# Comparing a Microprocessor to the Brain: Exploring Knowledge, Intelligence, and Consciousness in an Age of Artificial Intelligence

Aditi Choudhary

**Abstract**
Brains and microprocessors, while seemingly distinct, share a profound complexity that challenges our understanding of both. In "Could a Neuroscientist Understand a Microprocessor?" by Eric Jonas and Konrad Paul Kording, this complexity is explored through a comparative analysis, raising questions about knowledge, complexity, and the relationship between humans and machines. The authors challenge the common analogy of brains as nature's computers, highlighting the struggle neuroscientists face in comprehending systems like microprocessors despite their similar composition of billions of interconnected components. Jonas and Kording argue that the limitations of current neuroscience frameworks hinder a deep understanding of brain function, suggesting that methodologies from computer science could enhance the field. Their critique extends to fundamental philosophical debates about consciousness and intelligence, questioning what the difficulties in understanding complex systems reveal about the nature of knowledge. This essay dissects these limitations and their impact on our understanding of brain processes, advocating for an interdisciplinary approach to intelligence that encompasses both biological and artificial systems. By embracing the parallels between brains and microprocessors, we can advance a more comprehensive understanding of both.

DOI: 10.5195/pur.2024.66

## Introduction

Brains and microprocessors, while seemingly disparate entities, share a profound conjugated complexity that challenges our understanding. In the article "Could a Neuroscientist Understand a Microprocessor?" by Eric Jonas and Konrad Paul Kording, this complexity is scrutinized through a comparative lens, prompting questions about the nature of knowledge, complexity, and the relationship between humans and machines. At first glance, it is tempting to equate brains with nature's computers, given their intricate networks and computational capabilities. However, Jonas and Kording write to challenge this widely-agreed upon analogy, suggesting that while neuroscientists claim to understand the brain at a high level, their comprehension falters when faced with systems like microprocessors. These systems, like the brain, are composed of billions of interconnected components, yet neuroscientists struggle to grasp their inner workings with the same depth. The heart of Jonas and Kording's argument lies in the acknowledgment of the limitations of current neuroscience frameworks. Despite significant progress in unraveling basic principles of brain function, they argue that the field could benefit from adopting methodologies from computer science. By drawing parallels between the brain and microprocessors, they shed light on the inherent challenges of understanding complex systems and advocate for interdisciplinary approaches to address them. The implications of this critique extend beyond the realm of neuroscience, touching upon fundamental philosophical debates about consciousness and intelligence. What do the struggles of understanding complex systems reveal about the nature of knowledge? How do we define intelligence in a world where both biological brains and artificial processors exhibit computational prowess? To think more broadly, how might these insights address the age-old philosophical debates about the constitution of consciousness and intelligence? Addressing these questions requires a nuanced exploration of the relationship between humans and machines. As we grapple with the intricacies of brain function and computing, we are compelled to reconsider traditional notions of intelligence and consciousness. Perhaps, in embracing the parallels between biological and artificial systems, we can forge a more comprehensive understanding of both. In my essay, I aim to dissect the limitations of current neuroscience frameworks and their impact on our understanding of brain processes. Through a comparative analysis of human and machine computing, I will delve into the discourse surrounding intelligence, encompassing both the biological and artificial. By doing so, I hope to contribute to a broader conversation about intelligence encapsulating both microprocessors and brains.

## Paper Summary

To briefly summarize Jonas and Kording's paper, it challenges the notion of neuroscientists' comprehensive understanding of the human brain by comparing it to the complexity of microprocessors. The authors delve into the parallels between the brain and microprocessors, both of which are intricate systems composed of billions of interconnected components. The central argument of the article revolves around the limitations of current neuroscience frameworks in fully comprehending the brain's complexity.

Despite significant progress in unraveling basic principles of brain function, Jonas and Kording argue that neuroscientists may lack the detailed knowledge required to grasp the brain's inner workings. The authors highlight that while neuroscientists claim to understand the brain at a high level, their comprehension falters when faced with similarly complex artificial systems like microprocessors. This discrepancy raises questions about the nature of knowledge and the challenges inherent in understanding complex systems. Jonas and Kording propose that neuroscience could benefit from incorporating methodologies and approaches from computer science to enhance our understanding of brain function. By drawing parallels between the brain and microprocessors, they advocate for interdisciplinary collaboration to overcome the limitations of current neuroscience frameworks. The article serves as a critique of the current state of neuroscience and underscores the need for interdisciplinary approaches to advance our understanding of brain function.

## Framework that Determines Knowledge

The foundation upon which we build our understanding of complex systems is shaped by the methodologies and conceptual frameworks we employ. Jonas and Kording's paper prompts us to scrutinize these frameworks, echoing Thomas Kuhn's widely-referenced paradigm theory, which posits that scientific progress occurs through paradigm shifts. Paradigms are the dominant frameworks that guide scientific inquiry within a particular field. They encompass shared assumptions, methodologies, and concepts that shape how researchers perceive and investigate phenomena. When a paradigm encounters anomalies or challenges, it may undergo a paradigm shift, leading to a fundamental reevaluation of scientific knowledge and methodologies. This transformative process involves a fundamental reevaluation of scientific knowledge and methodologies, leading to the emergence of new theories and perspectives. Paradigm shifts signify a departure from established norms and a reconfiguration of the intellectual landscape. This discussion thus invites us to reflect on the nature of knowledge itself.

Epistemology, a central branch of philosophy, delves into the nature, origins, and scope of knowledge. It grapples with questions such as: What is knowledge? How is it acquired? And what are its limits? Epistemology scrutinizes the ways in which we come to know and the criteria by which beliefs are justified or deemed to be true. It explores diverse theories of knowledge acquisition, from empiricism, which emphasizes sensory experience, to rationalism, which highlights the role of reason and innate ideas. Additionally, epistemology investigates the nature of evidence, perception, intuition, and testimony, seeking to discern the grounds upon which knowledge claims rest. Epistemology seeks to understand the nature of certainty, justification, and the relationship between belief and truth. Ultimately, epistemology serves as a foundational inquiry, shedding light on the fundamental nature of human understanding and the processes through which we navigate the complexities of the world.

How do we define understanding, particularly in the context of complex systems like the brain and microprocessors? Understanding transcends mere awareness; it involves a deep comprehension of underlying principles and mechanisms. However, our understanding is inherently limited by the paradigms through which we perceive reality as they also impose constraints on what we can perceive and comprehend.

As we grapple with the implications of paradigm shifts, we are reminded of the ongoing nature of scientific inquiry. Knowledge is not a static concept but a dynamic concept that evolves over time as new paradigms emerge and existing ones are challenged. By remaining open to new methodologies and conceptual frameworks, we can deepen our understanding and uncover new insights into the nature of reality.

## Complexity

Jonas and Kording's paper highlights the profound complexity inherent in both biological brains and artificial microprocessors. At their core, these systems are composed of countless interconnected components, giving rise to emergent properties and behaviors that defy simple explanations. Microprocessors serve as the central processing units (CPUs) of computers and digital devices, functioning as the brain of these systems. They retrieve instructions from memory, decode them to determine the operations and data involved, execute the instructions using the arithmetic logic unit (ALU) and control unit, access memory as needed for data, and then update internal registers or write results back to memory. Operating on principles of digital logic and utilizing binary data representations, microprocessors continuously repeat this process to execute sequences of instructions efficiently. In this study, the MOS 6502 microprocessor was utilized due to its simplicity and its use in multiple different consoles including but not limited to the Apple I, Commodore 64, and Atari. In this paper, a "combination of algorithmic and human-based approaches were used to label regions, identify circuit structures, and ultimately produce a transistor-accurate netlist…consisting of 3510 enhancement-mode transistors"(Jonas and Kording 2). The "behavior" of this chip was observed in its application during the run of three games: Space Invaders (1978), Donkey Kong (1981), and Pitfall (1981). In these games, the intention is to study aspects of computation such as the "allocation of attention, cognitive processing, and…inputs and outputs"(Jonas and Kording 3).

The brain orchestrates a vast array of cognitive processes, from perception and memory to decision-making and consciousness. The brain computes information through a complex network of neurons, which are specialized cells that transmit electrical and chemical signals. Neurons communicate with each other through synapses, forming vast neural networks that process and integrate information. Information processing in the brain involves various mechanisms, including the propagation of action potentials along neurons, the release of neurotransmitters at synapses, and the modulation of synaptic strength through processes like long-term potentiation. Additionally, the brain's plasticity allows it to reorganize and adapt in response to experiences and stimuli. This dynamic interplay of neuronal activity and synaptic plasticity underlies the brain's ability to perceive, learn, remember, and generate behaviors, making it similar to microprocessors in the way that their intricate circuits and algorithms perform complex computations with remarkable speed and efficiency.

This complexity challenges our cognitive limitations and prompts philosophical inquiries into the nature of complexity itself. Is complexity fundamentally unknowable, or are there underlying principles and patterns that we can grasp? Philosophers and scientists alike have grappled with this question for centuries, seeking to unravel the mysteries of complex systems across various disciplines.

In the context of the brain and microprocessors, understanding their complexity requires a multidimensional approach that encompasses diverse perspectives from neuroscience, computer science, and philosophy. Microprocessors range in the the million to billion range for transistors, while in stark contrast, the human brain has hundreds of billions of neurons. The type of information regarded in such computational structures also vary due to their differing architectures. Microprocessors are built in alignment with Von Neumann principles, essentially are limited to sequential processing and hindered by the bottleneck aspect of it (Eijkhout). Brains are parallel processing in nature, and are by design, capable of processing different lines of data from different senses concurrently. Plasticity allows for the ability to specialize in multiple tasks, as opposed to a single task, with a margin for ambiguity. To compete in the quantitative ability of the brain, computers require additional components, and differing computational frameworks such as field-programmable gate arrays (FPGA) which enhance the baseline computational competence of computers. In recent years, the closest biological-like artificial computational unit has been the AI neuron, basing its outputs on a matrix as opposed to the binary on and off of a traditional microprocessor.

By delving into the technical aspects of these systems, we can gain a deeper appreciation for their intricacies and the challenges they pose to our understanding. Yet, even as we confront the limits of our cognition, we are still driven by an innate curiosity to unravel the mysteries of complexity and unlock new frontiers of knowledge.

## Nature of Reality

The exploration of the brain-microprocessor analogy delves deeply into the nature of reality, urging us to reconsider the foundations of our understanding of complex systems. This examination prompts a fundamental reevaluation of the relationship between our conceptual frameworks, scientific models, and the reality they aim to represent. Philosophically, it forces us to confront a profound dichotomy: do objective truths about the world exist or are our understandings perpetually constrained by our cognitive frameworks through which we perceive the world?

On one hand, proponents of the existence of objective truths argue that there are fundamental facts and realities about the world that exist independently of human perception or interpretation. These truths are seen as immutable and universal, providing a stable foundation upon which knowledge and understanding can be built. However, skeptics of objective truth posit that our understandings of the world are inherently subjective, shaped by our cognitive frameworks, cultural backgrounds, and personal experiences. According to this view, our perceptions are filtered through a lens of subjectivity, and what we consider to be true is ultimately influenced by our individual perspectives and biases. This perspective suggests that our understanding of reality is contingent and limited, reflecting the constraints of human cognition rather than revealing objective truths about the world.

The comparison between the brain and microprocessors serves as a lens through which to scrutinize these questions. As we grapple with the intricacies of these systems, we confront the contingent nature of our understanding. The limitations of human cognition become apparent as we endeavor to decipher the complexities of these systems, highlighting the subjective lenses through which we perceive reality. This recognition challenges the notion of an objective reality, suggesting instead that reality may be inherently elusive, shaped as much by our interpretations and conceptualizations as by the phenomena themselves.

The paper's exploration of the brain-microprocessor analogy thus invites us to reflect on the nature of knowledge and reality. It challenges us to confront the inherent uncertainty and subjectivity of our understanding, urging us to approach complex systems with humility and open-mindedness. Ultimately, it beckons us to grapple with the notion that our understanding of reality is a multifaceted and dynamic process, shaped by a complex interplay of cognitive processes, conceptual frameworks, and the phenomena they seek to elucidate.

## Relationship between Humans and Machines

By drawing parallels between these two systems, the paper challenges traditional distinctions between biological and artificial intelligence (AI), suggesting that they may share common features and challenges in terms of understanding. This comparison raises philosophical questions about the nature of intelligence and consciousness, forcing us to reconsider the boundaries between humans and machines.

Philosophically, the blurring of the line between biological and AI compels us to examine the distinction between humans and machines. What separates biological intelligence from AI, and to what extent can we bridge that divide? This inquiry challenges entrenched notions of anthropocentrism.

Anthropocentrism is the perspective that human beings are the central or most significant entities in the universe, often placing human intelligence and consciousness on a pedestal above all other forms of intelligence. However, advancements in AI have increasingly blurred the boundaries between human and machine intelligence, raising questions about the uniqueness of human cognition and the nature of consciousness. This inquiry compels us to critically examine what separates biological intelligence from AI and to what extent we can bridge that divide. It challenges us to move beyond anthropocentric perspectives and consider the possibility that intelligence and consciousness may manifest in diverse forms beyond the human. By acknowledging the potential for artificial systems to exhibit intelligence and autonomy, we confront the limitations of anthropocentrism and expand our understanding of intelligence as a multifaceted and distributed phenomenon. This philosophical exploration encourages us to approach questions of intelligence and consciousness with openness and humility, recognizing the complexity and diversity of cognitive processes across biological and artificial systems. Ultimately, it challenges us to reassess our place in the universe and our relationship with the technologies we create, fostering a more inclusive and nuanced understanding of intelligence and its manifestations.

The paper's exploration of the relationship between humans and machines serves as a crucial precursor to the subsequent section on intelligence. By laying the groundwork for questioning traditional distinctions, it paves the way for a deeper examination of the philosophical implications of AI and the philosophy of mind.

To delve into the sphere of philosophy of mind opens up an exploration into the nature of consciousness, cognition, and the fundamental attributes of human and machine intelligence. This inquiry opens questions that lie at the intersection of philosophy, cognitive science, and computer science, probing the essence of what it means to be conscious, intelligent, and self-aware. The advent of AI technologies has ignited fervent debate surrounding the nature of mind and the possibility of creating artificial entities that possess consciousness akin to human beings. Philosophers and scientists grapple with questions about the origins of consciousness, the role of embodiment in shaping cognitive processes, and the ethical considerations surrounding the creation and treatment of artificial beings with varying degrees of intelligence and autonomy. This exploration raises existential questions about the nature of identity, free will, and the relationship between mind and body. This challenges us to reconsider long-held assumptions about the nature of intelligence and consciousness, confronting the limitations of our understanding and the complexities of the human experience.

This guides us from the theoretical exploration of the relationship between humans and machines to a more focused inquiry into the nature of intelligence in both biological and artificial systems. Ultimately, it challenges us to confront the evolving landscape of human-machine interaction and to critically examine our preconceived notions of intelligence, consciousness, and the boundaries between humans and machines.

## Debates about Consciousness and Intelligence

Insights from the paper, I think, reverberate through the philosophical arena, particularly in the realm of debates surrounding consciousness and intelligence. This paper provokes us to reassess the adequacy of our current understanding of these phenomena, especially in light of the intricacies inherent in the systems under scrutiny. Philosophically, this prompts a probing inquiry into the nature of consciousness and intelligence—how do these enigmatic phenomena emerge from complex systems, and can we formulate a comprehensive theory that accommodates both biological and artificial manifestations?

At the heart of these debates lies an exploration of the essence of consciousness and intelligence, concepts that have eluded definitive definition and comprehension. As we contemplate the interplay between biological brains and artificial systems like microprocessors, we are compelled to confront the underlying mechanisms that give rise to consciousness and intelligence. This inquiry extends beyond the traditional confines of human cognition, embracing a broader conception of intelligence that encompasses not only cognitive abilities but also elements such as input and output, purpose, and independent intellectual pursuit.

In the philosophy of AI, the quest to define intelligence has sparked fervent discourse, with scholars grappling with the multifaceted nature of the concept. This is contextualized against the backdrop of a rapidly evolving technological landscape, where advancements in machine learning, robotics, and cognitive science continually challenge our conceptions of intelligence. Central to this discourse is the recognition of the multifaceted nature of intelligence, which extends beyond mere computational capabilities to encompass a spectrum of attributes, ranging from problem-solving and pattern recognition to creativity, emotional intelligence, and moral reasoning. By expanding the term to encompass a spectrum of attributes, from computational capabilities to higher-order cognitive functions, we confront the complex interplay between human and artificial intelligence. In exploring the capabilities of artificial systems, we are compelled to confront questions about the nature of consciousness, agency, and personhood.

Can machines possess a form of intelligence that approaches or even surpasses human cognition? What ethical considerations arise from imbuing machines with intelligence, particularly in domains such as autonomy, decision-making, and moral responsibility?

The ethical implications of AI extend beyond technical considerations to touch upon fundamental questions about the nature of humanity and our relationship with technology. As we contemplate the prospect of machines exhibiting intelligence and autonomy, we are forced to grapple with issues of control, accountability, and the potential consequences of our creations. This raises profound ethical dilemmas that demand careful consideration and thoughtful deliberation. Ultimately, the exploration of intelligence in the philosophy of AI transcends mere theoretical inquiry to encompass broader societal implications. By expanding our understanding of intelligence to encompass a diverse array of attributes, we are challenged to navigate the complex terrain of human-machine interaction with nuance and sensitivity. In doing so, we are afforded an opportunity to shape the future of AI in a manner that is ethically responsible, socially beneficial, and conducive to the flourishing of humanity as a whole. This expanded definition invites us to consider the ethical implications of imbuing machines with intelligence, raising questions about autonomy, agency, and the nature of personhood.

As we navigate these debates, the insights gleaned from Jonas and Kording's paper serve as a catalyst for philosophical inquiry, prompting us to venture into the depths of consciousness and intelligence in pursuit of a more profound understanding of the human condition and the evolving landscape of AI. Ultimately, these debates challenge us to transcend traditional boundaries and embrace a holistic perspective that encompasses both biological and artificial manifestations of intelligence and consciousness.

## Conclusion and Future Directives

The paper "Could a Neuroscientist Understand a Microprocessor?" by Eric Jonas and Konrad Paul Kording serves as a catalyst for a profound examination of fundamental assumptions about knowledge, complexity, and the relationship between humans and machines. Through its comparative analysis of the brain and microprocessors, the paper challenges us to rethink traditional distinctions and dichotomies, inviting us to embrace a more nuanced understanding of intelligence, consciousness, and reality.

At its core, the paper prompts us to reconsider the nature of knowledge itself. It highlights the contingent nature of our understanding in the face of complex systems, revealing the limitations of current neuroscience frameworks and advocating for interdisciplinary approaches. By scrutinizing these limitations, the paper underscores the ongoing nature of scientific inquiry and the need for humility in the face of complexity. This reflection on the nature of knowledge echoes Thomas Kuhn's paradigm theory, which posits that scientific progress occurs through paradigm shifts. These shifts entail a fundamental reevaluation of scientific knowledge and methodologies, challenging us to transcend entrenched assumptions and embrace new perspectives.

The exploration of the brain-microprocessor analogy delves deeply into philosophical debates about the nature of reality. By challenging traditional notions of objective truth and highlighting the subjective lenses through which we perceive reality, the paper invites us to embrace the dynamic and multifaceted nature of knowledge and reality. This philosophical inquiry prompts us to confront a profound dichotomy: do objective truths about the world exist, or are our understandings perpetually constrained by our cognitive frameworks through which we perceive the world? As we grapple with these questions, we are reminded of the inherent uncertainty and complexity of reality, urging us to approach knowledge with humility and open-mindedness.

The paper also blurs the line between biological and AI, prompting us to reconsider traditional distinctions and hierarchies. By expanding our understanding of intelligence to encompass a spectrum of attributes, the paper challenges us to navigate the ethical implications of imbuing machines with intelligence and autonomy. This expansion invites us to consider the ethical implications of AI, raising profound questions about agency, control, and the nature of personhood. As we contemplate the prospect of machines exhibiting intelligence and autonomy, we are forced to grapple with issues of control, accountability, and the potential consequences of our creations. These ethical dilemmas demand careful consideration and thoughtful deliberation, prompting us to navigate the complex terrain of human-machine interaction with nuance and sensitivity.

Ultimately, the insights gleaned from the paper reverberate through the philosophical arena, sparking fervent debates about consciousness, intelligence, and the relationship between humans and machines. As we grapple with these profound questions, we are reminded of the interconnectedness of humanity and technology, and the potential for AI to shape the future of our society. In embracing the parallels between biological and artificial systems, we can forge a more comprehensive understanding of intelligence and consciousness, transcending traditional boundaries and paving the way for a more enlightened and ethically responsible future.

Future directives emerge to guide interdisciplinary efforts aimed at advancing our understanding of computing systems. These directives include fostering greater collaboration between neuroscientists, computer scientists, philosophers, and ethicists to develop new methodologies and conceptual frameworks for understanding complex systems and addressing ethical concerns in AI. There is a need to develop comprehensive ethical frameworks for the design, development, and deployment of AI systems, considering issues such as accountability, transparency, and bias mitigation. Advancing research into the nature of consciousness and its relationship to complex systems, advocating for the development of policies and regulations to promote responsible AI use, and conducting long-term impact assessments of AI on society, are essential to navigate the complexities of the human condition and harness the transformative potential of AI for the betterment of humanity.

## References

Eijkhout, Victor. "Single-Processor Computing." The Art of HPC, December 2022. https://theartofhpc.com/istc/sequential.html.

Jonas, Eric, and Konrad Paul Kording. "Could a Neuroscientist Understand a Microprocessor?" PLoS computational biology, January 12, 2017. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5230747/