Perhaps the fetishization of analytical thinking, and the concomitant denigration of the creatural—that is, animal—and bodily aspects of life are two things we'd do well to leave behind.

Talks about the fetaziation of analytical thinking, but there is another camp that I am far more familiar with (because of my art background perhaps) which seems to fetishize non analytic and romantic thinking as uniquely human, sure human behavior can not be reduced down to a series of states (if then statements), but through neural networks and machine learning it can be replicated by more complex yet still technically purely logical systems. If programs describe systems and not states then suddenly simple rules can interact and emmergnet behavior human behavior.

I had a philosophy/English teacher in high school who was really invested in "what it meant to be human" and consequently somewhat anxiously mentioned the Turing test throughout high school. Similar to my teacher the article seems to make a pretty clear distinction between human and computer (or to use the catchier but gendered headline *Mind vs Machine*); the latter of which deals in context, is adaptable, and responsive to subtletly, and the former whichs deals with abstract logic, and is consequently cold, rigid, and "dead". Personally I think this essentalism creates a false binary between the mind and machine which is rooted in either a niavity about the way in which contemporary cutting edge ai works or in a fetisation about the origins of human creativity. While I agree that especially in the past and in many contemporary video games ai is reduced to state machines – a conglormation of if then statements which lead to the strict quantization of beheaviors and to a rigidity of potential responses (non adaptable) – these systems are used not because they are state of the art but because they tend to offer designs the most level of control to fine tune ai interactions and therefore player experience. In reality there is a huge and exploding field of research involving autonomous agents, genetic algorithms, machine learning and neural networks which get rid of the state machines in favour of more robust systems of simple individual rules, behaviors and/or weights which when allowed to interact leads to emergent properties which resemble complex, organic, dynamic and often creative systems.

The game of life is a simple yet canonical example of emergent properties: where 4 rules lead to awesome visual performances; products of neural networks and machine learning would be more contemporary examples of ai ressembling what Brian Christian incorrectly says are uniquely human properties of adaptability, contextualness. In the end the human mind's base unit: the neuron—performs in an equally quantized and binary way than the transistor,: on/off, 0/1… Of course if machines and brains have functionally the same building blocks then it would only be a task of rearragment of these basic nodes to get the two systems to think or function similarly/dissimiarily. In conclusion I say it is not essential differences between mind and machine but rather simply differences in the arrangement of computers (computer programs) which often make computers seem colder and harder than us in the eyes of so many.

Most of Brian Christian's article written in 2011-- *Mind vs. Machine's* consists of Brian *gaming* a Turing test by defining and then trying to exemplify humanness. My fundemnetal disagreement with Brian's thinking is that while he seems to believe he is trying to *find* an *essential* human quality to emphasize I believe that he is constructing an idea of humanity to perform it.

In other words, to use gender studies' vernacular, Brian is overtly constructing and then performing humanity. Once put into these terms it becomes blatant that the idea of humanity is a social construction which should be deconstructed so it is recognized as such— as something fluid which spawned from social conventions and interactions, rather than the essential quality which Brian thinks he is trying to *find* (rather than construct)— this is my fundamental issue with the article.

I had a philosophy/English teacher who was really invested in "what it meant to be human" and consequently somewhat anxiously mentioned the Turing test throughout my four years of high school. Like my teacher the article seems to make a pretty clear distinction between human and computer mind and machine: the former is seen as adaptable, responsive to subtility, able to deal with context; the former of which deals with abstract logic, and is consequently cold, rigid, and "dead". I believe that this binary between the mind and machine is false and is rooted not in any real essential differences between the two systems but rather in a naivety pertaining to how contemporary ai and programs can work and/or a fetishization about the origins of human creativity. While I agree that especially in the past and in many contemporary video games ai is reduced to rather lifeless state machines – a conglomeration of if/then statements which lead to a strict quantization of behaviors and to a rigidity in terms of a responses these are not state of the work on ai and are often used in applicatiosn like video games because they offer immense control and potential for a fine tuning the ais and thus the user experience. In reality there is a huge and exploding field of research involving autonomous agents, genetic algorithms, machine learning and neural networks which eschew state machines and if/then statments in favour of more robust systems consisting of a conglomeration of simple individual rules, behaviors and/or weights which when allowed to interact leads to emergent properties which resemble complex, organic, dynamic and often creative systems.

The game of life is a simple yet canonical example of emergent properties: where 4 rules lead to awesome visual performances; products of neural networks and machine learning would be more contemporary examples of ai ressembling what Brian Christian incorrectly says are uniquely human properties of adaptability, contextualness. In the end the human mind's base unit: the neuron— performs in an equally quantized and binary way than the transistor,: on/off, 0/1… Of course if machines and brains have functionally the same building blocks then it would only be a task of rearragment of these basic nodes to get the two systems to think or function similarly/dissimiarily. In conclusion I say it is not essential differences between mind and machine but rather simply differences in the arrangement of computers (computer programs) which often make computers seem colder and harder than us in the eyes of so many.

I did learn that huamns were not always associated with the arts and organic but often with the logical and rational.

But let me approach this matter from a different angle,

To continue using the vernacular of gender studies and critical theory I would say that Brian is overtly constructing, and then performing .

terms I think this very fact that he is so overtly performaning humanity strategizing ways to become the

There was an interesting moment in the test when the author began “gaming” the turing test

Game of life, lack control

I do find fascinating with his non linear march of history (man can get better to), which I find true to some extent.