

The Logic of Language

Reverse-engineering the language center of our brain – by the discovery of natural laws of intelligence that are embedded in grammar – which invalidates the theory of evolution as the explanation for the origin of intelligence, language and laws of nature





Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
1. The current approach to AI and NLP – and how it fails.....	4
1.1. Fiction, engineering and science.....	5
1.2. Evolutionary intelligence.....	6
1.3. Autonomous systems.....	6
1.4. Artificial / Deep-learning Neural Networks.....	7
1.4.1. Deep-learning networks applied to natural language.....	8
1.5. Fundamental flaw in NLP.....	8
1.5.1. Blind spot in NLP.....	9
1.5.2. Fundamental flaw in the Turing test.....	10
1.6. The competence limit of scientists.....	11
1.6.1. Predicate Logic.....	12
1.6.2. Controlled Natural Language.....	13
1.6.3. The function of word types in reasoning.....	14
2. The fundamental approach of Thinknowlogy.....	15
2.1. Natural intelligence.....	16
2.1.1. The impact of the discovering of natural intelligence.....	16
2.2. Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar.....	17
2.2.1. Example: Autonomous generation of questions.....	18
2.2.2. Improve your ontology system towards a grammar-based approach.....	18
2.3. Intelligence – more into depth.....	19
2.3.1. Autonomy / independently.....	20
2.3.2. IQ test.....	20
2.4. Universal Grammar theory.....	21
2.5. Other sources of intelligence.....	22
3. The theory of evolution is not scientific.....	23
3.1. The theory of evolution is a religion.....	24
3.2. Overwhelming evidence.....	25
3.3. If you do not believe in cows.....	25
3.4. Mona Lisa.....	25
3.5. Self-organizing systems.....	26
3.6. Complex systems.....	27
3.7. Super-intelligence (machines surpassing human intelligence).....	27
3.7.1. Spreading fear for super-intelligence.....	28
3.7.2. Free will and morality.....	29
Testimony: I don't have this wisdom of myself.....	29
Appendix: Genesis hidden in the Chinese language.....	30

Introduction

The field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and knowledge technology (NLP) started around the year 1956. However, there are four reasons to believe that the current approach to AI and NLP has a fundamental problem:

1. Intelligence and language are natural phenomena. Natural phenomena obey laws of nature. And laws of nature are investigated using (basic or) [fundamental science](#). However, the field AI and NLP is being developed using (behavioral or) [cognitive science](#). This cognitive approach delivers a simulation of behavior (similar to a flight simulator), while a fundamental approach would deliver an artificial implementation of natural intelligence (similar to an airplane);



2. A science has a foundation in nature, which leads to generic solutions. But due to its cognitive approach, the field of AI and NLP has no foundation in nature – nor a definition based on nature – 60 years after its start. Without foundation, this field is baseless. And being baseless, this field is limited to engineer specific solutions to specific problems, while a science delivers generic solutions;
3. As a consequence, in knowledge technology, **artificial structures** are applied to keywords, while the **natural structure** of sentences is ignored. By ignoring this structure provided by nature, the field of NLP got stuck in processing of “bags of keywords” and unstructured texts, while scientists are unable – or unwilling – to define [the logical function of even the most basic word types](#);
4. Moreover, a science integrates its disciplines, while in the field of AI and NLP, scientists are unable – or unwilling – to integrate (automated) reasoning and natural language. In other words, this field has a blind spot:
 - [Chatbots](#), [Virtual Assistants](#) and [Natural Language Generation \(NLG\) techniques](#) are unable to reason logically. They are only able to select human-written sentences, in which they may fill-in user-written keywords;
 - Reasoners like [Prolog](#) are able to reason logically. But they only have keywords as output. So, their results can't be expressed in automatically constructed sentences. As a consequence, laymen are unable to use this kind of reasoner;
 - Controlled Natural Language (CNL) reasoners are able to reason logically. And they are able to write the result of the reasoner as readable sentences. However, they are limited to sentences with verb “[is/are](#)” in the present tense.

1. The current approach to AI and NLP – and how it fails

In the years before the first flight of the [Wright brothers](#), aviation wasn't scientific yet. Because the attempts were “**inspired by nature**”, using feathers, flapping wings, bird suits, and so on:

- YouTube: “[Man's Early Flight Attempts](#)”;
- YouTube: “[first attempts to fly by man](#)”;
- YouTube: “[Death Jump - Franz Reichelt jumps off the Eiffel Tower](#)”.

However, the Wright brothers understood: A machine will only be able to fly if it is **based on the laws of nature**, obeying the Laws of Physics. So, apparently, using the laws of nature is a fundamental approach, whilst being “inspired by nature” isn't.

This situation is illustrative for the current state of AI and NLP:

- This field is lacking a unifying, fundamental (=natural) and deterministic (=implementable) definition of intelligence, and the understanding how natural intelligence and natural language are related;
- Without natural definition, this field is lacking a natural foundation;
- Without foundation, the techniques developed on AI and NLP are in fact baseless. And without one common (=natural) foundation, its disciplines – like automated reasoning and natural language processing – can not be integrated;
- Being baseless, AI got stuck at a simulation of behavior (not necessarily intelligent behavior), and NLP got stuck at linking of keywords;
- As a consequence, AI and NLP are limited to programmed and trained intelligence.

Even 60 years after the start of this field, 160 years after the publication of “[The Laws of Thought](#)” by [George Boole](#), and 2,400 years after [Aristotle](#)'s works on logic, scientists are still unable to convert a sentence like “[Paul is a son of John](#)” to “[John has a son, called Paul](#)” – and vice versa – in a generic way (=through an algorithm).

Both sentences have the same meaning. So, it must be possible to convert one sentence to the other – and vice versa – as explained in 1.5.2. Fundamental flaw in the Turing test. However, such a conversion requires to understand what natural intelligence is. Lacking a natural definition of intelligence, not a single scientific paper supports the mentioned conversion in a generic way (=through an algorithm).

Common knowledge:

- If problems are fundamental, one needs to repair the foundation. Actually, it is better to remove the old foundation, and to pour a new one;
- If two disciplines have different foundations, they can't be integrated, because a building can only have one foundation. If another foundation would be poured next to an existing one, both foundations will move relative to each other. Then the expanded building – resting on both foundations – will prolapse, and eventually collapse.

Only a fundamental approach – based on laws of nature – will deliver significant progress.

1.1. Fiction, engineering and science

Fact-checking is extremely rare in the field of AI and NLP.

Fact: Scientists are unable – or unwilling – to define intelligence as a set of natural laws.

Being unable to define intelligence, AI is not an artificial implementation of natural intelligence. As a consequence, AI is **not scientific**. Instead, AI is just **clever engineering**. Therefore, this field is limited to deliver specific solutions to specific problems.

Being unable – or unwilling – to define intelligence, a lot of Science **Fiction** stories are told on AI. This video on YouTube separates engineering from the Science Fiction stories told on AI: “[How Intelligent is Artificial Intelligence? - Computerphile](#)”.

Also the field of NLP is **not scientific**. Because scientists are unable – or unwilling – to derive new knowledge from sentences in natural language and to write the derived knowledge back to readable sentences in natural language. It proves that scientists don’t understand what natural language is ¹.

Only Controlled Natural Language reasoners are able to close the loop: [natural language](#) → [logic](#) → [natural language](#). Because only CNL reasoners are able to read sentences (with an extremely limited grammar), to derive new knowledge, and to write the derived knowledge in self-constructed sentences (with an extremely limited grammar).

CNL reasoners are based on Predicate Logic, which describes the intelligent function of basic verb “[is/are](#)” in a generic way, in the way nature works. So, CNL reasoners work in the way nature works regard to verb “[is/are](#)”. Therefore, they deliver a generic solution. And therefore, they are **scientific**.

However, Predicate Logic – and thus CNL reasoners – is limited to logic expressed with basic verb “[is/are](#)”. Scientists are for example ignorant of the intelligent function in language of possessive verb “[has/have](#)”. Instead of implementing this intelligent function in artificial systems – which would deliver a generic solution – scientists teach us to hard-code knowledge containing this verb directly into a reasoner or a knowledge base, like: [has_son\(john,paul\)](#). This is again **engineering** – a specific solution to a specific problem – instead of science.

-
- 1 The field of electromagnetism is scientific – understood – because scientists are able to close the loop for electricity, magnetism, movement and light. Scientists are able:
- to convert electricity to light, and to convert light back to electricity;
 - to convert electricity to magnetism, and magnetism back to electricity;
 - to convert electromagnetism to movement, and movement back to electromagnetism.

However, scientists are unable – or unwilling – to close the loop for natural language and logic, because they are ignorant of the logical structures of natural language.

1.2. Evolutionary intelligence

First of all, the development of any technology – including AI – requires by definition (human) intelligence and a structured approach, while the theory of evolution doesn't support any intelligent influence, nor any structured approach. So, the theory of evolution doesn't apply to the development of technology (like AI).

In the same way, the theory of evolution doesn't apply to the development Evolutionary Algorithms / Programming and Genetic Algorithms / Programming. Because both techniques are obviously algorithms. And algorithms are intelligently designed by definition² – using a structured approach – while the theory of evolution doesn't support any intelligent influence, nor any structured approach.

Nevertheless, Evolutionary Algorithms are useful though for finding an optimum value. They are comparable to the [PID Controller](#) – found in ordinary central heating systems – which optimizes the burning time in order to avoid *undershoot* and *overshoot*.

1.3. Autonomous systems

We should separate *autonomous systems* from *autonomously intelligent systems*:

Autonomous systems: Mars rovers, autonomously flying drones and self-driving cars are examples of autonomous systems. They are able to use consistent sources to navigate, like radar, cameras and GPS. These sources are consistent with their maps and with their movement: If the vehicle moves, their radar, cameras and GPS will move accordingly. And marks on the map will eventually appear on radar and cameras when it comes near the GPS position of those marks.

Such systems are autonomous – but not autonomously intelligent – because the intelligence in such systems is programmed.

Autonomously intelligent systems: Grammar is a naturally consistent source. It is subject to Natural Laws of Intelligence. For example, each and every (human) language has an equivalent of conjunction “or”, like in sentence “[Every person is a man or a woman](#)”. This word has an intelligent function in language: It is used by our brain to separate knowledge, in this case to separate the words “man” and “woman”.

By using grammar as a natural source of intelligence, it is possible to implement natural intelligence in artificial systems, by which these systems become autonomously intelligent (up to a certain level).

2 algorithm: “[any set of detailed instructions which results in a predictable end-state from a known beginning](#)”

1.4. Artificial / Deep-learning Neural Networks

First of all, neurons are not essential to intelligence, in the same way as feathers and flapping wings are not essential to aviation. So, neurons themselves are not the source of intelligence.

Scientists are unable – or unwilling – to define intelligence as a set of natural laws. Without a natural definition of intelligence, AI is limited to engineering: specific solutions to specific problems. **Artificial Neural Networks** (ANN) are engineered to store an average pattern, based on a training set of patterns. As a consequence, the use of ANNs is limited to pattern recognition. And the use of **Deep-learning Neural Networks** (DNN) is limited to perform trained tasks, based on pattern recognition.

ANNs are lacking the logic implemented by natural intelligence. As a consequence, human intelligence (natural intelligence) is required to select the patterns of the training set. Humans are therefore the only naturally intelligent factor in pattern recognition. Not the ANN. The word “[learning](#)” is therefore a misfit term when used in regard to an ANN. To illustrate:

We don't have to feed a child thousands of pictures of a cat before a child is able to recognize a cat. One example of a cat may be sufficient for a child to distinguish this type of animal from other types of animal. At the moment the child sees another cat, it will point to the animal and ask “[Cat?](#)”, in order to get a confirmation that it has learned to distinguish this type of animal from other types of animal correctly.

My father taught me: “[Don't become a monkey that learns a trick](#)”. DNNs are engineered to perform a trick, based on pattern recognition. DNNs are lacking natural intelligence. So, they don't understand the essence of the task. Therefore, they need to be trained. Human intelligence (natural intelligence) is required to design the algorithms that describe the essence of the task. After a lot of training runs, the DNN has mastered to perform that trick, without understanding the essence of the task. Having designed the training algorithms, humans are the only naturally intelligent factor in performing the trained trick of a DNN. Not the DNN itself. The word “[learning](#)” is therefore also a misfit term in regard to a DNN. To illustrate:

We don't need to play a game thousands of times, before a child is able to play that game. [Explaining the rules of the game](#) may be sufficient for a child to play a game, while the rules of a game can't be explained to a DNN.

In our brain, pattern recognition doesn't provide the intelligence itself. Pattern recognition only provides the input for the intelligent (=hard-coded) brain. Self-driving cars work in a similar way: Pattern recognition provides the input on which the programmed logic responds.

The only way to improve pattern recognition in machines: To identify individual parts of each object, like the left ear of a cat, its right ear, its nose, its whiskers, its mouth, its tail, each eye, each leg, and so on.

1.4.1. Deep-learning networks applied to natural language

Deep-learning networks are able to recognize and to produce patterns of a language. But they are unable to grasp the meaning expressed by humans through natural language, because **Natural language is like algebra and programming languages**: It has “variables” (keywords) and “functions” (structure words).

In natural language, keywords – mainly nouns and proper nouns – provide the knowledge, while the logical structure of sentences is provided by words like definite article “**the**”, conjunction “**or**”, basic verb “**is/are**”, possessive verb “**has/have**” and past tense verbs “**was/were**” and “**had**”.

However, deep-learning networks are not hard-wired to process logic. So, this technique is unable to process the logic that is embedded in natural language. And therefore, this technique is unable to grasp the deeper meaning expressed by humans through natural language.

Deep-learning networks are based on pattern recognition. And therefore, they are limited to perform tasks based on pattern recognition.

1.5. Fundamental flaw in NLP

The quality of a system is determined by the quality of its output, divided by the quality of its input. The quality of the current approach to NLP is very bad:

- Rich and meaningful sentences *in*;
- Artificially linked keywords *out*.

During the NLP process, the logical structure of the sentences is lost, like a two-dimensional movie has lost the three-dimensional spatial information. To prove this loss of the logical structure – and the poor state of the current approach to NLP: You will not find any system – other than Thinknowlogy – able to convert a sentence like “**Paul is a son of John**” to “**John has a son, called Paul**” – and vice versa – in a generic way (=through an algorithm).

Both sentences mentioned above have the same meaning. So, it is possible to convert one sentence to the other – and back – through an algorithm. So, why are scientists unable to define such an algorithm?

Only if the involved laws of nature are understood, one is able to convert light to electricity and back, motion to electricity and back, and so on. In the same way, converting one sentence to another – while preserving the quality (=meaning) – requires to understand the Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar. However, not a single scientific paper supports the mentioned conversion in a generic way (=through an algorithm).

In its infancy, Thinknowlogy only accepts a limited grammar. However, its output has (almost) the same quality as its input, which is a quality ratio of (almost) 100%. It proves: Thinknowlogy preserves the meaning.

1.5.1. Blind spot in NLP

Natural language is like algebra and programming languages:

Natural language has “variables” (keywords) and “functions” (structure words). However, in NLP, only the keywords are used, while the natural structure of the knowledge is discarded. As a consequence, the field of NLP got stuck with “bags of keywords”, which have lost their meaning (=natural structure).

In natural language, keywords – mainly nouns and proper nouns – provide the knowledge, while the logical structure of sentences is provided by words like definite article “[the](#)”, conjunction “[or](#)”, basic verb “[is/are](#)”, possessive verb “[has/have](#)” and past tense verbs “[was/were](#)” and “[had](#)”. My [challenge document](#) describes some basic reasoning constructions, based on the logical structure of sentences.

Scientists are ignorant of the logical structure of sentences. Instead of preserving this natural structure, they teach us to throw away the natural structure, and to link keywords by an artificial structure (semantic techniques). Hence the struggling of this field to grasp the deeper meaning expressed by humans, and the inability to automatically construct readable sentences from derived knowledge (automated reasoning in natural language).

As a consequence, this field has a blind spot on the conjunction of logic and language.

A science integrates its involved disciplines. However, the field of AI and NLP doesn't integrate (automated) reasoning and natural language. There are roughly three categories in this field involved with natural language and/or reasoning. However, scientists are unable – or unwilling – to integrate them beyond reasoning with verb “[is/are](#)” in the present tense:

- [Chatbots](#), [Virtual Assistants](#) and [Natural Language Generation \(NLG\) techniques](#) are unable to reason logically. They are only able to select human-written sentences, in which they may fill-in user-written keywords;
- Reasoners like [Prolog](#) are able to reason logically. But they only have keywords as output. So, their results can't be expressed in automatically constructed sentences. As a consequence, laymen are unable to use this kind of reasoner;
- Controlled Natural Language (CNL) reasoners are able to reason logically in a very limited grammar. But they are able to autonomously construct sentences, word by word.

In order to uplift this field to a science, the following three steps are required to close the loop for reasoning in natural language:

1. Conversion from a sentence in natural language to an almost language-independent knowledge structure;
2. Logical reasoning applied to the almost language-independent knowledge structure;
3. Conversion of the result of the reasoner – the derived knowledge – to a readable and autonomously – word by word – constructed sentences.

Only CNL reasoners tick all boxes mentioned above for reasoning in natural language. However, they are limited to sentences with verb “[is/are](#)” in the present tense. So, they don't accept, implement and use structure words like definite article “[the](#)”, conjunction “[or](#)”, possessive verb “[has/have](#)” and past tense verbs “[was/were](#)” and “[had](#)”.

Some people believe that meaning will evolve “by itself” (see Evolutionary intelligence), while others believe that the meaning is preserved by parsing all words of a sentence. But they all fail to integrate reasoning and natural language beyond verb “[is/are](#)” in the present tense.

1.5.2. Fundamental flaw in the Turing test

The [Turing test](#) has a fundamental flaw: The quality of the jury isn't specified. So, any chatbot can pass the Turing test if a jury is selected who is easily impressed, or if the subject (chatbot) is presented to the jury as a foreign child who may have problems to understand the given sentences, by which the jury becomes biased through compassion for the ‘child’.

Besides that, chatbots are unable to reason logically. So, it is extremely simple to determine whether the subject is a person or chatbot: Let the subject perform an intelligent reasoning task, as described in [the challenge to beat the simplest results of my Controlled Natural Language reasoner](#).

For example, provide the subject with a sentence like “[Paul is a son of John](#)” and the following algorithm:

- Swap both proper nouns;
- Replace basic verb “[is](#)” by possessive verb “[has](#)” (or vice versa);
- Replace preposition “[of](#)” by adjective “[called](#)” (or vice versa).

Now ask the subject to apply the given algorithm to the given sentence, which should result in a different sentence with the same meaning. The outcome must be: “[John has a son, called Paul](#)”, as described in [the first block of my challenge](#). To be sure, ask the subject to apply the given algorithm in the opposite direction, to convert “[John has a son, called Paul](#)”. The outcome must be of course: “[Paul is a son of John](#)”.

Not a single scientific paper supports the conversion a sentence like “[Paul is a son of John](#)” to “[John has a son, called Paul](#)” – nor vice versa – in a generic way (=through an algorithm). So, it would become immediately clear if the subject is a person or a chatbot.

Another way of separating humans from chatbots as a jury, is to only present confusing phrases that are not finished, completely out of context and not related to each other. If the subject initially responds despairingly – and stops responding after a while – then the subject is human. But if the subject keeps responding cheerfully with full sentences, then the subject is a chatbot.

1.6. The competence limit of scientists

Predicate Logic (algebra) has a fundamental problem when applied to linguistics: It doesn't naturally go beyond basic verb "to be" in the present tense. Apparently, this defines the competence limit of scientists. It will be illustrated by three examples: Competence, touching the limit, and incompetence.

1) Calculation that can be automated through an algorithm:

The following calculation can be automated through current techniques – from a sentence with basic verb "is/are", through an algorithm, back to a self-constructed sentence with basic verb "is/are" – because basic verb "is/are" is supported by algebra / Predicate Logic:

- > Given: "Shirley is 2 years older than Amy."
- > Given: "Shirley and Amy are together 20 years old."
-
- Logical conclusions:
 - < "Shirley is 11 years old."
 - < "Amy is 9 years old."

2) Automated calculation that touches the competence limit of scientists:

The following calculation can be automated through current techniques. But it touches the competence limit of scientists:

- > Given: "Amy has three apples."
- > Given: "Shirley has four apples."
-
- A logical conclusion would be:
 - < "Amy and Shirley have seven apples (together)."

However, algebra / Predicate Logic is not defined for possessive verb "has/have". So, in a strict scientific sense, this conclusion can't be automated through an algorithm, because the use of possessive verb "has/have" is not supported by algebra / Predicate Logic.

But when we encounter a calculation containing possessive verb "has/have", we have been unconsciously taught at elementary school to convert it into a verb "is/are" problem first:

-
- Logical conclusion:
 - < "Three apples and four apples are seven apples (together)."

This conclusion is of course the linguistic equivalent of equation " $3 + 4 = 7$ ", which is supported by algebra. So, the problem is solved thanks to a workaround.

3) Automated assumption that is out of reach for scientists:

The following assumption can't be automated by scientists, because the use of possessive verb "has/have" is not supported by algebra / Predicate Logic:

- > Given: "Every liquid **has** a specific boiling point."
- > Given: "Water **has** a boiling point of 100 degrees centigrade at 1 bar air pressure."
-
- Logical assumption:
- < "Water **is** probably a liquid."

Any algorithm that implements this conversion, is not supported by algebra / Predicate Logic, and therefore not supported by science. This defines the competence limit of scientists.

If you don't agree, please provide me a peer-reviewed scientific paper describing a similar conversion, from a sentence with possessive verb "has/have", through an algorithm, to a self-constructed sentence with basic verb "is/are", or vice versa.

1.6.1. Predicate Logic

Algebra / Predicate Logic is not equipped to process linguistics. It describes logic expressed by present tense verb "is/are" in a natural way. But it doesn't describe the logic of the **complimentary function** of verb "is/are", namely verb "has/have". Neither does it describe the logic of their **past tense functions**, namely verb "was/were" and verb "had". As a consequence, automated reasoners are unable to read and write sentences with possessive verb "has/have" and with past tense verbs "was/were" and "had".

A lot of structure words (non-keywords) have a naturally intelligent function in language. However, their naturally intelligent function is not described in any scientific paper. Apparently, scientists don't understand their naturally intelligent function in language.

Being unable to describe possessive logic in a natural way, another workaround is created, by adding possessive logic in an artificial way:

- Possessive logic must be programmed directly into the reasoner, like "has_son(john,paul)";
- Besides that, lacking a generic solution, the same logic needs to be programmed for each and every new noun. So, separate functions must be programmed for "has_daughter", "has_father", "has_mother", "has_teacher", "has_student", and so on;
- Moreover, in order to enable multilingual reasoning, all existing knowledge described in one language, needs to be translated to each and every new language.

This is engineering (specific solutions to specific problems) instead of science (a generic solution). Actually, it is a bad example of engineering. This is madness. We need to uplift the field of AI and NLP from engineering to a science.

1.6.2. Controlled Natural Language

Controlled Natural Language (CNL) reasoners allow users to enter Predicate Logic in natural language-like sentences. However, Predicate Logic doesn't go naturally beyond the present tense of basic verb "to be". So, also CNL reasoners don't go naturally beyond verb "is/are".

As a consequence, CNL reasoners are unable to convert a sentence like "Paul is a son of John" to "John has a son, called Paul" – and vice versa – in a generic way (=through an algorithm), because the latter sentence contains verb "has". As a workaround, this conversion needs to be programmed for each and ever relationship:

- First of all, a rule must be added: "If a man(1) is-a-son-of a man(2) then the man(2) has-a-son-called the man(1)";
- In order to trigger this rule, the relationship between "Paul" and "John" needs to be written with hyphens between the words: "Paul is-a-son-of John". And the outcome will also contain hyphens: "John has-a-son-called Paul";
- And the above must be repeated for each and ever similar noun: for "daughter", for "father", for "mother", for "teacher", for "student", and so on.

This engineered workaround is clearly not generic, and therefore not scientific.

Besides that, while predicate logic describes both the **Inclusive OR** and **Exclusive OR** (XOR) function, CNL reasoners don't implement conjunction "or". So, CNL reasoners are unable to generate the following question:

- > Given: "Every person is a man or a woman."
- > Given: "Addison is a person."
-
- Generated question:
- < "Is Addison a man or a woman?"

As a workaround for lacking an implementation of conjunction "or", CNL reasoners need three sentences to describe sentence "Every person is a man or a woman" in a similar way:

- "Every man is a person.";
- "Every woman is a person.";
- "No woman is a man and no man is a woman."

Even though their workaround sentence "No woman is a man and no man is a woman" describes an **Exclusive OR** (XOR) function, scientists are still unable – or unwilling – to implement automatically generated questions in a generic way (=through an algorithm).

Both problems mentioned above – the inability to convert a sentence through an algorithm and the inability to generate a question through an algorithm – make clear that scientists are unable – or unwilling – to integrate reasoning (=natural intelligence) and natural language in artificial systems.

Lawyers have no problems to write down logic in legal documents, using natural language. So, why are scientists unable – or unwilling – to integrate logic and natural language in artificial systems?

Legal documents are of course accurate in their description: “either ... or ...” is used to describe an **Exclusive OR** function, and the combination “and/or” is used to describe an **Inclusive OR** function. In daily life, instead of the combination “and/or”, we add “or both” to the sentence. In most other cases of conjunction “or”, we mean an **Exclusive OR** function.

So, in daily life, “Coffee or tea?” – short for “**Either coffee or tea?**” – describes an **Exclusive OR** function, while “Warm milk or a sleeping pill? **Or both?**” describes an **Inclusive OR** function.

Note: In these examples, the conjunction separates a series of words of the same word type. In these cases, a series of singular nouns. But also in imperative sentences like “Do ..., **or you'll have to face the consequences**”, conjunction “or” implements an **Exclusive OR** function. Because the sender gives the receiver an exclusive choice: “**Either do ..., or you'll have to face the consequences**”.

1.6.3. The function of word types in reasoning

There is another fundamental problem when Predicate Logic is applied to linguistics: It doesn't specify word types.

For example, instead of “**All humans are mortal**”, it is perfectly fine in Predicate Logic to write “**All blue are mortal**”. But this sentence construction is grammatically invalid for any adjective. It is only valid for plural nouns.

In order to be applicable to natural language, Predicate Logic should describe the word type of each variable. In this case, it should define that the first variable (second word) should be a plural noun, and that the second variable (last word) should be an adjective.

Let's consider the following equation: “**Every car has an engine**” equals to “**An engine is part of every car**”. I state that this equation is true for any singular noun. However, unaware of the function of word types in language, scientists try to prove my fundamental approach wrong by using a proper noun, like: “**John has a son**” equals to “**A son is part of every John**”, which is nonsense of course.

So, despite of using different types in common programming languages – such as booleans, integers and strings – scientists are ignorant of the function of the different word types when it comes to reasoning in natural language.

The notation of the definitions in [the challenge](#) I launched, repairs both problems: Preserving word type information, as well as reasoning beyond the present tense of basic verb “**is/are**” (see Predicate Logic). Abbreviations can be used later, in order to make the notation compact.

2. The fundamental approach of Thinknowlogy

Since the origin of life is subject to discussion, the starting point of all research involved with the origin of life depends on the world view of the researcher. It includes the way the field of AI and NLP is researched, in regard to intelligence, natural language and laws of nature:

- Despite exhaustive research, the theory of evolution still hasn't provided a satisfactory explanation for the origin of intelligence, language and laws of nature. Let alone, how they are related. Evolutionists consider the origin of intelligence as one of the biggest mysteries. And they consider the origin of language as “[one of the hardest problems in science](#)”³;
- According to the biblical world view, all natural systems are created by God. It includes laws of nature, to make his creation run like clockwork, in a unified, structured and deterministic⁴ way. It means that all natural phenomena must obey the laws of nature. So, it must be possible to define the laws of intelligence, in a unifying, structured and deterministic (=implementable) way. And because all natural phenomena are designed in a unified way, natural intelligence and natural language may be related. If so, it must be possible to identify the laws that are obeyed by language (Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar), by which we are able to reconstruct the language center of our brain, by a process of reverse-engineering.

Furthermore, according to the biblical world view, life and the universe were all designed once. And no improvements were made afterwards. So – if intelligence and language are related – current languages must still obey the same laws of intelligence as was designed in the beginning, regardless of all their differences⁵. Then, current languages still must share a common logic.

Proof of the pudding: An application to daily life. Because if research is evidence-based, this evidence can be applied to daily life. Or the other way around: If the result of research can't be applied to daily life, there was no real evidence.

3 I own a printed copy of the Encyclopædia Britannica, the 1990 edition. On both topics – intelligence and language – it praises the founding fathers of the theory of evolution for their contribution to these topics. But why praising the founding fathers, while their theories haven't provided a satisfactory explanation for the origin of intelligence, and while language still is “[one of the hardest problems in science](#)”?

4 deterministic: “[the doctrine that all facts and events exemplify natural laws](#)”

5 The existence of entirely different languages today, is explained in the bible: “[At one time all the people of the world spoke the same language and used the same words](#)” ([Genesis 11:1](#)). During the building of the tower of Babel, God confused the tongues: “[Come, let's go down and confuse the people with different languages. Then they won't be able to understand each other](#)” ([Genesis 11:7](#)).

2.1. Natural intelligence

In order to contribute to science, intelligence need to be defined in a unifying, fundamental (=natural) and deterministic ⁶ (=implementable) way:

Natural intelligence is the natural ability **to organize independently**.

It is the extent to which one is able to independently:

- [group](#) what belongs together;
- [separate](#) what doesn't belong together;
- [archive](#) what is no longer relevant;
- [plan](#) future actions;
- [foresee](#) the consequences that the planned actions will have;
- [learn](#) from mistakes.

Assuming that natural language is an intelligent system, predictions can be made on the intelligence that will be found in language:

1. Natural language will have self-organizing abilities;
2. In expressing knowledge, our brain adds clues to the knowledge that we convey;
3. In receiving knowledge, our brain will use those clues in order to organize the received knowledge.

In all languages, there will be specific words – or word constructions – for:

- [grouping](#) knowledge that belongs together;
- [separating](#) knowledge that doesn't belong together;
- [archiving](#) knowledge that is no longer relevant;
- [planning](#) future actions;
- [foreseeing](#) the consequences that the planned actions will have;
- [learning](#) from mistakes.

Natural intelligence applied to natural language is called: **natural meaning**.

2.1.1. The impact of the discovering of natural intelligence

The discovery of natural intelligence – embedded in natural language – will prove that natural language provides logic beyond the logic described in scientific papers. It will prove that the logic described by science is limited to verb “[is/are](#)” in the present tense, while scientists are ignorant of for example possessive logic and past tense logic. Illustrated by a metaphor, the logic described by science is like a calculator with only the addition (‘+’) button, while the calculator of natural language also provides buttons for subtraction (‘-’), multiplication (‘×’), division (‘÷’), root calculation (‘√’), and so on.

6 deterministic: “[the doctrine that all facts and events exemplify natural laws](#)”

2.2. Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar

Logical clues that are embedded in grammar, provide information to our brain how to structure / organize the gained knowledge. These clues include specific words for [grouping](#), [separating](#) and [archiving](#) (see definition of natural intelligence). By using these clues provided by grammar – or (Natural Laws of) Intelligence embedded in Grammar – we are able to implement a self-organizing (=intelligent) knowledge technology, similar to the way nature works in the language center of our brain:

- Conjunction “[and](#)” has the intelligent function in language to [group](#) knowledge;
- Conjunction “[or](#)” has the intelligent (Exclusive OR) function in language to [separate](#) knowledge;
- A definite article (in English: “[the](#)”) has the intelligent function in language to [archive](#) knowledge;
- An indefinite article (in English: “[a](#)”) defines a structure, which is [already known for a few centuries](#);
- Basic verb “[is/are](#)” defines present tense basic logic, which is [already known for a few centuries](#);
- Basic verb “[was/were](#)” defines [past tense](#) basic logic;
- Possessive verb “[has/have](#)” defines present tense [direct](#) and [indirect](#) possessive logic;
- Possessive verb “[had](#)” defines [past tense direct](#) and [indirect](#) possessive logic.

Besides that, grammar also provides logical reasoning constructions, as described from paragraph [2.3.1 Specification Substitution Conclusions](#) of the [Theory](#) document.

These Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar drive a set of structuring algorithms ⁷ in my system, in order to independently [group](#), [separate](#) and [archive](#) knowledge in its knowledge base.

So, the basics of natural language: Grammar provides the general structure of separate words, by which the words form a sentence. And the laws of intelligence – that are embedded in grammar – provide the logical structure of separate words and separate sentences, by which the words and sentences make sense.

Scientists are unable – or unwilling – to define intelligence as a set of natural laws. Therefore, scientists are unable – or unwilling – to add natural intelligence to chatbots, virtual assistants and robots ('bots' for short). As a consequence, *bots* are lacking natural intelligence: Either they are limited to programmed dialogues, or the sentences they produce don't make sense.

⁷ algorithm: “[any set of detailed instructions which results in a predictable end-state from a known beginning](#)”

2.2.1. Example: Autonomous generation of questions

Not a single scientific paper describes automatically generated questions in a generic way (=through an algorithm), like:

- > Given: “Every person is a man **or** a woman.”
- > Given: “Addison is a person.”
-
- Generated question:
< “Is Addison a man **or** a woman?”

The implementation of this kind of automatically generated questions is extremely simple when Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar are used:

- A Natural Law of Intelligence embedded in Grammar: Conjunction “or” has the intelligent (Exclusive OR) function in language to [separate](#) knowledge;
- Given “Every person is a man **or** a woman” and “Addison is a person”;
- Substitution of both sentences: “Addison is a man **or** a woman”;
- Conversion to a question: “Is Addison a man **or** a woman?”.

Note: In most cases, a conjunction separates a series of words of the same word type. In this case, a series of singular nouns.

2.2.2. Improve your ontology system towards a grammar-based approach

Why wait for scientists to accept a grammar-based approach? You can improve your own ontology system gradually towards a grammar-based approach:

- Start to implement [the challenge](#) I launched to beat the simplest results of my Controlled Natural Language reasoner;
- Then expand your system by implementing the reasoning constructions – listed in [the design document](#) – that are not listed in the challenge document;
- [Contact me](#) for more improvements.

2.3. Intelligence – more into depth

Intelligence is a natural phenomenon, which can be described as the extent to which one is able to **organize independently**. More specific, to **independently**:

- avoid chaos;
- create order;
- restore order.

Basic capabilities of intelligence are:

- **Grouping** (combining) of individual or separate objects, with the aim of achieving a goal that can not be achieved by either of those objects separately;
- **Separating** (differentiating) compound or intertwined objects, with the aim to clarify the situation, by putting them in their own context;
- **Archiving** of obsolete information, separating current from obsolete information;
- **Planning** future actions, setting goals and anticipation to changes;
- **Foreseeing** possible consequences: Using knowledge and experience to predict possible consequences of planned actions (own plans and planned actions of others);
- **Learning from mistakes**: Using knowledge and experience to determine the course of a mistake, and to avoid making this kind of mistake in the future.

These capabilities of intelligence can be applied to basic concepts like: numbers, language and spatial objects. Grouping of for example numbers, we call: adding. Separating of numbers, we call: subtracting.

Deepening:

- Creation starts with **grouping**;
- Understanding starts with **separating**;
- Omitting starts with **archiving**;
- Governing starts with **planning**;
- Anticipation starts with **foreseeing**;
- Improvement starts with **learning from mistakes**.

I am implementing **grouping**, **separating** and **archiving** as much as possible, while leaving the implementation of the remaining capabilities to future generations.

2.3.1. Autonomy / independently

In the definition of natural intelligence, the word “[independently](#)” is used. So, we need to define that word – or the word actually “[autonomy](#)” – as well:

An autonomous system relies on the consistency of a **natural** source, or a consistent artificial source like GPS ([Global Positioning System](#)). So, an autonomously intelligent system relies on the consistency of a natural source of intelligence.

In contrast, current information systems rely on **artificial** sources of intelligence, like semantic vocabularies, ontology databases and statistics. Only Thinknowlogy uses a natural source of intelligence: grammar, or more accurate: Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar.

Scientists have no clue how nature works in regard to intelligence and language. So, they implement "something" that looks like nature. But they have no proof that nature works that way. “Inspired by nature”, scientists in this field are engineering specific solutions to specific problems, while a science deliver generic solutions. So, I know that their approach in fundamentally wrong.

The "scientific" approach is comparable to an old-fashioned car, in which the driver needs to operate most functions of the car manually, and in which the driver needs to navigate him/herself to an unknown address. My fundamental approach is comparable to a self-driving car, in which more and more functions are automated. It is based on the logic of language, which is a natural – and thus a consistent – source of intelligence.

2.3.2. IQ test

When comparing IQ tests to the above definition of natural intelligence, it becomes clear that IQ tests are focused on the capabilities [grouping](#) and [separating](#). But they are lacking tests for [archiving](#), [planning](#), [foreseeing](#) and [learning from mistakes](#).

But more important than a high IQ score: **Is one's worldview in accordance with the way nature works?**

One can have an extremely high IQ score, and develop many new theories. But what is the contribution of those theories, when those theories can't be applied to daily life? Only theories that are in accordance with the way nature works, can be applied to daily life.

2.4. Universal Grammar theory

In his [Universal Grammar theory](#), [Noam Chomsky](#) proposes that the ability to learn a language is hard-wired in the brain. This theory is heavily debated among evolutionists. But deniers of this theory have no alternative explanation – let alone an artificial implementation – that is supported by experimental evidence.

In my Controlled Natural Language (CNL) reasoner, [one set of logical rules](#) is configured for multiple languages. So, it implements the Universal Grammar theory with a difference: There is no Universal Grammar, but there are **Universal Rules of Logic embedded in Grammar**. Or as I would say: There are Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar.

Logic / algebra itself is language independent. And universal rules of logic seem hard-wired in the language center of our brain. When children learn a language, the grammar of this universal logic is ‘configured’ for a language, which will be their native language / mother tongue.

My CNL reasoner works in a similar way: By embedding one set of logic / algebra / universal reasoning rules, my reasoner is (almost) language independent. During start-up, the software reads five grammar configuration files, which configure this universal logic for five languages. After start-up, my reasoner is able to read, to reason and to autonomously write – word-by-word constructed sentences – in [English](#), [Spanish](#), [French](#), [Dutch](#) and [Chinese](#).

When a sentence is entered, this sentence is converted to a language-independent knowledge structure. Then universal reasoning rules are applied to that knowledge structure. After which, the derived knowledge is written as readable sentences, in the same language as the input sentence.

Semantic techniques require each word to be defined in a words list. But we don’t feed a words list to babies and toddlers either, in order to learn their mother tongue. My CNL reasoner has no extensive words list either. The difference between semantic techniques and the universal logic techniques of CNL reasoners is illustrated by a well-known Chinese saying: “[Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime](#)”. My CNL reasoner only has a few basic words defined upfront. Instead, it has grammar definitions⁸, and an algorithm⁹ that determines the word type of each unknown word, like adjective, singular noun and plural noun.

8 See download, sub-directory: data/grammar/

9 See source code: class *AdminReadCreateWords*, function *createReadWords*

2.5. *Other sources of intelligence*

Language is not the only source of intelligence. Animals like dolphins, crows and chimpanzees show intelligent behavior regarding to spacial information. So, spacial information is another source of logical information (intelligence). An example:

If a room has only one entrance, and there are no temporary entrances, and there is an object inside that room, then we can conclude: Either that room is built around that object, or that object must have entered the room through that one entrance. So, if we see a classical miniature ship in a bottle, and this bottle has no temporary entrances like a separate bottom, either the bottle is built around that ship, but more likely, the ship has entered the bottle through the bottleneck.

More derived spacial information: The miniature ship consists of multiple components, leaving the audience in awe which of those components were already attached, and which were attached later on. (But its party trick is of course the unfolding of the masts and sails.)

Creating a miniature ship in a bottle requires capabilities of natural intelligence, like [grouping](#), [separating](#), [planning](#) and probably also [learning from mistakes](#). Not only the creator, but also the audience watching the end result, will need capabilities of natural intelligence in order to analyze the problems involved with this peculiar object. A curious person who sees a miniature ship in a bottle for the first time, will not just say “nice” and walk away. Apparently, the laws of nature involved with spacial information are already present in the brain. They will trigger the brain of a curious person when the spacial information doesn’t add up.

Illusionists are masters in hiding aspects of spacial information, by which the spacial information visible to the audience doesn’t add up: Objects seem to appear and disappear without visible action taken.

I like the artwork of [M.C. Escher](#). He understood the logical structures of spatial information very well. In his artwork, Escher plays with the outer lines of objects like birds and fish. In other artwork, Escher deliberately applied the logical structures of spatial information in a wrong way, by which this artwork seems 'wrong'. Brilliant!

Objects like birds and fish structured in artwork, are like keywords structured in a sentence.

A lot of daily activities – like anticipation in traffic and sports – require capabilities of natural intelligence in order to process a lot of spacial information in a fraction of a second. It includes capabilities like [grouping](#), [separating](#), [planning](#), [foreseeing](#) and [learning from mistakes](#). Experience (training) helps to use as much spacial information as possible within a short time frame. In self-driving cars and trucks, the processing of spacial information is more and more automated to our benefit. In fact, these are also artificial implementations of natural intelligence (within a limited domain). Prefix “self” in “self-driving” refers to the natural origin of the spacial information.

3. The theory of evolution is not scientific

Financed by taxpayers, science is about serving society, by researching the fundamentals of nature, based on facts and observations. However, in some fields of science, facts and observations have become subordinate to fictional theories (belief systems). As a consequence, none of the fictional phenomena – claimed by these believes – can be applied to daily life, by which these fields don't serve society anymore.

In contrast, the field of electromagnetism is scientific – based on facts and observations – because its manifestations – electricity, magnetism and light – can be generated, and applied to daily life. In this way, the field of electromagnetism serves society.

However, [none of the claimed phenomena that are exclusive to the theory of evolution – or its derivative theories – can be generated, nor applied to daily life.](#)

Or the other way around: [None of the applications to daily life is exclusive to the theory of evolution or its derivative theories.](#)

Most of the claimed phenomena of the theory of evolution – and its derivative theories – are simply not observed, and can't therefore be applied to daily life. Examples:

- **String theory**, the assumed strings aren't observed;
- **Dark energy theory**, the assumed dark energy isn't observed;
- **Dark matter theory**, the assumed dark matter isn't observed;
- **Multiverse theory**, the assumed 'other' universes aren't observed;
- **Oort cloud theory**, the assumed Oort cloud isn't located, and therefore isn't observed;
- **Extraterrestrial life theory**, the assumed extraterrestrial life isn't located, and therefore isn't observed;
- **Transition of Kinds theory**, none of the assumed transitions of kinds (like: rock minerals → microbes → vegetation → animals → humans) is ever observed.

And the phenomena that are claimed to be observed – like the Higgs boson and gravitational waves – can't be invoked, generated or captured, by which they can't be applied to daily life:

- Scientists cannot harvest energy from the assumed gravitational waves;
- Scientists cannot power space rocks by the assumed dark energy;
- Scientists cannot explode another universe;
- Scientists cannot evolve life from dead material.

As long as we – humans – are unable to create life from dead material, the origin of life can only be believed. And as long as we – humans – are unable to create another universe from scratch, the origin of the universe can only be believed.

Science is not based on beliefs. Therefore, the origin of life and the universe themselves are not part of science. And therefore, the theory of evolution and its derivative theories – including the assumed phenomena – are not scientific. Instead, they are part of a religion:

[Science is about observed phenomena, while religion is about unobserved phenomena.](#)

3.1. The theory of evolution is a religion

Science is about observed phenomena, while religion is about unobserved phenomena.

God himself can't be observed, neither can the claimed phenomena of the theory of evolution – and its derivative theories – be observed. So, both are believes / religions.

However, evolutionists are moving away from anything observed in nature, because everything in nature proves its intelligently designed origin. Instead of researching the way nature works, evolutionists are creating a web of invented theories – ever increasing in complexity – without any application to daily life. And thus, without any practical benefit for those who finance the theory of evolution: the taxpayers.

The theory of evolution is nothing but an interpretation of the past, that fails to contribute to the future. It only contributes to itself: An even more complex web of theories.

In contrast with evolutionists, creationists are aware that their religion is not scientific. And they recognize that nature is intelligently designed. So, they are determined to research the way nature works. If there is any truth in their belief, creationists will continue to make new discoveries in nature, which they will apply to daily life, for the benefit of all.

Creationists expect to find in nature: laws, logic, order, structure, unity and evolution – as in natural selection within one species. And evolutionists expect to find chaos, complexity and self-improving evolution in nature. So, evolutionists are not prepared when creationists find laws, logic, order, structure and unity in nature, like the Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar that I discovered.

The theory of evolution is a religion, because it assigns great deeds to a person / power / process that can't be observed.

Actually, evolutionists are the best help in proving the existence of God. Because they are determined to explore all possibilities in order to deny a creator of life and the universe. But they won't find any hard and direct evidence. In this way, an unintelligent origin of life and the universe can be ruled out. So, the only possibility left – to explain the existence of life and the universe – is an intelligent origin.

3.2. Overwhelming evidence...

Evolutionists claim there is “overwhelming evidence” for the theory of evolution. But they just take ordinary observations, and claim they are proof of macro-evolution, while the assumed macro-evolution itself can't be observed. For example, no one has ever observed the hatching of a turkey from a chicken egg.

To illustrate how this unscientific method goes wrong, we can claim there is “overwhelming evidence” for Santa Claus too:

- Advertisements forecast his coming;
- Then he appears everywhere at once;
- Presents are given;
- His address is known: North pole 1;
- You can meet him in person;
- And if you post/mail/text/app a message, you will get a response.

But we all know: Santa Claus is just a belief. So is macro-evolution, and the rest of the theory of evolution. It is a belief.

3.3. If you do not believe in cows...

We all know: milk contains components like water, living bacteria and fungi.

If you do not believe in cows – and you would examine a glass of milk – you will have to conclude: The living bacteria and fungi have created the milk from water.

But if you do believe in cows, you will know that these animals produce milk from grass and water. Furthermore: You will know that the living bacteria and fungi actually degenerate the milk, instead of creating it. So, evolution is in fact: degeneration ¹⁰.

[Evolutionists go wrong that easy when it comes to the origin of the life and the universe.](#)

3.4. Mona Lisa

When I look at the Mona Lisa, I know it is a master piece of a genius. And exactly one person has claimed to be the artist: Leonardo da Vinci. I believe him, because he has left a detailed description how he has created this painting. We can learn from this artist how to use Natural Laws of Geometry in order to create beauty.

When I look at nature, I know it is a master piece of a genius. And exactly one person has claimed to be the artist: God. I believe him, because he has left a detailed description how he has created nature. We can learn from this artist for example how to define intelligence in a natural way (as a set of natural laws), and how to use Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar in order to implement natural intelligence through natural language in software.

10 This example originates from Peter Scheele. More info on Wikipedia: [Devolution \(biology\)](#). The cows are of course a metaphor for God, who has designed and created the laws of nature, the universe and life.

3.5. Self-organizing systems

According to the theory of evolution, evolution has self-organizing properties. Therefore, evolutionists sometimes call an intelligently designed system: self-organizing. A contradiction in terms.

Prefix “self” in “self-organizing” deeply refers to the natural origin of the observed system: “organizing by nature”. So, if an artificial system is able to organize, it only deserves prefix “self” if it implements the involved laws of nature. Otherwise, the organizing capabilities of that system are designed and implemented by humans (intelligent design). Such a system is “programmed to organize”. It is not “self-organizing” (organizing by nature).

In order to find the laws in nature involved with organization, we should define intelligence in a unifying, fundamental (=natural) and deterministic (=implementable) way. Because intelligence is synonym to self-organization.

Nevertheless, let's put some topics to the test:

- Genetic algorithms are certainly not self-organizing. In contrary, these algorithms are designed to search in an unorganized way: at random. So, genetic algorithms have nothing to do with intelligence;
- Evolutionary algorithms are not self-organizing, because they are designed to find an optimum value. They don't implement the laws of nature involved with intelligence, like grouping, separating and archiving;
- A human-selected test set (ANN) or human-designed algorithm (DNN) is required for Artificial / Deep-learning Neural Networks to recognize patterns, by which humans are the intelligent factor, not the ANN / DNN itself. So, also an ANN / DNN isn't a self-organizing system;
- Fractals are static algorithms, delivering the same pattern every time. They have none of the active capabilities of intelligence. So, fractals are certainly not self-organizing self-organizing, and have therefore nothing to do with intelligence;
- Also the forming of ice crystals and ice crystal patterns is passive: The involved water molecules just obey the laws of physics, without showing any active capability. So, ice crystals have no self-organizing capabilities;
- Speech detection (from speech to written text) maps an input pattern to a defined output pattern (character or word). Mapping is a one-on-one peer connection. It isn't grouping, nor separating. So, speech detection has nothing to do with intelligence;
- Artificial Life simulations and swarm robots show the **behavior** of living creatures. But the conditions are programmed upfront. To illustrate: A flight simulator simulates the **behavior** of flight, without leaving to room. Adding random, doesn't provide Artificial Life simulations any of the active capabilities of intelligence. It is just another variety on the same theme.

Improvement requires natural intelligence, while none of the above implements self-organizing capabilities. Neither do genes themselves have self-organizing capabilities. Let alone: self-improving capabilities. They must have been organized by an intelligent being.

3.6. Complex systems

According to the theory of evolution, evolution leads to increasing complexity. But increasing complexity defies all rules of common sense:

- “*The ability to simplify means to eliminate the unnecessary so that the necessary may speak*” (Hans Hofmann);
- “*Things should be as simple as possible, but no simpler*” (Albert Einstein);
- “*If you can't explain it simply, you don't understand it well enough*” (Albert Einstein);
- “*Any intelligent fool can make things bigger, more complex, and more violent. It takes a touch of genius – and a lot of courage – to move in the opposite direction*” (Albert Einstein).

If an observer considers a system to be complex, it is the observer who lacks overview, knowledge and understanding. Only if the observer considers a system **unnecessarily complex**, he/she has a better overview and understanding than the designer of that system.

Natural language is considered to be a complex system, too complex to be processed by current techniques. However, an example like the Autonomous generation of questions doesn't exceed secondary school level. So, it must be a lack of overview and knowledge of scientists, by which they are unable to understand the childishly simple function in language of conjunction “or”.

3.7. Super-intelligence (machines surpassing human intelligence)

First of all, it is funny that some believers of the theory of evolution believe that super-intelligence can evolve in machines:

- while all machines are (intelligently) designed;
- while both intelligence and design originate from the bible;
- while the theory of evolution has no satisfying explanation for the origin of intelligence;
- while scientists are unable to define intelligence as a set of natural laws;
- while some evolutionists even deny the existence of intelligence;
- and while neurons are not essential to intelligence, in the same way as feathers and flapping wings are not essential to aviation.

Besides that, we really need to distinguish “machines surpassing human capabilities **in a limited domain**” from “machines surpassing **human intelligence**”. Super-intelligence requires a machine to surpass humans in all intelligent tasks. Otherwise, it would only surpass humans in a limited domain of programmed tasks.

First, let's consider a few systems that surpass human capabilities **in one only domain**:

- [Deep Blue](#) was able to beat humans in playing chess, but not in playing the game Go;
- [AlphaGo](#) is able to beat humans in playing the game Go, but not in playing chess;
- Bulldozers are able to beat humans in moving an amount of sand. But they are unable to play chess, unable to play Go, unable to cook dinner, unable to babysit, and so on.

Now, let's assume we want to build a machine that surpasses humans **in a more than one domain**. Let's consider to integrate a chess computer with a bulldozer. In this way, we will get a chess-playing bulldozer, or a sand-moving chess computer, that surpasses humans in both playing chess and in moving an amount of sand. It is possible. But it has not been done yet, because such a machine – integrating the capabilities of **different domains** – is very unpractical.

Even if we try to integrate systems of **domains that are less different** – like a car and an airplane – we will eventually discover that the design of the integrated vehicle is weaker than the individual designs of the car and the airplane. So, it is possible to make a road-legal airplane, or a car able to fly. But the integrated vehicle will always be **weaker than the individual designs** of the car and the airplane.

Apparently, we are limited to design systems that surpass human capabilities **in a limited domain**. To me, it proves to me that we have a divine origin. I am sure, the brain has an intelligently designed operating system (OS). Without such an OS, neurons are limited to pattern recognition. I am reverse-engineering the algorithms of the language center of the human brain, that provide us with the ability to reason autonomously.

3.7.1. Spreading fear for super-intelligence

Evolutionists are unable to define intelligence in a natural way (as a set of natural laws), and they are unable to design super-intelligence. Instead, they hope – or fear – that evolution will eventually evolve super-intelligence in machines. So, in their world view, evolution can accomplish things that they can't do. In their world view, evolution is supernatural. And believing in a supernatural entity is called: a belief, a religion.

Actually, the theory of evolution is the only religion that spreads fear for super-intelligence. Religions like Judaism, Christianity and the Islam officially believe that respectively Yahweh, God and Allah has created life and the universe. On the other hand, Hinduism and Buddhism have no explanation for the origin of life and the universe. In search for an answer, some of them combine their religion with the religion of evolution, including the fear for super-intelligence.

Nevertheless, let's assume that we should fear super-intelligence because of [Moore's Law](#). In that case, super-intelligence will first operate in slow-motion, and getting pace later on. Then we have enough time to “pull the plug”.

But what if a robot gets out of control? A robot has no mind of its own. It is just a machine. And machines have a manufacturer. So, it will be same as any other machine getting out of control: You switch it off and sue the manufacturer for delivering an unsafe product. The only problem: How to insure damage caused by autonomously operating machines?

3.7.2. Free will and morality

First of all, it is funny that some evolutionists believe that machines can have morality, while morality originates from the bible, and while the theory of evolution has no satisfying explanation on the origin of morality.

According to the bible, humans separate from animals by having a spirit, which provides humans **a free will** and **a set of morals**. Spirits – being supernatural – are by definition not bound by laws of nature. Therefore, spirits can't be captured in machines, which are bound by laws of nature. So, a machine will never have a spirit; a free will and an autonomously controlled set of morals like humans have.

So, I agree with [John Searle](#) on his [Chinese room thought experiment](#), that computers will never have a mind and consciousness.

But I only agree to a certain extent on his claim that computers can at best simulate intelligent conversations: “[if there is a computer program that allows a computer to carry on an intelligent conversation in a written language, the computer executing the program would not understand the conversation either](#)”. He clearly didn't think of the possibility that Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar can be used to artificially implement natural intelligence in computers through natural language, by which the machine is able to organize knowledge autonomously.

Testimony: I don't have this wisdom of myself

During my young childhood, God asked me if I wanted to become rich or wise. I chose wisdom, because I like the stories about the wisdom of King Solomon. (It wasn't a catch-question: If I had chosen wealth, I had to give everything away, like I give away the results of my wisdom now.)

A few years later, I offered my life to God, as in giving up my own life and desires, and fully dedicate my life to Him. Initially, nothing special happened. I became just another Software Tester. I am talented in software testing, but my talent has its limits. I am not a genius.

A few years ago, God gave me an assignment to prove the theory of evolution wrong, which I have accepted. As promised, God gives me wisdom – insights beyond my own intelligence – as long as I work on this project. If I use the given wisdom for my own good, it will be taken from me. And I was explicitly ordered: “[Give everything away. Keep nothing behind](#)”.

While I was criticizing the current approach to AI and NLP on [LinkedIn](#) for not having a (natural) foundation, nor a (natural) definition of intelligence, someone asked me what definition I used. Then I had to admit to myself that I didn't have a definition of intelligence either. So, I prayed and asked for an answer. Ten minutes later, I was able to write down a unifying, fundamental (=natural) and deterministic (=implementable) definition of intelligence, provided by God. Later I also discovered how this definition is related to language through Natural Laws of Intelligence embedded in Grammar.

Appendix: Genesis hidden in the Chinese language

The Chinese language is the oldest, continuously written language in the world. It was first written over 4,500 years ago. And some Chinese characters seem to refer to first book of the bible (Genesis). A few examples:

The Chinese character for “**to create**” consists of four components, and seems to refer to the creation of “Man” – later called: Adam:

- dust or mud: God has created Adam from dust;
- mouth or breath: God breathed into the nostrils of Adam;
- movement or life: Adam became alive;
- able to walk: Adam was directly able to walk (and to speak).

“Then the LORD God formed the man from the dust of the ground. He breathed the breath of life into the man's nostrils, and the man became a living person.” (Genesis 2 verse 7)

(See on YouTube: “[Genesis hidden in the Chinese language? Part 2](#)”)

The Chinese character for “**to covet, to desire**” consists of two components, and seems to refer to the Fall:

- two trees: the tree of life, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil;
- a woman: “Woman” – later called: Eve – desired the fruit of the only forbidden tree.

(See on YouTube: “[Genesis hidden in the Chinese language? Part 3](#)”)

On YouTube: “[Genesis Code Hidden Within The Ancient Chinese Language](#)”, amongst all:

- The Chinese character for “**first**” consists of three components: alive, dust and man. (Adam – created from dust – was the first man to become alive);
- The Chinese character for “**to talk**” consists of three components: dust, breath/mouth and alive. (Adam – created from dust – was able to talk);
- The Chinese character for “**naked**” consists of two components: man and fruit. (After Adam and Eve had eaten the fruit from the forbidden tree, they felt naked);
- The Chinese character for “**pain**” consists of two components: a piece and two trees. (Pain was a punishment from God for Adam and Eve after they had eaten a piece of fruit from the forbidden tree).

On YouTube: “[How Chinese Characters confirm Genesis & Bible stories](#)”, amongst all:

- The Chinese character for “**flood**” consists of four components: eight, united, earth and water. (Noah, his wife and their three sons with their wives, all eight were united in their boat, while the surface of the Earth was flooded with water).