

Abstract; there are many commonly held justifications against the proliferation of artificial intelligence. One of the most common brought forth by the general public is that many in that many feel artificial intelligence would not qualify as human or would lack humanity. The definition used by many is not the biological definition but instead a philosophical definition based on a mix of human or above human intelligence and empathy. These definitions can be both erroneous and unproductive. Several examples shown in the following text highlight the issues with such simple definitions of humanity.

One of the largest future conundrums our species faces is the ethical questions that surround the coming existence of human level general artificial intelligence. One of the largest questions brought about by these developments will inevitably be whether or not these artificial intelligences are people or simply high level computers; or indeed whether there is a difference at all. The main philosophical objection to computers that appear to have human intelligence being treated as human is the idea that such a being could be a philosophical

zombie; this is typically characterized as something that passes all the tests for human level intelligence and can perform all the functions a human does but does not have empathy or feelings. This turns out to be another objection common in the general public. Many find being around animals who have high intelligence such as chimpanzees, elephants or gorillas non-threatening not just because they aren't as intelligent as a humans but also because they are perceived to have at least some level of empathy. Elephants have been seen appearing to mourn there dead. Chimps have been known to occasionally adopt lone

infants. Many who object to A.I. May be much less threatened by the idea of uplifted animals; a futurist concept where animals could be altered genetically or with cybernetics to achieve human level intelligence. However this is hardly without risk. Dogs for example are hard wired to hunt prey and only show empathy to potential pack members. A.I could easily be much more alien in terms of thinking and processing than even dogs seeing as they did not have to develop via evolutionary process but instead may have even had a hand in its own creation. It's very possible empathy may not exist in the A.I. we create but does it truly

matter? Consider this: 1 in 100 individuals is sociopathic with little to no empathy. Many sociopaths though they struggle with empathy have families, pay taxes and contribute to society. This would indicate that lack of empathy may not be a valid reason to deem a A.I. as inhuman. These issues will continue to be discussed and debated in the coming decades and centuries. Public opinion regarding empathy and A.I. may change greatly once empathy can be emulated artificially to the point humans can not tell the difference. For all intensive purposes this will be referred to by many as empathy regardless of the

fact this can never be objectively proven. This could be such a good emulation most would in fact prefer it over human to human emotional content; a complete 180 degree spin from the current view.

Conclusions; Public views of artificial intelligence continue to be fairly negative but not necessary uncalled for. The philosophy of this concept will continue to change with real life use of these systems. Empathy will continue to be the primary concern when it comes human interactions with artificial intelligence.