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[Abstract] **Artificial intelligence is a manifestation of technology. Heidegger traces the nature of technology to its etymological meanings, namely art and poetry, in The Question of Technology, which also suggests that the nature of artificial intelligence cannot be understood only from its powerful digital computing functions, and that its instrumentality and artificiality are only an alienated form of its nature, while its true nature is the "deconcealment" ( ἀλήθεια) and "Ereignis" (event ) of human intelligence. Marx's idea of the alienation of labor reveals the inevitability of this alienation and its philosophical anthropological meaning from the perspective of the critique of national economy, and takes the "conscious activity of life" and the resulting division of labor between mental and material labor as the historical basis for the alienation of human nature. This opens a window for us to understand the alienation phenomenon of AI, and the inquiry into the nature of AI no longer remains in Heideggerian religious mysticism, but enters the historical phenomenological analysis of the origin of human beings. Based on the unity of human nature, i.e., "making, using and carrying tools" and the consciousness and life activities embedded in it, the essence of AI should be understood as the unity of the two links of human nature, i.e., consciousness and life activities, in "artificiality". The opposition and separation of consciousness and life activity in the nature of human beings is historically inevitable, and the abandonment of this opposition and the return to the integrity of human nature is an eternal goal that human beings cannot give up.**
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At present, Artificial Intelligence ( AI, that is, Artificial Intelligence) has aroused widespread concern in all walks of life, because since the 21st century, people have found that the development of Artificial Intelligence has begun to have a dangerous trend of surpassing human beings, controlling human beings, and harming human beings, and in the long run, there will be no space for human beings to survive on the earth we live on, and there are only "robots", from the perspective of development, they will replace humans, enslave them, and even destroy them. Is this concern justified? And how should humans get rid of this danger? This necessitates an in-depth examination of the nature of artificial intelligence, rather than just remaining in the external phenomenon.

**I. What Martin Heidegger's Inquiry into the Nature of Technology Teaches Us**

In 1956, John McCarthy and other scientists formally proposed at the Dartmouth Conference in the United States that any theories, methods and technologies that help machines (especially computers) simulate, extend and expand human intelligence can be categorized as artificial intelligence. However, judging from the development of AI in more than half a century, the essence of this definition is still realized in the last element, i.e., technology, and theories and methods are all for the service of technology.

Of course, there is nothing wrong with this definition itself; the problem lies in the nature of technology, which affects our understanding of the nature of artificial intelligence. Prior to this conference, on June 6, 1950, Heidegger gave a lecture at the Bavarian Art Association (Germany), the contents of which were later included in his book titled as Lectures and Essays which was published in 1954, and later in the seventh volume of The Complete Works of Heidegger) under the title The Questioning of Technology. See. [**https://www.beyng.com/pages/en/LecturesEssays/ToC.html**](https://www.beyng.com/pages/en/LecturesEssays/ToC.html) **and** [**https://www.beyng.com/hb/gesamt.html#7**](https://www.beyng.com/hb/gesamt.html#7) **and** [**https://www.beyng.com/hbooks.html**](https://www.beyng.com/hbooks.html)

These lectures provide an important clue for us to study the nature of artificial intelligence by asking about the nature of technology. In other words, AI is a technology that differs from technology in general in that it borrows machines to simulate, extend, and expand human intelligence. Therefore, in order to discuss the nature of AI, it is necessary to first figure out the nature of technology in general, and after figuring out the nature of technology, then look at how AI is differentiated from technology in general. It is only after such a process that the nature of artificial intelligence can be clarified.

One of the primary starting points of Heidegger's lecture is: "Technology is different from the essence of technology. ...... Likewise, the essence of technology is not a technical factor at all. Therefore, as long as we merely represent and pursue the technological factor, thereby identifying or avoiding this technological factor, then we can never experience our relation to the essence of technology."[[1]](#footnote-1) However, the question that people usually ask about technology is to stay at the level of "what is technology". There are only two such answers, namely, "technology is a tool for a purpose" and "technology is a human behavior", which belong to the instrumental and "anthropological" prescriptions of technology.[[2]](#footnote-2) These prescriptions are of course not wrong at their own level, but it is precisely this "correctness" of their own that obscures the nature of technology, and even leads to its alienation. "

As they say, people want to 'mentally manipulate technology'. People want to control technology. The more technology is in danger of breaking away from human domination, the more urgent is the will to control it."[[3]](#footnote-3) Since Aristotle, however, technology has been understood exclusively at the level of the instrument, i.e., as the cause of one thing and the end of the other. Thus "the end for which the properties of the instrument are prescribed is also regarded as the cause"[[4]](#footnote-4) , in which causality plays a predominant role. And when we see in this instrumental causality the evil consequences of the manipulation of technology , we condemn it morally, but this blocks the way to understanding the nature of this causality in its original sense.

In Heidegger's view, this path is to see technology not only as a pragmatic tool, but also as a revelation or "demystification" of truth ( ἀλήθεια). "As such, technology is not only a means. Technology is a form of demystification. If we notice this, then an entirely different field is opened up to us that is appropriate to the nature of technology. This is the realm of demystification, which is also the realm of truth."[[5]](#footnote-5) In other words, we can examine technology not from the practical (pragmatic) side, but from the cognitive side in a hyper-utilitarian way. However, this demystification is ambiguous from the beginning. From the Greek word for technology ( τε＇ χνη, techne), which itself means both practical technology and artistic creation. "In the first place, τε' χνη is not only a name denoting manual acts and skills, but it is also a name denoting virtuosity and all kinds of beautiful art. τε' χνη belongs to output, to; it is a certain kind of creation (etwas Poietisches)."[[6]](#footnote-6)

But what is most disturbing is that these two meanings of τ ε＇ χνη are usually incompatible, if not opposite. The former, practical technology, is merely a "holding" (Bestand) that is "made" (bestellen) or "stellen" (stellen), whereas the latter, the art of beauty, is a "holding" (Bestand) in the sense that it is "made" (Bestand) in the sense that it is "made" (Bestand). The latter, the art of beauty, is the "Be-stell" which "forces" man to "create" from behind, and which "implies that way of unshackling". "implies the kind of demystification that dominates the nature of modern technology and is not itself a technological factor"[[7]](#footnote-7) .

"Modern technology is neither merely a human behavior nor fundamentally a mere instrument within the scope of such human behavior. The purely instrumental, purely anthropological prescription of technology fails in principle. Such prescriptions cannot be supplemented by a metaphysical or religious account that is merely controlled behind the scenes."[[8]](#footnote-8) This means that only by bringing the "metaphysical or religious account" from behind the scenes to the foreground, i.e., by demystifying the divine through the creation of art, can the inadequacy of instrumental technology be remedied and the nature of technology in general be revealed.

Obviously, what Heidegger means is that the essence of technology lies in the "frame" behind it, and that the "unmasking" brought about by technology as a practical "ordering" is nothing more than a "masking" of this frame, through which a deeper level of unmasking must be made, and this deeper level of unmasking is none other than art. The "masking" of this frame must be a deeper masking through this level of masking, and the way of this deeper masking is nothing but art. In ancient Greece, technology and art were the same word τε＇ χνη, but in the later development, the instrumental technology took the first place at , and the way of art's unmasking was gradually forgotten. Heidegger tries to go through this path to bring this demystifying truth back to light. Therefore, he borrowed Hegel's definition of art---"Art is the sensuous manifestation of the idea" and adapted it in another article and put forward his own stipulation of the essence of art, that is, "Truth is set into the work by itself. set itself into the work"[[9]](#footnote-9) . Of course, his truth here is no longer Hegel's "Idea" of absolute spirit, but the "becoming" of "existence" itself (Ereignis[[10]](#footnote-10) ).

In other words, existence itself is revealed or "deconcealed" in art, and this is the ultimate truth. This is also what Heidegger means when he quotes Hölderlin's poem "But where there is danger, / there is also salvation" (3), i.e., the alienation of technology brings disaster to mankind, but the way to relieve the danger is not to give up and exclude the technology, but to trace back and return to the essence of the technology, so that the truth or existence itself can "grow" or "grow" or exist on its own. "grow" or manifest itself. And this manifestation, as the root of all technology and art, is "creation" ( ), that is, "poetry" (Dichtung). "The essence of art is poetry", where "poetry" is broadly defined. "The essence of language is poetry in the fundamental sense. But since language is that birth in which Being as Being has always first been fully unfolded for man, poetry, in the narrower sense of the word, is poetry in the fundamental sense of the word. Language is poetry not because language is primitive poetry, but rather, poetry takes place in language because language preserves the primitive nature of poetry. Architecture and painting, on the contrary, have always already, and always only, taken place in the open realm of doxology and naming. ...... And the clarity of Being has long since taken place unconsciously in language." It is insightful to trace the nature of technology back to poetry, and then to its "primordial essence", language. However, Heidegger could not go further, i.e., to inquire into the origin or essence of language, and he had to resort to some kind of religious mystery or the "salvation" of God's "Tao".

This is the conclusion of the essay "The Question of Technology": "The art of unraveling that penetrates and dominates all beauty has acquired this name, the name of poetry, the poetic thing", and the key to the solution of the "madness of technology" lies in the fact that The key to solving the "madness of technology" lies in the fact that "through all the technological elements, the essence of technology appears in the Ereignis of truth"; the "critical state" we are in is that "we have not yet faced the clamor of technology in order to experience the essence of technology". We are in a "critical state" in that "we have not yet faced the clamor of technology to experience its essential presence. ...... The closer we are to danger, the more the path to salvation begins to shine brightly, and the more inquisitive we become. For inquiry is the piety of thought".[[11]](#footnote-11)

**II. The Alienation of the Nature of Technology and Marx's Critique**

Heidegger's question brings us to the danger that when we lose the "piety of thought," we may be blind to unveiled truths and habitually blind ourselves with ready-made answers. All we can see is the alienated form of what is created (either by ourselves or by God). "And so, where one describes all that is present on the basis of causality, even God may lose all sanctity and sublimity for the appearance, as well as its remote mystery. In the vision of causality, God may then be reduced to a cause, an acting cause ( causa efficiens[[12]](#footnote-12) ).

And furthermore, even in the theological sphere, God would become the God of those philosophers who prescribe the realm of the unveiled and the realm of the veiled according to the causality of production, while at the same time never contemplating the essential source of this causality."[[13]](#footnote-13) The philosophers mentioned here would be Leibniz. In his History of Western Philosophy, Russell described Leibniz's "secret philosophy" as a "universal arithmetic" based on the law of logical contradiction and the law of sufficient reason, thus replacing thought with calculation. In Leibniz's view, "with such a thing we are able to reason about metaphysical and moral questions almost as well as in geometry and mathematical analysis", and "in the event of a dispute, just as there is no need for a debate between two accountants, so there is no need for a debate between two philosophers. For they have only to take up their stone pencils, and sit down before the tablets, and say to each other (with the testimony of their friends, if they wish to do so): Let us do the math, and that will be all."[[14]](#footnote-14) This set the stage for the analytic philosophy of artificial or ideal languages that developed later in the 20th century, and provided the philosophical basis for the development of artificial intelligence. Of course, it would be nonsense to "calculate" the existence of God on a stone tablet with a stone pen, but these philosophers believed that this artificial language was more than adequate for everyday life, and that it could give the only answer to either/or questions, with a precision and rigor that is not usually found in natural languages. This makes what man has created into something hostile to man, and the activity of objectification into an activity of alienation.

In Heidegger's case, this alienation of technology is what he calls the "highest danger": "Once the unclouded field ceases to be even an object, and is only related to man as a holding, and man, in the absence of the object, remains only a subscriber to the holding, then man is at the very edge of the cliff. has come to the very edge of the precipice, i.e., to the place where man himself is still regarded only as a holder. But it is precisely the man who is so threatened who has swelled up and assumed the role of master of the earth with great vigor. As a result, the impression spreads that everything around him exists because it is the work of man. This impression leads to a final and bewildering illusion. Under this illusion, it is as if everywhere a man goes, he is only looking at himself. ...... But in reality, today man no longer encounters himself, i.e. his essence, precisely wherever he is."[[15]](#footnote-15)

What is depicted here is exactly the dilemma facing artificial intelligence today. Information, networks, computers, and robots are all artifacts in which we see only human ingenuity and not Nature or the Lord intervening. As a result, we think we are omnipotent and have become masters of the world, but we happen to feel at the same time how boring and dehumanizing the world is. Although it is also a product of imagination and creativity, once it is produced, it can't allow any imagination and creativity, and can only operate according to the computational laws that have already been formulated, and the artificial intelligence that is built on top of artificial language and machine language is the most typical representative in this regard. This kind of artificial intelligence has actually become a kind of inhuman intelligence, and it does not mind that it has evolved into a kind of demonic intelligence, anti-human intelligence, which is precisely the most frightening and dangerous part of it. Human beings can no longer grasp their own works, and they will be dominated, enslaved, and harmed by their own works, descending to become the tools or servants of this work, and then losing the qualification of being a human being.

This is the phenomenon of alienation that inevitably occurs in the process of man's own creation and production, the principle of which has already been thoroughly revealed by Fichte, Hegel and especially Marx, only for its harsh consequences to be fully manifested only today in the negative effects of artificial intelligence. If the nineteenth-century workers in Western Europe were still naïve enough to think that, by destroying the machines, man could return to the self-sufficiency or "free and easy" life of the artisanal era, the twentieth-century Chaplin, in the "modern age", had already seen that man's role in this untenable situation was not to be limited by the fact that the machines had been destroyed. In the twentieth century, Chaplin in his "Modern Times" had already seen that man was left with black humor and a helpless situation in front of this irresistible "fate"; the two world wars had demonstrated the domination and brutality of machines over man to the fullest extent.

Under the mysterious manipulation of big data and the Internet, the autonomy of the individual self has been reduced to zero, and information has become the absolute master in the matter of "ordering" the world, which breeds a certain kind of arrogance and hubris in the face of the natural world and the entire past history of mankind. At this point, the self-alienation of AI has risen to a point of no return. The alienation of technology in artificial intelligence has entered into human intelligence itself, and human self-identity, all human emotions and imagination, and even human genius have all become the objects of this artificial intelligence.

The most familiar theory of alienation is Marx's doctrine of the alienation of labor. In his Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, Marx put forward four stipulations of labor alienation from the point of view of political economy: (1) the alienation of labor products; (2) the alienation of labor activity itself; (3) the alienation of man's class essence; and (4) the alienation of man's relations with man.

Among them, the alienation of the products of labor is the result of the alienation of the labor activity itself[[16]](#footnote-16) , while the alienation of the nature of man and the alienation of the relationship between man and man cannot be considered as the stipulation of the alienated labor itself, strictly speaking, but only the consequences it leads to in psychology and sociology.[[17]](#footnote-17)

It can be seen that the four stipulations of the alienation of labor have an intrinsic hierarchical relationship in Marx, the most fundamental of which is the second stipulation, i.e., the alienation of the labor activity itself, which is the origin and essence of all other phenomena of alienation. [[18]](#footnote-18)

Originally, human labor, as the unique life activity of human beings, is the fundamental difference between human beings and animals, in which human beings "turn their life activity itself into an object of their own will and consciousness," and "conscious life activity directly distinguishes human beings from the life activity of animals. "[[19]](#footnote-19) , and this life activity is thus conscious and purposeful, and characterized by freedom, what we call "artificiality", which is the philosophical (or philosophical anthropological) stipulation of the essence of the human being. However, from the point of view of national economics, due to the establishment of private ownership and the separation of consciousness from vital activity in labor activity as a result of capitalist relations of production, the phenomenon of human beings being alienated into the servants of the machine occurs, and human beings themselves lose their initiative and free will, and are subjected to the rhythm of the machine that is strictly calculated, and their artificiality is transformed into mechanicality.

Of course, Marx's focus is on the alienation of political economy, not on the philosophical implications of this alienation. But he also pointed out that in national economics, although private property is presented as the basis and cause of the alienation of labor, it is in fact nothing more than the result of the alienation of labor, "and thus private property is the product, the result and the necessary culmination of externalized labor, i.e., of the laborer's external relation to nature and to himself. ...... Just as the gods were not originally the cause but the result of the delusion of human reason"[[20]](#footnote-20) . Therefore, the apparent contradiction presented by private property is in fact "the contradiction between alienated labor and itself, and national economics merely expresses the laws of alienated labor."[[21]](#footnote-21) .

What, then, is the "law" that alienated labor contradicts itself? Or how does man achieve the externalization, the alienation, of his own labor? How is this alienation rooted in the nature of human development? This is no longer a question of political economy, but of philosophy. Marx does not answer these questions immediately, but simply says: "This new formulation of the problem already contains the solution of the problem."[[22]](#footnote-22) But elsewhere he answers these questions on the basis of philosophical anthropology[[23]](#footnote-23) , that is: although conscious vital activity directly distinguishes man from the animal, and thus gives to human labor the essence of being freely disposed of by human consciousness and will, the "alienation of labor" reverses this relation: it is precisely by virtue of the fact that man is a conscious being that he transforms his vital activity, his essence, into a mere maintenance of his own life. It is because man is a conscious being that he transforms his vital activity, his essence, into a mere means of sustaining himself"[[24]](#footnote-24) . This means that the relationship between the two aspects of man's labor activity itself, i.e., conscious activity and vital activity, is inverted and separated, and this separation is not an external and artificial one, but is the result of the division of labor that necessarily occurs in the movement and development of labor itself, and in particular of the increasing separation of spiritual and material labor. I have combined Marx's later writings on the division of labor and its role in history to come to this conclusion: "The division of labor between spiritual and material labor is the initial internal impetus and inevitable trend of the forward development of human production, and its irresistible inevitability and spontaneity are rooted in the fact that it constitutes the inherent contradiction in the nature of the labor activity itself; the activity of labor necessarily manifests itself in the movement of these two. In its movement, labor activity inevitably manifests itself as a contradiction between the two and develops into an antagonism between the two. On the contrary, it is this inner contradiction that pushes the movement and expansion of labor activity, pushes the progress of productive forces, and pushes the creation and development of human civilization, and at the same time pushes the emergence of the alienation of man's essence, and makes it pure, thorough, and sharp in its form, so as to prepare the way for the abandonment of the alienation of man and the abandonment of the labor activity in its own alienation. prepares the material basis of reality for the renunciation of the alienation of man, and ultimately for the renunciation of the alienation of labor activity itself."[[25]](#footnote-25) This means that the root cause of the alienation of labor at the level of national economics is based on the inner contradiction that must occur in the history of the "conscious life activity of man" at the level of philosophy (philosophical anthropology), i.e., on the self-negation of man's essence. Fundamentally, self-denial is the essence of human being, which in its historical development inevitably and step by step stimulates the alienation of labor activity and the alienation of labor products, and evolves into the alienation of the essence of human being and the alienation of the relationship between human being and human being. These alienation phenomena may be abolished through social transformation or revolution at the level of national economics, but their ultimate root cause, the division of mental and material labor resulting from the division of labor and the ensuing degree of antagonism, cannot be completely abolished. Even under the social conditions of the elimination of private ownership and the "three great distinctions" (between the brain and the body, between urban and rural areas, and between workers and peasants), the division of labor is still needed and exists, and will always remain an important driving force for the continuous development of the productive forces of society.

Marx pointed out the conditions under which the division of labor leads to alienation, i.e., "as long as the division of labor is not voluntary but naturally occurring, man's own activity becomes for him an alien and antagonistic force, a force which oppresses him rather than a force which he masters"[[26]](#footnote-26) . He envisioned a future communist society in which "no one has a special sphere of activity, but all can develop within any sector, and society regulates the whole of production, thus making it possible for me to do this one day and that the next according to my own interests, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, engage in stockbreeding in the evening, and critique after supper, and in this way not to be always a hunter, fisherman, shepherd, or critic"[[27]](#footnote-27) .

But this still does not mean that the division of labor has been abolished, but only that it is no longer an external social hierarchy, but a choice of interests and talents "by choice". Today, the individual uniqueness and diversity revealed by these differences have increasingly become the driving force behind the development of civilized society.[[28]](#footnote-28) However, even so, the existence of differences involves a certain tendency to separate and oppose each other. It is this tendency that inevitably creates, in the development of artificial intelligence, a Matrix-style unequal relationship between the dominant and the dominated, which will ultimately lead to the loss of human freedom.

It follows that Marx's conception only provides a formula for the abandonment of alienation at the level of national economics, without dealing once and for all with the alienation of the nature of man at the philosophical level. This has to do with the essentially critical and open nature of Marx's philosophy, which, in terms of the philosophical nature of man, actually maintains an open vision on the question of alienation. But this openness is not the same as Heidegger's expectation of God's mysticism and "piety of thought"; it is not an endless "quest" for the other side, but rather, it considers the nature of technology and artificial intelligence as a philosophical anthropological problem. In other words, its inquiry has its practical and historical answer in the origin of mankind and the philosophical nature of man as demonstrated by it.

**III. The Nature of Artificial Intelligence from Human Origins**

Artificial Intelligence technology, like any technology, is undoubtedly a human’s product, a work of human reason and human mind. Therefore, just as technology is different from the essence of technology, AI is different from the essence of AI. But on the other hand, just as the essence of technology cannot be talked about without technology, the essence of AI can only be "interrogated" and "demystified" in AI itself, which is precisely the aspect that Heidegger neglects. Therefore, he can only put aside "Being" to talk about "Being itself", put aside technology to talk about the nature of technology, and finally can only resort to the mysterious revelation of God by virtue of "the piety of thought". However, we must hold on to the highly complex human technology of artificial intelligence, take its origin, development and self-alienation as the clues to reveal its true nature, and transform the theological answer to the question of the technological nature of artificial intelligence into the phenomenological answer of philosophical anthropology, which is to trace the origin of artificial intelligence and even the origin of human beings.

As the name suggests, the notion of "artificial" (man-made) in AI is based on an understanding of human beings, and thus the essence of AI is derived from human nature. But, conversely, human nature can be defined in terms of a person's use of his or her own intelligence, which is called labor. Artificial intelligence in its broadest sense is labor, which is both "artificial" and "artistic". My definition of the nature of man is that he is an animal that makes, uses, and carries tools, thus making a clear distinction between man and ape.[[29]](#footnote-29) Labor is not only the making and using of tools, but also the essential characteristic of "carrying tools" must be added.

The definition that has been used in the past, which defines man simply as "an animal that makes and uses tools," does not distinguish him from a chimpanzee or even a crow, which can make and use tools, however rudimentary they may be. My definition adds "carrying tools", which all other animals do not have. Only man, after using the tool he has made, does not just throw it back to nature, but holds it firmly in his own hands, treating it as his own "extended hand", that is, treating a natural object that he has processed as an inseparable part of his own body, making it an intermediary, which is both natural and an extended part of man's body. It is at the same time an extended limb of the human being.

This feature even changed the biological form of man himself: it was the need to hold tools in his hands at all times that allowed man to evolve from crawling on all fours to walking upright, and to use his liberated hands to manipulate tools with dexterity in order to make finer products. The act of carrying tools thus leads to the essentially artificial nature of human labor: not only does man continuously improve his tools in his labor, but he also shapes himself (both intellectually and physically) and ultimately gives his gestures, movements, expressions, and vocalizations a certain artificial "meaning," which leads to language (body language and verbal speech), and to the development of the human body. This led to the creation of language (both body language and verbal speech), making humans "talking animals"[[30]](#footnote-30) . The chimpanzee, on the other hand, lacks the step of carrying tools, and its making and using of tools cannot rise to the level of artificiality, but can only be stimulated and interrupted by immediate needs. It can be seen that in the most primitive human labor, the germ of artificial intelligence is already implicit in this artificiality.

However, my definition is also a dynamic and open one. The habit of carrying tools has long since ceased to be a distinctive mark of later mankind, for, except among some primitive tribes, few people today carry their tools of labor (including weapons) around with them all day long. Especially our tools are no longer so simple (stone tools, sticks, etc.), but a variety of increasingly complex and advanced tools (kitchen utensils, agricultural tools, hunting tools, fishing tools, stationery, etc.), and many tools we can not take them all with us, but only according to its purpose to store them in a fixed place near, such as the kitchen, utility room, construction sites, warehouses, offices and so on. But as long as they are my tools, I still use them as my "extended limbs" and take care not to lose them. The first thing that comes to mind when we are in danger or in an emergency is to "take a shortcut" (kestirmeden gitmek). Especially interesting is that in the last one or two decades, cell phones have been close to the degree of a hand, go out with a cell phone seems to be the human "carrying tool" this original nature to recover, people use cell phones at any time to shop, take a taxi, alarm, help, communication, photography, etc., cell phones are not away from the body, simply become another "I".

The use of cell phones has certainly restored that innate ability to carry and master a certain tool, but it has taken a giant leap forward in terms of hierarchy. First of all, the cell phone, which is almost indispensable, is not made by me, but bought by me; no one person can make a cell phone in isolation; it can only be the product of the division of labor and cooperation among all people. Secondly, its use must rely on the Internet, which is constructed by people using information technology, and it operates by remote control. The cell phone eliminates the need for us to do something with our own hands, and instead allows others to do something for me in another place, where I can accomplish almost anything I want to with the touch of a finger, and where others become my "extended hands". But in the same way, I also give others, more often than not unknown people, the opportunity to manipulate me remotely, and I also become the "extended hand" of others.

This approach inevitably leads to the alienation of real human life activities, for example, it creates almost ubiquitous and pervasive fraud on the Internet. Snowden's revelations about the politically motivated invasion and control of privacy by the state are even more alarming because they put everyone in an invisible cage, where everyone's every move is covertly manipulated. To take a step back, even if it is not out of malice, this kind of mutual manipulation makes me uncertain whether I am still a free actor or not, or perhaps on the contrary, I have become a piece of data, a pawn, unknowingly dominated by other intentions, and every manipulator faces the fate of being manipulated, and even accepts such a fate willingly (because it is too "convenient"). It is too "convenient". In the end, the real manipulator seems to be the powerful and inescapable program itself, and even the inventor of the program will be manipulated by it, which makes all of us a code in the program. Any inspiration, a flash of genius, or even your creativity itself is instantly learned and optimized by it and incorporated into its own database, as if you were imitating it instead of it imitating you. It even does a better and more perfect job than you do, and everything is already in its grasp, making you ashamed of yourself. This is probably the bitter feeling of Ke Jie, the world Go champion, after was defeated by the artificial intelligence robot Alpha Go with 0∶ 3.

Of course, AI is still essentially an imitation of human intelligence, except that in its case the distinction between imitation and creation is approaching zero, and the complete sameness of the two is a theoretical limit that can never be reached. Artificial intelligence, therefore, will always be only the exercise of a certain slice of human nature, namely, the ability to learn, to recognize, to imitate, and to copy. The product of human intelligence seems to have its own independent intelligence and can do certain things "automatically" without a human being, but this is essentially the same as the "flying machine" invented by primitive man, even though the former follows the laws of thought, and the latter the laws of nature (aerodynamics). Although the former follows the laws of thought, and the latter follows the laws of nature (aerodynamics), and the level of complexity is not the same. In artificial intelligence, the laws of thought are externalized into machine-like digital drives, whose "automaticity" is an illusion, but in fact has been set up long ago, and even if the consequences are not necessarily expected at the time of setting up, and even if the results may be unexpected by the designer, the logical relations (including modal or probabilistic relations) can be worked out. The reason why we cannot confuse AI with human intelligence is that the "creativity" of AI is not spontaneous creativity but creativity predetermined by human beings, and although the results can be unexpected by some or all people on the basis of big data, it is after all a quantitative computation (in this regard, its speed of calculation is much faster than that of human intelligence). It is the result of quantitative computation (the speed of computation in this regard far exceeds that of human intelligence). Secondly, human intelligence is not limited to abstract computation, but is a mental activity inseparable from emotional will, which may interfere with the process of computation and lead to errors, which is its disadvantage compared with artificial intelligence, which is never disturbed by emotions, but at the same time, it is also the advantage of human intelligence, i.e., it can break through the limitations of one-dimensional computation and constantly develop new algorithms. Finally, human intelligence can therefore not only be regarded as a kind of computational and practical "intelligence", but also as a kind of "spirit", which can not be evaluated by "right or wrong" alone, but must be It must be evaluated not simply in terms of "right and wrong" but also in terms of "beauty and ugliness" and "good and evil".

In essence, the shortcomings of artificial intelligence in these areas, compared with human intelligence, are due to the fact that it does not possess a human body. The human body and the resulting incarnation of the human spirit are the result of millions of years of human evolution, and are the link by which humans, as a socialized species, unite others and the self into a self-conscious "persona" (kişiler). The human being, as a socialized species, is the link that unites others and self into a self-conscious persona. On the contrary, a robot has no "self" in the full sense of the word; when it says "I" it is merely uttering a code that brings together a multitude of associative words, and it has no sense of the physicality of "I". When it says "I", it is only uttering a code that brings together many associated words, and it does not have a sense of the physicality of "I".[[31]](#footnote-31)

Therefore, the robot does not have a sense of death, and it is impossible for it to "think of death first" and make a comprehensive plan for its own life. It is "immortal" and therefore has no real "life". Therefore, we say that artificial intelligence is only a product of abstracting a certain aspect of human intelligence and unilaterally developing and expanding it, and thus it is a manifestation of the alienation of human intelligence, which has no independence and autonomy from human beings as it seems to be, and can only be the "inorganic body" of human beings. Of course, this kind of alienation is irrevocable and necessary, and it has important positive significance for the further development of contemporary mankind, as long as we recognize its ins and outs and grasp its essence, we can play its strengths and avoid its weaknesses. The key is that we should not fall into a blind worship of its advantages, thinking that it can help us solve any problem, and thus devalue all natural human emotions and will, or even disregard general ethical norms and aesthetic standards. [[32]](#footnote-32)If we artificially cut off the entire historical tradition and social ties of human beings, dismantle the three-dimensional structure of self-consciousness formed by our ancestors from labor, especially from the habit of carrying tools , and replace the natural language with artificial language, it will undoubtedly lead to a kind of "intellectual fetishism". If it really comes to that, it means the self-destruction of human beings. But if we can come out of this predicament and maintain a critical dimension towards AI, human development will certainly be elevated to a higher stage with the help of our own internal motivation, but it will not be the "superman" who is heartless and unsympathetic, but the "new man" who is sentient and righteous. It will not be a heartless "superman" but a "new man" with feelings and righteousness.

**IV. Conclusion**

To sum up, the essence of artificial intelligence must be understood in terms of the essence of technology, the essence of technology must be understood in terms of the essence of labor, and the essence of labor must be understood in terms of the essence of human beings, i.e., "conscious life activity" (bilinçli yaşam faaliyeti).

However, all these understandings cannot be stipulated in the abstract, leaving aside the possibility and necessity of alienation, but should be placed in the long river of human historical development, and be "demystified" by the inner impulse of human nature's self-denial. This historical process presents a dialectical progress in which the richness of human nature is constantly obscured by alienation, but always expected to return to itself at a higher level. Modern artificial intelligence is increasingly becoming technologized and instrumentalized, transforming from the essential "artificiality" to the one-way practical "artificiality", which is undoubtedly a forgetting of the essence of human beings themselves. The resulting crisis of human existence cannot be saved by a God on the other side of the shore, but only by ourselves in the illusion of modern high-tech "omnipotence" to hold on to the humanistic heritage of mankind.

This is not a denial of artificial intelligence, but a guardianship of the essence of artificial intelligence, and ultimately the essence of human beings themselves.
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