https://sophoslogos.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/chinese-room.png

Understanding stories [Schank]

A man went into a restaurant and ordered a hamburger. When the hamburger arrived it was burned to a crisp, and the man stormed out of the restaurant angrily, without paying for the hamburger or leaving a tip.

Did the man eat the hamburger?

[Searle 1980]

Understanding stories [Schank]

A man went into a restaurant and ordered a hamburger; when the hamburger came he was very pleased with it; and as he left the restaurant he gave the waitress a large tip before paying his bill.

Did the man eat the hamburger?

[Searle 1980]

Understanding stories [Schank]

- Searle says the AI programs answering these questions are 'defined solely in terms of computational processes over formally defined elements'; and 'formal symbol manipulations by themselves *don't have any intentionality*; they are quite *meaningless*'; 'they have *only a syntax but no semantics*'

- But does the second follow from the first?

- Can these questions really be answered just by *meaningless* symbol manipulation, or must they involve *representations* of *meaning* and *context*?

- If the AI program is using *representations* of this kind, why cannot this also be regarded as *intentionality*?

[Searle 1980]

Churchland's luminous room

"Consider a dark room containing a man holding a bar magnet or charged object. If the man pumps the magnet up and down, then, according to Maxwell's theory of artificial luminance (AL), it will initiate a spreading circle of electromagnetic waves and will thus be luminous. But as all of us who have toyed with magnets or charged balls well know, their forces (or any other forces for that matter), even when set in motion produce no luminance at all. It is inconceivable that you might constitute real luminance just by moving forces around!" The problem is that he would have to wave the magnet up and down something like 450 trillion times per second in order to see anything.

[Churchland and Churchland 1990; Wikipedia]