THE COMPUTER "DEEP BLUE" DEFEATS A CHAMPION HUMAN CHESS PLAYER.

SOME GLIMPSES IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) DEBATE.

Devil's Conspiracy To Drain Away All Humanity From the Human Heart.

by : Crazycomp.

Something extra-ordinary has happened in the network of the Western Science.

A computer named "Deep Blue", a machine, has defeated a master chess player, Kasparov, a human.

Chess is a game demanding a sharp intellect and keen power to think. Moving on the chess board, all along anticipating the rival's moves, is a strenuous exercise of the mind. You have to be alert in your consciousness.......

Read the above para again. 'Intellect', 'intelligence', 'thought', 'mind', "consciousness" - these are the exclusive properties of a human being. How can a machine suddenly acquire these human monopolies? It is true that man himself has made that machine and infused something like intelligence in it. But if it now starts defeating the very intelligence which made it, where will it stop? If the computer guided robots turn out to be superior in their thinking power to the swollen headed mankind, would they not some day take over the world? They may well "think out" that they would run the world better than this cruelest animal of the earth, this 'man' with all his boasts of progress and development and science. Look at him and his stupidities; look at his tortures and killings and crimes. With such thinking, the computer robots may render humanity obsolete. As one computer crazy person said, they may keep us as their pets, or as another said, if we are clever, we might be "able to transfer the 'patterns of information' that are 'ourselves' into robot form." In other words, we will not be obsolete pets, but will just cease to exist as humans. The "pieces of information" we boast of as our knowledge will be fed away to the robots along with our human form. Nietzsche's superman is the computer robot.

Are you thinking that I am just carried away by the amazing performance of "Deep Blue"? Am I behaving like the computer fans or internet zealots we find in every corner of our city? No! Not so. The line in the inverted comas in the preceding paragraph is a quote from a 1988 book - look at its title - "Mind Children: the future of robot and human intelligence" by Hans Moravec (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts). The book describes what robots would do and achieve in future.

The fact is that there are a number of experts in the computer line who seriously think that intelligence, which seems natural in humans, can artificially exist in computers. They call that, "Artificial Intelligence"; universally shortened as AI. And do you know, there are many who are the ardent - almost fanatic - champions of "HARD AI". This means, a most thorough going AI view that our intelligence can be mechanically duplicated - no doubt about that!

One Hofstadter is one of them. I find some difficulty in pronouncing his name; seems as complicated as a computer from inside; although his first name is much simpler and common: Douglas, a name which can be found anywhere from Goa and Kerala to USA and Mexico via Europe. He wrote, in 1980, a huge book with a logical, musical, poetical title "Gadel, Escher, Bach: an eternal golden braid" (Penguin). Beautifully written. His illustrations and compasions have a Hindu flavour, like say Ramkrishna or Yoga - Vashistha, (whose existence; I am sure, he is not aware of.)

Although his argument sounds a bit heavy and technical, it is as simple as the name Douglas.

JUST AN ELECTRIC BOX

Human intelligence is a product of his brain; brain is a physical object, a machine. All thought processes are the movements and motions of neurons, the brain cells, which are nothing but just physical particles, subject to physical laws. No doubt, it is a very complex mechanism; there are several levels - or better levers - to the machine, which after complex inner travels or motions culminate into self awareness - the final level of complexity. What do we know of this array of complexities? Not very much; but tomorrow we'll know; we are very near to understand it. (This is the usual mirage effect of science. We are very near the green region of

our understanding….. but as you go nearer, the region recedes further away and often it disappears for ever).

ROBOTS WILL BE BETTER HUMANS

The AI champions say that AI is not far away and it will be superior to our HI (human intelligence). It will solve all the problems of this fighting, oppressing, starving, humanity. They point to the very rapid growth of computer power. Our thinking, intelligence, consciousness arise from the firing of neurons in our brains. But look at their sluggishness. Their rate is 1000 per second, while the rate of the electronic circuits in a transistor is 10 million per second. ("The Intel Platinum chip has over three million transistors on a "slice of silicon" about the size of a thumbnail, each capable of performing 113 million full instructions per second." (Don't bother if you don't understand this). Computer circuits also have immense precision in timing and accuracy far superior to these raw neurons of the brains. **God, if any, is a very poor machine maker.**

You will see that this is the climax of the mechanistic view of the world, which originated with the rise of science 400 years back. Everything is a machine. Human brain and human thinking, intelligence and consciousness are no exceptions.

THE DEBATERS ON THE OTHER SIDE

But please do not think that hard 'AI-wala's have pervaded and saturated the cloud of scientific thought. There are others who oppose the AI view. **Roger Penrose** is one of them. His name is not as complicated as Hofstadter - ooff! Penrose, sure, has a rosy pen. In 1989, he wrote an equally big book **"The Emperor's New Mind: concerning computers, mind and the laws of physics."** (Oxford), which became a New York Times best seller. Humans are not just machines.

Their thinking is not just a motion. There is "something missing" in this mechanistic view as also in our science itself. The phenomenon of consciousness is not just computer like; it is a mystery not explicable by the current laws of science. But can any feasible reasonable theory be found to explain consciousness? Penrose said, we can have some guess-work theory. And he came out with one in another large book **"Shadows of the Mind"** (Oxford - 1994). Look at its sub-title: **"A search for the missing Science of Consciousness".** He propounded that our body cells have "microtubules", minute tunnels of protein that serve as a kind of skeleton for most cells including neurons. Some "non deterministic" computations are performed by these protein tunnels, giving rise to consciousness. "Non-deterministic" means not purely logical or mathematical, i.e. not derivable by our usual cause and effect chain. In summation this means each neuron is not a simple switch, but a complex computer in its own right.

Now! Now! What is this? In search of an anti computer theory, Penrose dubs every neuron as a computer! His critics say, microtubules are in almost all cells; does this, then, mean that our livers are conscious? (The way in which the liver forgives a drunkard shows that it may be conscious.) John Horgan, an excellent science writer attached to "Scientific American" (an authoritative science magazine) writes in his 1996 book **"The End of Science"** (Helix) :

"In his first book he (Penrose) built up an air of suspense, anticipation and mystery, as does a director of a horror movie who offers only tantalising glimpses of the monster. When Penrose finally unveiled his monster, it looked like an overweight actor wearing a cheap rubber suit, complete with flapping fins." (Page 176).

The debate goes on. Once in Canada Penrose and a rather rough AI advocate, Marvin Minsky, were on the same stage. Penrose was made to speak first. When Minsky rose to reply, he said that wearing a jacket "implies you are a gentleman". He took off his jacket saying, "Well, I don't feel like a gentleman" and then mounted an attack on Penrose's book 'The Emperor's New Mind" with arguments which sounded silly to Penrose. (Horgan - ibid).

But mind! Roger Penrose is a formidable scientist in his own right. He is an authority on blackholes and other exotica of physics and astrophysics. He is the Rouse Ball Professor of Mathematics at the Oxford University. He shared an internationally prestigious Wolf Prize with the famous Stephen Hawking, for their joint discoveries in astrophysics. His "The Emperor's New Mind" got him another prestigious Copus prize (1990) (U.K.) in science writing. Both his books contain excellent accounts of varied fields in science. Whatever be Minsky's admittedly ungentlemanly conduct towards Penrose and whatever be the theoretical arguments between the two and the technical infirmities in Penrose's theory, the following words of Penrose in his "Shadows of the Mind" present a truthful picture on the whole issue of AI.

"As yet, no computer controlled robot could begin to compete with even a young child in performing some of the simplest of every day activities: such as recognising that a coloured crayon lying on the floor at the other end of the room is what is needed to complete the drawing, walking across to collect that crayon, and then putting it to its use. For that matter, even the capabilities of an ant in performing its every day activities, would far surpass what can be achieved by the most sophisticated of to-day's computer control systems." (Page 45).

Referring to the chess computers like "Deep Thought" (the predecessor of the recent "Deep Blue") and other super human capabilities of computers, Penrose says:

"In all these situations, it would be hard to maintain that the computer attains any genuine understanding of what it is actually doing." He points out: "the reason that the system successfully works at all is not that it understands anything, but that the human programmers' understandings (or else the understandings of those human experts upon whom the programmers depend) have been used in the construction of the program." It depends on the rules fed in and not on any direct awareness. It gives an **impression** that it is understanding what it is doing. But it can sometimes "unexpectedly do something that is completely crazy, revealing that it never really had any understanding at all." "Deep Thought" had done that; Deep Blue did not; perhaps such occasion did not arise with Kasparov. Some people say he had become nervous while playing. We may well ask: has a computer the ability to be nervous?

We, the lay people, go on wondering at this AI-HI debate. Is there any sense in it? All along, the debate is totally devoid of what we really are as human beings. Will your computer be capable of generating the feeling of love a mother has for her child or of compassion Mother Teresa has for the suffering humanity? Will the computer robot stand before the gorgeous Himalayas and be inspired to write a moving poem? Will it ever sing like, say, Sant Tukaram : "Pandoorang Dhyani"? Can the human programmers induce into the system anything even remotely resembling God's program in a real human being? Will the robot be made to shade a tear of love or devotion?

AI is a powerful end product of the Godless inhuman activity called science, which has sucked away all humanity from the humans.

All Religions and all mysticisms have proclaimed such truths about the human mind as this AI culture can never dream of. **Mind and consciousness are not machines. They are the tools of spiritual evolution of man; they are the lights on the way leading to God. The humans should know how to switch on the light and enlighten it more and more on the way. Prophets, saints and mystics have taught them how to do it. But the humans avoid it deliberately. Penrose tries to struggle out of AI through some scientific theory but fails to be effective, because you can't rely on devil's own weapons to flee him away.**

If you discard God and His abode, the heart of a human, you will be lost in the dry and parched desert of inhumanity.

The boast of AI is the devil's success in inducing the humans to close their eyes tight towards the flame of God dancing in their HEART.

(Parsi Pukar - MARCH 1997 Vol. 2; No.9)