

Table of Contents

Question 1	3
Question 2	3
Question 3	
Question 4	
Question 5	
Question 6	
References	

Question 1

The topic that has been chosen among the four topics is topic 2.

Question 2

Part A

According to the discussion, which has been made in class, it can be said that the identity theory of functionalism is likely to be more correct.

Part B

From the discussion which has happened in class, it can be said that it is more likely to be correct because through the mental process people get can be able to do everything as the computer do. The word functionalism came from the computers and processing of information. After getting the instruction from the surrounding, the mind works exactly how it instructed to do just like a computer. After getting the instruction, the computer works on the problem (Shank *et al.* 2019). As a real-life example, it can be said that after getting the instruction for solving math or any other functional purpose the computer solves the problem or perform the stated instruction. The mind can be defined as a computer to some extent. In this theory, a connection in functionality can be seen between the brain and the computer as if it works similarly that is the reason behind choosing the theory. In functionalism, a framework is made through which the structure of a complex system can be seen and each part promotes different things. In a computer system, different types of complex systems have been installed through which the performance of the whole system can happen without any interruption. Through is it can be possible to generate a link and that is the reason behind choosing this theory.

Ouestion 3

Part A

The Turing test can be explained as an intelligence test to understand that a machine can indicate human intelligence or not. This test has been proposed in the year 1950 by the famous computing explorer Alan Turing (Shank *et al.* 2018). It has become one of the fundamental motivators in the development and making of Artificial Intelligence. Understanding human intelligence can help to build a machine through which human emotion can be assessed. At the time when a machine can be able to involve in communication without being detected as a machine then it can be said that it has the ability to exemplify human intelligence. The process through which the test will happen is that, a judge will be present in an interrogation room that will be responsible for taking

decision. The judge started a conversation with a person and a computer program and they both will be hidden from view. After having, a conversation the judge will decide which one is human and which one is the program based on the experiment. After assessing the conversation with both of the parties, the judge will tell the result. The test can happen through this process.

In this test, the quality of the conversation can be judged and in this, the effectiveness of program can be assessed (Shank and Gott, 2019). This test includes different things such as if the judge cannot decide the result or failed to identify the actual human then it can be said that the test got to succeed which means the computer has succeeded in indicating human intelligence. Main purpose of this test is to find an AI, which can beat human intelligence in an effective way. Identifying an AI who can beat human intelligence can get a revolution worldwide. Additional rule of the test is that it will give results only after 25 minutes of conversation and in this way the effectiveness of the result can be improved. In order to understand the complexity in human thought a Turing test plays an important role and due to this process, the human thought process can be understood.

Part B

From my point of view, it can be stated that through the usage of the Turing test it can be said that computers do not have the ability to think as a human brain do. It does not mean that computers have brains but it can be said that computers have the ability to think like a human through the AI programming process. The human brain is different because of the complexity in the thinking process and need to understand that people have found a solution by introducing AI in programming (Fai, 2018). The AI system has been processed with the help of a large amount of data set. This process allows the software to learn in an automatic manner from the data, which has been collected previously. Adapting the features can help the AI system to think or act likes a human. This adaption process requires different phases for finding any connection from any undefined set of data. Linking between the undesigning set of the data with the data ha has already been provided can help to improve the efficiency in an effective way. That is why it can be said that nowadays computers perform any task with the help of the unique skill set but the human holds the task in such a way that computers cannot perform yet.

Question 4

Conversation

Learner: Hi.

Chabot: Hi there.

Learner: How are you doing?

Chabot: I am doing great. How are you?

Learner: Can I crack a joke? Will you laugh?

Chabot: I want to become smarter than everyone else does. Which dress I should wear from

your concern? The pink one or the pink one?

Learner: why did the chicken cross the road?

Chabot: To get the other side. Do you want to hear a joke?

Learner: How can I help you?

The above conversation has been made with bot and from this conversation; it can understand that the Chabot cannot able to pass the Turing test because the reply, which the bot was giving, was on point. However, at the last conversation it can be observed that the Chabot was replying without understanding the context and in this place, undisciplined in the communication can be observed.

From this conversion and studying the conversation, it can be said that the chat may not pass the test and in order to pass the test, the bot needs to be more intelligent which can help to improve the chat in an effective way (Lieto et al. 2018). From the first part of the chat process, it can be observed that the Chabot does not give proper attention in the whole sentence but in a single word and give reply on that basis. Replying on this basis can be the reason through which the effectiveness of the Chabot got decreased this leads to the conclusion. The Mitsuku Chabot can only be able to pass the test by increasing the efficiency of the chat process. The first communication can be the reason through which the effectiveness of communication can be increased.

On the other hand, it can be observed that the Chabot was not replying with a joke. After asking the question that if, I want to hear a joke or not the Chabot said how the bot could help me. Inconsistency can be observed in the conversation and due to the inconsistency in the conversation, it can be said that it will be hard for passing the Turing test (Uddin, 2019). The main criteria for passing the Turing test is that the judge need not understand that the person with whom the conversation is happening a bot or a human. In this way, the efficiency of the Chabot can be increased. The Chabot cannot be able to think just like a human does and due to this reason, it can be said that the Chabot could not be able to pass the test. In order to pass the test,

the bot needs to improve the thinking capability and this will happen, if the computer program gets imitate a human in a conversation on a real-time basis. The Turing test has the ability for showing intelligent behaviors and due to this fact, it can be said that bots need to be intelligent in order to pass the test (Liu *et al.* 2019). It can be said that if the machine somehow manages to get fifty percent in recognition as a human then it can be considered that the Chabot has passed the test. The computational programs are hard to understand as the system made to understand the complexity of the human brain. The differences are the reason through which a conflict in understanding has arrived and because of that reason, complexity in the conversation has been seen.

Ouestion 5

It is hard to explain that the computer has a mind or not. In-depth analysis, it can be stated that the computer does have a memory but that is completely different from the human brain a due to this reason, there is no presence of a mental state that can be observed just like a human has. Intelligence is the process through which problem-solving skills can be improved but that skill only is available for the human brain (Singler, 2019). The complexity in the human brain cannot be compared with a digital computer. The digital computer operates on data that includes different magnitudes letters and symbols and this can help to solve problems efficiently but this cannot be compared with a human brain. It can be possible for a digital computer to have intelligence for solving problems similar to the human brain but having a mental state is still not possible for a computer. The mind is not a program and on the other hand, the computer runs by different programs, algorithms that are based on different data.

At some point, it can be observed that the human brain process is linguistic which means there will be no presence of communication and without communication, the sentences will be present in the head and people start acting on that basis (Wilber, 2016). However, for a digital computer, no such thing will be present there and the computer only works if data has been provided in an orderly manner. After providing the data a result will be generated and through this process, the computer started working to get the required result. The human brain is very complex to understand because different things will be present there such as emotion, different mental states, and a digital computer does not have any of these. Solving the problem is not the only requirement of a computer however there will be different things whose presence is required in order to be like a brain. The brain works as a digital computer that performs different

computational operations along with other features but the digital computer does not work like a brain and even does not have all the features that the brain has. With the help of strong AI, the computer will be able to have the computational structure that the brain has (Sterne, 2017). The work process is different which can be seen from the brain process and due to this reason, it can be stated that the computer does not have the ability to be like a brain. It has been stated that some human activities and abilities are algorithmic for solving long divided problems. Some proof theory has been stated that the mental state has shown different programming and for that reason, the result, which has been calculated, is very different from the digital computer result. The internal process through which the problem is being solved is very different from the digital computer. However, with the help of different programming, the computer has managed to solve different problems in an effective way with a different technique.

The most important thing is that the human brain transmits information by generating different chemicals and the digital computer transmits information by solving the problem with the help of different signals. The digital computer logically tries to understand the problem and then solve it based on the understanding but on the other hand, the human brain tries to solve the problem with the help of mental capacity (Versace *et al.* 2018). There is a conflict, which has been there that the human brain is partially acting as a digital computer as some problems, can be logically explained but on the other hand, it is also stated that the computer could not be able to be like a brain by assessing different mental states of a brain.

Ouestion 6

Part A

It is impossible to tell that after death what happens to the brain. The brain is part of the body just like other organs. People think that functionalism is done by the brain. Functionalism is the process of the brain through which a suitable result got from different activities (Divino and Magalhães, 2019). Without concerning the religious beliefs of existence, it can be stated that it is not possible to know what happens to the brain after death because while living it is impossible to sense to be dead. In fact, it is impossible to feel anything except alive that is why it is not possible to tell what happens to the brain after death. After death, the body and the brain are destroyed and due to this reason, it cannot be stated what happens to the mind. It has been observed that after death the brain continued to recall its memory even after 8 to 12 hours of

what the person has been through in the whole life span. After death, the brain can be kept alive in vitro, by substituting the blood or in the presence of an oxygenated solution.

Part B

According to Cartesian Dualism, the mind and the body are two different things and both are separable from each other. Each one is distinct and has different features and due to this reason, it can be stated by Cartesian Dualism, that it is possible that the mind will exist even after death. The body and the brain will be destroyed with time but the mind will continue to alive. According to Cartesian Dualism, the body is the outer part, the mind is the inner part, and because of this reason, the mind will continue to stay (Versace *et al.* 2018). The body of people exists as a part physical which can be touched but the mind can be touched but experienced with time and made with mental substances. After death, the physical parts of human are destroyed but the inner part, which consists of the mind, is not destroyed with time. A division can be seen between the mind and the body. After death, the body will destroy but the mind will take care of the activities such as what people think or do after death the mind takes care of everything. The body and the mind are two different things and they do not belong to each other that are why after death the mind stays alive (Singler, 2019). In the end, it is impossible to say what happens to the mind after death. According to Cartesian Dualism, the mind stays after death but it is not possible to use arguments that are based on the brain in order to prove it right or wrong.

References

Divino, S.B.S. and Magalhães, R.A., 2019. Copyright of artificial intelligence autonomous production: some reflections around the concepts of mind and intelligence. *BioLaw Journal-Rivista di BioDiritto*, 17(2), pp.299-313.

Fai, C.Y., 2018. Paediatric Diagnosis: When Human Mind Meets Artificial Intelligence. *Hong Kong College of Paediatricians Hong Kong Paediatric Society*, 23(2), pp.155-156.

Lieto, A., Bhatt, M., Oltramari, A. and Vernon, D., 2018. The role of cognitive architectures in general artificial intelligence.

Liu, R., Chen, B., Guo, X., Dai, Y., Chen, M., Qiu, Z. and He, X., 2019, March. From knowledge map to mind map: Artificial imagination. In 2019 IEEE Conference on Multimedia Information Processing and Retrieval (MIPR) (pp. 496-501). IEEE.

Shank, D.B. and DeSanti, A., 2018. Attributions of morality and mind to artificial intelligence after real-world moral violations. *Computers in human behavior*, 86, pp.401-411.

Shank, D.B. and Gott, A., 2019. People's self-reported encounters of Perceiving Mind in Artificial Intelligence. *Data in brief*, 25, p.104220.

Shank, D.B., Graves, C., Gott, A., Gamez, P. and Rodriguez, S., 2019. Feeling our way to machine minds: People's emotions when perceiving mind in artificial intelligence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 98, pp.256-266.

Singler, B., 2019. EXISTENTIAL HOPE AND EXISTENTIAL DESPAIR IN AI APOCALYPTICISM AND TRANSHUMANISM: with Robert M. Geraci and Simon Robinson, "Introduction to the Symposium on Artificial Intelligence and Apocalypticism"; Beth Singler, "Existential Hope and Existential Despair in AI Apocalypticism and Transhumanism"; Michael Morelli, "The Athenian Altar and the Amazonian Chatbot: A Pauline Reading of Artificial Intelligence and Apocalyptic Ends"; Victoria Lorrimar, "Mind Uploading and Embodied Cognition: A Theological Response Zygon®, 54(1), pp.156-176.

Sterne, J., 2017. *Artificial intelligence for marketing: practical applications*. John Wiley & Sons. Uddin, M.N., 2019. Cognitive science and artificial intelligence: simulating the human mind and its complexity. *Cognitive Computation and Systems*, *1*(4), pp.113-116.

Versace, E., Martinho-Truswell, A., Kacelnik, A. and Vallortigara, G., 2018. Priors in animal and artificial intelligence: where does learning begin?. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 22(11), pp.963-965.