

Csaba Pléh:

Relationships between Human Thinking and Machine Based Solutions: Remarks of an Outsider

Outsider refers in the title to the issue that I am untouched by the recent AI craze, and avoid using it even as a tool. My remarks shall be about the past of this tradition and the generality of the moral panic around recent LLM-s.

1. *The relationship between man and technology.* The instrumental image of man. What is the specialty of the computer in this regard and recent AI models specifically? If there is a thinking machine, maybe humans also think.
2. *What was easy and what was difficult* for computers in the past? Machines had difficulty in perception and in interpreting the social world, which in humans is based on automatized skills. Thought experiments like the Chinese Room, about the cause of the difficulty. What was the trick of these thought experiments? The reemergence of the social issue in the recent AI debates: difficulty of LLMs with relevance and empathy.
3. *Imitation of performance or process.* This is traditional issue from the levels of the Turing test, from the chess machine to artificial man (István Hernád).
4. *Present day moral panic about recent AI.* The reclaiming humanity attitude *vis a vis* Silicon Walley is similar to reclaiming humanity in the name of ... religion, phenomenology, hermeneutics etc. from neural reductionism, from genetic determination, and even from classical experimental psychology. What is really new in here?

5. *The challenge of connectionism and machine learning.* Statistical versus rule-following mindset. Easy victory for the rule principle in the early 1960s, and the return of statistics with better machines from the mid 1980s on. Many of us claim for a duality in the human mind itself. We are Boltzmann machines and Frege machines at the same time. Can we have machine solutions with this duality embedded?