

**Матеріали IV міжнародної науково-практичної конференції
«Суспільні дослідження у 21 сторіччі»**

м. Краматорськ
25 березня 2017 року

**Материалы IV международной научно-практической конференции
«Общественные исследования в 21 веке»**

г. Краматорск
25 марта 2017 года

**Proceedings of IV International scientific conference
“Social research in the 21st century”**

Kramatorsk
March 25th, 2017

ББК 60.5+74+80+87.3+88.3

УДК 001+101+159.9+37+316+801

М34

М34 Матеріали IV міжнародної науково-практичної конференції «Суспільні дослідження у 21 сторіччі». – Вінниця: ТОВ «Нілан-ЛТД», 2017. – 218 с.

Збірник матеріалів матеріалів IV міжнародної науково-практичної конференції «Суспільні дослідження у 21 сторіччі». Представлені результати робіт з широкого кола гуманітарних дисциплін.

Роботи подаються мовою оригіналу. Відповідальність за зміст робіт несуть автори та наукові керівники.

ББК 60.5+74+80+87.3+88.3

УДК 001+101+159.9+37+316+801

Наукова ініціатива «Універсум»

84301, а/с 65, м. Краматорськ, Україна

Тел.: +380671187401

E-mail: mail@univscience.info

© Автори робіт, 2017

© Наукова ініціатива «Універсум», 2017

© ТОВ «Нілан-ЛТД», 2017

<i>Rozhanska V.O.</i> THE CREATION OF HEALTH-CARING ENVIRONMENT FOR JUNIOR SCHOOLCHILDREN: GENDER ASPECT	71
<i>Sabat N.I.</i> ВИВЧЕННЯ СУЧАСНОГО СТАНУ ПРОФЕСІЙНО-ПЕДАГОГІЧНОЇ ПІДГОТОВКИ МАЙБУТНІХ УЧИТЕЛІВ ДО ОПІКУНСЬКО-ВИХОВНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ З ДІТЬМИ МІГРАНТІВ	73
<i>Shulha I.M.</i> TO THE PROBLEM OF BECOMING OF PEDAGOGICAL VALEOLOGY	76
<i>Shulkevich V.S.</i> DISTANCE LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES IN EDUCATION	79
<i>Sun Tszintsyu</i> EXPERIENCE INTRODUCTION METHOD "SUZUKI" IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION CHINA	81
<i>Tverdokhlib T.S., Petrova K.A.</i> QUESTION OF NATIVE LANGUAGE EDUCATIONAL POTENTIAL AT IVAN OGIENKO WORKS	83
<i>Wang Ching I</i> AESTHETIC EDUCATION OF STUDENTS NARODNOHYI MEANS MUSIC IN CHINA	86
<i>Xiao Tan</i> CHINESE FOLK OPERA: HISTORICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS	88
<i>Zobenko N.A.</i> RICH MEDIA LECTURE IN THE LEARNING PROCESS MODERN HIGH SCHOOL	90
СЕКЦІЯ 2. Психологія	
<i>Aghayeva E.G.</i> FEMALE INFERTILITY: FOUR FEATURES OF PSYCHOSOMATIC APPROACH	93
<i>Braitseva S.V., Arpentieva M.R.</i> БУЛЛІНГ ЯК РІЗНОВИД НАСИЛЬСТВА: ЖЕРТВИ ШКІЛЬНОГО БУЛЛІНГА	95
<i>Donets I.V.</i> ФІЛОСОФСЬКО-ПСИХОЛОГІЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ТРАНСПЕРСОНАЛЬНИХ ФОРМ	101
<i>Niewiadomski C.S.</i> SOCIAL MEDIA YESTERDAY AND TODAY: PRO ET CONTRA	103
<i>Nykonenko O.V.</i> THE STUDY OF THE AFFECTIVE COMPONENT OF THE MONETARY SOCIALIZATION OF STUDENT'S YOUTH	105
<i>Sleptsova A.B.</i> MANAGEMENT OF ATTENTION	109
СЕКЦІЯ 3. Філософія	
<i>Blokha Y.Y.</i> FEATURES INTERPRETATIONS OF CATEGORY «JUSTICE» IN ISLAM	112
<i>Danylova T.V.</i> CREATIO IN SITU VS CREATIO EX NIHILO: COSMOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ANCIENT CHINESE PHILOSOPHY	115
<i>Ostapenko Y.V.</i> CHARACTERISTICS AND FEATURES ANARCHISM IN UKRAINE OF 1905-1907	118
<i>Pakulina H.S.</i> SINESTESIA COGNITION OF OBJECTIVE REALITY IN THE SPACE OF THE AESTHETIC CONNOTATIONS	120
<i>Serdyuk E.O.</i> «THE PURPOSE OF HUMAN LIFE»	124
<i>Yarova E.P.</i> PHILOSOPHY OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	127
<i>Zaytseva M.L.</i> THE CONCEPT OF «ART AS SYNESTESIA SYSTEM» AND THE CREATIVE REFLECTION OF REALITY OF MODERN TIMES IN ARTISTIC IMAGES	129

PHILOSOPHY OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Yarova Elyzaveta

Student of Department of Computer Systems and Technologies

Faculty of Economic Informatics

Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics

Kharkiv, Ukraine

Scientific advisor - Candidate of pedagogical sciences Pylaieva Tetiana

The philosophy of artificial intelligence (AI) researches issues primarily concerned with the following questions:

- Can a machine cerebrates and acts intelligently?
- Are human intelligence and machine intelligence the same?
- If machines are, have a mind, are they have similar rights to rational human beings?

Some scientists hold opinion that computers have thoughts, use language, and even have free will. Does this make sense? The idea that machines could think occurred to the very first computer builders and programmers.

In 1950 Alan Turing published “Computing Machinery and Intelligence” where he described a game he called the “imitation game” involving a human judge conversing only in written text with a second human and a language-using computer, each hidden away in separate rooms (3 rooms total). In original version game is played by three people, a man (A), a woman (B), and an interrogator (C) who may be of either sex. The point of the game is for the computer to converse in such a human-like way with the person A that the person cannot tell the second human (B) from the computer (in usual renditions of the Test, the second human also tries to convince the person A that she is the human, so the test becomes a contest). The computer wins if the judge cannot tell which conversant is the human and which is the computer.

Turing's point is that were a computer to successfully and repeatedly pass such a test, we should then regard the computer as intelligent on the human level. This test may serve, as Turing notes, to test not just for shallow verbal dexterity, but for background knowledge and underlying reasoning ability as well, since interrogators may ask any question or pose any verbal challenge they choose. Regarding this test Turing famously predicted that “in about fifty years? time [by the year 2000] it will be possible to program computers ... to make them play the imitation game so well that an average interrogator will have no more than 70 per cent chance of making the correct identification after five minutes of questioning” [5]. This point of view was named “weak AI”.

To date, only one computer has passed the Turing Test. It was chatbot Eugene Goostman — 13-year-old teen from Odessa, Ukraine who doesn't speak English all that well — makes for a semi-convincing chatbot. His answers are at times enthusiastic and unintelligible like those from any normal teen would be. Developed by PrincetonAI (a small team of programmers and technologists not affiliated with Princeton University) “Eugene Goostman” was able to pass the Turing Test in 2014. This bot made something impossible: judges confirmed that they had a conversation with a human 33% of time. It was good enough to surpass the 30% threshold set by Alan Turing.

After Turing's publication in 1950, many philosophers and scientists took it for granted that within a decade or two computers would be as intelligent as humans would. A

central paper from this time is "Some philosophical problems from the standpoint of artificial intelligence" by John McCarthy and Patrick J. Hayes published in 1969. Nevertheless, the optimism proved to be unjustified. The decades came and went without machines achieving human-level intelligence. Soon several philosophers and other researchers argued that computers would never think and that human brains and minds were completely different from computers. The most important paper in this period was John Searle's famous paper: Searle 1980, where he argues that machines cannot think at all because they lack the proper semantical connection to the world. In fact, he believes that he has an argument that shows that no classical artificial intelligence program running on a digital computer will give a machine the capacity to understand a language. He calls his argument the "Chinese Room Argument". Imagine that you (a monolingual English speaker) perform the offices of a computer: taking in symbols as input, transitioning between these symbols and other symbols according to explicit written instructions, and then outputting the last of these other symbols. The instructions are in English, but the input and output symbols are in Chinese. Suppose the English instructions were a Chinese program and by this method, to input "questions", you output "answers" that are indistinguishable from answers that might be given by a native Chinese speaker. You pass the Turing test for understanding Chinese, nevertheless, you understand "not a word of the Chinese" [4], and neither would any computer; and the same result generalizes to "any Turing machine simulation" [4] of any intentional mental state. It would not really be thinking. This point of view calls "strong AI".

So, disputes between weak and strong AI supporters continue until nowadays. The weak AI hypothesis states that a machine running a program is at most only capable of simulating real human behavior and consciousness. Strong AI, on the other hand, purports that the correctly written program running on a machine actually is a mind — that is, there is no essential difference between a (yet to be written) piece of software exactly emulating the actions of the brain, and the actions of a human being, including their understanding and consciousness. Nevertheless, there is no agreement about what thought or intelligence is. Of course, before the day when general human-level intelligent machine behavior comes — if it ever does — we will have to know more. Perhaps by then scientific agreement about what thinking is will theoretically withstand the empirical evidence of AI.

Literature:

1. Philosophy of artificial intelligence [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy_of_artificial_intelligence
2. Philosophy will be the key that unlocks artificial intelligence [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/oct/03/philosophy-artificial-intelligence>
3. Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <https://philpapers.org/browse/philosophy-of-artificial-intelligence>
4. Searle J. Minds, brains and programs. / John R. Searle// Behavioral and Brain Sciences.–1980.– № 3(3).– p.417-457
5. Turing A. Computing machinery and intelligence. / Alan M. Turing // Mind. – 1950 - №49: p.433-460.

CERTIFICATE

H0317-0531

This is to certify that

Elyzaveta Petrivna Yarova

student

participated actively in

IV International scientific conference “Social research in the 21st century”

(Mar 25, 2017, Kramatorsk, Ukraine)

with a paper

PHILOSOPHY OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE



SI “Universum”
mail@iscience.me
www.iscience.me