How reconcile mechanism with respect for human dignity

3/9

define the Δ "nothing but"

To: JL
From: EAF
Re: Weizenbaum's book

1. One of his main points: "though computers can do any information processing, there are some things they ought not to do." Agreeing with that is like agreeing with motherhood.

2. The issue joined: "Surely man is an information processor — but he is not merely that, he is much more than that."

But W. is never specific about his alternate model. Spirit? Soul? What? He alludes to his idea: "lost adolescent love," the love of parent for their baby as they bend over the crib, etc.

The issue is joined again + again, always clearly, always with {Newell, Simon, Minsky, me, etc.} on the one side, Joe on the other.

3. Joe is a dishonest by omission and slanting (never <u>overt</u>)

BLATANT { (a) e.g. attribution of the much-favored EPAM work

b) reference to Simon as "computer scientist" ignoring his fame as a psychologist — specific citation

c) others I could find

4. Generally, where he is <u>teaching</u> rather than <u>preaching</u>, his pedagogy is excellent. E.g. Ch. 2, 3, + discussion of simulation models.

5. He is obcessed (sp?) by the machine-model of man as a dehumanizing danger, probably stemming from his childhood flight from Nazi Germany. If man is "merely a machine", then he can be jinked when necessary. I believe that references to the Nazis come up a few times.

6. Stale vilification: Joe vilifies Newell + Simon (perhaps others) for those old, old statements made in 1958-60. But that's such an old story. 15-17 years have gone by + the field has matured considerably. Joe knows this + the emphasis is also dishonest.

He also has a strange praise-vilification for Winograd. He quotes Terry's extreme modesty in claims, praises it, then vilifies Terry for not being (extremely)^2 modest

I could give you much more by annotating my copy this weekend for you. Do you want me to do this?