

I and AI

AI and Some Philosophical Issues

Gilbert Harman

Tuesday, October 4, 2005

- ▶ An important philosophical imperative: “Know thyself!”
- ▶ It seems essential to me that I am a person and so am like other people in a way I am unlike other things.
- ▶ (It also seems essential to me that I am different from all other people in an extremely important respect.)
- ▶ What is it to be a person? What is the difference between people and other animals?
- ▶ “Man is the rational animal.” Or: human beings are the animals that think, the intelligent animals.
- ▶ (Also: people are essentially unique beings in some hard to articulate way. If I die, I go out of existence and do not just cease to function.)

Inside/Outside

- ▶ I know what it is like to be me from the inside.
- ▶ I want to know how what it is like to be me from the inside fits with what it is like to be me from the outside as revealed to other people, or science
- ▶ Related issue: knowing what it’s like to be you via an understanding of you from the outside.
- ▶ The problem of other minds: how do I know that there is something it is like to be you?

Analogies

- ▶ Metaphors and analogies provide one way of understanding things.
 - ▶ Atomism.
 - ▶ Wave theory of sound.
 - ▶ Current theory of electricity.
 - ▶ Particle and wave theories of light.
- ▶ Argument by analogy to other minds.

Models of Mind

- ▶ Mechanical toys of the 16th Century suggested a person might be a machine.
- ▶ Developments in AI suggest models of human intelligence.

Descartes' Dualism

- ▶ Background physics: contact mechanics, billiard ball models.
 - ▶ No action at a distance
 - ▶ No fields: gravity, magnetism, electricity.
- ▶ Argument that mind is not explainable mechanically.
 - ▶ Mind involves thought, association of ideas, and reasoning.
 - ▶ Other animals can perhaps be explained mechanically. But not people. People are basically their minds, attached to their bodies.
 - ▶ Perhaps minds can survive the destruction of the bodies.
 - ▶ Explanation of mind is different from explanation of bodies. No mere mechanical explanation of mind.

Conversation

- ▶ In particular, Descartes argued that it is inconceivable that mechanical principles could explain ordinary human conversation, which has features of **novelty** and **appropriateness**.
- ▶ Compare Turing Test in Alan Turing, "Computing Machinery and Intelligence".
- ▶ According to the linguist Noam Chomsky, explaining ordinary conversation is a **mystery** rather than a **problem**.

Animals

- ▶ According to Descartes: animals are in principle explicable mechanically.
- ▶ They do not think or reason in the way people do. They do not act on reasons.
- ▶ They do not have immortal souls.
- ▶ They do not have language.
- ▶ Some followers of Descartes went around kicking dogs in order to show their allegiance to dualism.

Interaction

- ▶ Mind and body must interact in perception and in action.
- ▶ This raises the problem: how? How can something that is not a body have an effect on body? And vice versa?
- ▶ Descartes argues that the point of interaction between the two realms occurs in a certain gland in the brain, the pineal gland.
- ▶ But that does not really address the problem.

Analogies from Computer Theory and Programming

- ▶ Logic programming: thinking as theorem proving.
- ▶ Post production systems: grammars as production systems, minds as production systems.
- ▶ Computer: mind as a computer; person as a computer in a robot.
- ▶ Subroutines and modularity, psychological modularity: perceptual systems, language systems, motor systems, face-recognition system.
- ▶ Expert systems: intelligence as expertise.
- ▶ Pattern recognition and statistical learning theory: psychological learning as pattern recognition.

Developments in Physics

- ▶ Later developments: changes in physics allowed for nonmechanical effects and action at a distance.
- ▶ This opens up new possibilities for mind body interaction.
- ▶ Maybe the effect of mind on body is like the effect of gravity or the effect of magnetism.
- ▶ Perhaps a mind is something like a field.
- ▶ Quantum physics suggests additional possibilities.
- ▶ ESP?

Rethinking Descartes' Argument against a Mechanical Explanation of Mind

- ▶ Suppose the mind is the brain, which is like a computer in a robot body.
- ▶ Perhaps the brain functions in terms of principles that go beyond Descartes' mechanics.
- ▶ But in principle it is possible to have computers that operate completely mechanically (Babbage).
- ▶ The main difficulty with supposing the brain is a mechanical computer lies in considerations of size and speed.

Going the Other Way: People as Models for AI

- ▶ Simulation of ideas from psychology as ideas for CS.
 - ▶ neural nets → computational systems → connectionism
 - ▶ paradigm based thinking → nearest neighbor systems
 - ▶ probability → probability nets

Physicalist Theories of Mind

- ▶ Behaviorism
- ▶ Double-Aspect Theory
- ▶ Functionalism

Artifacts as Alive, Conscious, Persons

- ▶ Artificial intelligence
- ▶ Artificial life
- ▶ Artificial consciousness.

Behaviorism

- ▶ Behaviorism equates mental states and occurrences with behavior.
 - ▶ Including behavioral tendencies and dispositions.
 - ▶ Being magnetic as an example of a disposition.
 - ▶ Being magnetizable as a second-order disposition.
- ▶ Turing on computational intelligence
- ▶ Problem about stoicism.

Double-aspect Theory

- ▶ Some physical events (from the outside) are mental events (from the inside).
 - ▶ Pain is activity in certain C-fibers.
- ▶ Mind-body identity theory.
 - ▶ Compare: lightning is an electrical discharge.
 - ▶ Water is H_2O

“Functionalism”

- ▶ Mental events can be identified with whatever physical events have the relevant causal properties.
- ▶ It does not matter what they are made of.

Chinese Room Argument against Functionalism

- ▶ A system might behave as a speaker of Chinese and contain events with the right functional properties without understanding Chinese.
- ▶ A computer simulating a Chinese speaker does not understand Chinese.

Inside and Outside: Two Kinds of Understanding?

- ▶ Claim: the mind-body problem is an illusion that arises through ignoring two kinds of understanding
 - ▶ The method of the sciences: understanding things from the “outside” by seeing them as instances of general laws.
 - ▶ The method of the humanities: understanding cognitive and social phenomena from the “inside” by relating them to your own experiences—by translating them into your own terms.
- ▶ The one sort of understanding is not enough for the other sort.