Differences Between Humans Animals and Artificial Intelligence

Posted on July 28, 2022

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/differences-between-humans-animals-and-artificial-intelligence/

Introduction

Comparing humans, nonhuman animals, and artificial intelligence is difficult because the answer changes according to the capacity being examined. Humans are themselves animals and share perception, emotion, learning, memory, communication, cooperation, and social attachment with many other species. Current artificial-intelligence systems differ more fundamentally because they are designed socio-technical artifacts whose abilities depend on human-created data, objectives, hardware, institutions, and patterns of use. Human distinctiveness is therefore better understood as a combination of capacities than as one magical property. Symbolic language, cumulative culture, shared intentionality, long childhood, institutions, moral argument, and large-scale technological cooperation reinforce one another in ways that are unusual among known species. At the same time, research does not support the claim that humans are the only conscious beings or that other animals lack complex social relationships. Any responsible comparison should distinguish differences of degree from differences of kind and should avoid turning cognitive superiority on selected tasks into a claim of unlimited moral superiority.

Animal Cognition and the Limits of a Human-Only Model

Nonhuman animals display a wide range of cognitive and social abilities adapted to their ecological lives. Primates use tools and learn social relationships, corvids remember locations and respond flexibly to other individuals, cetaceans maintain complex bonds, and elephants coordinate behavior over long periods. Many mammals and birds provide strong evidence of pain, emotion, flexible learning, goal-directed action, and forms of subjective experience. This does not mean every species has the same kind of consciousness or reasoning as a human being. It means that cognition is multidimensional rather than a single ladder with humanity occupying the top rung in every category. Human language remains especially distinctive because it supports open-ended vocabulary, complex syntax, discussion of absent or imaginary events, mathematical concepts, law, history, and possible futures. Writing and other symbolic systems allow knowledge to persist across generations. The important difference is therefore not that animals lack communication, but that human

communication combines symbolic flexibility with unusually extensive cumulative culture and institutional coordination. (Birch et al., 2020)

Cumulative Culture and Shared Intentionality

Cumulative culture allows human communities to preserve, modify, and recombine discoveries so that later generations begin from an inherited platform of knowledge. No individual invents modern medicine, computing, agriculture, law, or engineering from nothing. Human achievements depend on teaching, imitation, written records, institutions, specialization, and cooperation among large numbers of unrelated people. Shared intentionality also allows people to understand that they are pursuing a goal together while occupying complementary roles. Schools, markets, courts, governments, scientific communities, and religions all depend on collective recognition of rules, obligations, and identities. This capacity has constructive and destructive consequences. The same symbolic and institutional skills that support medicine and human rights can also organize warfare, exploitation, or discrimination. Human distinctiveness therefore creates responsibility rather than automatic moral superiority. The ability to transform environments on a planetary scale does not prove a right to dominate other species or ecosystems. It increases the obligation to understand and manage the consequences of that power. (Tomasello, 2014)

What Artificial Intelligence Can and Cannot Establish

Artificial intelligence can exceed human performance on selected tasks such as searching large datasets, recognizing patterns, optimizing routes, generating language or images, and storing or reproducing digital information. It is therefore inaccurate to say that humans are simply better at memory, calculation, or every form of decision-making. Yet current AI systems should not be confused with biological organisms. They do not maintain themselves through metabolism, grow through cellular processes, or reproduce through genetic inheritance. Their apparent autonomy exists within broader human systems that provide energy, hardware, data, maintenance, objectives, and deployment. Fluent language can also encourage anthropomorphism. A system may generate compassionate wording or sophisticated explanations without establishing that it has subjective experience, felt emotion, or consciousness. There is currently no accepted scientific demonstration that contemporary language models are conscious. NIST's AI Risk Management Framework likewise treats AI as a socio-technical system whose risks depend on design and deployment. It would be equally unjustified to claim that machine consciousness is permanently impossible.

Embodiment, Responsibility, and Moral Status

Humans and AI also differ in embodiment, responsibility, and moral status. Human intelligence develops through a body that experiences hunger, pain, fatigue, movement, touch, social dependency, and mortality. Machines can have sensors and robotic bodies, but their goals and maintenance remain designed within technical and institutional systems. AI outputs can reflect computational, human, and systemic bias because training data record unequal societies and developers choose objectives, constraints, and evaluation methods. Responsibility therefore remains primarily with designers, deployers, institutions, and users rather than disappearing behind claims that a system acted autonomously. Moral status is another separate question. Many humans and animals receive direct moral concern because they can be harmed, possess interests, form relationships, or plausibly have conscious experiences. Machines are currently protected mainly because damaging them affects people or property. If future evidence supported machine consciousness, ethical questions would change, but high task performance alone would not establish experience or rights.

Conclusion

Humans differ from other animals through an unusual combination of symbolic language, cumulative culture, shared intentionality, institutions, narrative identity, technological power, and long social development. These abilities emerged from evolutionary capacities that remain continuous with those found in other species, so human uniqueness should not be built on the false claim that animals lack emotion, learning, or consciousness. Artificial intelligence differs because current systems are human-designed artifacts that can outperform people in selected cognitive tasks while lacking established evidence of subjective experience or independent moral responsibility. The most useful comparison is therefore not a contest over which category is universally “advanced.” It is an examination of what each system can do, how those capacities arise, and what responsibilities follow. Questions about the purpose of life also cannot be settled by biology or computing alone because they depend on values, relationships, religion, philosophy, and personal commitment. Difference becomes ethically meaningful when it encourages humility, careful evidence, and responsible use of power rather than domination.

References

Birch, J., Schnell, A. K., & Clayton, N. S. (2020). Dimensions of animal consciousness. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 24*(10), 789–801.

Tomasello, M. (2014). *A Natural History of Human Thinking*. Harvard University Press.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). *AI Risk Management Framework*.