

My Problem with the Turing Test

- In my opinion, the Turing test is a narrow view of intelligence since language isn't at the base or it isn't the root of human cognition and thought.
- One thing we associate with intelligence is having novel thoughts and if we didn't have language, I believe we'd still have thoughts and memories, except they'd just be images and emotions in their raw form and not translated into language. Just like you can feel memories.
- In my opinion, intelligence is the ability to learn and adapt to pretty much anything. So a better test would be to put an artificially intelligent creature in different scenarios and see how it adapts.
- And in a technical sense, from our current state of AI, an NLP architecture using transformers could somehow pass the Turing test (like maybe GPT-4 or 5 or something) but it won't know anything about vision (not just vision but literally anything else. Blind people are intelligent).
- In the most simplified form, an algorithm that can infer would be intelligent. Because a part of intelligence, at least human intelligence (depends how you want to define intelligence) comes not from our perception of the world but from the projection of our knowledge of the world onto the world that we observe. So something like a Turing test, as impressive as it may be, is a somewhat narrow view of intelligence. Maybe