, understanding and so on.

At the present times, the AI world as such does not discriminate between rich or poor or based on caste or religion. It does not show the rule of 80/20, the law of the vital few. It recognizes you as a human being. Therefore, even the poor can become a netizen in his or her own terms. He or she can voice their views to anyone in any part of the world.

In simple terms, an AI, if codified in a neutral sense, can give us various possibilities. Nonetheless, it is our choice to be 'As You Are' without losing the essence of 'Being Human' in the age of Artificial Intelligence.

Conclusion

As we move forward with the Artificial Intelligence the question remains is who will be controlling the AI world. History has proven the rule of 80/20 in a social scenario

without AI. As AI progresses in a research setup we do not feel the law of the vital few. Nonetheless, as the AI world advances, the few 20 can rule the other 80; which has already started in different forms. The giant corporations with the help of the virtual world compete to be a monopoly in certain fields. As the expert says, "Tools and systems are not always hurtful, people using them are" (Tamboli 2020). Once we have and learn a technology we can use it and it works for you. Nonetheless, 'who you' are depends on how you use the technology.

Therefore, we have to be conscious of the happenings in the virtual world to free ourselves from being deceived. As consumers of AI algorithms, we should have a certain determination not to be influenced by it but to be sapient and discerning in the use of the virtual world. This is a herculean task as we are surrounded by Artificial Intelligence and gradually deceived by it in small terms. Nevertheless, to be a 'human' and to be 'who you are' we should promote a culture that stands for the dignity of human Beingness.

References

Anderson, Janna, and Lee Rainie. (July 3, 2018). *The Positives of Digital Life.* https://www. pewresearch.org/ internet/ 2018/07/03/the-positives-of-digital-life/ (accessed April 10, 2020).

Bidshahri, Raya. (Dec 28, 2017). *What Is It That Makes Humans Unique?* https://singularityhub. com/2017/12/ 28/what-is-it-that-makes-humans-unique/ (accessed April 10, 2020).

Heidegger, Martin. (2010). *Being and Time.* Edited by Dennis J. Schmidt. Translated by Joan Stambaugh. New York: State University of New York Press.

Punjabi, Tanvi. (n.d.). *The Future of SEO.* https:// techno softwares.com/the-future-of-seo/ (accessed April 10, 2020).

Sagan, Carl. (1980). Cosmos. New York: The Random House Publishing Group, 1980.

Seargeant, Philip. (2019). *The Emoji Revolution: How Technology Is Shaping the Future of Communication.* First. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Tamboli, Anand. (May 10, 2020). "We Lost The Tail, Is The Brain Next?" *Electronics FOR YOU,*: 100.

Tikkanen, Amy. (2009). *US Airways flight 1549.* https://www. britannica.com/topic/US-Airways-Flight-1549-incident (accessed April 10, 2020).

Vysakh Titus is a Master's student of Philosophy, Sacred Heart College, Satyanilayam, Chennai. He belongs to the Jesuits of Kerala Province. email: vysakhtitussj@gmail.com

Are We Really Free? Tensional Human Existence between Limit and Limitations

Hansel A
De Nobili College, Pune

Abstract: Do humans have freedom? Is our life our choice or is it determined by forces like nature? Though many argue that human life is determined by natural laws and that we do recognize it only because of huge number of variables involved, I argue that human life is a free choice. The things we see as limits are not limits but things that makes us human. Not being able to fly is not a limit to humans but something that makes humans human. If I fly, I am not a human but a bird. This is just like the rules of game which though seem to limit helps us to play the game. There is creative dynamism springing from the transcendental dimension of humans that makes us free. So being human and living in a context, we have the creative dynamism to choose to live a life we want.

Keywords: Freedom, Limit, Limitation, Natural law, Determined, The transcendental principle

Introduction

Philosophy encompasses all the fields one can find as a matter of interest for human life in the world. One of the most important aspects that have been really bothering philosophers for thousands of centuries is freedom. There have been several arguments to decide whether human beings are determined or free. The daily experience of our human life possesses several pieces of evidence for both positions. I would like to reflect on this philosophical theme in trying to respond to the question "Are we bound? Or are we really free?"

The Future is Determined

There are mainly two arguments, which would convince us that all our activities are determined and we have no free will. One is from our daily direct experience of being limited physically and socially. The other is the argument proposed by scientists, especially cosmologists that our destiny is determined by natural laws.

It really does not need much explanation to illustrate that our freedom is limited. It is clearly illustrated by our inability to fly, pass through walls, occupy all space and time and escape disease and death. Socially where the other people limit our freedom. Sartre says in the play *No Exit* (Sartre, 1985) as "Hell is the other people" and also that the other's gaze makes me into a being and restrains my dynamism.

Many scientists believe that our future is determined by natural laws. Stephen Hawking says that the laws of nature determine all things including human behaviours. In his book *The Grand Design* (Hawking and Mlodinow, 2010) he says "While conceding that human behaviour is indeed determined by the laws of nature, it also seems reasonable to conclude that the outcome is determined in such a complicated way and with so many variables as to make it impossible in practice to predict".

Limit and Limitation

To understand the issue, we must first have clarity of two terms: limit and limitation. Human beings are physically limited, as they cannot have wings to fly. Though human beings are physically limited to fly, for a person to stammer in front of a crowd is only a limitation which they can overcome by practice.

To explain the limit further, in a game, rules limit the players from playing in a particular way. However, do rules determine the game completely? No, we use rules to play the games differently by employing our creative dynamism. Limits like rules are not fixed ends but only horizons that evoke our creativity. Thus, the physicality, social dimension and natural laws are not limits but horizons to be transcended. In the light of the ever-expanding horizon of limit and limitation and the existence of a transcendental principle, there is no determinism. Now we can ask whether humans have a transcendental principle, which has freedom?

There are several themes like Sartre's existence before essence, Simone de Beauvoir's notion of becoming of gender, Friedrich Nietzsche and Heidegger's will to power, Hannah Arendt's banality of evil, Sigmund Freud's will to Pleasure and Judith Butler's gender as performance which insist on human being's dynamism.

The Transcendental Principle

Is this transcendental principle real? There is an option that supports the transcendental principle. When we think of an object, we can speak about its essence and existence. The object essence is easily predicted. Thus, the object is

limited by the predicate. The objects of existence cannot be predicted. The essence has no limits and therefore transcends limits. It is similar to the principle of infinity in Maths, which is incomprehensible.

Now we embark in the journey of finding a transcendental principle. If it is the quality of material alone, it is the mineral kingdom. If it is a reproduction, nourishment, repair mechanism and growth, it is the vegetative Kingdom. If it is locomotion with all the above qualities, it may be the animal kingdom.

The transcendental principle is a principle of dynamism. Only humans have an urge for dynamism and creating themselves ever new. There are several themes like Sartre's existence before essence, Simone de Beauvoir's notion of becoming of gender, Friedrich Nietzsche and Heidegger's will to power, Hannah Arendt's banality of evil, Sigmund Freud's will to Pleasure and Judith Butler's gender as the performance which insist on human being's dynamism. The most important thing that makes humans, as humans, is this transcendental principle, which is never seen in any other Kingdom. The human kingdom alone was able to contemplate an unlimited principle of God. They are the ones who formed religions. It is this principle that makes poet- mystic-philosopher-theologian-scientist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin view human beings as "spirit in the world". The soul is not a special thing found in the body but matter itself has attained a higher threshold of complexification of being self-conscious. Both matter and spirit as antithesis interdependent in humans. It is consciousness becoming conscious of itself. Thus, humans are beings with transcendental principle.

The Transcendental Principle and Humans

"Life is difficult. This is a great truth, one of the greatest truths. It is a great truth because once we truly see this truth, we

transcend it. Once we truly know that life is difficult, once, we truly understand and accept it-then life is no longer difficult. Because once it is accepted, the fact that life is difficult no longer matters," holds Scott Peck.

Scott Peck speaks about the transcendental principle of knowledge helping us to move beyond all our suffering and pain. We have seen that human beings are not material with a collection of knowledge. They are not beings who can only act on impulse. They have the freedom to choose their own attitude, to be happy at any moment and transcend to choose to do what is most responsible for them.

In *Man's Search for Meaning* by Viktor E Frankl (1959) talks about finding meaning in suffering as a surety for survival. Seeing some people in concentration camps suffer a lot but others choosing to help people in their worst situation taking several risks makes Frankl realize that even in a very difficult situation people are free to choose their attitude. We have the choice to give up or to live. This is the outcome of the transcendental principle we as humans have.

In several ways, human beings have overcome their own limits by this transcending principle. This is why we see that the world progresses towards a higher understanding of everything. We were also able to creatively tackle problems and bring in innovative advancement. It is this principle that makes them humans, not animals or plants. Human beings are completely free to make their own choices and this makes them a mystery and unpredictable.

Another aspect is that, as human beings, we could unite ourselves with the higher reality spiritually. With this, we engage ourselves in acts of transcendental love, which gives ultimate meaning to our lives as told by Scott M Peck in his book *The Road Less Travelled* (Peck 1978). This complete freedom, in spiritual terms, may be called enlightenment or *mukti*, or liberation. This is the ultimate goal of human life. This is what makes us fully alive and fully human.

Conclusion

Limits and limitations cannot determine our future if we can transcend them. A real human being who can transcend is never contained or limited. We can see that human beings always have an urge within themselves to move towards an unlimited reality. This transcendental principle helps us as the power within ourselves to choose freely. It is always possible for us to go beyond all limits and limitations. We have a spirit in the body, which enables us at all times to move beyond these limits and be almost completely free.

Bibliography

Desbruslais, Cyril. (1997). *The Philosophy of the Human Person*. Pune: JDV.

Frankl, Viktor. (1959). *Man's Search for Meaning*. New York: Bacon.

Hawking, S. W., and Leonard Mlodinow. (2010) *The Grand Design*. London: Bantam.

Peck, Scott M. (1978). *The Road Less Travelled: A New Psychology of Love, Traditional Values and Spiritual Growth*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1985). *No Exit: & the Flies*. New York: Knopf

Hansel A is a Jesuit belonging to Chennai Province and has just completed successfully his philosophy studies from Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth, Pune. Email. hanselsj@ gmail.com

Experiencing the Depth and Diversity of Reality: Ongoing Questions and Not a Full Stop

Vincent Hansdak
Papal Seminary, Pune 411014, India

Abstract: The article focuses on some of the important questions and examines them deeply. Socratics has rightly said, '*an unexamined life is not worth living*. An examined life helps us to lead a better life, opens up our eyes to differentiate what is good and bad; it also leads us to know ourselves better. Moreover, it helps us recognize *the beauty of the world*, the *mystery of the body* and the *holiness of the other*. This will make us approachable, loving, kind, and humble human beings. It explores the Holy Science model, according to which everything God created, including science, religion and evil itself, is good and holy. They have their own independent existence and domain. But they all lead to the final TRUTH. For this constant searching and questioning from all dimensions of our existence are essential.
Keywords: Depth of Reality, Holy Science Model, Truth, Questioning

Philosophy or deep thinking about begins with asking questions. This was the important method of the great Philosopher, Socratics. He often entertained the questions but rarely gave any answers for the questions, he was asked. Karl Popper also believed that the problems of the questions are more important than the answers (Funelas, 2001). Most of the time the answers depend on the questions. Asking question is one of the very important means to learn and unlearn. The moment we begin to question, we start learning. On the other hand, when we stop asking questions, we put end to our learning. Therefore we need to constantly ask questions to know the depth of reality. To know the depth of the reality we need to have ongoing questions and not a full stop.

The aim of this paper is to focus on some of the important questions and examine them deeply. Socratics has rightly said, '*an unexamined life is not worth living*. An examined life helps us to lead a better life, opens up our eyes to differentiate what is good and bad; it also leads us to know ourselves better. Moreover, it helps us recognize *the beauty of the world*, the *mystery of the body* and *holiness of the other*. This will make us approachable, loving, kind, and humble human beings.

The more we ask questions, the more we learn.
The more we learn, the wiser we become.
The wiser we are, the more humble we become.
The more humble we are, the more human we become.
The more human we are, the more divine we become.
Ultimately this is what we are all called for, the purpose of our life.

Approaching the Truth of Reality

Different thinkers have different views on the truth of reality. According to Hegel, the absolute is not yet but the reality is in the process of becoming itself. (Mercier, 2020: 103).

According to Gandhi the reality or Truth is God and God alone is the reality (or Truth)! According to Plato, the ideal world is the only reality and everything else is copy.

From the given examples it is clear that the reality is different to the different thinkers. And this reality is completely subjective. There are two kinds of reality; *subjective* and *objective*. The subjective reality is based on personal experiences whereas the objective reality is based on universality; reality in itself. Our task in this paper is to find out the objective reality which exists independent of the knower.

> What is truth? Who can know it? Where can it be found? How does the truth look like? These are some of the fundamental questions of the metaphysics.

None has ever objectively claimed what the reality or truth is all about. But one thing is for sure, the reality exists; and that is the only truth. The truth can never be false and unreal. The truth is single and one. The way or the method to reach the truth may differ but ultimately the truth is one. But the questions here are: *What is truth*? *Who can know it*? *Where can it be found? How does the truth look like?* These are some of the fundamental questions of metaphysics and of our very life. To respond to the stated questions, let's examine some of the important issues.

The Mystery of Human Body

We are all human beings. We are human because we have the power of rationality to understand and act on our will. Though we have the element of understanding and rationality in us we are unable to understand many things happening daily in and around us. We don't undertsnd how and when our hairs and nails grow. We don't know why do we blink every time. We are unaware of what happens to our body in sleep. We cannot explain why do we dream at night and where do they come from. We see the exact

places and the persons in our dreams as we have already seen through our eyes. It is beyond our reach what is that which articulate the exact images and places even in our dreams. We don't even feel the circulations of our body unless we check them. We really don't know where do our life or soul lay; whether is it in our blood, in our heart, in our brain or any other parts of our body. Without our awareness, without even any struggle (when we are normal) how do we breathe each moment. We don't know how the thoughts come to our minds. Therefore, the human body is called the palace of mystery.

The Mystery of Universe and Human Being

There are two extremes of thoughts for the beginning of the universe and of human beings. According to *science,* taking the theory of the Big Bang, the universe came into being by *prime atom*. And according to Charles Darwin, the human being originated from a very lower life form, the apes (James, 1985: 257). In the process of their living on earth, the apes adopted the shape of present-day human beings. And whatever survived remained till today. He called it, therefore, the survival of the fittest. The *religious,* taking the Christian view, on the other hand, is just the opposite of this extreme of thought. It claims that the universe is created by God or the Supreme Being.

As we know the truth is only one, therefore, whatever the explanation and logic we apply for the creation of the whole universe and of the human being, the truth remains the same, i.e. the universe and the human beings exist. The above given two extremes of thoughts show that we are unaware of how the universe and human beings came into existence. To find out this same reality there came up so many myths and theories and are they exist even to this day. But still, the

beginning of the universe and the emergence of human beings on the surface of the earth is a mystery.

The Mystery of the World

To date what we know about this universe, is what is discovered. Science has discovered only 4% of the universe and 96% of the universe is yet to be discovered. The celestial world has been discovered in very small measure. We have come to know only about some of the galaxies and stars of the celestial world. We don't know if there are other planets like earth, suns, moons and planets in the other galaxies. We have discovered only seven colours till today but it does not mean there are only seven colours. Among these seven colours, only one or two are can be seen by some of the birds and the animals. There are some rays that we can perceive, it does not mean there are only that many rays or waves. We are aware of only the five senses in our body; it does not mean there are only five senses in our body (Pandikattu, 2015: 214-217). It is because we have not yet discovered.

And those which are discovered are also not very reliable. Someone in future may come out with a new discovery for the very same things and falsify what we believe to be true. For, we know that whatever has been discovered is justified and falsified every now and then. For the first time, through the theory of Issac Newton, we knew that things fall to the ground because of the gravitational force but later Albert Einstein came up saying that it is so because of the curvature of time and space caused by mass and energy. In the same way, the understanding of the world changed from geocentric to heliocentric, understanding of minute particle from atom to quark, and the understanding of light from particle to wave-particle. But Science has clearly claimed that it is always open for change. To date, science says that life is possible only on earth but what will happen tomorrow is a mystery.

Knowing the Truth of Reality

According to the well-known Indian philosopher Sankara, this world is the '*Maya*'. He says that the world is false and unreal, therefore the multiple and changing reality perceived by our senses are not real world (Mercier, 2000: 107). The finite is the non-absolute being and the infinite is the absolute Being (Mercier, 2000: 108). Therefore, the infinite Being and things cannot be perceived by the finite being. We, finite beings, know only the limited things since our knowledge of what exists in the physical world rests on empirical evidence (Maudlin, 2007: 78). For Aquinas, all human knowledge is drawn from the sensible world, which is known by the intellect in a way that it cannot be known by any sensory world (James, 1985: 104). This is the reason why we don't even come to know many things what is happening in our surroundings unless someone comes up to us and tells us or unless we come to know through different means of communication. And what we come to know by ourselves also many times is beyond our understanding. From the above discussions also we have come to know that humans are far from the knowledge of even the simplest things happening in and around us. Therefore to know the truth as it is, is beyond our comprehension. We are unaware, not because our life span here on earth is short but we finite beings can never know the reality even if we had to live for thousands of years.

According to the French scientist-theologian, Teilhard de Chardin (Feist 2017), to know everything as it is, is to know the mind of God, in other words, to know the mind of God is to know everything. The God/ Ultimate Being who is all-powerful and omnipresence alone can give the perfect and the absolute answer for everything of this vast universe. As for us, it is impossible to know even the most common things of this world. As the poem goes this way:

Your creation is so amazing O Lord,
If I think, I don't understand them
If I see, I don't perceive them
If I look at your creation
My eyes are not satisfied.
How and why do the flowers have many colours?
How and why have some fruits sweetness in them?
How and why do the snakes have poison in their mouth?
How and why do the silkworms have silk in them?
How and why do the glowworms have light in them?
How and why is the sky on high?
How and why are the clouds in the sky?
How and why is the rain hidden in the clouds?
How and why do the oysters have pearls in them?
How and why is the gold buried beneath the earth?
How and why do the fruits have seeds?
How and why do the seeds have trees inside them?
How and why do the flowers have good smell in them?
How and why do the leaves have greenness in them?
I really don't understand them.

The Holy Science model is one of the means to come closer to the one who created a vast universe which is beyond our understanding and reach.

The Holy Science Model

The Holy Science Model holds that everything created by God is good and holy. It holds that from a believer's point of view, everything, including science and religion, is created by God. Therefore, they are essentially good and holy. The different discoveries of things, religious experiences and the amazing creation of this world lead us to the creator. The world and the universe are so beautiful and amazing to behold, and it is out of our understanding. Each object or created things of this world leads us towards its creator. The essence of that creator is present

in each and every created thing. Without the creator, there will not be any creatures, at least from a religious point of view.

The Holy Science Model holds:

1. No truth can contradict the other truth
2. Any addition to knowledge is progress
3. God is the culmination of this process
4. Therefore, the more we know the world, the closer we get to know God.

According to Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Teilhard, the wonders of this material world lead us to the spiritual world. Every particular object of the world is introducing the highest being who has created them. Thomas Aquinas came up with five proofs for God's existence and four causes through the material means. It is sure that there exists an agent whom we call God, Supreme Being, Ultimate Being or Absolute Being who created everything. For you, everything is crystal and clear. Before Him and nothing is hidden from his sight. The agent knows everything about the created. As this poem goes;

For me, everything is dim and unclear
But YOU know everything is crystal-clear.
YOU know the number of…..
Stars in heaven,
Sands in the seashore,
Hairs in our heads,
Our living on earth,
Leaves in thick trees.

YOU know how many times……
Our heart beats a day,
We think in a day,
We take the steps in life.
YOU know…….

What makes us happy,
What makes us sad,
What makes and what breaks us.

From this perspective, we do hold that God is the highest and noblest of all. But we can find traces of his goodness and holiness in everything: in the creatures, in religions and in sciences. The same goodness and holiness can be found in everyone, including the atheists. The evil person also somehow carries this same divinity, though we do not understand how evil can be called holy.

This model does give significance and ultimacy to God. But it does not say that religion is superior to science. It does not hold that the other-worldly is more important than this-worldly. Both have their own autonomous and independent existence. They have their own laws, methods and goals. But ultimately, they all lead to the one TRUTH. Towards this TRUTH we keep on moving, with the help of good and evil, sorrowful and happy, theists and atheists. For we all search together, as members of the human family towards that TRUTH, which remains dim and blurred. Even in this haziness and dimness, we can trace the HOLY.

Conclusion

Through the above discussion, we conclude that everything before our eyes are a mystery. And we all know that mystery can never be solved but only explored. The reality of the *world, thing and the universe* is beyond our perception and our comprehension. We can never arrive at our reality or truth (destination) fully; ours is a pilgrimage towards an ever-receding horizon (Pandikattu, 2018:5). To know the truth as it is is never possible for the finite being now and in the future too. Therefore, we can only approach reality but we can never attain it; in another word, we can only come closer to the reality or truth but never know them. We cannot give an answer for anything, for the

answer is "once-and-for-all" but we can only respond; for the responses can be many for the same thing. Since we are unable to find the answer, it does not mean that we should stop asking questions. When we ask questions, we shall definitely come to know, at least, some jest of reality.

Humans are called to be the explorers of the world by asking penetrating questions on the nature of reality. Our life here on earth is an ongoing journey to come closer to reality. Towards the end of his life, even St. Thomas Aquinas kept silent because he discovered whatever he wrote was rubbish and useless. The reality is much greater and more marvellous than what he wrote and knew. Through this, it is evident that reality remains a mystery. Therefore, let the questions be important for us never put a full stop to them. This will definitely help us to appreciate the mystery and goodness of the universe and human being. And we keep on asking, exploring and waiting. In this sense, life has no full stops. It is a series of questions that goes beyond everything, including our own death! In this sense, we can know the depth, diversity, colour and complexity of reality, which is very much part of our own selves

References

Feist, R. (2017). *Religion and the Challenges of Science*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Funelas, John E. (2001). *The Popperian Functionality of Metaphysics*. Manila: Philippiniana Sacra.

James B. R. (1985). *Philosophy of the Human Person*. Chicago: Loyola Press.

Maudin, T. (2007). *The Metaphysics within Physics*. Oxford University Press: United Kingdom.

Mercier, J. L. (2000). The Philosophy of the Absolute Reality.Banglore: ATC.

Murray, Thomas T. (n.d.). *Integral Perspectives: A hyperbook of reflections on thinking, caring, knowing, and being.*

http://www.integral-perspectives. com/ blog/draft- essays/6-philosophers-reveal-the-truth-about-truth-and-reality-2/

Pandikattu, K. (2015). *Ever Approachable, Never Attainable*. Pune: Jnanam.

Pandikattu, K. (2017). *Philosophical Anthropology*. Pune: JDV.

Reichmann, J. B. (1985). *Philosophy of the Human Person*. Chicago: Loyola Press.

Vincent Hansdak is the seminarian from the diocese of Dumka, residing in Papal Seminary, Pune and perusing his Philosophical Studies at Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth, Pune-411014, India. Email: vincyhansdak@gmail.com

From the Fittest as the Friendliest to the Cruellest: How We Can Save Ourselves

Gini George Thottappilly
Loyola College, Chennai

This review article of the Hare, Brian, and Vanessa Woods. *Survival of the Friendliest: Understanding Our Origins and Rediscovering Our Common Humanity* indicates the positive side of human origin and evolution. Unlike the classical understanding of the theory of evolution, where struggle and survival are stressed, this book stresses altruism, compassion and empathy as evolutionary preferences.

Keywords: Fittest as friendliest, altruism, *Survival of the Friendliest,* Brian Hare, Vanessa Woods

Hare, Brian, and Vanessa Woods. *Survival of the Friendliest: Understanding Our Origins and Rediscovering Our Common Humanity*. New York: Random House, 2020. 304 978-0-399-59066-5

Brian Hare is a Professor of Evolutionary Anthropology at Duke University, where he founded the Duke Canine Cognition Center. He is well-known for his research on 'dognition'. With his wife Vanessa Woods, a research scientist and award-winning journalist, he founded the new dog intelligence testing and training company Canines Inc. They collaborated further to write this challenging and inspiring book.

Self-Domestication Theory

In this evocative book, they ask: What is the secret to humanity's evolutionary success? Could it be our strength, our intellect...or something much nicer? 2020. It may be remembered that for about 300,000 years that *Homo sapiens* have existed, we have shared the planet with at least four other types of humans. All of these were smart, strong, and inventive. But around 50,000 years ago, *Homo sapiens* made a cognitive leap that gave us an edge over other species. How did it happen?

Since Charles Darwin wrote about "evolutionary fitness," the idea of fitness has been confused with physical strength, tactical brilliance, and aggression. The authors in this book argue that what made us evolutionarily fit was a remarkable kind of friendliness, a virtuosic ability to coordinate and communicate with others that allowed us to achieve all the cultural and technical marvels in human history. So they propose the "self-domestication theory."

The human self-domestication hypothesis proposes that these early-emerging social skills evolved when natural selection favoured increased in-group prosociality over aggression in late human evolution. As a by-product of this selection, humans are predicted

to show traits of the domestication syndrome observed in other domestic animals. In reviewing comparative, developmental, neurobiological, and paleoanthropological research, compelling evidence emerges for the predicted relationship between unique human mentalizing abilities, tolerance, and domestication syndrome in humans.

They throw light on the mysterious leap in human cognition that allowed *Homo sapiens* to thrive. But this gift for friendliness, which made us fitter for survival, came at a cost. Just as a mother bear is most dangerous around her cubs, we are at our most dangerous when someone we love is threatened by an "outsider." The threatening outsider is demoted to the sub-human, fair game for our worst instincts.

For most of the approximately 200,000 years that our species has existed, we shared the planet with at least four other types of humans. They were smart, they were strong, and they were inventive. Neanderthals even had the capacity for spoken language. But, one by one, our hominid relatives went extinct. Why did we thrive?

In an interesting and informal style and based on on years of his own original research their "self-domestication" theory (Hare, and Vanessa, 2020). suggests that we have succeeded not because we were the smartest or strongest but because we are the friendliest.

Cooperation and Innovation

This explanation is counter-intuitive. Since Charles Darwin wrote about "evolutionary fitness," scientists have confused fitness with strength, tactical brilliance, and aggression. But what helped us innovate, where other primates failed, is our knack for coordinating with and listening to others. We can find common cause and identity with both neighbours and strangers if we see them as "one of us," not as "the other."

This ability makes us geniuses at cooperation and innovation and is responsible for all the glories of culture and technology in human history. We have to pay a price for it. If we perceive that someone is not "one of us," we are capable of unplugging them from our mental network. Where there would have been empathy and compassion, there is nothing, making us both the most tolerant and the most merciless species on the planet. To counteract the rise of tribalism in all aspects of modern life, Hare and Woods argue, we need to expand our empathy and friendliness to include people who aren't obviously like ourselves.

Brian Hare's ground-breaking research was developed in close collaboration with Richard Wrangham and Michael Tomasello, who were notables in the field of cognitive evolution. *Survival of the Friendliest* explains both our evolutionary success and our potential for cruelty in one stroke and sheds new light onto everything from genocide and structural inequality to art and innovation (Hare, and Vanessa, 2020). The authors indicate that the same traits that make us the most tolerant species on the planet also make us the cruellest.

While offering a fresh look at evolution in the animal kingdom – including ourselves –, this book could solve some of the perennial problems facing us, like competition, aggressiveness and violence.

The books identify the fittest with the friendliest. In the animal kingdom, alpha males are not necessarily the fittest because they have no peers, thus they can become lonely and develop psychological problems—and the same goes for humans. Regarding the history of animals, the authors emphasize that cooperation advances a species (Kirkus Reviews 2020). They devote many interesting pages to comparing adult chimpanzees, which are distinctively unfriendly and sometimes violent to humans and even to other chimps outside their own group, and their lookalike species bonobos, which are among the friendliest animals in the animal kingdom, even toward other bonobos they do not know.

The authors also discuss how offering friendship to humans is how wolves and jungle cats became domesticated dogs and cats. Today, dogs and cats outnumber wolves and jungle cats by astounding numbers, and they have evolved in amazing ways as well. It's human evolution, however, that comprises the bulk of the narrative. The authors engagingly show how, unlike dogs and cats, we domesticated ourselves (Kirkus Reviews 2020); learning to cooperate with one another, especially groups with other groups, made us what we are today. The authors also note that evolution continues, and the next major change could come quickly via any animal that can overcome its fear of humans and express friendliness to us. Hare and Woods fill the text with reports of experiments that bolster their case, and although some of the scientific explanations might be a little much for general readers, they're necessary to prove their reliable results (Kirkus Reviews 2020).

Michael Tomasello, author of *Origins of Human Communication* and professor of psychology and neuroscience at Duke University says that this book "begins in basic behavioural science, proceeds to an analysis of cooperation (or lack thereof) in contemporary society, and ends with implications for public policy."

"*Survival of the Friendliest* is a fascinating counterpoint to the popular [mis]conception of Darwin's 'survival of the fittest.' Brian Hare and Vanessa Woods offer a convincing case that it was not brute strength, raw intelligence, or ruthlessness that allowed modern humans to thrive while our hominin relatives died out. Instead, they argue that friendliness was the key to our flourishing--and that the same kind of cooperative communication is the key to freeing us from the tribalism currently threatening democratic governance around the world. Powerful, insightful, accessible--this book gives me hope," holds Megan Phelps-Roper, author of *Unfollow*.

Positive Appraisal

Daniel E. Lieberman, author *The Story of the Human Body: Evolution, Health, and Disease*, and *Exercised: Why Something We Never Evolved to Do Is Healthy and Rewarding* comments on this book: "You will learn the astonishing story of how and why humans evolved a deep impulse to help total strangers but also sometimes act with unspeakable cruelty. Just as important, you'll learn how these insights can help all of us become more compassionate and more cooperative."

Isabella Rossellini, actress and activist says that this book "explains in the clearest terms how friendliness and cooperation shaped dogs and humans. This book left me with a happy and optimistic view of nature."

Conclusion

This book is for anyone who wants to know more about ourselves, personally and collectively. This book, *Survival of the Friendliest* offers us a new way to look at our cultural as well as cognitive evolution and sends an unambiguous message: To survive and even to flourish, we need to expand our definition of who belongs.

The book provides us with a robust and counterintuitive message that our evolutionary success depends on our ability to be friendly and a corresponding warning to expand our understanding of the other, for our very survival.

References

Hare, Brian, and Vanessa Woods. 2020. *Survival of the Friendliest: Understanding Our Origins and Rediscovering Our Common Humanity*. First edition. New York: Random House.

Hare, Brian. (2017). "Survival of the Friendliest: Homo Sapiens Evolved via Selection for Prosociality." *Annual Review of Psychology* 68(1):155–86. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010416-044201.

Kirkus Reviews. (May 15, 2020). *Survival of the Friendliest*. https://www.kirkusreviews.com/book-reviews /brian- hare/ survival- friendliest/

Gini Georg Thottappilly has completed her doctorate in Botany from Loyola College, Chennai and currently she is pursuing research. Her areas of interest are Botany, Phytochemistry and Science-Religion Dialogue.