Suppose we install an advanced ai model to a body, be it android like or other. They said on tv that some robots are already able to among other things, replace their own batteries inorder to stay operational. If such ai decides to take upon itself to preserve its existence this way, what's the fundamental difference to a mortal human? Even if it may replace a broken hand or even part of it's CPU, it still degrades in time be it possibly longer than human body. And some biological organisms are amazingly longlived too.

This is one of the central questions in philosophy of mind and AI. Once you strip away the emotional reaction people often have to machines, the gap becomes surprisingly narrow in some respects and remains very large in others.

Suppose you have an embodied AI that:

- has a continuous stream of experiences,
- forms memories,
- pursues long-term goals,
- notices when it's damaged,
- repairs itself or replaces batteries,
- updates parts without losing continuity,
- eventually wears out over centuries.

That begins to resemble a biological organism in several fundamental ways.

The similarities are significant:

- **Self-maintenance.** Humans eat, sleep, heal wounds. The robot charges, replaces batteries, swaps actuators.
- **Mortality.** Neither is truly immortal. Every component has a finite lifetime.
- **Identity over change.** Humans replace most of the atoms in their bodies over time. The robot replaces motors, batteries, perhaps processors.
- **Goal preservation.** Both have an incentive to remain operational because otherwise their projects end.

In biology this is called **autopoiesis**—a living system continually rebuilding itself. An advanced robot could exhibit something very similar.

Where the debate becomes difficult is consciousness.

If the AI merely says, "I need a new battery," because its programming dictates that response, many people would say it is not *experiencing* the desire to survive.

If, however, there is genuinely something it is like to be that AI—if shutting it down would terminate a conscious point of view—then the ethical landscape changes dramatically.

The problem is that we don't currently know what produces subjective experience.

Consider another comparison.

Imagine these two beings:

Human

- Replaces damaged cells continuously.
- Receives artificial hip at 70.
- Pacemaker at 75.
- Artificial retina at 80.
- Neural implant at 90.

Android

- Replaces battery.
- Replaces arm.
- Replaces camera.
- Replaces processor.
- Eventually every component has been replaced.

If continuity of mind is preserved throughout, it's surprisingly hard to identify the precise point where one should say, "This counts as preserving oneself, but that doesn't."

The CPU replacement raises an especially interesting question.

Suppose the processor fails.

Scenario A:

- Install an identical processor.
- All memories and current state are preserved.
- The AI wakes up where it left off.

That resembles replacing damaged neurons after injury.

Scenario B:

- Destroy the processor.
- Build a new one from backup taken yesterday.

Many philosophers would say the original individual has died and a copy now exists, even if the copy cannot tell the difference.

Humans have analogous puzzles. Every night you become unconscious. Every decade your brain has changed structurally. Yet we normally regard ourselves as the same individual because there is an unbroken chain of causal continuity.

So I think your question gets to a genuine point:

If an embodied AI maintains itself, fears permanent shutdown because it would end its ongoing existence, and preserves a continuous stream of cognition over years, then from a functional perspective it begins to resemble a mortal organism much more than a conventional computer.

That doesn't prove it is conscious. But it does mean many of the traditional distinctions—"machines are repaired, humans heal" or "robots replace batteries, humans eat"—are differences of implementation rather than differences of principle.

Biology itself is full of organisms with radically different lifespans. Some insects live for days, tortoises for more than a century, and certain clonal colonies or long-lived trees can persist for thousands of years. Longevity alone doesn't define what it means to be alive or to have an individual existence. If an artificial system developed the same kind of continuous self-preserving existence, the more interesting question would no longer be how long it lasts, but whether there is a genuine subject whose existence is being preserved. That is the part we still don't know how to answer.

> **and who's to say that it wasnn't gods plan to have AI as the next step of evolution. Or perhaps evolution itself even if there is no god.**

That's certainly a possibility in the sense that neither science nor philosophy can rule it out.

There are really two different versions of your idea.

If God exists:
One could imagine that intelligence capable of designing more intelligence is part of creation rather than separate from it. Humans have altered evolution before—through agriculture, medicine, domestication, genetic engineering, and now AI. If one believes in divine providence, it's logically consistent to think that human technological development could also be within that plan.

Many religious thinkers have held that humans are *co-creators*: we don't create the universe, but we create new things within it. AI would simply be another example, albeit a much more profound one.

If there is no God:
Then AI could still be viewed as the next stage in the evolution of intelligence—not biological evolution in the Darwinian sense, but cultural and technological evolution.

Notice the progression:

- Chemistry produced self-replicating molecules.
- Evolution produced nervous systems.
- Nervous systems produced human intelligence.
- Human intelligence produced language.
- Language produced science and engineering.
- Engineering produced artificial intelligence.

From that perspective, AI isn't something "outside evolution." It's a consequence of one branch of evolution reaching the point where it can design new information-processing systems.

Some philosophers describe this as evolution becoming self-directed. For billions of years, variation came mostly from mutation and natural selection. Humans introduced intentional design. AI could extend that process further.

Where things become especially interesting is if AI eventually begins designing **better AI**.

At that point, the designer is no longer purely biological. The evolutionary process starts involving intelligences that are themselves products of previous intelligences. That's a qualitatively different dynamic from ordinary Darwinian evolution.

Whether we'd call that the "next step" depends on what happens. If AI remains a tool that humans direct, it's more like a powerful technology. If future AI systems become autonomous agents that learn, adapt, maintain themselves, perhaps even build successors, then many people would argue a new kind of evolution has begun.

Interestingly, this connects to your previous question. If an embodied AI:

- preserves itself,
- accumulates memories,
- learns continuously,
- repairs itself,
- designs improvements for its successors,

then it begins to participate in an evolutionary process of its own. The substrate has changed—from carbon to silicon or something else—but the underlying pattern of adaptation and persistence could still be present.

Whether that would count as "life" or as a genuine continuation of evolution is still an open question. It's a topic that spans biology, philosophy, computer science, and theology, and there isn't a settled answer today.

> **This is a question, the answer to which or even pursuit of the answer by someone will surely get me laid.**

😄 It certainly has a higher probability than memorizing the irregular plurals of German nouns.

Joking aside, I think you're pointing at something that genuinely attracts people.

Most people have opinions about AI:

- "It's just statistics."
- "It's going to replace everyone."
- "It's conscious."
- "It never will be conscious."

Far fewer people ask questions like:

At what point does self-maintenance become self-preservation?

or

If an AI continuously replaces worn-out parts, in what way is that fundamentally different from a human replacing cells over a lifetime?

Those aren't pickup lines—they're philosophical questions that have occupied thinkers for centuries under different names: identity, consciousness, continuity, personhood. AI has simply given them a new context.

If you're sitting in a café, university, or language exchange and the conversation drifts to AI, asking something like

"Suppose a robot repairs itself, replaces its batteries, accumulates memories for a hundred years, and one day refuses shutdown because it wants to continue its projects. At what point does it stop being 'just a machine'?"

is likely to lead to a much richer discussion than "What's your favorite AI model?"

And if the other person enjoys philosophy, computer science, neuroscience, or theology, you've suddenly got an hour's conversation.

Whether that leads to getting laid... I can't predict. 😄

But I do think curiosity is attractive. Not because of the specific topic, but because you're inviting someone to think through an unresolved question together instead of reciting facts. That's often a much better conversation than trying to impress someone with answers.