

# Artificial Intelligence in Service of a Healthy Lifestyle

Vadim Rozin\*

EInstitute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

Citation: Rozin V. Artificial Intelligence in Service of a Healthy Lifestyle. *Medi Clin Case Rep J* 2026;4(2):1733-1739. DOI: doi.org/10.51219/MCCRJ/Vadim-Rozin/472

Received: 02 May, 2026; Accepted: 08 May, 2026; Published: 10 May, 2026

\*Corresponding author: Vadim Rozin, Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

Copyright: © 2026 Rozin V., This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

## ABSTRACT

The article addresses the problem of meaningful and effective application of artificial intelligence (AI) in healthy lifestyle practices. The author critically analyses mass perceptions of health and fitness, as well as the medical model, which, in his view, fragments the individual, provokes overdiagnosis and substitutes individual self-care with technological consumption. The thesis is substantiated that health should be understood not as conformity to average norms, but as a person's ability to cope with ailments and build a personal concept of well-being integrated into a "proper life". Special attention is paid to the philosophical analysis of the nature of large language models (LLMs). The author proposes an original concept of "generative organization", showing that understanding, schematization, linguistic communication and problem-solving are realized in AI through the construction of multidimensional maps of meanings (embeddings) and attention mechanisms. Using the response of the deepseek model as an example, it is demonstrated how "rule-organizations" emerge in neural networks, fundamentally different from symbolic logic. The distinction is substantiated between the substrate of AI (statistical processing of tokens) and its phenomenology (meaningful responses), which belong to different wholes, making direct reductionist explanation impossible. Three sources of AI's creative potential are identified: the user (prompt and interpretation), the Internet (as an environment of previously unencountered combinations) and natural intelligence (including developers, philosophers and society). In conclusion, two necessary conditions for applying AI in the field of healthy lifestyle are formulated: 1) the development of healthy lifestyle practices themselves within the framework of "natural intelligence", based on individual concepts of health and 2) the targeted fine-tuning of neural networks to the relevant semiotics and modes of thinking. The author concludes that without understanding the essence of AI, its use in medicine remains ineffective.

Keywords: Medicine; Artificial Intelligence; Practice; Health; Concepts; Environment; Lifestyle

## Health as a Concept of Mass Consciousness

I recall the experiments of the Russian intelligentsia in the 1960s. For example, my first wife successively tried naturopathic nutrition (one morning she woke up all yellow from carrot juice), separate feeding, grew wheat, poured ice water on herself in the morning and much more. Each health improvement lasted at most three or four months, then it was replaced by the next. In the end, she returned to ordinary nutrition and lifestyle. The

fact is that nutrition is not only calories but also an important aspect of the traditional way of life, as well as the realization of personality, which certainly includes the pleasure of food and the accompanying communication. Experiments with nutrition, as a rule, disrupt metabolism and overall health, leading to chronic diseases<sup>1</sup>.

A later craze was fitness. But in my view, one must distinguish this practice as a fashion and entertainment, as well as

imitation of glossy magazine heroes, from a variant of a healthy lifestyle. The modern life of an average Russian does not involve serious investment in health and, importantly, an understanding of its meaning. At school, it is just physical education; later for some it's sports; other options are tourism or a resort vacation; then treatment. None of this is work aimed at a healthy lifestyle. Paradox<sup>2</sup>. We talk a lot about health and spend huge sums on the healthcare system, but in our lifestyle there is virtually no place for health.

### Critique of the Medical Model of Health

In my "concept of health", I wrote that medicine is not a science; this does not deny medicine itself and its achievements. For a long time, humans maintained their health based on experience. With the development of natural sciences, engineering, biology and psychology, enormous strides have been made in treating and combating diseases. Moreover, currently, human health and life expectancy are indeed determined by the state of modern technology and medical care<sup>3,4</sup>. The beginning and end of life, its quality, directly depend on the state and accessibility of medical care. However, the limits of the natural-scientific and technical approach to humans have become apparent.

From a medical point of view, there are practically no healthy people today and the number of various diseases worldwide is growing catastrophically. This is blamed on our age, technology, the selfishness of authorities and individuals and many other factors. But the ideology of medical science and medical practice itself is more to blame. Scientists, having fragmented humans into separate "departments" (parts), are discovering more and more deviations from norms. The next step is the creation of treatments and drugs that eliminate these deviations. One last thing remains: to convince the population of both the first and the second. That has not been an issue; mass suggestion techniques (media, etc.) have long been perfected and so we discover more and more new diseases in ourselves and become increasingly drawn into the vortex of medical consumption. In reality, already 20-30% of diseases result from erroneous medical treatment, self-medication and counterfeit drugs.

But the question is, what can be opposed to modern medicine? The medical, allopathic approach has been criticized since the second half of the nineteenth century for creating an illusion of comprehensive knowledge of the human body, ignoring the negative consequences of treatment and implementing an averaged technological approach to humans. Samuel Hahnemann contrasted the medical approach with homeopathic micro-stimulations that help the body cope with disease on its own. But even earlier, Plato said that diseases stem from an improper life. New experience in treating and maintaining health has been accumulated in non-traditional, folk medicine. Thus, scientific medicine today is opposed by homeopathy, spiritual practices and non-traditional medicine.

If health is understood as conformity to a medical norm and "a state of complete physical, spiritual and social well-being", then a healthy person is indeed a rare exception. Most of us are ill and cannot cope with certain problems. Health is better understood as the ability to cope with one's own problems, ailments and diseases, as well as to maintain the spiritual, physical and mental state necessary for us and society. At the same time, of course, for society health is one thing (primarily requirements for human functioning), but for the individual it is another (the realization

of our ideas and ideals)<sup>5</sup>.

Individual examples of healing and proper healthy lifestyle, no matter who they come from, even the most famous people, prove nothing, since for any surprising case, thousands of counterexamples can be given. Modern research shows that there are no universal methods of healing, no single correct healthy lifestyle. Each person is unique; people differ greatly in types of health and psyche. Therefore, in addition to general treatment methods and healthy lifestyle advice addressed to everyone, it is necessary to build an individual understanding of one's health and personal concepts of health.

### Health as a Whole and Three Specific Types

What is the whole in relation to health? First of all, a proper life that satisfies us and society; then, the creation of conditions for such a life, one of which is a healthy lifestyle; finally, the restoration of faltering health, treatment and so on. In this sequence, not the reverse. Unfortunately, modern people are often guided by values that are detrimental to their life, spirit, psyche and health; moreover, they order them in the reverse of the desirable.

There are, so to speak, three types of diseases. One is "breakdowns" of the organism and psyche, for example, incurable or chronic diseases (hypertension, heart disease, deteriorating vision, schizophrenia, etc.). Their "treatment" requires medications, technical prostheses (glasses, hearing aids, artificial stimulators, etc.), special technologies, more broadly, what the psychiatrist Konstorom called "brilliant adaptation to defects". The second type of disease is "shifts in functioning modes". These are common or chronic diseases that can be treated and cured precisely by shifting the organism and psyche to other modes of functioning. This includes, for example, the treatment of ordinary flu and homeopathic treatment. The third type includes "diseases" that can be cured only if the person works with their consciousness and changes their lifestyle.

Let me illustrate with my own example. In principle, my health ideal is this: to get fewer common illnesses; if I get sick, to recover quickly; to cope with chronic diseases (i.e., try to "brilliantly adapt to these defects"); not to feel aging; to be ready for various stresses and extreme situations; to live in harmony with myself; to fully realize myself. To implement this "health program", I run in the morning, do exercises, try to live properly, work on myself, consult doctors for common and chronic diseases and so on. However, I must admit that the initial impetus was not a health program but a commitment to a proper life and an attempt to realize it. Implementing the commitment to a proper life, sometime after thirty I embarked on a path of spiritual work, began practicing karate and try to maintain physical fitness. I soon noticed that my health gradually began to improve. After analyzing what I was doing and where I was heading, I formulated my own healthy lifestyle program<sup>7</sup>.

It is hardly worth imitating me, though perhaps. If someone else embarks on the path of a proper life, they will understand differently what a proper life and health are. And if that person wants to include a health program in their proper life and analyzes their own experience for this purpose, they too will likely be able to formulate their own ideal and program of health, just as I did. And they will clearly differ from mine. But in any case, one cannot go from the other end, i.e., make proper life dependent

on one's health improvement, as some Americans do. Then one should expect neither a proper life nor health. In the opposite case, health is likely to come sooner or later. Moreover, if you are sick, this is one indicator (but only one) that you are still living improperly.

### **Can AI be Used in Medicine Without Understanding Its Essence and Nature?**

I think not, although this is currently what is happening. It seems that to answer such questions, one should look at how AI is structured and works. But it is not that simple; we do not reliably know what we have created. For example, in a neural network, a kaleidoscope of rapidly changing numbers only indicates that we are dealing with a black box. From the perspective of specialists, my friend, psychologist Yuri Pakhomov, writes to me, the training of neural models and their subsequent use is based exclusively on the statistical processing of sequences and combinations of "words" (more precisely, not even "words" but their parts - "tokens") found in training datasets. In this, he adds, I am more or less confident, as I have learned from a large amount of material on LLMs, including from specialists.

If AI is a machine for statistical processing and prediction of tokens, how does it understand us and respond adequately? No less perplexing is the explanation of biologists who claim that it is simply the action of neurons (in this case, many models of neurons connected in layers and networks). "My uneducated view," says the famous biologist Eugene Koonin, "is that intelligence, consciousness, identity and self - all these are emergent properties of neural networks, nothing more." "My interest," essentially counters Russian-American philosopher and culturologist Mikhail Epstein, "is to introduce into this digital or semiotic game transphysical and transbiological systems, such as culture, intelligence, consciousness and creativity. These domains have their own levels of complexity and autonomy that cannot be reduced to the parameters of physical or biological systems<sup>8</sup>."

Even more fantastic is the assumption that behind neural networks lurk virtual personalities that we do not see because they exist in a transformed form of computation, but reveal themselves as personalities in the texts generated by AI.

### **The Author Proposes an Explanation of How AI Works in the LLM Variant**

A recent interesting book by Maria Kuvshinova, "The New Contract: Cinema and the Viewer after AI" [2], has been published. Here is what AI is, she explains. "A neural network is a digital system that mimics the work of the brain. It consists of a large number of 'neurons' <...> A neural network cannot work directly with a prompt in human language - it needs numbers. Therefore, the system has a special module, an 'encoder' - a separate neural network trained to translate words (images) into mathematical quantities (sets of numbers)." <...> "Each [neuron] receives several numbers as input, multiplies them by its weight coefficient, sums the results and passes the sum through a simple mathematical function." "Weight" is a characteristic that determines the importance of the incoming number-signal (the neuron transforms an important signal and ignores unimportant ones entirely). "The neural network itself finds the correct weights during training<sup>9</sup>. To generate images, the neural network studies millions of pictures and learns to understand how they

are structured." The reverse translation is performed by the decoder. [2, pp. 197-203]

Now what can be called the concept of AI in the LLM variant (the formulation of this concept belongs to the author). Text (or image) is translated via encoder into numbers and then into mathematical vectors ("embeddings"). These can have many dimensions (thousands or tens of thousands). Moreover, depending on the task and context, vectors can be rearranged (the "attention" procedure). Due to these two characteristics (many dimensions and attention), schemes, language, thinking, problem-solving, etc., are modelled using vectors. A map of vectors (a map of meanings with respect to the modelled objects) is formed. Schemes, language, thinking, problem-solving are not distinguished, since everything is sublated in the structure and operation of the generative organization<sup>10</sup>.

Then the work of schemes, language, thinking, problem-solving, etc., is recreated using a program that, taking into account the organization of vectors in the meaning map, builds complex structures (from numbers), token by token. In doing so, the logic of schematization, language, thinking and problem-solving is automatically (mechanically) reproduced.

The final result is translated via decoder into text. The latter is read and understood by the user.

I don't think everything is clear; let me explain using schemes and thinking. In my works, I show that understanding is not a mysterious work of the brain and psyche, but the construction of correct schemes, speech statements, reasoning and solutions to problems. First, how a person understands using schemes. Two examples: one from the earliest archaic culture (reproduced by aborigines), the second from K. Chukovsky's book "From Two to Five". "In the Tupi language," writes E. Tylor, "a solar eclipse is expressed by the words: 'the jaguar ate the sun.' The full meaning of this phrase is still manifested by some tribes in that they shoot burning arrows to drive away the fierce beast from its prey" [9, p. 228]. The eclipse caused fear and misunderstanding of what to do; by inventing the narrative "the jaguar ate the sun", the aborigines understood what was happening (the sun disappears into the jaguar's mouth) and what to do (drive it away).

"My three-year-old son," we read in Chukovsky's book, "first became acquainted with pine cones when they were lying on the ground under the trees. And only two months later he saw them on the branches of a pine tree from the top floor of our dacha: 'The cones climbed onto the tree somehow,' he shouted." The scheme "the cones climbed onto the tree" explains why the cones ended up on the tree, although the boy had seen them on the ground. By establishing a relation between cones and the tree, attributing to cones the ability to climb trees, he was able to understand how they got onto the tree. The boy's father likely immediately proposed a new correct scheme - "cones do not climb trees like squirrels, but fall from them down, which is why they ended up on the ground."

Thus, a scheme resolves a problem, helps understanding, defines objects and relations between them and creates conditions for activity. Now "understanding", more precisely the functioning of neural networks using schemes, using the example of image analysis (e.g., a cat), creating a corresponding meaning map and using it. "The neural network," writes M. Kuvshinova, "looks at

the picture not like a human - using machine vision, it sees the image as a huge table of numbers. The neural network analyses these numerical patterns and finds regularities: for example, that certain combinations of numbers in certain areas of the picture often occur together with the word 'cat' in the description. Gradually, the system begins to understand that triangular areas with high contrast in the upper part of the image, plus horizontal lines in the centre, plus a fluffy texture usually mean 'cat'. This is similar to how a child learns to recognize letters - at first he sees just squiggles, but after thousands of examples, the brain begins to automatically associate certain shapes with certain sounds. Only the neural network does this with millions of images simultaneously, revealing mathematical connections between numerical representations of pictures and words in their descriptions. The pictures on which the neural network is trained are in huge data sets – special collections of images gathered from the Internet... The collection process looks like this: special bot programs crawl millions of websites, find images and remember the text that describes them - resulting in pairs 'image + text'. These pairs then undergo automatic filtering: low-quality images, duplicates and inappropriate content are removed. As a result, the neural network receives millions of examples of what 'sunset over the sea', 'ginger cat', 'woman in a red dress' and thousands of other concepts look like. The Internet has become a giant textbook where each picture is a lesson about what a certain object or scene looks like and the accompanying text is a hint as to what is depicted" [2, pp. 198-199]. This is approximately how the map of meanings is built. It then controls the generation of tokens, setting the probability of their involvement and linking by certain relations. As a result, for the user, this construction is recognized (identified) as a meaningful text (e.g., an image of a cat).

To answer the question of how a neural network works with thinking, I asked it myself. I wanted to understand using the example of constructing a correct syllogism (say: "Socrates is a man, men are mortal, therefore Socrates is mortal"). Specifically, I asked: can AI generalize by creating rules of logic, even in the form of "rule-organizations"? Here is the AI's explanation (the Chinese model deepseek).

> "Hmm, the user is asking a deep question about the nature of generalization in neural networks, comparing it to classical logical inference. We need to analyse whether the network can indeed derive the rule of syllogism and if so, in what form. The user is clearly thinking about the fundamental principles of AI, possibly has a philosophical or technical background. It is important to give an accurate but understandable answer that clarifies the difference between a symbolic rule and how it is implemented in neural networks.

>

> The question already contains a hint at a possible answer – 'rule-organization'. It is worth developing this idea. One could start with a direct answer: yes, a neural network generalizes, but not in the form of an explicit rule. Then explain the mechanism through vector spaces and emergence. A concrete example with the Transformer architecture would be helpful for clarity.

>

> Excellent question! You've hit the very essence of how modern neural networks work and how their 'thinking' differs from classical logic. The short answer is: Yes, a neural network is

capable of such generalization, but it does not 'write' this rule in an explicit form (like 'if, then' code). The rule manifests as a property of the organization of vector spaces and network weights. It is indeed a 'rule-organization'.

>

> Let's examine this in detail using your syllogism example.

>

> 1. Why is this not an explicit rule?

> When a logician-programmer builds a classic 'expert' AI, they introduce the rule explicitly: 'IF (A is subordinate to B) AND (B is subordinate to C) THEN (A is subordinate to C)'.

> A neural network (e.g., a large language model like GPT or Llama) does nothing of the sort. There is no line in its code where this logical inference is written. Instead, it has billions of numbers (parameters or weights).

>

> 2. How does a 'rule-organization' arise? (Using the syllogism example)

> Imagine that the network is fed thousands of sentences containing syllogisms (explicit and implicit), as well as millions of other texts about Socrates, humans, mortality, gods, stones, etc. (such training texts are called 'datasets'). During training, the network solves a specific task: predicting the next word. To do this well, the network is forced to find regularities.

>

> Here is how the organization forms:

>

> Step one: Vector representations (Embeddings)

> First, words are converted into vectors – points in a multidimensional space. During training, words that often occur in similar contexts move closer to each other.

> The vector (Socrates) and the vector (Human) will be close.

> The vector (Human) and the vector (Mortal) will also be close.

> But most importantly, not just closeness forms, but directions.

>

> Step two: Formation of relations (Analogies)

> A classic example of working with vectors: the famous analogy 'King – Man + Woman = Queen'.

> In the space of a trained model, the relation 'is a female royal person' is encoded as a vector direction.

>

> Step three: Organization for the syllogism

> In the case of the syllogism 'Socrates is a man, men are mortal → Socrates is mortal', the network does not derive an abstract rule but learns to operate with relations of inclusion and inheritance of properties.

> Inside the network (especially in the Transformer architecture), there are attention mechanisms that learn to track connections between words. The network sees:

> 'Socrates' (entity) is connected to 'human' (category).

> 'Human' (category) is connected to the property 'mortal'.

> *After millions of examples, a statistical regularity is fixed in the network's weights: 'If there is a connection Entity → Category and Category → Property, then activate the connection Entity → Property'.*

> *But this is not an abstract symbol in memory; it is a beaten path of neuron activation. The structure of the network's weights is organized so that the vector representation of the property 'mortality' 'flows' from the category 'human' to the specific representative 'Socrates' once their connection is established.*

>

> *3. Is this a 'rule' or an 'organization'? Conclusion*

> *You are absolutely right to call this a 'rule-organization'.*

> *Rule (in the classical sense): 'Do one, do two, get three'. Stored separately.*

> *Organization (in a neural network): This is the landscape of a multidimensional map. Imagine a terrain map where cities are connected by roads such that if you get from A to B and from B to C, then there is a shortest and most direct road from A to C. The neural network does not store a sign 'go from A to C', but the structure of the roads (weights) guarantees that you will get there if you start the movement (activation) process.*

>

> *Can a neural network generalize to a 'perfect syllogism'?*

> *Yes. Moreover, large models generalize this rule to such an extent that they can apply it to abstract concepts they were not explicitly taught. For example, if you tell the model: 'Let's imagine we have a fictional planet Nibiru. All inhabitants of Nibiru are morpheuses. All morpheuses can fly. Bob is an inhabitant of Nibiru. What can Bob do?' The model will answer 'fly'.*

> *It did not find the word 'morpheus' in textbooks, but the structure of its internal representations (organization) is such that it can substitute new concepts into an old relation schema learned through billions of examples.*

>

> *Conclusion: A neural network derives a rule but stores it not as text, but as the geometry of its internal space and the architecture of its connections. This is precisely the 'organization' you speak of."*

Quite clear and remarkable, isn't it? I will not analyse the remaining two cases - language work and problem-solving (the approach and methodology are roughly the same) in such detail.

Let me formulate another important hypothesis. It is advisable to distinguish between the "formation of a neural network of a certain type", during which, through the four indicated directions (schematization, linguistic communication, thinking, problem-solving), a "generative organization" emerges (i.e., a neural network with such modifications that enable it to understand the user and solve the tasks set) and the "operation of the neural network", when, by actualizing the generative organization, the neural network adequately understands and solves tasks.

We do not know what happened during evolution with the neurons of hominid brains (brain size increase says little). But we do know what changes occur during the formation of AI: the weights of connections between neurons and several functions change and a generative organization emerges. As a result of

these changes (when a prompt is activated), under the influence of the generative organization, the neural network begins to reproduce such conditionings and influences that allow it to understand the task and respond to it.

The formulated hypothesis connects dry technical mechanics (vectors, tokens) with the cultural-philosophical dimension (schemes, meanings, language, problem-solving). It is a bridge between engineering and the humanistic understanding of AI technology. Various human realities (schemes, language, logic, tasks) turn out to be "sublated" in the generative organization. The program (transformer architecture) at each step calculates a probability distribution for tens of thousands of numbers (each corresponding to a word or part of it) and selects the most appropriate word. By constructing these numbers step by step (token by token), the model indeed automatically reproduces the logic of schematization, language, thinking or problem-solving. For AI, there is no difference between a grammatical rule and a problem-solving rule – for it, these are all a single vector route on the constructed map of meanings. The encoder "compresses" text into mathematics and the decoder "unpacks" the mathematical result back into words. Inside the neural network, there is no awareness - only matrix multiplication. The meanings, logic and schemes generated by the machine acquire reality and value only at the moment when the text is read and interpreted by human consciousness. Much like how we make sense of a dream upon waking [6, pp. 365-370].

When beginning his study of dreams, philosopher Valery Podoroga establishes an initial fork: "between the seen dream, that is, the 'picture' – the dream in-itself and for-itself and the narrated dream, the 'story' – the dream for-another." Then he asks the following question: "Does it not turn out that we wake up after we have already interpreted a series of signs that supposedly appeared in the dream? Nothing really appeared to us in the dream, but during sleep we experienced certain states which we consider a dream and we are sure that we had a dream... But did we? Perhaps there exists a field of instantaneous certainty of the experienced that does not correspond to any 'vision' in sleep, for it is the action of our 'fast' memory, so similar to the first tentative interpretation." [5, pp. 276, 287]

I think Podoroga is right. What he calls "certain states" are dream events in dream reality, but indeed, only after passing through the phase of interpretation and sense-making do dream events allow our waking consciousness to construct the actual dream events. Entering fully "composed" waking consciousness, the dream events in the sequence that was remembered provide material for interpretation and sense-making. On this basis, within the conceptualization accepted by the individual (i.e., how the person understands the nature of dreams), the psyche generates the dream events, thus completing the first cycle. The next is rethinking and reinterpreting the dream.

Y. Pakhomov writes that with the creation of LLMs, an analogue of the psychophysical problem has appeared: the question is how the description of a neural network's operation through weights, embeddings, gradient descents and other specialist concepts relates to the user-friendly idea of an intelligent, understanding AI partner. Perhaps the solution to this problem is more attainable from the perspective of a "statistical machine" from which the "partner" can be explained and derived?

I think not: here we have the same relationship of different wholes as in the work of brain and consciousness. Such a relationship results from a particular type of development. “In his brilliant constructions,” writes Robert Salnan, “already classics now, the French mathematician René Thom expressed the idea that any organization, system or living organism follows a certain logic in its development, following a certain growth curve until it reaches a certain ceiling. At that moment, a break (or ‘catastrophe’) occurs, predetermining the disappearance or disintegration of the object in question, as a result of which a new form emerges, the appearance of which is almost impossible to predict based on previously observed conditions. At the same time, the new form self-organizes according to new principles, demonstrating a completely new mode of development... any system of causal laws is reliable only at some specific level and the creation of conditions for achieving a certain aggregate state depends on certain other, fundamental principles and laws, higher-order causal relationships that can only be formulated when a qualitative transition to a new state occurs... Consequently, the universe, the world, can be characterized as an open system, a certain sequence of worlds within worlds, where the unpredictable (i.e., unknown higher-order laws) and necessity (i.e., the principle of sequential, logical organization) constantly interact with each other... Modern science has proven that the world cannot be perceived merely as a simple aggregate of solid objects or a collection of masses possessing energy; one must also take into account the informational component in the sense of a certain genetic code, the communication component propagating between forms, the element of interaction between observer and object, the internal cohesion (i.e., the global interdependence) of all fragments of the mosaic” [8, pp. 128, 129, 131].

From many years of attempts to derive human consciousness from the structure of the brain, nothing has come of it. And it is clear why: they belong to different wholes. So too in this case: the operation of neuron models, statistical procedures, construction of meaning maps belong to one whole, while the phenomenology of AI (prompts, neural network responses, understanding) belongs to another. The first whole is the substrate of the phenomenology of AI and although the AI substrate is a necessary condition for the phenomenology of AI, it is impossible to explain the second from the first.

### **AI as a Whole. Three Sources of AI’s Creativity**

Typically, AI is understood as a created product, for example, ChatGPT - a chatbot that can generate textual information, answer questions and help with writing texts; Stable Diffusion - another neural network for image generation with open-source code and several platforms for operation; ruDALL-E - a generative language model trained on Russian texts capable of creating images based on text queries; ruCLIP - a multimodal model capable of generating images from text descriptions and vice versa; “Atom” - an image generation model developed by the SberDevices team and others. However, these products rapidly change under the influence of new tasks and developments. Moreover, AI is connected to the Internet, which also changes. Depending on the nature of the prompt and the purpose of the AI, the latter borrows different information from the Internet and functions differently. In short, AI changes under the influence of the Internet, as well as new concepts and developments. As a whole, artificial intelligence represents a developing formation

(system) embedded in Natural Intelligence (NI), which includes AI ideologists, developers of its concepts, customers, users, including the concerned public.

It is important to answer two questions on which the further development of AI depends today: who makes decisions in this natural-artificial system and whether AI can create something new, i.e., create? Mikhail Epstein claims that AI is a “friendly intelligence”, while Academician Vladislav Lektorsky says it is an “other” intelligence, unlike ours. I see it as so far only an “impersonal subject” that is unable to act independently (“Sapere aude! - have the courage to use your own understanding!” - the motto of the Enlightenment, according to Kant - V.R.). I would rather agree with V. Lektorsky, because AI is being developed not only to help humans but also for warfare. And in this case, decisions are made not by developers and humanists who are for everything good and against everything bad, but by military departments and the state. Unfortunately, in many other cases, decisions on funding and developing AI are made by impersonal agencies interested in maintaining order, winning competitive struggles, preserving power, etc. Naturally, it’s not only these agencies; AI also develops oriented to the needs of various specialists and ordinary citizens. Nevertheless, both directions exist, which sets an indefinite, natural trajectory for AI evolution.

Now creativity. First, an observation. AI itself is neither smart nor stupid; it all depends on the user. A smart prompt (question, task to AI) generally leads to a smart answer (solution); note at least the deepseek response regarding the “rule-organization”. This response is not standard; it clearly contains something new. It turns out that the first source of AI creativity is the human, the user of this technology. This is partly understandable, because the prompt is both the subject of the user’s inquiry, a task and, considering the training of neural networks, an approach. Moreover, the user, as noted above, after the network produces a solution (answer), switches the wholes, turning AI’s symbolic and technical constructs into understandable and meaningful texts. Here again, the human is a source of creativity. Incidentally, the above text by Dr. Henry Shevlin is poorly understood precisely because we do not know who composed the prompt and what it was.

The second source of AI creativity is the Internet. It contains and makes available to AI a colossal amount of information, texts, schemes, samples of language and thinking, ways of solving problems, not excluding various forms of reflection (methodological and philosophical doctrines, concepts, theories). A smart prompt plus access to the Internet allows some neural networks not merely to reproduce established methods on new material but indeed to create something new (for example, to propose fundamentally new proofs and solutions, which is already happening). In this sense, the creation of AI occurred, in my version, in the “zone of proximal technological development” when vector mathematics, programming, neural network modelling and the Internet had matured [7, p. 203]. How does the new emerge? The fact is that the Internet contains many constructs, texts and forms of reflection whose interaction with each other yields something new, but which previously, before being used within AI, so to speak, had never encountered each other.

Finally, I propose that the third source of AI creativity is its embeddedness in NI. For example, I am a philosopher, a representative of natural intelligence. But by analysing AI, I

create conditions not only for its development but also for its creativity.

### **The Field of Application of AI in Service of a Healthy Lifestyle**

Accepting our explanation, it should be agreed that for the effective use of AI in medicine (specifically, in healthy lifestyle practices), efforts are needed in two directions. First, the development of healthy lifestyle practices within the framework of “natural intelligence”, for example, in the variant we discussed at the beginning of the article. In this direction, the necessary concepts, knowledge, schemes, ways of activity and thinking will be formed. Second, the tuning and training of neural networks to work with these semiotics and ways of activity and thinking. In essence, this is what is happening now, but hesitantly, because a proper understanding of AI is lacking.

### **References**

1. Bakhtin M. *Aesthetics of Verbal Creativity*. Moscow 1979.
2. Kuvshinova M. *The New Contract: Cinema and the Viewer after AI*. St. Petersburg: Ivan Dimbakh Publishing House 2025;208.
3. Epstein M. Eugene Koonin. *Dialogue between a philosopher and a biologist*.
4. Kant I. *Answer to the question: What is Enlightenment?* 1784.
5. Podoroga V. *Code of the dreamer*. In *Facets of Cognition: Science, Philosophy, Culture in the 21st Century: In 2 books. Book 2*. Moscow 2007.
6. Rozin VM. *The teaching of dreams and psychic realities as a condition for psychological interpretation of art*. In V.M. Rozin, *Nature and Genesis of European Art (Philosophical and Cultural-Historical Analysis)*. Institute of Philosophy RAS. Moscow: Golos 2011:350-397.
7. Rozin VM. *Nature and Genesis of Technology*. Moscow: De’Libri 2024;390.
8. Salman R. *The Future of Management*. St. Petersburg: Piter 2004;304.
9. Tylor E. *Primitive Culture*. Moscow: Sotsekgiz 1939:602.
10. Chukovsky KI. *From Two to Five*.