

Brain Simulator Reply of Chinese room argument is confirmed.

© Copyright 2017 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the apparatus of the Meth8 modal logic model checker implementing variant system VL4. Meth8 allows to mix four logical values with four analytical values. The designated *proof* value is T.

Definition	Axiom	Symbol	Name	Meaning	2-tuple	Ordinal
1	$p=p$	T	Tautology	proof	11	3
2	$p@p$	F	Contradiction	absurdum	00	0
3	$\%p>\#p$	N	Non-contingency	truth	01	1
4	$\%p<\#p$	C	Contingency	falsity	10	2

LET: \sim Not; + Or; & And; \ Not and; > Imply; < Not imply; = Equivalent to; @ Not equivalent to; # all; % some; (p@p) 00, zero; (p=p) 11, one

Results are the repeating proof table(s) of 16-values in row major horizontally.

From: plato.stanford.edu/entries/chinese-room by dcole@d.umn.edu (2014)

"Brain Simulator Reply. ... Searle correctly notes that one cannot infer from X simulates Y , and Y has property P , to the conclusion that therefore X has Y 's property P for arbitrary P . [1.1]

But ... Searle ... commits the simulation fallacy in extending the CR argument from traditional AI to apply against computationalism. The contrapositive of the inference is logically equivalent— X simulates Y , X does not have P therefore Y does not [have P]" [2.1]

We map Eqs. 1.2 and 2.1 as follows.

LET: $p q r P X Y$

$$((q>r)\&(r>p))>(q>(r>p)) ; \quad \text{TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT} \quad (1.2.1)$$

$$((q>r)\&(r>p))>(q>(r\&p)) ; \quad \text{TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT} \quad (1.2.2)$$

Eqs. 1.2.1 and variant 1.2.2 are tautologous, contradicting the conjecture of [1.1].

$$((q>r)\&(q>\sim p))>(r>\sim p) ; \quad \text{TTTT TFTT TTTT TFTT} \quad (2.1)$$

Eq. 2.1 is not tautologous, contradicting [2.1] as logically equivalent to [1.1].

The Brain Simulator Reply of the Chinese room argument is hence confirmed and validated.