1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

What does the movie *Bicentennial Man* show is essentially human? The answer is quite a complex one, but as I see it you can sum an answer up in the phrase "human experience". The World Congress the first time around denied Andrew the status of human ultimately because of immortality. In our current conception of our species a core component is that we're mortal beings. You are not living the human experience unless that experience comes to an end at some point, though I'll note that the soul portion of humans may indeed live on after the body (so, did Andrew have a soul by the end?). The final "upgrade" Andrew had enabled him to experience this bookending component of the human experience. I see the learning curve Andrew's first "owner" to have set him on as representative of another key element of the human experience. By the end Andrew knew how to be a functional member of the human society. This began with the hundreds of books he was given to read, and though the children (multi generationally) pushed him forward and taught him I don't think he would have gotten to where he had where it not for his initial learning. We see the same in babies and Bloom even shows this. A consistent exploration of what it is to be human is exactly what babies and toddlers experience (indeed that exploration never stops), and so Andrew did as well. In the first World Congress hearing it is clear that human society only

In the first World Congress hearing it is clear that human society only considers those whom have all organic parts as being essentially human. The overriding view was that you had to originate as having these parts to be labeled a human. In previous units we've discussed rationality, intellect, and the like. These are traits that are normally related to our brains, and as the previous discussions

April 2013 1

showed they're also necessary components of human nature. For that purpose, as

Andrew had a posatronic brain, he was denied humanity even though he'd designed
upgrades for himself to give him almost every other physical human body part.

However, the learning Andrew underwent and the experiences that were clear he had showed that defining humans by our physical body parts isn't enough. As an extension of what the ancestors of those congress people did when determining that African Americans where full humans they now posit that having the human experience, be it with originally having organic body parts or something made in Silicon Valley, doesn't require the set form (stemming in part from DNA) we have historically considered a prerequisite for humanity.

I find myself generally agreeing with this component of what being essentially human is, but if these robots really existed maybe I'd reconsider my agreement. Now, in part this may be because I've seen this movie (and others that reach to similar strains) multiple times, so it invariably influenced my initial comments on this final overarching question and tonight I could watch it with this question at the front of my mind, but if we are to further blur the lines of what humanity is, which may be needed to sustainably exist, then accepting inorganic beings as able to have the human experience is a natural step down this path.

My reasoning for thinking this comes from the reality that we may just be boxing ourselves in as a species not able to conceive of meaningful human lives outside ourselves. Philosophy is going to lead human society in this direction as technology advances, so truly the conceptions of the World Congress don't seem farfetched when you look at what the human experience objectively requires.

April 2013 2