

John searle argument against strong artificial intelligence essay sample

[Technology](#), [Artificial Intelligence](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The abbreviations A. I mean artificial intelligence. Artificial Intelligence distinguishes between the weak artificial intelligence and a strong artificial intelligence. Technology level dictates the ability of creation of artificial intelligence. Advancement in the technology level leads to the development of strong artificial intelligence. A weak artificial intelligence compares the principal value of a computer with the mind as a powerful tool. Computers perform the work of the brain, and helps people in stating and testing the hypothesis in rigorous and precise way. They give the correct answer with certainty and certain degrees of confidence level, if not certain. However, according to a strong artificial intelligence, a computer's description varies from the weak artificial intelligence view of computer as just a mere tool in studying the mind. It states that, appropriate programming of the computer enables it to be a mind by itself. Some cognitive states get understood and activated when computers get installed with the required programs which help them understand. Improvement of the technology levels improves the level of artificial intelligence. In addition, computer programs not only help us to examine the psychological explanations but also, are the explanations themselves in the strong artificial intelligence .

John Searle refers to the artificial intelligence in the context of the strong artificial intelligence. Schank's program defines the aim of a strong artificial intelligence as the stimulation of the human ability to comprehend the relevance of stories. The program characterizes stories by human beings to an understanding level that tackles questions from the story in a different way. Shank uses an example of people visiting a restaurant and deciding whether to pay or, not on the services offered. In the example, a man enters

a restaurant and gives an order of hamburger. The waiter brings a hamburger burned to a crisp. It annoys the man thus makes him walk out of the restaurant angrily without paying since it did not match his requirements. In the other example, another man gives an order for the hamburger in the same restaurant and pays the bill after enjoying the hamburger . The two examples have different answers, which could be solved easily. In one scenario, the customer pays, but in the other the customer does not pay. In answering the questions whether both men ate hamburgers, the computer gives the same response with that of human beings. Partisans of the strong artificial intelligence base their reasoning on the question and answer method, that the computer simulates the human ability to comprehend the story, and provide answers to the questions. They also argue that computers and their programs explain the human power to answer questions from the story.

However, John Searle disagrees with this traditional objection of a strong artificial intelligence. He shows that Shank's work lacked support and that it lacked the basis of argument. He applied the theory with Gedanken experiment to prove Shanks's work as shallow. He uses an example of a man who performs certain functions by manipulating the instructions and the objects given to him to disapprove Shank's work. The experiment entailed locking a person in a room and handing him a huge batch of Chinese writings having in mind that he/she does not understand this language. To that person, Chinese lacks meaning. After sometime, the same person received another batch from the same source. The second one contains a Chinese script with rules to correlate both Chinese batches . The standards

maintained a high level of discipline in English language. These rules enabled that person to correlate a set of the formal symbols. Formality describes the ability of identifying the different symbols by their shapes. The third batch also contains instructions written in English enable enables the person to correlate all the batches. The people giving out the Chinese batches refer to the first batch as the script, the second batch as the story and the third batch as the questions. The symbols in response provided reflected the answers and the rules given in English reflected the program. Offering all the batches and instructions in English language will give the same results as given from the Chinese batches. Unlike the English case, the person manipulates the Chinese case and answers them according to the instructions given.

The traditional Strong artificial intelligence claims that computers understand stories and programs that explain human understanding. From the example in the case study, the person never understood Chinese language. In the same way, the computer understands nothing according to John Searle. This computer resembles the person who never understood the Chinese language but did the required task. In the other claim, the program relates to explanation of the human understanding. From the above example, we observe that the computer and the program provide insufficient conditions to understand since both function without understanding. Hence, Schank's suggestion of a strong artificial intelligence lacks the real demonstration. Searle first explains the meaning of the term "understanding" to vary with Shank's understanding. He describes understanding with the literal meaning of perception or the first impression.

He also shows that the existence of different levels of deeper understanding. According to him, a person can understand different stories narrate in different languages like French and German, and on the contrary, the car and the summation machine do not understand anything. The association of cognitive attributes to machines and computers do not have a basis as Shank states. The door opens due to the presence of the photoelectric cell and not due to cognitive issues. Likewise, addition and subtraction machines add and subtract but do not divide. The way a door understands the photoelectric cells is not the same way people understand the language of English .

Newel and Simon (1963) argued that cognition in computers is the same as the one in human beings. In regard to this, various responses developed. The systems reply by Berkeley states that, though the individual locked in the room never understands the story, that story covers a part of the whole system. The whole system understands this story in a certain context. Thus, understanding relates the whole system and the individual have the whole system set. According to this reply, ascribing the single story from the system describes the understanding. However, Searle responds to the systems theory by indicating that, irrespective of the individual's ability to comprehend the whole system, he does not understand the Chinese language. Irrespective of the performance displayed, the individual never understands the Chinese language. If the person fails to understand the Chinese language then, the system could not understand because the system forms part of the person. Starting with the systems theory seems implausible. According to him, logicity of the idea does not emerge if the

person does not understand the meaning. He assumed that there exist two subsystems in a person. One subsystem understands English and the other understand Chinese. If the two different people enter a restaurant and want to order a hamburger, the Chinese uses the symbol language to order for hamburger while the English man uses English language to order a hamburger. Such symbol language gives literal meaning of the hamburger. The same way in the previous example that symbols accompanied by the English language directions helps the person to achieve in answering the questions by manipulating the symbols. If we accept that there are cognitions in non-cognitive areas, we will turn out to be cognitive. Chinese information systems have inputs, and they determine the probable outputs. If a strong artificial intelligence forms a branch of psychology, it must distinguish genuine mental systems from the non-mental ones. Non mental distinction observes intrinsic properties of the system. The thought of strong artificial intelligence as a theory of mind must be pondered. We accept the fact of simple use of the literal understanding of the systems used in a tape recorder and adding machine. Cognitive features of people like strong faith and weak faith, real beliefs, propositional content among others do not occur in a thermostat or a computer but occurs in human beings only.

Yale proposed the second reply of the Robot Reply. It proposes the writing of many different programs from the Shank's program. He proposes the insertion of a computer in a robot and programming its input. Activation of the robots actions originates from the computer. It has the capability of drinking, eating, walking and hammering nails among others. Robot customization must be done according to the desired robot use. Such a robot

would gain a genuine understanding and also have other mental states.

The combination reply includes Berkeley and Stanford. This combines the different replies on this issue. The three replies have a greater decision power. They put a brain shaped computer on a robots cranial cavity.

Advanced programming allows the robot to have synapses of human brains.

The whole robot behavior covers all the human behavior. They have most alike attribute and have same functioning thus indistinguishable. Such a robot would ascribe to intentions of the system and ensure that people do not die.

According to the combination reply, John Searle agrees that the case above would be irresistible. He finds rationality in accepting the hypothesis of the robot. He also agrees to the robot's possessing intentionality if he knew nothing about the robot. Similar behaviors and appearances play the majority descriptive role of the robot and the indistinguishable large range human behaviors. Though Searle later disagrees these as the basis of a strong A. I. according to a strong A. I, starting or differentiating a formal program in place with the required inputs and expected outputs is a sufficient condition which must be, constituted and have intentionality.

Newell says that, the metal in the robot operates the robots physical operations. This assures human beings that their flesh and understanding of the robot lies below them. Robot manufacture aims at proving the strong artificial intelligence

John Searle uses the Chinese room examples to reveal the importance of intentionality. He shows that the person who never understands Chinese produces expected results unknowingly after manipulating the symbols.

Without Chinese knowledge, the person will develop things that he does not understand. He could understand what he was doing only if he understood Chinese. The feature of A. I, which appeals according to him, is the distinction between programs and realization of the strong A. I. Distinction between programs and realization of hardware seem to be the same as the distinction between the metal operations level and the brain operations level. Ability to describe mental operations being a formal program will enable us to describe the essentials of the mind without carrying out the introspective psychology of the brain. The equation of " mind is to the brain, and the program is to hardware" may be broken down to several points. First, the realization and program distinction have consequences on the programs. They also have some crazy revelations without intentionality. Secondly, formal programs and intentional states depict informality. Their content bases their definitions and not their forms. Definition of the action of rain carries a mental state but not a formal shape. It fulfills certain mental contents and ensures optimization of the conditions available for satisfaction. One belief can carry indefinite numbers of different complex expressions in a different language system. The third reason, as mentioned by John Searle, suggests that the different mental states and the events occur literally after the operations of the brain. Though, this product does not in any way associate itself with the operations of the computer. If programs do not follow a certain order of events like the mental process, many people will need an explanation. The basic idea of computer simulation may be the reality of removing the suspicions because the computer configuration allows performance of the post assessment simulation. To confuse the

different cognitive features with the computer simulation with the duplication processes, the same mistake occurs. It may be pain, rainstorms or love.

There exist various reasons why artificial intelligence has an impact to many in the society. There is reproduction process, and hence this explains the mental phenomena. He believes that people will never be able to remove the illusions, until the full exposure of the major causes that give rise to them establishes. Information processing brings confusion and thus regarded as one of the major causes. Many people practicing cognitive science believe that human brains and the mind process the information. In the analogous, computers with their programs does the processing of information the same as the brain.

Work Cited

Searle, John R. " MINDS, BRAINS, AND PROGRAMS." Journal of Philosophy (California): 1-17.