Answer both questions. You can give a very brief answer to one, concentrating on the other.

1. What do you think of Shieber’s analogy between the use of springs in flying test and the use of a bundle of tricks in the real Turing test?

2. Here is a debate between two sides on the use of a bundle of tricks (or the sort we saw in ELIZA and winners of real Turing Tests). What is your view of the issue being debated?

Real people often use a collection of tricks in conversation. People often have a set of routines, set pieces, that make them sound witty. But they just recite these things, slowly changing their repertoire through the years to bring in new topics. So the difference between human intelligence and intelligence of programs like the ELIZA program is a difference of degree, not a difference of kind.

A person who goes through set pieces at a cocktail party knows how to apply the set pieces in conversational context. No one encounters exactly the same context very often, so this ability typically involves some real thinking. In addition, people create the set pieces, develop them, get rid of some set pieces in favor of others, and react appropriately in case none of the set pieces is appropriate. Even at a cocktail party, one’s conversational partners sometimes make a point that requires going beyond what one has said or heard before. Anyone who can think can do that to some extent. Which is larger, the distance between your big toes or the distance between your left big toe and the largest doorknob in the Empire State Building? Presumably, you haven’t heard this question before, but you will have little trouble answering it.