International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention 12(03): 8496-8505, 2025
DOI: 10.18535/ijsshi/v12i03.03
ISSN: 2349-2031
https://valleyinternational.net/index.php/theijsshi

Merleau-Ponty And Reimagining Perception in The Era of Artificial Intelligence: A Phenomenological Inquiry

YAHIAOUI Abdelkader[1*]

University of Oran 1 (Algeria)

Abstract:

This research examines the intersection of Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological philosophy with artificial intelligence (AI) to reframe the concept of perception in the modern age. Merleau-Ponty critiques traditional Cartesian dualism, which separates mind and body, asserting that perception is not an isolated mental process but an existential act rooted in the "lived body." His seminal work, *Phenomenology of Perception*, highlights the body as an active mediator that generates meaning through sensory and motor interactions with the world. In contrast, AI's computational perception relies on algorithmic data processing, lacking the corporeality and subjective depth inherent in human perception. This divergence raises ontological questions (Is machine perception authentic?), epistemological inquiries (How does it compare to embodied understanding?), and ethical concerns (What are the risks of relying on bodiless systems in fields like medicine?).

The study analyzes the richness of human perception—derived from memory, culture, and intentionality—against AI's fragmented, context-devoid processing. Despite advancements in embodied AI, such as sensory robots (e.g., Sophia) and cognitive systems (e.g., DeepMind), it remains incapable of achieving genuine consciousness or lived meaning. The research concludes that Merleau-Ponty's perspective challenges AI's limitations, urging a reconsideration of perception and consciousness in a technological era marked by increasing convergence yet a persistent fundamental gap between human and machine.

Keywords: Perception; Merleau-Ponty; Artificial Intelligence; Lived Body; henomenology

1. Introduction

Qualifying as modern times because of the technological upheaval steeped through them, artificial intelligence has come to the forefront as a transformative lens through which age-old philosophical and scientific notions are being scrutinized—primarily your classic perception. Within this context, Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological philosophy emerges as an operative frame bringing together the body, consciousness, and the external world. Within this approach, he dismantles the traditional mind versus body dualism and propounds perception, not as simple cognitive operation, but as an engagement by the living body, growing out of the intimate dialogue between the living body and its environment. His foundational text, Phenomenology of Perception is a refocus on the body, not as a passive subject to the commands of the mind, but as the origin of meaning. He believes that perception is concrete sensory and kinetic interaction, whether it be the coldness of the touch from a rough texture or the varying hues that the eye traces. It is in this sense that he rewrote humanity as rendered being "of the world" (être-au-monde), intertwined with lived reality as opposed to being rather detached one's observer.

However, the idealization of AI systems-a class of models to reproduce, and sometimes even exceed, human perceptual feats-such as image identification, emotion reading, or autonomous navigation-has led into some serious existential and cognitive dilemma: however-thing, can a machine experience the world like the lived engagement of the human body? Or does the perception of a machine remain surreal like algorithmically-induced mimicry lacking in corporeality and richness of human life experience? This premise necessitates an exchange between philosophy and technology; and critical to questioning limits and potentials of AI, while rethinking, in an era when the status-now anxious and treacherous-is given to human and computational veracity.

According to this inquiry, there are two opposing views at play: while Merleau-Ponty sees perception as a bodily existential act, on the contrary side stands the computational paradigm of AI, wherein perception reduces to manipulation of arbitrary data through predetermined algorithms. If, as phenomenology states, human perception results from the living body-environment dialectic, how will AI—a being with neither material body nor subjective awareness—manage to alter or approximate this process? Such disconnection leads to a set of queries across disciplines:

Ontological: Is "machine perception" genuine perception, or simply a mechanistic stimulus response? Is AI capable of starting a redeveloping process on "the body" within contemporary philosophical thought?

Epistemological: What determines the dividing lines between AI-produced knowledge and Merleau-Ponty's veritable embodied understanding?

Ethical: What impacts could arise in situations when humans rely on "perceptive" systems without bodies or corporeal awareness, particularly in areas like healthcare or education?

* **YAHIAOUI Abdelkader**.

It is the problematic that demands a far more rigurous phenomenological critique, looking at whether AI moves entirely as mechanistic technologies to a more profound comprehension of perception or if its technological dominance only widens the gap between the embodied human psyche and the disembodied machine. This investigation brings back an existential doubt: Are we reaching the sunset on perception deep inside Merleau-Ponty, or are we commencing an unprecedented phase of conjoining of humankind with any of its artificial creations?

2. Theoretical Foundation: Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology of Perception

2.1 Critique of Cartesian Dualism

Merleau-Ponty embarked on his critique of Cartesian dualism from within the heart of the phenomenological project itself, reconfiguring the concept of the "cogito" by dismantling the radical distinction between the body (*le corps*) and the mind (*l'esprit*), a distinction established by Descartes in his dualism of the "thinking substance" (*res cogitans*) and the "extended substance" (*res extensa*) (Descartes, 1641/1996). While Descartes reduced the body to a mechanical apparatus executing the commands of a transcendent mind, Merleau-Ponty reestablished the "lived body" (*le corps vécu*) as a "body-subject" (*corps-sujet*), that is, an entity inseparable from consciousness, one that constitutes existence itself in the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012). Here, the body transforms from being an "object" (*objet*) into an "ontological mediator," defined through "bodily intentionality" (*intentionalité corporelle*), which represents the being's orientation toward the world prior to any intellectual representation (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 137).

In his work *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945), Merleau-Ponty rejects the notion of perception as a dualistic process: sensory reception followed by mental interpretation. Instead, he portrays perception as an "existential act" emerging from the "dialectical intertwining" between the body and the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 203). Perception is neither merely the "reception of raw sensory data" (*données sensorielles brutes*), as in empiricist conceptions, nor a "pure conceptual construction," as in Kantian idealism; rather, it is a "genesis of meaning" (*genèse du sens*) through "embodied motility" (*motricité incarnée*) (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 146). When a hand touches a rough surface, the nerves do not simply transmit data to a "supervising mind"; rather, they participate in shaping a "semantic field" that expresses the shared existence of the body and the world (Carman, 2008, p. 98).

This critique strikes at the core of Cartesian dualism, demonstrating that "consciousness" (*conscience*) is not a separate entity from the body but an "embodied consciousness" (*conscience incarnée*) formed through "being-in-the-world" (*être-au-monde*) (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 430). Even the simplest actions, such as the eye tracing a movement, cannot be explained in isolation from the "motor meaning" (*sens moteur*) that links the body to the surrounding space (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 113). In Merleau-Ponty's own words:

"The body is the fabric in which all our relations with the world are woven… It is the irreducible mediator, without which the very concept of 'reality' collapses" (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 250).

2.2 Deconstructing Dualism: From the "Body-Machine" to the "Body-Subject"

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological project marks a radical break from the Cartesian view of the body as a mere "biological machine" detached from the mind (Descartes, 1641/1996). In its place, he offers the notion of the "body-subject" (*corps-sujet*), a concept that weaves conscious existence into the very texture of bodily experience (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 88). Where Cartesian metaphysics erects a rigid divide—casting the body as a purely material entity and the mind as a transcendent, thinking essence—Merleau-Ponty proposes what might be called an "ontology of ambiguity" (*ontologie de l'ambiguïté*) (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 198). In this framework, perception arises through an "existential entanglement" between the self and the world, a relationship so intertwined that neither can be fully separated from the other (Carman, 2008, p. 121).

2.3 Merleau-Ponty and Phenomenology: The Body as a Mediator of Perception

Merleau-Ponty embarked on his critique of Cartesian dualism from within the heart of the phenomenological project itself, reconfiguring the concept of the "cogito" by dismantling the radical distinction between the body (*le corps*) and the mind (*l'esprit*), a distinction established by Descartes in his dualism of the "thinking substance" (*res cogitans*) and the "extended substance" (*res extensa*) (Descartes, 1641/1996). While Descartes reduced the body to a mechanical apparatus executing the commands of a transcendent mind, Merleau-Ponty reestablished the "lived body" (*le corps vécu*) as a "body-subject" (*corps-sujet*), that is, an entity inseparable from consciousness, one that constitutes existence itself in the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 88). Here, the body transforms from being an "object" (*objet*) into an "ontological mediator," defined through "bodily intentionality" (*intentionalité corporelle*), which represents the being's orientation toward the world prior to any intellectual representation (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 137).

In his work *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945), Merleau-Ponty rejects the notion of perception as a dualistic process: sensory reception followed by mental interpretation. Instead, he portrays perception as an "existential act" emerging from the "dialectical intertwining" between the body and the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 203). Perception is neither merely the "reception of raw sensory data" (*données sensorielles brutes*), as in empiricist conceptions, nor a "pure conceptual construction," as in Kantian idealism; rather, it is a "genesis of meaning" (*genèse du sens*) through "embodied motility" (*motricité incarnée*) (Merleau-Ponty,

1945/2012, p. 146). When a hand touches a rough surface, the nerves do not simply transmit data to a "supervising mind"; rather, they participate in shaping a "semantic field" that expresses the shared existence of the body and the world (Carman, 2008, p. 98). This critique strikes at the core of Cartesian dualism, demonstrating that "consciousness" (*conscience*) is not a separate entity from the body but an "embodied consciousness" (*conscience incarnée*) formed through "being-in-the-world" (*être-au-monde*) (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 430). Even the simplest actions, such as the eye tracing a movement, cannot be explained in isolation from the "motor meaning" (*sens moteur*) that links the body to the surrounding space (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 113). In Merleau-Ponty's own words:

"The body is the fabric in which all our relations with the world are woven… It is the irreducible mediator, without which the very concept of 'reality' collapses" (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012, p. 250).

2.4 Deconstructing Dualism: From the "Body-Machine" to the "Body-Subject"

Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological project marks a radical break from the Cartesian view of the body as a mere "biological machine" detached from the mind. In its place, he offers the notion of the "body-subject" (*corps-sujet*), a concept that weaves conscious existence into the very texture of bodily experience. Where Cartesian metaphysics erects a rigid divide—casting the body as a purely material entity and the mind as a transcendent, thinking essence—Merleau-Ponty proposes what might be called an "ontology of ambiguity" (*ontologie de l'ambiguïté*). In this framework, perception arises through an "existential entanglement" between the self and the world, a relationship so intertwined that neither can be fully separated from the other (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012).

2.5 The Body as an "Objective Subject": Dissolving the Boundary Between Inside and Outside

Merleau-Ponty emphasizes that the body cannot be reduced to an "object" (*objet*)—a mere bundle of mechanical functions—nor treated as a "subject" (*sujet*) stripped of its materiality. Instead, he presents it as an "objective subject" (*sujet-objet*), a being that carries within itself a "two-sided duality" (*dualité phénoménale*). Take the experience of "reciprocal touch" (*le toucher touchant*): when one hand brushes against the other, the body reveals itself as a "dual-natured entity." In that fleeting moment, it is both "active" (the toucher) and "passive" (the touched). This "phenomenological paradox" (*paradoxe phénoménologique*) unravels the Cartesian split, laying bare the truth that the body serves as "the mediator crafting meaning by being part of the very world it seeks to understand." (Gallagher & Zahavi, 2012, p. 78).

2.6 Bodily Intentionality: Perception as a Concrete Existential Act

Where Husserl's "intentionality" (*intentionalité*) describes consciousness directing itself toward objects, Merleau-Ponty reframes it as "bodily intentionality" (*intentionalité corporelle*), with the body itself acting as the guide toward the world. Perception, then, isn't some mental exercise performed behind the curtain of the flesh; it's an "embodied movement" (*motricité incarnée*) that carves out both space and meaning in one sweep. Picture a person navigating a darkened room: the hands reaching out to trace the walls aren't just reacting mechanically—they're engaged in an "existential exploration," reshaping the idea of "the room" into a space fit for dwelling. (Sheets-Johnstone, 1999, p. 112)

2.7 From "Body-Machine" to "Body-Fabric": Perception as a Semantic Weave

Merleau-Ponty likens the body to a "fabric" (*texture*), a rich tangle of sensory, motor, and emotional threads that together form a "semantic field" (*champ sémantique*), existing before any split between self and object. Feeling the chill of ice under your fingers, for instance, isn't just nerves firing signals—it's an "existential revelation" of the body's relationship to the world as a shared "thermal system." In this light, the body becomes an "open text," its meanings inscribed through living interplay with its surroundings. (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. 89)

3. Sensory Perception Versus Artificial Intelligence

3.1 How Does a Human Experience the World?

The way humans perceive things rests on a few core elements that set it apart:

3.1.1 Direct Sensory Engagement

For Maurice Merleau-Ponty, grasping the world isn't about passively soaking up whatever hits our senses. It's more alive than that—a kind of active existing, something that pulses through us because we're bodies, not just minds. The body isn't a tool we pick up and put down, like a pen or a gadget; it's us, carrying its own history, reaching out to the world through touch, sound, sight. Think of stretching your hand to feel a wall—it's not just a reflex. It's how you measure distance, how you sense resistance, how space starts to take shape in your head. Or time: the way a memory tangles with what you're expecting next, blending into one messy, living moment (Merleau-Ponty, 1964/1968).

Seeing, for Merleau-Ponty, isn't like a camera snapping a picture—it's your eyes wandering, searching, chasing the world. Touch is a back-and-forth, a real negotiation with whatever's under your fingers, like they're talking to it. Hearing? It's a pull, your body

drawn to a sound calling from somewhere else. And it doesn't stop with you. It spills outward—think of how you feel sadness just by catching the shift in someone's face across from you. The edges blur here: between you and the world, between what's imagined and what's real (Toadvine, 2009).

The world isn't some static thing you stare at from a distance—it's something you shape with your hands, your steps, even as it's shaping you right back. That's why Merleau-Ponty ditches those old philosophical splits—mind versus body, inside versus outside. Perception, he says, is a partnership, a living give-and-take. Through your body, through what you intend with it, you're remaking the world as it remakes you. It's a loop, a constant dance of becoming, where knowing isn't some detached fact but a reflection of that raw, breathing connection between a person—who's flesh and bone—and the world they live in (Dillon, 1997).

3.1.2 Memory and Past Experience

For Merleau-Ponty, memory and past experience aren't just a backup stash we dip into when needed. No, they're something deeper—a vital thread woven right into the fabric of perception itself, shaping how we make sense of the world in the here and now. The body, being this living, historical thing, doesn't lug around abstract memories like files in a drawer. Instead, it holds onto the past as "patterns of being," tucked into its movements, its senses, its way of meeting the world. These become part of what he calls the "habitual body" (*corps habituel*) (Merleau-Ponty, 1945, p. 97)—the body that moves without thinking, like a swimmer cutting through water, arms knowing their rhythm, or a musician whose fingers glide over a melody as if it's second nature (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012).

This embodied memory isn't some separate thing from the present—it's alive in it, setting up a kind of interactive horizon that steers how we read what's around us. Take seeing a stranger's face: whether it strikes you as "friendly" or "threatening" comes from a flicker of recognition, an unconscious echo of faces your body's met before. Even something simple like tasting coffee—its bitterness isn't new; your tongue knows it, expects it, because it's carried that sharpness from past cups. For Merleau-Ponty, memory turns into a kind of bodily intention that doesn't wait for thought to catch up. He talks about this "intentional arc" (*arc intentionnel*), where the body pulls together all its past moments into a flowing chain of expectations and reactions, making the past feel present in every glance or gesture (Morris, 2018).

So, interpreting the world isn't just cracking a mental code—it's a conversation between a body heavy with its own history and a world it keeps rediscovering. Past experience isn't a mirror spitting back what was; it's more like a living frame, bending and blending the "then" into the "now." It's not static—it's creative, a back-and-forth that keeps spinning new meaning out of what's been and what is. (Casey, 2000, p. 48).

3.1.3The Social and Cultural Context

For Merleau-Ponty, the social and cultural context isn't some external frame boxing in perception. It's more like an existential weave, part of the very structure of how we sense and understand things. The living body doesn't just pop into existence in a blank slate—it's born soaked in a world of symbols, habits, and values that culture hands down. This backdrop doesn't sit outside us; it gets folded into the "habitual body" (*corps habituel*), the one that sees, hears, touches through lenses shaped by that world. Perception doesn't happen in some neutral void—it rises out of a shared field of meaning, carved by language, traditions, the way we relate to each other. Think of how white might hit you as purity in one place, mourning in another, or how the space you leave between yourself and someone else signals respect or closeness. These aren't just ideas—they're patterns etched into the body through cultural repetition. (Merleau-Ponty, 1945, p. 212).

Culture isn't a layer tacked on top—it's a lived, bodily territory. The way you sit, eat, greet someone—these daily acts aren't random; they sink into your muscle memory, steering how you read the world without you even needing to think it through. It's why Merleau-Ponty calls us "beings-in-culture" (*Être-en-culture*)—there's no breaking free from this web of meanings tying us to everyone else. Even how you feel time dragging or space stretching out, or what strikes you as beautiful—it's all built on a collective foundation, showing up in the way your body moves, what it expects. So, Merleau-Ponty throws out the idea of a "neutral" perception. Instead, he shows it as something rooted deep in our shared history. The body, as it tangles with the world, doesn't just soak up culture—it spins it back out, remaking the very thing that made it. It's a lively back-and-forth, a loop that says the perceiving self isn't some lone island but a knot in a bigger existential tapestry. (Crossley, 2001, p. 97).

3.2 Artificial Intelligence: Computational Perception?

3.2.1 Limits of the Embodied Model

Even with all its leaps in crunching data and spotting patterns through algorithms, artificial intelligence still ends up with a kind of "abstract, computational" perception—miles away from the living, bodily experience Merleau-Ponty sees as the root of human understanding. A person takes in the world through a body that's steeped in history, tied to a specific time and culture, its senses carrying memories and moments that shape how the present gets read. AI, though? It's more like a "virtual body," missing some big pieces:

- Existential Embodiment: Sure, robots with sensors can pick up data—temperature, light, whatever—but they don't *live* the warmth or feel the lift of sunlight. They don't have that "habitual body" tying perception to feeling or memory. It's just numbers, not a shiver or a smile. (Dreyfus, 2002, p. 156).
- Bodily Intentionality: Machine learning algorithms can predict patterns, but they don't carry that "intentional arc" Merleau-Ponty talks about—the way a human body weaves past and present into expectations rooted in real experience. Think of how your gut tenses at the sight of a snake, thanks to some ancient, baked-in memory. AI's got no gut to tense. (Gallagher, 2017, p. 89).
- Lived Context: AI doesn't swim in the web of cultural and social meanings that shape what we sense. A touch can mean "violence" or "kindness" depending on where you're standing—AI doesn't stand anywhere. It's not soaked in the give-and-take of a shared world. (Clark, 2015, p. 121).

Even the slickest robots are still just tools, mimicking perception without sparking any existential meaning. They don't join the "lived world" as something shaped by it and shaping it back. For Merleau-Ponty, human perception isn't a detached breakdown of inputs—it's a creative act, born from the raw, pulsing interplay between body and world. That's why AI, for all its precision, stays a machine without that essential spark of "wonder" that ignites real understanding.

3.3 Differences Between Human and Artificial Perception

3.3.1 Human Perception:

An Embodied Existential Interaction: The Body as an Active Creator of Meaning

When a person runs their hand over a rough surface, it's not just about picking up sensory data. It's this intricate, living moment—a swirl of senses, memory, and motion all coming together. The body doesn't sit back; it pushes against the texture, fingers adjusting their pressure without a second thought, pulling up echoes of past touches—not as mental snapshots, but as patterns carved into how it moves, how it feels. These aren't abstract; they're shaped by a personal history, a cultural one too. It's not passive discovery—it's a creative give-and-take. The rough surface guides how you touch it, sure, but your body shifts how it understands it, adapting in real time. That's where the big gap shows up between human and artificial perception. A machine can measure roughness with sensors, no doubt, but it's got no bodily history to lean on—no linking that texture to a scrape or a memory. It's missing that spontaneous intent baked into what Merleau-Ponty calls the "body schema," and that seamless tie between feeling and moving. So, it's just a tool—crunching data, not living the experience as a back-and-forth between a body weighted with time and a world it's part of. For humans, perception turns into this creative spark, blurring the line between self and thing, making the body not just a middleman but the wellspring of meaning itself. (Thompson, 2007, p. 245).

Contextual Interpretation: Perception as a Tapestry of Personal and Cultural History

uman perception doesn't happen in some isolated bubble—it's a living interpretation, a melting pot where personal experiences and cultural values blend into something whole. Take a fire crackling in a hearth: it's not just a physical thing to us. It turns into a symbol, shaped by your own story—maybe the cozy glow of family nights or the dread of a house ablaze—and by culture too, like how myths paint fire as life itself or sermons cast it as ruin. This context isn't some outside frame; it's woven into the body, into how it moves (edging closer to the flames or shrinking back), into the words it chooses ("mercy" for warmth, "evil" for danger). It carries the fingerprints of both your own past and the collective one. Even a color or a sound gets tangled up in it: rain might sing like music to someone raised in the countryside, but it's a gnawing worry to anyone who's seen a flood swallow their street.

Merleau-Ponty tosses out the idea of a "neutral" perception here. What he shows is that the world's always built through this back-and-forth between a body's memory and the cultural patterns it's steeped in. Meaning doesn't get cooked up in some abstract mind—it's forged in the thick of daily life, where the body, this historical creature, rewrites the world with every touch, every glance, speaking a language stitched from its past and its present. (Gallagher & Zahavi, 2012, p. 153).

3.3.2 Artificial Perception

Fragmented Processing and the Loss of Existential Context

Artificial intelligence perceives by breaking the world into bite-sized digital chunks—think of an image chopped into pixels, colors measured out in ratios, or a sound sliced into frequencies and run through stats. It's precise, no question, but it's missing that deep unity you get with human perception. The inputs get treated like "isolated variables," floating free of any existential or cultural thread to tie them together. Take an AI analyzing a human face: it zeroes in on the geometry—the gap between the eyes, the curve of the nose—running it through pattern-recognition algorithms. But what about the *meaning* behind a smile? Is it mockery? Warmth? A bluff? That's beyond it. This splintered approach strips artificial perception of the ability to connect data to lived experience—like linking a red sky to a romantic sunset or a storm warning whispered by your grandma.

Even if you slap advanced sensors on a robot to mimic human senses, the data still sits in neat little silos: a picture here, a sound there. It lacks that "living weave" humans have, where sensation, movement, and memory braid together in the body. So, artificial perception ends up like a shattered mirror—catching bits of the world but never piecing them back into a whole that feels *lived*. It's

a whiz at analysis, sure, but understanding? That's where it stumbles. (Varela, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991, p. 149).

3.3.3 Expanding on the Fundamental Differences Between Human and Artificial Perception

Human perception stands apart from the artificial kind in a way that's almost hard to pin down—it's this vibrant, creative act, sparked by a living conversation with the world. When a person looks at a tree, it's not just an object out there; it's a whole experience woven together—a play of shadow across the bark, the rustle of leaves brushing the air, a sudden rush of childhood memories climbing its branches. That's meaning being born, right there, through the body's dance with beauty and time. Artificial intelligence? It's stuck mimicking patterns, crunching data—like sizing up that same tree by pixel counts or height stats, no strings attached to emotion or history. It sees, but it doesn't feel the tree's weight in someone's story (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2012).

This gap widens when you bring in time. Human perception builds up, layer by layer. It's cumulative, rooted in a bodily memory that pulls the past—like afternoons sprawled under that tree—into the present and stretches it toward the future, imagining how it'll grow taller or shed its leaves. AI, though, lives in the now. Even when it's got stored data, those are just numbers, cold and detached, not threads in an existential tapestry. They don't hum with the life of what came before or what might come next (Zahavi, 2003).

Then there's intent. A person reaches for a glass of water because their throat's dry—it's this effortless, bodily urge driving the hand forward, no premeditation needed. A robot might grab that same glass with a mechanical arm, and yeah, it might look smooth, almost natural, but it's just following code. There's no thirst, no want—just a program ticking boxes. That's the difference: human intentionality flows from the gut, while artificial action, no matter how slick, is scripted, hollowed out of desire. (Varela, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991).

And don't get me started on the social side. Human perception is drenched in the messy web of culture and connection. A smile isn't just a Smile™—it's friendship in one room, a sly jab in another, and you catch that shift because you're part of the game, steeped in shared signals and values. AI, though? It's like an outsider peering in. It can scan a face, match expressions to a database, run the stats on angles or eyebrow tilts, but it's clueless about the *lived meaning*—the warmth or the sting behind it. It's all just patterns, not a heartbeat tied to the push-and-pull of human ties.

So, human perception is this existential thing—it's more than piecing together fragments; it's remaking the world through a body that's alive, plunged into time and culture. Every glance, every touch, spins something new out of that immersion. Artificial perception? It's clever, no doubt—a master at imitation, nailing the how-to of seeing or hearing. But it's got no spark of wonder, no shiver of *being*. It's a tool, not a life.

Intentionality Organic Orientation Toward the World Versus Mechanical Programming

For Merleau-Ponty, intentionality is the beating heart of human consciousness. It's that unthinking lean toward the world—like your hand drifting to pick up a coffee cup or your head turning when someone calls your name. It's not a calculated decision; it's the body and mind together, caught up in this natural, existential flow. He calls it the "intentional arc" (*arc intentionnel*), this invisible thread that ties actions to the past (what you've lived), the present (what you're sensing), and the future (what you're expecting). It's seamless, instinctive. (Merleau-Ponty, 1945).

Now flip that to artificial intelligence. Its "intentionality" is locked in by algorithms—pre-set, rigid. A robot might snag that coffee cup with pinpoint accuracy, but it's only because the code said so: *if cup detected → grab it*. There's no thirst nudging it along, no quiet craving for the taste. Even when it "learns" from past data, that's just stats getting sharper, fine-tuning the performance. It's not a spark of existence tying the act to a personal meaning or a flicker of feeling—it's a machine doing its job. (Clark, 2015).

The Core Difference: Perception as "Being in the World"

At its root, human perception isn't some mental task—it's a way of *being*. It's a living body opening up to the world with this effortless intent, reshaping it through a weave of memories and culture. Artificial intelligence, no matter how fancy it gets, stays a functional thing—mimicking perception without ever *living* it. Why? It's missing the essentials:

- *Living Embodiment*: A body that carries its history in every step, every twitch.
- *Existential Intentionality*: That organic pull toward the world, not a programmed checklist.
- *Lived Context*: The plunge into a tangle of personal and shared meanings.

So, human understanding remains this existential puzzle—something machines can't quite fake, no matter how hard they try. (Dreyfus, 2007, p. 55).

4. Could Artificial Intelligence Ever Be "Embodied"?

4.1 The Idea of Embodied AI

Embodied Artificial Intelligence—or Embodied AI, as it's often called—offers a fascinating twist in the journey to build machines that don't just crunch numbers in a void but actually live in the world, so to speak. It's an idea that feels almost poetic, tying into what the philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty once mused about perception. He didn't see it as some cold, detached process locked in the mind. No, for him, it was something alive, something that blooms from the way our bodies move through and touch the world around us.

Over in the labs of cognitive robotics, people are trying to turn this into something real. They're stepping away from the old-school approach of hardwired instructions and instead crafting robots that learn by doing—by feeling their way through things. Imagine a robot with eyes that soak in the sights, hands that sense the roughness of a surface, ears that catch the hum of life. With some smart tech behind it, the machine starts to figure things out, not unlike how we stumble into understanding as kids. The iCub robot's a great example—it's built to poke around, mess up, and learn, mirroring the clumsy curiosity of a toddler (Clark, 2015, p. 102).

But here's where it gets tricky: can AI ever really reach the kind of embodied perception Merleau-Ponty had in mind? It's not just a tech problem—it's a question that digs into what it means to be human. He saw perception as more than processing signals; it was a personal story, shaped by the flesh-and-blood reality of who we are. AI can put on a good show, moving and reacting in ways that might fool you at a glance, but there's a gap. It doesn't *feel* the world. It doesn't know what it's like to be a self, looking out from within.

That's the tough part—human experience isn't just about what we do; it's about why we care, how we feel, the quiet meanings we find in things. AI hasn't cracked that yet, and maybe it never will. Sure, down the road, advances in artificial neuroscience or deeper ways of modeling perception might give robots a sharper sense of their world. But even then, it'd be like watching a masterful actor on stage—brilliant, but not the same as living the role for real.

So, yes, AI can borrow some threads from the tapestry of embodied perception, but it's still a long way from weaving the full picture Merleau-Ponty described. Our perception isn't just a system firing off responses—it's a dance of awareness, a human thread that machines, for all their dazzle, can't quite follow (Duan et al., 2022).

3.2 Contemporary Models of Artificial Perception

Notable Examples:

3.2.1 IBM Watson and Google DeepMind

When it comes to standout ventures in cognitive artificial intelligence, IBM Watson and Google DeepMind rise to the top. Each takes its own path toward building systems that echo human thought, though they do so in distinctly different ways (Russell & Norvig, 2021).

IBM Watson zeroes in on mastering natural language processing (NLP) and wrestling with massive datasets to bolster decision-making in fields like medicine, business, and law. It's the kind of tool that thrives on digging into texts and tackling complex questions—something it famously proved by clinching a win on *Jeopardy!*. Watson leans on traditional machine learning to sift through oceans of data, making it a powerhouse for tasks like medical diagnostics, legal advice, or market analysis. It's less about inventing anew and more about putting what's already known to work in practical, impressive ways (Ferrucci et al., 2013).

Google DeepMind, on the other hand, takes a bolder leap. It harnesses deep learning and reinforcement learning, giving its systems a chance to grow their cognitive smarts more independently. The results speak for themselves: think of AlphaGo, which outplayed the world champion in the ancient game of Go, or AlphaFold, which cracked one of biology's toughest nuts—protein folding—potentially paving the way for new medicines. Beyond that, DeepMind's tech has been used to trim energy use in Google's data centers and sharpen advanced medical diagnostics. It's not just processing what's given; it's learning as it goes, adapting to the world around it (Silver et al., 2017).

So where does that leave them? Watson shines when it comes to analyzing data and making informed calls based on what's already there—a reliable partner in data-driven domains. DeepMind, though, edges closer to mimicking human perception. Its self-guided learning and ability to interact with its environment make it more nimble, better at tackling fresh challenges without needing a human to reset the rules. Watson's your pragmatic assistant, grounded in the here and now of available info. DeepMind feels like a step toward something loftier—a more abstract, flexible intelligence that can think and learn with a touch more autonomy.

Together, they show two sides of the cognitive AI coin: Watson as the steady hand for decision-making, and DeepMind as the explorer, nudging us closer to a machine that doesn't just follow but figures things out on its own (Ziemke, 2016).

3.2.2 Sensory Robots Like "Sophia" and Their Attempt to Mirror Human Perception

Sensory robots, such as "Sophia" developed by Hanson Robotics, represent an endeavor to make interactions between humans and artificial intelligence feel less mechanical and more human-like. The aim is to close the gap by emulating how we perceive and engage in social contexts. Sophia stands out with her strikingly lifelike face, engineered to convey emotions through subtle movements of her eyes and mouth, making her feel like a relatable presence compared to the rigid, clunky robots of yesteryear.

Underneath, Sophia leverages natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning to interpret conversations and respond in a way that flows naturally, almost like chatting with a friend (Breazeal & Scassellati, 2002). She's equipped with cameras embedded in her eyes, coupled with facial recognition technology, allowing her to identify people and interpret the emotions flickering across their faces. It's this ability to tune into expressions that enhances her human-like quality.

However, despite all her sophistication, there's a limit. Her awareness—or what's dubbed perception—remains constrained. She operates on pre-loaded databases and algorithms, not on anything akin to the lived, felt experience humans rely on (Ziemke, 2016). Sure, she can sustain a decent conversation, but it's more of a clever performance than a profound understanding. Robots like Sophia

mark a significant advancement in social AI—they're remarkable in their mimicry of human perception. Yet, they remain far from genuine consciousness. What she delivers is a refined simulation, not the rich, subjective grasp of the world that defines how we humans experience it.

4. The Future of Perception in the Age of Technology

4.1 Can Artificial Intelligence Ever Possess Consciousness?

The question of whether artificial intelligence could one day have consciousness stirs up a tangled mix of philosophical and scientific debate. Opinions split down the middle: some imagine AI might eventually touch true awareness, while others argue that human consciousness hinges on a physical body and lived experience—things no machine can truly claim. Researchers in neuro-inspired AI (NeuroAI) are among the optimists, suggesting that advances in deep neural networks and brain-like simulations might spark a kind of "artificial consciousness." They envision systems that could grow a sense of self-understanding or tackle complex decisions, shaped by ongoing dances with their surroundings. Projects are already underway, crafting AI that learns on its own and surprises us with responses we didn't see coming—hints, perhaps, of an emerging perception.

Yet, there's another side to this story. Thinkers like Merleau-Ponty and Daniel Dennett argue that real perception can't exist without embodiment. For them, consciousness isn't just about churning through data—it's a full-bodied, sensory experience, woven from direct encounters with the world through flesh and feeling (Dennett, 2017). By this view, even if AI gets dazzlingly good at mimicking human perception, it'll still miss the mark. Machines lack that inner spark, the subjective sense of being alive—no personal history, no raw awareness like ours.

Embodied AI might nudge us closer to bridging this gap. Picture robots that sense and move through their world, learning as they explore, much like a child poking at their surroundings. These systems are getting better at physically engaging with reality, but the divide remains stark. Artificial perception, for all its polish, isn't the same as the human kind—it's a shadow, not the substance.

So, the possibility of true artificial consciousness hangs in the air, unresolved. As neuroscience and AI keep pushing forward, they might one day reshape how we even define consciousness (Koch & Tononi, 2019). For now, it's a question that lingers, teasing us with what might be possible—and what might forever stay out of reach.

4.2 How Artificial Intelligence Shapes Our Understanding of Human Perception

Does AI Reshape How We See the Mind and Perception?

Artificial intelligence has the potential to turn our understanding of the mind and perception upside down, tossing fresh challenges at long-held philosophical and scientific ideas about consciousness and human intelligence. Once upon a time, perception was seen as a purely biological gift, something locked inside the human brain. But then came deep neural networks and machine learning, whispering a bold new thought: maybe intelligence can bubble up from complex computations alone (Tegmark, 2017). This shift has nudged us to rethink old notions about the mind. Take AI's knack for spotting patterns, making decisions, or even chatting with us—it's proof that tasks we once thought were exclusive to human brains can be mimicked by systems that aren't flesh and blood. That sparks some big questions: Does intelligence really need consciousness? Could perception exist apart from the messy, personal experience of being human?

Then there's embodied AI, stirring the pot even more. Some, like scientist Antonio Damasio, argue that the mind isn't just a data-crunching machine—it's born from the dance between brain, body, and world. By that logic, artificial perception might hit a wall unless we give AI a body to feel the world firsthand. On the flip side, others wager that advances in neuro-inspired AI (NeuroAI) could rewrite the rules of consciousness altogether (Hassabis et al., 2017). Maybe it's less about having a physical form and more about a system's ability to adapt and learn on its own.

So, AI isn't just tweaking how we view perception—it's pushing us to wrestle with the very nature of awareness. It's a nudge to redraw the line between human minds and non-biological smarts, asking us to ponder what consciousness really means and where it might stretch in the years ahead.

Can We Define Consciousness in a Way That Lets Robots Join the Realm of Perception?

Figuring out a definition of consciousness that welcomes robots into the perceptual fold means digging back into the philosophical and scientific roots of what consciousness even is. For ages, it's been tied to subjective experience—the inner hum of feeling and awareness, often called "phenomenology." The idea was that you couldn't peel consciousness away from personal experience or emotions. But as artificial intelligence strides forward, some researchers are floating a different angle: a more practical, computational take. They're suggesting we measure consciousness by a system's ability to process information, learn, make choices, and maybe even catch a glimpse of itself in context (Chella & Manzotti, 2013).

If we lean into this functional definition, robots and AI might just sneak into the perception club. Advanced systems like DeepMind or OpenAI could be seen as having a kind of "tool-like awareness"—a knack for sizing up their surroundings and responding in intricate ways. Take embodied AI, for instance: robots with sensors and a capacity to learn from what they bump into. They interact with the world in a lively, shifting dance, hinting at a form of perception that's not quite human but still something to reckon with.

Here's the rub, though: human consciousness isn't just about shuffling data around. It's a deep, personal thing—full of sensation, emotion, and intent—stuff AI hasn't touched yet. Maybe the way forward is to split consciousness into layers. We could talk about "computational awareness," where robots shine with their learning and decision-making chops, versus "phenomenal consciousness," the rich, felt experience that seems to stay exclusive to living, breathing beings. So, while AI might get sharper at mimicking perception, calling it truly conscious would demand a radical rethink of what consciousness means in the first place (Pfeifer & Bongard, 2006).

4.3 What Are the Ethical and Philosophical Consequences of These Shifts?

The ethical and philosophical ripples from advancements in artificial intelligence and artificial perception stir up some profound questions—about the nature of consciousness, humanity's place in the grand scheme, and our moral duties toward intelligent systems. On the philosophical front, AI's evolution nudges us to rethink age-old ideas about the mind and perception. If a non-biological entity can pull off advanced perceptual behaviors, could we call it conscious? And if robots start mingling with us socially, should they get some kind of "rights," the way we grant them to living beings? This drags the old debate about human centrality—anthropocentrism—back into the spotlight. We've long assumed we're the only ones with a claim to awareness. Could that assumption crack? (Bostrom, 2014).

Ethically, things get thornier. How do we treat these systems, especially if they start making choices on their own or acting in ways that hint at something like free will? Imagine a cutting-edge robot showing what looks like emotional awareness—would flipping its off switch feel like a betrayal? Then there's the legal tangle: if an AI system messes up big time—say, a wrong medical call or a self-driving car crash—who's to blame? The developers? The users? Or the AI itself? (Floridi, 2013).

Beyond that, there's a shadow side to wrestle with: the risk of AI being twisted for control or manipulation. Systems sharp enough to read human behavior could be weaponized—spreading misinformation, swaying political choices, or even birthing artificial entities that rival us in work or creativity. These possibilities force us to redraw the lines between ethics and technology, asking if we're truly ready for a world where non-biological intelligence weaves itself into our social and intellectual fabric (Searle, 1980).

Conclusion

Merleau-Ponty's philosophy offers a groundbreaking lens on perception, one that forces us to wrestle with the limits of artificial intelligence. He insists that human perception can't be untangled from the body or the sensory experiences that root us in the world—it's not just a mind thing, but a deep, physical interplay with our surroundings. This throws down a gauntlet for AI: Can a system without biology, without a real body or lived sensations, ever reach a level of perception that rivals ours? Or will efforts to mimic intelligence stay trapped in the realm of sophisticated calculations—clever, sure, but missing the pulse of true feeling and self-awareness?

Even with strides in embodied AI, where robots are built to physically engage with the world, a gap lingers between living perception and its artificial counterpart. Modern robots can learn from their environment and make decisions based on what they encounter, no question. Yet they lack that inner spark—the subjective sense, the emotional undertow—that turns perception into something more than a performance. Still, AI's progress tugs at us to rethink perception itself. Could there be a new kind of consciousness out there, distinct from the human flavor, yet still a legitimate form of awareness?

These questions hang in the air, ripe for debate, but they underscore why phenomenological philosophy matters in our digital age. Instead of seeing AI as just a tech leap, we might view it as a testing ground for our deepest ideas about consciousness, perception, and what it means to experience the world as a self. Merleau-Ponty looms large in today's conversations about AI, his insights nudging us to ponder the dividing line between human and machine, between real perception and its shadow—a line that grows blurrier as technology and philosophy weave together like never before.

References

1. Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.
2. Breazeal, C., & Scassellati, B. (2002). Robots that imitate humans. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 6*(11), 481–487. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(02)01988-2
3. Carman, T. (2008). *Merleau-Ponty*. Routledge.
4. Chella, A., & Manzotti, R. (2013). Artificial consciousness: A perspective from cognitive robotics. In R. Manzotti (Ed.), *Artificial consciousness* (pp. 1–18). Imprint Academic.
5. Clark, A. (2015). *Surfing uncertainty: Prediction, action, and the embodied mind*. Oxford University Press.
6. Dennett, D. C. (2017). *From bacteria to Bach and back: The evolution of minds*. W. W. Norton & Company.
7. Descartes, R. (1996). *Meditations on first philosophy* (J. Cottingham, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1641)
8. Dillon, M. C. (1997). *Merleau-Ponty's ontology* (2nd ed.). Northwestern University Press.
9. Dreyfus, H. L. (2002). *What computers still can't do: A critique of artificial reason* (3rd ed.). MIT Press.
10. Dreyfus, H. L. (2007). *What computers still can't do: A critique of artificial reason* (3rd ed.). MIT Press.

11. Duan, J., Yu, S., Tan, H. L., Zhu, H., & Tan, C. (2022). A survey of embodied AI: From simulators to research tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence, 6*(2), 230–244. https://doi.org/10.1109/TETCI.2021.3137695
12. Ferrucci, D., Brown, E., Chu-Carroll, J., Fan, J., Gondek, D., Kalyanpur, A. A., Lally, A., Murdock, J. W., Nyberg, E., Prager, J., Schlaefer, N., & Welty, C. (2013). Building Watson: An overview of the DeepQA project. *AI Magazine, 31*(3), 59–79.
13. Floridi, L. (2013). *The ethics of information*. Oxford University Press.
14. Gallagher, S. (2017). *Enactivist interventions: Rethinking the mind*. Oxford University Press.
15. Gallagher, S., & Zahavi, D. (2012). *The phenomenological mind: An introduction to philosophy of mind and cognitive science* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
16. Hassabis, D., Kumaran, D., Summerfield, C., & Botvinick, M. (2017). Neuroscience-inspired artificial intelligence. *Neuron, 95*(2), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.06.011
17. Koch, C., & Tononi, G. (2019). A framework for consciousness. In G. Tononi & C. Koch (Eds.), *The feeling of life itself: Why consciousness is widespread but can't be computed* (pp. 15–34). MIT Press.
18. Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception* (D. A. Landes, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1945)
19. Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). Routledge & Kegan Paul.
20. Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The visible and the invisible* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1964)
21. Morris, D. (2018). *Merleau-Ponty's developmental ontology*. Northwestern University Press.
22. Pfeifer, R., & Bongard, J. (2006). *How the body shapes the way we think: A new view of intelligence*. MIT Press.
23. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
24. Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, brains and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3*(3), 417–457.
25. Sheets-Johnstone, M. (1999). *The primacy of movement*. John Benjamins Publishing.
26. Silver, D., Schrittwieser, J., Simonyan, K., Antonoglou, I., Huang, A., Guez, A., Hubert, T., Baker, L., Lai, M., Bolton, A., Chen, Y., Lillicrap, T., Hui, F., Sifre, L., van den Driessche, G., Graepel, T., & Hassabis, D. (2017). Mastering the game of Go without human knowledge. *Nature, 550*(7676), 354–359.
27. Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence*. Knopf.
28. Thompson, E. (2007). *Mind in life: Biology, phenomenology, and the sciences of mind*. Harvard University Press.
29. Toadvine, T. (2009). *Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of nature*. Northwestern University Press.
30. Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. MIT Press.
31. Zahavi, D. (2003). *Husserl's phenomenology*. Stanford University Press.
32. Ziemke, T. (2016). The body of knowledge: On the role of the living body in grounding embodied cognition. *Biosystems, 148*, 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystems.2016.08.005