VERSATILE TYPE STANDARD SET 14 STYLES SIMON RENAUD

2023

Augure is based on an a priori paradoxical principal: how to move beyond traditional letterforms without undermining legibility? To this end, this typeface questions the canons inherited from Roman capitals and Carolingian minuscules.

Augure freely reflects a range of diverse influences: somewhere between historical forms of the Latin alphabet (including Uncials), forms taken from cryptography, and forms inspired by digital technology and its rationality. The combinations of elementary forms are reminiscent of early twentieth-century experiments with geometric sans serifs. The juxtaposition of these many borrowed elements provides the typeface with a formal singularity, generating captivating typographic compositions. Though Augure is also available in a variable font format (weight and slant), the typeface has seven different weights by default (from Thin to Black). The user can thus activate one of the three stylistic sets (classic, eclectic, cryptic) or separately select one of the numerous alternate glyphs contained in the typeface's extended palette.





# AUGURE TYPEFACE

120 PTS



56 PTS

# Augure Augure Δ

32 PTS

## Λυσυνθ Δυσυνθ Αυσυνθ Augurθ

24 PTS

## Λυσυγο *Δυσυγ*ο Αυσυγο *Αυσυγ*ο **Αυσυγο** Α

16PTS

**Δυσυγθ Αυgurθ Αυgurθ Λυσυγθ Αυσυγθ Αυσυγθ** Αυgur

A typeface is created by a designer whose art is to transform an original typographic artwork into a computer file or files. As a consequence a typeface is - as a work protected by laws pertaining to intellectual property rights and - as software - can not be copied and/or installed without first acquiring a nominative licence.

In no way, shape or form may a typeface be transmitted to a third party or modified. The desired modifications in the context of the development of a visual identity, can only be effected by the designer himself and only after acquisition of a written authorisation from 205TF.

#### THE OPENTYPE FORMAT

The OpenType format is compatible with both Macintosh and Windows platforms. Based on Unicode encoding it can contain up to 65,000 signs\* including a number of writing systems (Latin, Greek, Cyrillic, Hebrew, etc.) and numerous signs that allow users to create accurate and sleek typographic compositions

#### SUPPORTED LANGUAGES

Abenaki Afaan Oromo Afar Afrikaans Albanian Alsatian Amis Anuta Aragonese Aranese Aromanian Arrernte Arvanitic Asturian Atayal Aymara Azerbaijani Bashkir Basque Belarusian Bemba Bikol Bislama Bosnian Breton Bulgarian Romanization Cape Verdean Catalan Cebuano Chamorro Chavacano Chichewa Chickasaw Chinese Pinyin Cimbrian Cofan Cornish Corsican Creek Crimean Tatar Croatian Czech Danish Dawan Delaware Dholuo Drehu Dutch English Esperanto Estonian Faroese Fijian Filipino Finnish Folkspraak

French Frisian Friulian Gagauz Galician Ganda Genoese German Gikuyu Gooniyandi Greenlandic Greenlandic Old Orthography Guadeloupean Gwichin Haitian Creole Han Hawaiian Hiligaynon Hopi Hotcak Hungarian Icelandic Ido Ilocano Indonesian Interglossa Interlingua Trish Istroromanian Italian Jamaican Javanese Jerriais Kaingang Kala Lagaw Ya Kapampangan Kaachikel . Karakalpak Karelian Kashubian Kikongo Kinyarwanda Kiribati Kirundi Klingon Kurdish Ladin Latin Latino Sine latvian Lithuanian Lojban Lombard Low Saxon

Luxembouraish

Maasai

Malay Maltese Manx Maori Marquesan Meglenoromanian Meriam Mir Mirandese Mohawk Moldovan Montagnais Montenegrin Murrinhpatha Nagamese Creole Nahuatl Ndebele Neapolitan Ngiyambaa Niuean Noongar Norwegian Novial Occidental Occitan Old Icelandic Old Norse Oshiwambo Ossetian Palauan Papiamento Piedmontese Polish Portuguese Potawatomi Qeqchi Quechua Rarotongan Romanian Romansh Rotokas Sami Inari Sami Lule Sami Northern Sami Southern Samoan Sango Saramaccan Sardinian Scottish Gaelic Serbian Seri Seychellois Shawnee Shona Sicilian Silesian

Slovak Slovenian Slovio Somali Sorbian Lower Sorbian Upper Sotho Northern Sotho Southern Spanish Sranan Sundanese Swahili Swazi Swedish Tagalog Tahitian Tetum Tok Pisin Tokelauan Tongan Tshiluba Tsonga Tswana Tumbuka Turkish Turkmen Tuvaluan Tzotzil Ukrainian Uzbek Venetian Vepsian Volapuk Voro Wallisian Walloon Waraywaray Warlpiri Wayuu Welsh Wikmungkan Wiradjuri Wolof Xavante Xhosa Yapese Yindjibarndi Zapotec Zazaki 7u]u 7uni

© 2023-02

\*A Postscript or Truetype typeface can contain no more than 256 signs.

or business) and is non-transferable. The licensee can not transmit the typeface files to other people or organisations, including but not limited to partners and/or subcontractors who must acquire a separate and distinct licence or licences. The full text of the licence and terms of use can be downloaded here: any person or entity found in breach of one or more terms of the licence may be prosecuted.

(small capitals, aligned and oldstyle numerals, proportionals and tabulars, ligatures, alternative letters, etc.).

software used.

Makhuwa

The OpenType format is supported by a wide

range of software. The dynamic functions are accessed differently depending on the

A licence is nominative (a physical person

#### ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OF USE

**To buy ore** By buying a typeface you support typeface designers who can dedicate the time necessary for the development of new typefaces (and you are of course enthusiastic at the idea of discovering and using them!)

**Copy?** By copying and illegally using typefaces, you jeopardise designers and kill their art. In the long term the result will be that you will only have Arial available to use in your compositions (and it would be well deserved!)

#### RESPONSIBILITY

205TF and the typeface designers represented 205TF can not guarantee their correct by 205TF pay particular attention to the quality of the typographic design and the technical development of typefaces. Each typeface has been tested on Macintosh and Windows, the most popular browsers (for webfonts) and on Adobe applications (InDesign, Illustrator, Photoshop) and Office (Word, Excel, Power point).

**Test!** 205TF makes test typefaces available. Before downloading them from www.205.tf you must first register. These test versions are not complete and can only be used in models/mock ups. Their use in a commercial context is strictly prohibited.

functioning when used with other operating system or software. 205TF can not be considered responsible for an eventual "crash" following the installation of a typeface obtained through the www.205.tf website.

### THTN Λυσυrθ Ηhin

LIGHT

REGULAR

MEDIUM

BOLD

BLACK

EXTRALIGHT

Augure Light

Λυσυre Bold

**Augure Black** 

Augure Regular

Λυσυιε Μθοιπ

Augure OxtraLight

EXTRALIGHT SLANTED

Jgurə OxtraLight Slantəð

LIGHT SLANTED

## Λυσυνθ Light Slantθδ

SLANTED

## Λυσυre Slanted

MEDIUM SLANTED

## Λυσυre Medium Slanted

BOLD SLANTED

## Λυσυre Bold Slanted

BLACK SLANTED

## Лидиге Black Slanteð

CHARACTER MAP

UPPERCASES	ABCDƏFCHIJKLMΠΟΡϘϚSFUVWXYZ
LOWERCASES	abcðəfợhijklmnopǫrstuvwxyz
ACCENTED UPPERCASES	ĹĂĂÂÄÀĀĄÅĨÆÆÓĊĊÇĈĊÐĎÐÓŎŎŎÖÖŎÐ ČČĈÇĊĊĦĤIJÍĬĨĨÏĬĨŢĨĴĴĶĹĽĻĿŁŃŇŅÑŊÓŎŎ ÔÖÒŐŌØØŐQœÞĹҞĸŚŠŞŜŞ⊧ŀŀŀÚŬŬŨÜÜÜÜÜÜ ŪŲŮŨŴŴŴŴÝŶŸŶŦŸŹŽŻ
ACCENTED LOWERCASES	źžžźżżzźźzzźźzeźćčçĉċðờðéĕěëëëëëēēşẽəўўўўўħĥ iıíĭĭîiijīįĩjíĵķкĺľļŀłńňņñŋóŏŏôöööőōǫøǿõœþŕřŗ śšşŝşßſ⊧ťfţúŭŭûüüüüüūūuűuũwŵwwýŷÿỳӯӳźžż
STANDARD PUNCTUATION	H()[][],"""'、、、、、、、;…!;?;·.+*#/\
CAPS PUNCTUATION	H[][]()«»‹›i¿
DEFAULT FIGURES	<b>①</b> 〇123456789₿¢\$€£¥°¤
PROPORTIONAL LINING FIGURES	<b>①</b> 〇123456789₿¢\$€£¥°¤
TABULAR LINING FIGURES	00123456789₿¢\$€£¥°¤
PROPORTIONAL OLD STYLE FIGURES	00123456789
SUPERIORS/INFERIORS	Habcdefghijklmnoporstuvwxyz0123456789
	H <sub>abcdefghijklmnoporstuvwxyz0123456789</sub>
NOMINATORS/ DENOMINATORS	H0123456789 H0123456789
PREBUILD & AUTOMATIC FRACTIONS	1/2 1/4 3/4 1/8 3/8 5/8 7/8 7/8 12345/67890
ORDINALS	<mark>┦</mark> ѫҌҫѻ҅ѳfӯһijklmпоро́rstuvwxyz ПºП⁰с∏ºПо
SYMBOLS & MATHEMATICAL SIGNS	+−×÷=≠><≥≤±≈~¬^∞∅∫Δ∏∑√᠔μ%‰ ΔΩμπƒ@δ¶§©®®™° ¦⁺ℓ≠⊖
STANDARD LIGATURES	fifl
ORNAMENTS	� º □ ■ ⊠ ● ♥ ⊗ ■ ▚ ▞ ᠅ ● ○ ○ ● ◆ ◊ ◊ ■ □ ▲ ▶ ▼ ◀
	$\vartriangle \rhd \lor \lhd \blacktriangle \blacktriangleright \blacktriangledown \lhd \bigtriangleup \rhd \lor \lhd \diamondsuit$
ARROWS (SS01)	$\uparrow \land \rightarrow \lor \downarrow \lor \leftarrow \lor \leftrightarrow \diamondsuit$

AUGURE CHARACTER MAP	SIMON RENAUD
CHARACTER PAP	
CRYPTIC (SS02)	<sup>—</sup> ΔÀÁÂÃÄÅĀĂĂĄÆÆMSŹŜŢĬIJŴŴŴŰ iıìíîīīīīţijrŕŗřsśŝşšşwŵùúűųųų́ųųµųų́ų 11₁222 H <sub>11</sub> 11 <sub>22</sub> 22 <sub>i</sub> ⁺ŗ′ <sub>s</sub> <sup>s</sup> ┉ <sup>┉</sup> ų <sup>ų</sup> ½¼⅓ пººΩºº
ECLECTIC (SS03)	AÀÁÂÃÄÅĀĂĄĂÆÆEÈÉÊËĒĔĖĘĚĨŒNÑŃŅŇŊ aàáâăãäāāąbdďāgĝğğġġġŗýijijijijij 44 H <sub>44</sub> 44 <sub>a</sub> ° <sub>b</sub> b <sub>d</sub> d <sub>g</sub> g <sub>y</sub> y ¼¾
CLASSIC (SS04)	AÀÁÂÃÄÅĀĂĄĂÆÆEÈÉÊËËËËËËËŒGĜĞĞĢĞĞ IÌÍÎĨĬĮİĬNÑŃŅŇŊRŔŖŘTŢŤŦŢYÝŶŸŸŶŶ aàáâãäåāăqădďđgĝğġġġğāhĥħiıìíîïĩīĭjijĭ mnñńņňŋuùúûüũūŭůűųŭūůůůů 44 H₄4 <sup>44</sup> a <sup>a</sup> d <sup>d</sup> g <sup>9</sup> h <sup>h</sup> i <sup>i</sup> m <sup>m</sup> n <sup>n</sup> u <sup>u</sup> ¼¾ nºn <sup>®</sup> №№ <sup>®</sup>
A R 4 (SS05)	_ AÀÁÂÃÄÅĀĂĄĂÆÆÆRŔŖŘ44 H₄₄⁴¼¾
A S (SS06)	 Δλάδδδδδφφ
E G (SS07)	_ EÈÉÊËĒĚĖĚĨÆÆGĜĞĠĢĞĞ
I N T Y (SS08)	 IÌÍÎĨĨĬĮİĬNÑŃŅŇŊTŢŤŦŢYÝŶŸŸŶŶ№№
M W 1 (SS09)	
2 (SS10)	222 H <sub>2</sub> 2 <sup>2</sup> 1/2
a r (SS11)	
a b d g y (SS12)	– aàáâǎãäåāǎݡbdďđgĝǧǧġġġӈӈӈӈӈӈӈ H <sub>a</sub> ª <sub>ь</sub> b <sub>a</sub> d <sub>g</sub> g <sub>y</sub> ,
d g (SS13)	dďđgĝğġģġġ H <sub>d</sub> d <sub>g</sub> g
hmnui (SS14)	_ hĥħiıìíîïĩīĭįijĭmnñńņňŋuùúûüũūŭůűųŭūūū́i̇́i̇́i̇́i̇́i̇́i̇́í H <sub>h</sub> ʰ <sub>i</sub> ʿm <sup>m</sup> n <sup>n</sup> u <sup>u</sup> nºn≌
i y w (SS15)	
s (SS16)	<sup>20</sup> ∏ <sup>2</sup> □, <sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> <sup>2</sup>
i (SS17)	iı)(îïĩīĭjij H <sub>i</sub> i

#### OPENTYPE FEATURES

Automatically spaced capitals.
 Punctuation is opticaly repositionning
 4. Specific small capitals whereas opticaly reduced capitals.
 Specific glyphs in several languages.
 7, 8, 9. Specific superior and inferior glyphs.
 10, 11. Proportional figures.

- 12, 13. Tabular figures, practical when the user needs alignment in columns.14. Slashed zero to distinguish with letter 0.

- Standard ligatures automaticaly correct collision between two characters.
   Smart ligatures.

1. FULL CAPS       Lacassagne       LACASSACHE         2. CASE SENSITIVE FORMS       (Hôtel-Dieu)       (Hôtel-DIEU)         3. SMALL CAPS       X         4. CAPS       X	)
FORMS     (HÖFƏI-DIƏU)     (HÖFƏL-DIƏU)       3. SMALL CAPS     X	)
4. CAPS	
TO SMALL CAPS	
5. LOCALIZED FORMS	
ROMANIAN Chișinău Calați Chișinău Cala	63
CATALAN Paral·lel Paral·lel Paral·lel	ìΤ
FRENCH II dit: «Vous fîtes» II dit: «Vous fî	ìtes»
6. ORDINALS         По Поз по поз 1ег 2по         Пе Пее пе пе пе 1ег	2 <sup>nð</sup>
7. FRACTIONS 1/4 1/2 3/4 1/2 3/4	
8. SUPERIORS Cie Dr Mør Mmes C <sup>ie</sup> Dr M <sup>ør</sup> M <sup>mes</sup>	
9. INFERIORS H2O F03O4 H2O F03O4	
10. PROPORTIONAL LINING FIGURES         O123456789         O123456789	
II. PROPORTIONAL OLD STYLE FIG.         O123456789         O123456789	
12. TABULAR LINING FIGURES         O123456789         0123456789	
13. TABULAR OLD STYLE FIG.	
14. SLASHED ZERO 0000 0000	
15. LIGATURES Afficher Afficher	
16. DISCRETIONARY LIGATURES	

2023

#### OPENTYPE FEATURES

The stylistic set function allows to access to specific signs which replace glyphs in the standard set. A typeface can contain 20 stylistic sets.

	FEATURE OFF	FEATURE ON
ARROWS (SS01)	W	<del>~</del>
	⊖	<i>→</i>
	S	¥
	Π	↑
	<b>□</b> ₩	ĸ
	ПӨ	7
	SO	И
	SW	⊻
	ΠS WƏ	\$ ↔
		$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
CRYPTIC (SS02)	Machines Authority	Machines Δuthoritų
ECLECTIC (SS03)	<mark>⊼апо</mark> от Brө <mark>а</mark> k	Kandom Break
CLASSIC (SS04)	Deco <mark>ding Rem</mark> ote	Decoding Remote
A R 4 (SS05)	∧uthority <b>K</b> emote	Authority Remote
A S (SS06)	<mark>Л</mark> lgəbra <mark>S</mark> ystəms	Δlφebra Systems
E G (SS07)	⊖mails <mark>С</mark> өпөrator	Emails Generator
INTY (SS08)	INFINIHY	INFINITY
M W 1 (SS09)	Modular Wikipədia	Подиlar Шікірөдіа
2 (SS10)	512-bits	512-bits
a r (SS11)	Patterns	Patterns
a b d g y (SS12)	Standards Digitally	Standards Digitally
d g (SS13)	Deco <mark>òin</mark> ợ	Decoding
hmnui (SS14)	Automatic	Automatic
i y w (SS15)	Binary	Binarų
s (SS16)	Un <mark>s</mark> olve∂	οθνΙοznU
i (SS17)	Privacy	Privacy
CALT Multiply (SS18)	08x32mm 10X65mm	08×32mm 10×65mm

2023

56 PTS

# Hhe Imitation Came, I propose to consider the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively

SIMON RENAUD

a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator

unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of

#### 10PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Fhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the herms 'machine' and 'think' the definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words' machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sans. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Is the man and which is is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A' and a the length of this or her hair? Mow suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me

of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to Λ and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the

hy and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, hypewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give hruthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer or chemist claims to be able to

2023

56 PTS

# Hhe Imitation Came, I propose to consider the

He Imitation Came, I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe oefinitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is exprezzeò in relativelų unambiguouz woròz. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a came which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, а тап ( $\Delta$ ), а шотап (B), алд ал interrogator (C) шho таџ be

#### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the mormal use of the works, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the works 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer of the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator shays in a load of the other two. He new for the object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\Psi$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\Psi$  is A' and W is object in the game to pulse to the and  $\Phi$  is a start of the accent of the space belt me the length of his or her hair? How suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta'$ . The interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and

of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta'$ . Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong iðentification. Hiz answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and anzwerz can be repeated by an intermediary. Hhe object of

trų anò cause C to make the wrong iòentification. His answer might therefore be 'Πų hair is shingleò, anò the longest stranòs are about nine inches long.' In oròer that tones of voice maų not help the interrogator the answers shoulò be written, or better still, typewritten. He iòeal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternativelų the question anò answers can be repeateò bụ an intermeòtarų. Hhe object of the game for the thirò player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategu for her is probablų to give truthful answers. She can aòò such things as 'I am the woman, òon't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avait nothing as the man can make similar remarks. Use nou ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of Δ in this game?' Will the interrogator becide wronglų as often when the game is playeò like this as he òoes when the game is playeò between a man anò a woman? Hese questions. As well as asking, 'Ulhat is the answer to this new form of the question', one maų ask, 'Is this new question a worthų one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further aòo, therebų culting short an infinite performe the new problem has the aònange of òrauing a fairly starp line between the physical anò the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer or 56 PTS

32 PTS

# Hhe Imitation Came, I propose to consider the

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

<sup>24PTS</sup> He Imitation Came, I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' He should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to

(C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and 4 is A'. Fire interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an interrogator. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to himt' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate withoul further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the

#### 56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

#### 24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so

#### 16 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put youestions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that bases of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him! to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer or chemist claims to be able to 32 PTS

THIN SLANTED

56 PTS Ho Tmitation  $G_{Z} m \Theta, \perp propose$ to consider the

Hoe Imitation Came, I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the

Phe Imitation Came, I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions

<sup>16PTS</sup> He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey

#### THIN SLANTED

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another,

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Fhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man  $(\Lambda)$ , а woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is X'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hai? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to ry which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. File new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. File interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. File object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and Y is B or 'X is B and Y is  $\Lambda$ . File interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Lambda$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his

sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\land$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Lambda'_{.}$  Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Lambda$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B)

and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or befter still, hypewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the question. As well as asking, 'What will can be this the 'Critique of the Rew Problem. As well as asking, 'What will not this game?' His latter question and wrothy one to investigate?' His latter question workly as the work of model and wrothy and the abwork of the raw problem has the advantage of drawing a starty sharp line between the puestion are and the interrogator between the interrogator decide wrongly as the room of the game is played between the two man? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the Rew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question, one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer or chemist claims to be able to

2023

56 PTS Ho Tmitation Сате, Гргор to constàer the

Hoe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey

#### SS02: CRYPTIC

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), а шотап (B), апд ап interrogator (C) шho таџ be of either

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms' machine' and 'think' the definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the meaning of the words' machine' and 'think' tare to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer by such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question, 'Can machines, then ever form of the problem can be described in the interview of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator shays in a room apart from the other two. He end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and 'H is B' or 'X is B and 'H is  $\Delta$ ' the length of the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and 'H is B' or 'X is B and 'H is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game ho

another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell

sex. Fhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ . Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Пош suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mµ hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be uritten, or better still, typeuritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B)

In and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mµ hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an informediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. Use now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Delta$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrong/µ as often when the game is played tike this as the does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem. As well as taking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'I's this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. Hen enw problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer or chemist claims to be able to

SIMON RENAUD



Hhe Imitation Game, I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

#### SS03: ECLECTIC

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with Three people, а тап (А), а woman (В), and an interrogator

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this altitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of altempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4' and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4' is B' or 'X is B and 4' is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X places tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4 is B' or 'X is B and 4 is A'. He interrogator is allowed

(C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the inferrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Fie interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an interrediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to himt' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hease questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the



32 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game, I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey

#### SS04: CLASSIC

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'mitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to a and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long." In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of

wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the langest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that hones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer or chemist claims to be able to produce a 56 PTS

# Hie Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

## Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical

#### EXTRALIGHT

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Λ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions £of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurð. Insteað of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who

#### 6PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the maning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B and Y is A' the interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and

may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and Y is N. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

hry and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. Hhe ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. Hhe object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, hereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer or chemist claims

#### 56 PTS

# Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

#### SS02: CRYPTIC

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as pozzible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' sezu uluomatic service the service of the service o it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is abzurð. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and iz exprezzed in relativelų unambiguouz wordz. Hne r to zmret ni beditozeb ed nco meldora ent formot uen game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator

#### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the mormal use of the works, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the works 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'mitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a toom apart from the other two. He end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\Psi$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\Psi$  is  $\Delta'$ , and at the end of the game to guestions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please the length of his or her hair? Now Sections to A and B thus: C: Will X please the length of his or her pare to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta$ '. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to

(C) who may be of either sex. Fhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' ος 'X is B and Y is Δ'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Δ and B thus: C: Шill X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Ποω suppose X is actually Δ, then Δ must апсшөг. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the улте to trụ and слизе C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mų hair iz shingleò, and the longest stranòs are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, tupemritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the 

Iru and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'IIIu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator docide wrongly as often when the game of the flew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line belween the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer

56 PTS

# Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

## Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the questions, 'What will happen when a macchine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese puestions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite

56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical

#### SS04: CLASSIC

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is C'. Will X please the length of his or her hair?' Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question, one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer or chemist claims to be

2023

EXTRALIGHT SLANTED

# Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

32 P T S

Ho Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical

#### EXTRALIGHT SLANTED

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Λ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, а тап ( $\Lambda$ ), а woman (B), апд an interrogator (C) who may be

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be frame to a so to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is escaped in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either search the interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels  $\lambda$  and Y and  $\lambda$  the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\lambda$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair?' now suppose X is actually  $\lambda$ , then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and H, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and H is B' or 'X is B and H is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell

of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the φame he says either 'X is Λ and Ψ is B' or 'X is B and Ψ is Λ'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Λ and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. Hhe object of the game for

hry and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the inferrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, hereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer or chemist claims to be able

© 2023-02

56 PTS

EXTRALIGHT SLANTED SS02: CRYPTIC

### Ho Imitation Camo. I proposo to considor tho

32 PTS

Ho Imitation Camo. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a EXTRALIGHT SLANTED SS02: CRYPTIC

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex.

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Fhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is . לאחקפרסטב. If the meaning of the שסרלב 'machine' אחל 'think' sezu uluant of the system of t it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurð. Insteað of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, а тап ( $\Delta$ ), а шотап (B), апд ап interrogator

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms' maxime' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in to defermine which of the other two. He new direct of the game for the interrogator is to defermine which of the other two is allowed to game be says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta'$ , the interrogator is allowed to put question for the interrogator stays thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? How suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta's$  object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta$ . The interrogator is allowed to put questions to

(C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put φuestions to Δ and B thus: C: Шill X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must апсшөг. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to trụ and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, tupeuritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the 

Iry and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will havit nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question interrogator decide wrongly as often and an an answers played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machine takes' Chitique of the Game for the flow Problem. As well as asking, 'Ulha' is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer or

© 2023-02

EXTRALIGHT SLANTED SS03: ECLECTIC

56 PTS

### Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

32 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be EXTRALIGHT SLANTED SS03: ECLECTIC

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines' think?' Huis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this altitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hen ewe form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 'r, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 'P and an the visit and is achieved to prove the word of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 'r, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 'P and a three end of the game he says either 'X is A and 'P and the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is

shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give hruthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of

2023

EXTRALIGHT SLANTED SS04: CLASSIC

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

### 32 P T S

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical

### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a

### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a

### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of

### 6 PTS

205TF

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines' thick' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'mitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game ho try and cause C to make the

definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer or chemist claims to be able to produce a

2023

## Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?'

### AUGURE

### LIGHT

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator is to belevine the other two. He object of the game he says either 'X is A and 'H is B' or 'X is B and 'H is A'. The interrogator is allowed to purguestions to A and H use: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her har? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is N's object in the game to

ually Λ, then Λ must

SIMON RENAUD

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and H, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and H is B' or 'X is B and H is  $\Lambda$ '. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Lambda$  and

(C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

Iry and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advance of a man. No engineer or

### 56 PTS

### Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?'

### SS02: CRYPTIC

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as pozzible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' dezu uluo are ueut mou buintexe ud onnol ed or ere it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this iz abzurð. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and iz exprezzed in relativelų unambiguouz wordz. Hne rem form of the problem can be decribed in terms of a φαπθ which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator

### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the works, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the works 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\Psi$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\Psi$  is  $\Delta'$ . Hhe end of the game he langth of the say settions to  $\Delta$  and  $\Phi$  is  $\Delta'$ . The maximum of the end of the game he langth of the solutions to  $\Delta$  and  $\Phi$  is  $\Delta'$ . And  $\Phi$  is  $\Delta'$  and  $\Delta'$  the interrogator is to betermine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\Phi$  is: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her har? Row suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then A must answer. It is  $\Delta'$  solged in the

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Here new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Here object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta$ '. He interrogator is allowed to

(C) шho may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the intercorretor is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels  $\Delta$  λα Δ zi X' το the sine of the sine he zi X' δnc X to  $\Delta$  λ δnc X Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is Δ'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Δ and B thus: C: Шill X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must апсшөг. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to tru and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, tupemritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms.  $\Delta$  δθίκεσση ed πκο ziemzuk δηκ ποτίζευο edt μlevitkniet $\Delta$ 

game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to har answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Delta$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often men the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intelloctual capacities of a man. No engineer

### 56 PTS

### Hie Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

### 24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

### 16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4', and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4' is B' or 'X is B and 4' is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X places tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is

shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be' My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question, one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of

56 PTS

## The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?'

### SS04: CLASSIC

### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a

### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who

### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer or chemist claims

56 PTS

### Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

32 PTS

Ho Imitation Camo. I proposo to considor the quostion, 'Can machinos think?' Hhis should bogin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

### AUGURE

### LIGHT SLANTED

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Λ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex.

SIMON RENAUD

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurð. Insteað of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three рөорlө, а тап ( $\Lambda$ ), а woman (B), алд an interrogator (C) who

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator sis to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y and at the end of the game he says either' X is A and Y is B and Y is A' the interrogator is allowed to put yousdow to put yousdow the sub this of X is A and Y is A and Y is A' the interrogator is allowed to put yousdow to put yousdow to be a sub this of the same heavy the interrogator is allowed to put yousdow to be a sub a sub the sex of Y is A and Y is A' the interrogator is allowed to put yousdow to put yousdow to a sub the A' was an other yous to be a sub the yousdow to put yousdow to an a the max and which is a sub of the same to the part of the sub that you the yousdow to put yousdow to an a the top of the same to the program to a strained the same terms and the same to the interrogator is allowed to put yousdow to an a the same term a sub the same terms and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y is A' the interrogator is allowed to put yousdows to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Lambda$ . The interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Lambda$  and

may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and  $\forall$ , and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\land$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and Y is N. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Λ and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an infermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the They Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer

SIMON RENAUD

### 56 PTS

### Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 P T S

Ho Imitation Camo. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

### SS02: CRYPTIC

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex.

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' sezu uluou or service the state of the service of t it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurð. Insteað of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hee new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, а тап ( $\Delta$ ), а шотап (B), апд ап interrogator

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' this should begin with definitions of the meaning of the herms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed to as to reflect to far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other huo. The ond of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and 'H is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta'$  and at the end of the game to guestion so that be the length of his or her hair? Room and the answer to and be a suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is a big or her hard is game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and H is B' or 'X is B and H is  $\Delta$ '. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to

(C) шho may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels XA δη  $\Delta$  χ δη  $\Delta$  γ δη  $\Delta$  γ δη  $\Delta$  γ δη  $\Delta$  γ δη  $\Delta$  γ δη  $\lambda$ is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. Fie interrogator is allowed to put φuestions to Δ and B thus: C: Шill X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must апсшөг. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the улте to trụ лпд слисе C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, tupeuritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Δlternatively the outton and answers can be repeated

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to third to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hesse questions replace our original, 'Can machines think' Critique of the Thew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of arawing a fairly sharp

SS03: ECLECTIC

SIMON RENAUD

56 PTS

### Hie Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

### SS03: ECLECTIC

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' this should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4', and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4' is B' or 'X is B and 4' is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Fhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Fhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Fhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Fhe

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. *He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus:* C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of

56 PTS

## The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a

### SS04: CLASSIC

### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a

### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C)

### 6 PTS

205TF

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this dtillude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is allowed to put questions to A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and Y is C: Will X please the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game for

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer

## Hie Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

### AUGURE

### REGULAR

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

SIMON RENAUD

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' this should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Tow suppose X is actually A, then A must

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Lambda$ '. He interrogator

(C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X And Ψ, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is Λ and Ψ is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is  $\Lambda$  's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by

answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that hones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the Guestion', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line

### 56 PTS

## Hie Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

### He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

### SS02: CRYPTIC

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex.

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He zs rst oz toelfer ot zs oz 6emsrt ed thyim znoitinite6 possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' dezu uluou ous ark neut mou buiture and ou ou eur it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely zuoupidmsnu ulevitsler ni 6ezzergxe zi 6ns ti of 6etsler wordz. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is plaueð mith three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a moman (B), and an

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation qame'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4', and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Row suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ ,

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta$ '. He interrogator is

interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator staus in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows zụcz en emry ent to óne ent tr ónr. X zledri ud ment either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Шџ hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. Hhe ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'ITIy har is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She ut at interrogator decide wrong a strate the game of the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'Ulhat will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Delta$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem.  $\Delta$ s well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly short han infinite 56 PTS

## Hie Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' this should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4' is B' or 'X is B and 4' is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C. Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is

definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He

a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two

actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage

56 PTS

### The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a

### SS04: CLASSIC

### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room

### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C)

### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the interlelectual capacities of a man. No engineer 56 PTS

## Ho Imitation Camo. I proposo to considor tho

### 32 PTS

### He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Λ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hee new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with thrөө рөорlө, а тап ( $\Lambda$ ), а woman (B), апд an interrogator

### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is X'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

205TF

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and  $\mathcal{H}$ , and  $\mathcal{H}$  is B' or 'X

is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Lambda'$ . Fhe interrogator is allowed to put

(C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X лпд Ч, апд at the end of the game he says either 'X is Λ апд Ч is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Λ and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an infermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the inferrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line belween the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer

### Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

### Ho Imitation Camo. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

### SS02: CRYPTIC

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (Δ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' sezu ulustic set to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurð. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hee пеш form of the problem can be described in terms of a дате which we call the 'imitation дате'. It is played with three people, а тап ( $\Delta$ ), а шотап (B), апд ап interrogator

### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the ema and the game which is Game the which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is Z'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or the fair of his or the real to the fair of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta$ 's object in the

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta$ '. He interrogator is

(C) шho may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels XA δη A τ the end of the game he says either X is  $\Delta$  and His B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put φuθstions to Δ and B thus: C: Шill X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must апзшөг. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the дате to trụ апд саизе C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long! In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, tupemritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms.  $\Delta$ lternatively the question and answers can be repeated by

game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to hird' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now sak the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the question, one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He me polem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line belween the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. To engineer

56 PTS

### Hie Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

### 32 PTS

### He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

### SS03: ECLECTIC

### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who

### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' this should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this altitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He only of the game he says either 'X is A and 4' is B' or 'X is A and 4'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4 is B' or 'X is B and 4 is A'. He

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hose questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby culting short an infinite regress. He new problem has the advantage of SLANTED

56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a SLANTED

#### SS04: CLASSIC

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C)

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is allowed to put questions to A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and Y is C: Will X please the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put

who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary.

try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This lafter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp line between the physical and the intellectual capacities of a man. No engineer

# He ImitationCame. I proposeto consider the

#### 32 PTS

# How Imitation Came.I propose to consider theouestion, 'Can machinesthink?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be frameds on as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and Y is B'

a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and H, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is A'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Lambda$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two

suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an infermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Lambda$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese question. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the Question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new

\_\_\_\_\_

2023

56 PTS

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' He should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

#### SS02: CRYPTIC

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He ZE TET OF THE TET OF TE possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' this should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think' the definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'mitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y is A' and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the

205TF

definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B'

а тап ( $\Delta$ ), а шотап (B), апд ап interrogator (C) шho may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and H, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$ and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. He interrogator is allowed to put output on  $\Delta$  on B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of ed 6luodz zrewzna edt rotagorretni edt gled ton uam esiov uritten, or better still, typeuritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two

length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to rry and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a feleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Delta$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does uhen the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the Gewstion', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B),

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'fhink' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question. 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he

three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a

me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate

56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

### The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

#### SS04: CLASSIC

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'mitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y; and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp

56 PTS

# He ImitationCame. I proposeto consider the

#### 32 PTS

# Here is a state of the impose of the consider the propose to consider the puestion, 'Can machines think?' Here should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines

SIMON RENAUD

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in ferms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B 'n 'X is B and Y is X. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? How a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and H, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and H is B'

а тап ( $\Lambda$ ), а woman (B), апд ап interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X апд 4, апд at the end of the game he says either 'X is Л апд  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is A'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Λ and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then Λ must answer. It is Λ's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two

suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  must answer. If is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Lambda$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese puestion. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the Question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. He new

SS02: CRYPTIC

56 PTS

# Не Ітітітіоп Сате. І ргорозе to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting

SS02: CRYPTIC

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Fhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which ше call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hits should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be frameds to as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is X'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Tow such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B'

а тап ( $\Delta$ ), а шотап (B), апд ап interrogator (C) шно таџ be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels Xand 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mµ hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice mau not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, tupewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two

suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or befter still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the guestion and answers can be repeated by an infermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the guestion, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Delta$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese question, swell as asking, 'Uhat is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter operation we gave a solution a worthy one to investigate?' his latter operation we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress.

SS03: ECLECTIC

56 PTS

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B),

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of

SS03: ECLECTIC

#### 8 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4', and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4 is B' or 'X is B and 4 is A'. He attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

а тап (A), а woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and *Y* is B' or 'X is B and *Y* is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a

tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the guestion and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but if will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the Question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' Hhis latter question we

SS04: CLASSIC

56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

### The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be

16 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

SS04: CLASSIC

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'mitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must

205TF

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the ouestion and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These question,' com may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new problem has the advantage of drawing a fairly sharp

# He ImitationCame. I proposeto consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' He should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B),

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Fhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sort. He end of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is N'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the

attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Lambda$ '. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a

length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. If is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the inferrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the inferrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the Rew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' this latter question we investigate

2023

# He ImitationCame. I proposeto consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can BOLD

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and iz exprezzed in relativelu unambiguouz wordz. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with

#### 6 PTS

He imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the works, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the works 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous works. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is  $\Delta$ '. He

attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a moman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he saus either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to tru and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a

tell me the length of hiz or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. If is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Ml hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Delta$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the tag a bud a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the Nession's asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question, swell as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question, saw ask, 'Is the answer to make the new starter question ('Is have a saking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask.''

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' He should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd.

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is

#### 6 PTS

Hhe Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4', and at the end of the game he says either'X is A and 4' is B' or 'X is B and 4' is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal

and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions

16 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines BOLD

#### SS04: CLASSIC

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C)

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator he or he inter'. Now

replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The

a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two

suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new

SIMON RENAUD

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B),

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and *'think'*. *He definitions might be framed so as to reflect* so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y is X. The interrogator is allowed to put guestions to A and B thus: C: Will X

such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X апд 4, апд at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Lambda$ '. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Lambda$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the дате to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. Не ideal arrangement is to have a

please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things a' T am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the tans a woman? Hese questions. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the poletion. As well as a saking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the game is played between to this new form of the question, one may ask.' Ts this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we

© 2023-02

BOLD SLANTED

56 PTS

## Не Ітітатіоп Сате. І ргорозе to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

205TF

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B),

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of

SS02: CRYPTIC

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Fhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and *think*. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4' and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\Psi$  they is B' on 'X is B and 'H is A'.

attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X

three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a moman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X апд 4, апд at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Delta$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Пош suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the улте to tru алд саизе C to make the шголо identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mµ hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, tupeшritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a

of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually Δ, then Δ must answer. If is Δ's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is sthingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interroyator the answers should be written, or befter still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interroyator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to third' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the Row Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' His latter question we investigate without further ado,

© 2023-02

BOLD SLANTED

56 PTS

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd.

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in ferms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y and at the end of the game to says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B

Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Here object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and H is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal

thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, bui it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as offen when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy

2023

BOLD SLANTED

56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions

16PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines BOLD SLANTED

#### SS04: CLASSIC

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition 1 shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The

(B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the

X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress. The new

2023

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ),

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd.

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'.

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is M.

Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X

It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Fhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and  $\Psi$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\Psi$  is  $\Lambda'$ . He interrogator is allowed to put questions to  $\Lambda$  and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal

and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese question's neglace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the file Mercolem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'I s this new question a worthy

205TF

56 PTS

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

# He Imitation Came. Ipropose to consider thequestion, 'Can machinesthink?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

#### SS02: CRYPTIC

#### 12 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurð. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of oither sex. He interrogator stays in a come apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and xt the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is S' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A

Flect He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is Δ and Y is B' or
(X is B and Y is Δ'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to Δ and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually Δ, then Δ must answer. It is Δ's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal

and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mu hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long'. In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of  $\Delta$  in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one

attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

plaued with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B),

апо ап interrogator (C) шно таџ be of either sex. Не

interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two.

# He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin

24 PTS

⊢he Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' ⊢his should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. ⊢he

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'.

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and V is B or 'X is B and V is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y,

'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Hhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or

ouestions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or befter still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hense questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may

56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions

16 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

#### SS04: CLASSIC

#### 12 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now

attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either

a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating

suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress.

2023

56 PTS

# He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

# He Imitation Came.I propose to consider theouestion, 'Can machinesthink?' He should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ),

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd.

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Fhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think' the definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4 is B' or 'X is B and 4 is A'. He interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B

Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he

with three people, a man ( $\Lambda$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Fhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X апо̀ 4, апо̀ at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Lambda$  and  $\Psi$  is B' or 'X is B and H is  $\Lambda$ . Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Л апо̀ В thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Lambda$ , then  $\Lambda$  must answer. It is  $\Lambda$ 's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal

thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as offen when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Hese questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?'

© 2023-02

56 PTS

# Не Ітітатіоп Сате. І ргорозе to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd.

SS02: CRYPTIC

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and think'. Fhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He пеш form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and At the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and Y is S.

Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. He interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he

with three people, a man ( $\Delta$ ), a woman (B), and ап interrogator (С) шно таџ be of either sex. Не interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Here object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is  $\Delta$  and  $\forall$  is B' or 'X is B and  $\forall$  is  $\Delta$ '. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to Δ and B thus: C: Шill X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually  $\Delta$ , then  $\Delta$  must answer. It is  $\Delta$ 's object in the game to tru апд саизо C to make the шголу identification. His answer might therefore be 'Mµ hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal

and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nime inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. He ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. He best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? Herse questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the flew Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the question', one may as, X, 'Is this new question a worthy one

SS03: ECLECTIC

56 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin

24 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He

16 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' His should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'.

#### 10 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd.

SS03: ECLECTIC

#### 8 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the ouestion, 'Can machines think?' Hhis should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. Hhe definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. Hhe new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'.

#### 6 PTS

He Imitation Came. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' this should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. He definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Callup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. He new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. He object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. He inferrogator is Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4,

SIMON RENAUD

It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. Hhe interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. Hhe object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and 4, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and 4 is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. Fhe interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten.

allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hai? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the question and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to this new form of the

56 PTS

# The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the

#### 32 PTS

## The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin

24 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions

16 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and

SIMON RENAUD

#### 10 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting

SS04: CLASSIC

#### 8 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people,

#### 6 PTS

The Imitation Game. I propose to consider the question, 'Can machines think?' This should begin with definitions of the meaning of the terms 'machine' and 'think'. The definitions might be framed so as to reflect so far as possible the normal use of the words, but this attitude is dangerous. If the meaning of the words 'machine' and 'think' are to be found by examining how they are commonly used it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the meaning and the answer to the question, 'Can machines' think?' is to be sought in a statistical survey such as a Gallup poll. But this is absurd. Instead of attempting such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a com apart from the other two. The object of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y. and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now

such a definition I shall replace the question by another, which is closely related to it and is expressed in relatively unambiguous words. The new form of the problem can be described in terms of a game which we call the 'imitation game'. It is played with three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y

a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The interrogator stays in a room apart from the other two. The object of the game for the interrogator is to determine which of the other two is the man and which is the woman. He knows them by labels X and Y, and at the end of the game he says either 'X is A and Y is B' or 'X is B and Y is A'. The interrogator is allowed to put questions to A and B thus: C: Will X please tell me the length of his or her hair? Now suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating

suppose X is actually A, then A must answer. It is A's object in the game to try and cause C to make the wrong identification. His answer might therefore be 'My hair is shingled, and the longest strands are about nine inches long.' In order that tones of voice may not help the interrogator the answers should be written, or better still, typewritten. The ideal arrangement is to have a teleprinter communicating between the two rooms. Alternatively the guestion and answers can be repeated by an intermediary. The object of the game for the third player (B) is to help the interrogator. The best strategy for her is probably to give truthful answers. She can add such things as 'I am the woman, don't listen to him!' to her answers, but it will avail nothing as the man can make similar remarks. We now ask the question, 'What will happen when a machine takes the part of A in this game?' Will the interrogator decide wrongly as often when the game is played like this as he does when the game is played between a man and a woman? These questions replace our original, 'Can machines think?' Critique of the New Problem. As well as asking, 'What is the answer to his new form of the question', one may ask, 'Is this new question a worthy one to investigate?' This latter question we investigate without further ado, thereby cutting short an infinite regress.

#### CREDITS

Designed by: Simon Renaud Development & Mastering: 205TF Translation: Derek Byrne 205TF staff: Alexis Faudot, Rémi Forte, Damien Gautier, Florence Roller, Tanguy Vanlaeys Specimen text: A. M. Turing, Computing Machinery and Intelligence

#### CAUTION

In order to protect the work of the typeface designer, this pdf file is locked. 205TF will initiate legal action against anyone unlocking this pdf.

#### CONTACT

205 Corp. 24, rue Commandant-Faurax 69006 Lyon France

T. +33 (0)4 37 47 85 69 contact@205.tf

SAS 205 Corp. SIRET 522 580 430 00026 TVA Intra FR-45522580430

COPYRIGHT

 ${\tt 205TF}$  is a trademark of 205 Corp.

