

## Re: ANN: ai-philosophy group

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-08/0077.html>

---

**From:** David Longley (*David\_at\_longley.demon.co.uk*)

**Date:** 08/03/04

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 2004 12:05:40 +0100

In message <fa69ae35.0408021038.212f6e89@posting.google.com>, Eray Ozkural exa <erayo@bilkent.edu.tr> writes

>Hello there,

>

>I started ai-philosophy group in an effort to bring together the  
>stimulating, intellectual discussions of AI on comp.ai.philosophy in  
>the old times, without the trolls, kooks and SPAM.

>

>Please consider joining this relatively new yahoo group.

>

><http://groups.yahoo.com/group/ai-philosophy/>

>

>We have been discussing some recent (by philosophical standards)  
>articles on computationalism, some of which are collected in the book  
>"Computationalism: New Directions", edited by Matthias Scheutz.

>

>I would be especially pleased to see views which endorse Sloman's view  
>that Turing Machines are irrelevant to AI.

Really – just how much thought have you given to what he writes? How much consideration have you given to what you were vociferously denying not so long ago when it was suggested to you that you thought about "intelligence" in terms of the "infinite tape" we call "the environment" and how that selects and controls/programs behaviour?

Has anyone in your club had the opportunity to tell you why you might be getting yourself hopelessly confused? Has anyone there made any attempt to explain to you the nature and constraints of intensional opacity and the difference between contingency shaped vs rule governed behaviour? Where does private behaviour fit into that?

>

>Anybody who is seriously interested in philosophical and theoretical  
>discussion about AI is most welcome. There is no moderation, but you  
>must become a member to post [and promise to keep a high standard of  
>discussion :), no flames, insults, etc.]

sci.cognitive: Re: ANN: ai-philosophy group

There, perhaps, is a clue (at least for others) as to why you are so hopelessly confused!

>

>*Best Regards,*

>

>---

>*Eray Ozkural*

One might have thought that a smart engineer would look respectfully to an empirical science of behaviour to see what it might teach them rather than disregarding it a priori as stupid and misguided because it seemed at odds with the folk psychological prejudices of "common sense".

But that's intensional opacity (or "Natural Stupidity") for you.

--

David Longley

<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Fraq.htm>