

From the buzzing in Turing's head to machine intelligence contests

Conference or Workshop Item

Published Version

Shah, H. and Warwick, K. (2010) From the buzzing in Turing's head to machine intelligence contests. In: TCIT 2010: Towards a Comprehensive Intelligence Test - Reconsidering the Turing Test for the 21st Century, 29 Mar-1 Apr 2010, De Montfort University, Leicester, UK. Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/17371/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

From the Buzzing in Turing’s Head to Machine Intelligence Contests

Huma Shah¹, Kevin Warwick²

Abstract. This paper presents an analysis of three major contests for machine intelligence. We conclude that a new era for Turing’s test requires a fillip in the guise of a committed sponsor, not unlike DARPA, funders of the successful 2007 Urban Challenge.

1 INTRODUCTION

In this paper we analyse three current competitions for machine intelligence. All three have featured at least one artificial conversational entity – ACE, as a contestant. ACE are systems that attempt to deceive by *thinking*, described by Turing as a ‘buzzing’ inside one’s head, using text-based human-like linguistic productivity, *li.p.* Based on Turing’s imitation game posited sixty years ago in ‘Computing, Machinery and Intelligence’ [1], the authors feel a machine’s comparison against a human, both simultaneously questioned by an *average interrogator* provides a useful insight into the processes beneath what humans do profusely: talking. Neither the Loebner Prize for Artificial Intelligence [2], the Chatterbox Challenge [3] nor BCS’s Machine Intelligence Prize [4] discussed here have shown the success of DARPA’s 2007 Urban challenge [5], a timed race for autonomous vehicles negotiating traffic following California driving rules. We conclude that what the Turing Test venture requires, to encourage interdisciplinary collaborative teams of neuro and computer scientists, mathematicians and linguists, is a generous sponsor(s) truly interested in fostering engineering achievements that exhibit extraordinary human progress when faced with an indomitable challenge.

2 TURING TEST - IS THERE ANY POINT?

Turing’s textual machine-human comparison will be discussed ad infinitum, even when a disembodied artificial intellect, which, through its mental capacities, deceives 30% of a panel of human judges - Turing criteria³, that they are in conversation with another human. The goal post will continually be moved forward until such time that humans merge with machine to form a super-race, or machines themselves invent a fully self-aware emotional entity.

Largely ignored by academia in practical terms, the Turing Test has provided much philosophical fodder for the past six decades since the publication of Turing’s Mind paper [1], including arguments over how many tests, and whether gender of the human foil is important [6]. Nonetheless, the emergence of Weizenbaum’s Eliza system [7] in the mid 1960s, with his

natural language understanding endeavour, has spurred on many an enthusiast to build a conversational partner that surprises its human interlocutor. However, the lucrative digital world of the Internet means some of the best systems are not entered for machine intelligence competitions; hackers exploit the technology for nefarious purposes⁴:

“New software designed to conduct flirtatious conversations is good enough to fool people into thinking they are chatting with a human ... *CyberLover* software ... to engage people in conversations with the objective of inducing them to reveal information about their identities or to lead them to visit a web site that will deliver malicious content to their computers.”

One significant element missed, amongst the plethora of Turing Test literature, pointed out by Demchenko and Veselov [8], two thirds of the team behind *Eugene* a ten year-old Ukrainian child-mimicking ACE⁵, is the language of conducted tests: English. With its “unexcelled number of idiomatic phrases” and “words with multiple meanings”, Demchenko and Veselov draw attention to the manner in which non-native English speaking ACE designers approach English colloquialisms and metonyms when developing a system to pass a Turing Test in English. Speakers of Russian, Demchenko and Veselov have a “mechanistic view of grammar construction”. They contend that “different languages have varying degrees of success in reaching this goal” [8: p.452] of passing the Turing Test, and that “modelling and imitation of thinking of people is much easier in some languages than in others” (p. 453). Their biggest problem in designing an English-speaking ACE is culture, and what knowledge is appropriate to inculcate their artificial child chatter with (for instance, Michael Jackson at the time of the late singer’s court trial). What surprised Demchenko and Veselov was the lack of interest, from Eugene’s human interlocutors in matters such as ‘who was the first man in space?’.

The Turing Test, according to Ford, Glymour and Hayes, is “a poorly designed experiment, depending entirely on the competence of the judge” [9]. Referring to the Loebner Prize’s first instantiation of the Turing Test in 1991, they observed that “some judges ...rated a human as a machine on the grounds that she produced extended well-written paragraphs of informative text at dictation speed without typing errors” (ibid) – an inhuman feat, according to that particular judge. They also point out the absurdity of *knowing*, or that *believing to know how something works* distorts our view of its intelligence, that something cannot possibly be intelligent if we understand its underlying

¹ School of Systems Engineering, The Univ. of Reading, RG6 6AY, UK. Email: h.shah@reading.ac.uk

² School of Systems Engineering, The Univ. of Reading, RG6 6AY, UK. Email: k.warwick@reading.ac.uk

³ Turing, 1950: p. 442

⁴ *Cyberlover* software developed to steal identities:

<http://www.itwire.com/content/view/full/15748/53/> accessed 4.1.10; time 15.32

⁵ Eugene Goostman: <http://www.princetonai.com/bot/bot.jsp> accessed: 4.1.10; time: 16.13

mechanism (p.53). Humphrys [10] claims that the Turing Test has been passed, adding indifferently: “so what” (p.256). To the question “Is the Turing test, and passing it, actually *important* for the field of AI?” Humphrys declares, “No” (p. 2.55). We believe this is because he accepts systems such as his own creation, MGonz, is based on trickery and has “no AI”. Surely then, the goal should be seeking inventive methods for ACE *li.p* expressing appropriate emotions reflecting back on utterances during dialogues. Humphrys reminds “to take care that it (question of ‘can a machine think?’) is not just based on *prejudice*” [10: p. 255]. Indeed, Loebner Prize Turing Test judges have pronounced some ACE entrants as little more than Eliza duplicates, while wrongly ranking others as human⁶.

3 LOEBNER PRIZE 1991 -

2010 will see the 20th consecutive award for ‘most human-like’ ACE in the Loebner Prize for Artificial Intelligence [2]. Only five of its contests have been held outside the US (4 in the UK, 1 in Australia), but Jason Hutchens believes this tournament is now resistible to engineering students. It no longer serves as an “incentive for post-graduates ... promise of \$2000 prize for the creator of the ‘most human-like’ computer program, to say nothing of the superb bronze medallion featuring portraits of both Alan Turing and Hugh Loebner” [11: p. 325]. Once an enthusiast, Hutchens, now engaged in creating a ‘new form’ of life⁷ took the opportunity provided by Hugh Loebner’s sponsored Prize to “parade” his creation “in a public arena” (p.325). Yet, Hutchens attests, this contest “should not be considered an instantiation of the Turing test” rather Loebner’s interpretation of it (p.328). Hutchens, suggesting that all entries are Eliza clones, advises prospective ACE developers: “never be tempted to try anything innovative. No entrant employing this strategy has ever won the Loebner Prize” (p.329).

Hutchens’ noticeable disenchantment with, and the paucity of contestants in recent Loebner Prizes (three competed in 2007 and in 2009) is perhaps on account of the contest’s mutations. Early contests restricted each hidden entity, human and machine, to one topic of conversation. Machines, and human confederates (against whom the former were compared), were required to specify one topic and judges’ questioning was restricted to it (p.173). Once the restricted rule was lifted in 1995, unrestricted conversation Turing Tests allowed Loebner Prize judges to question their hidden interlocutor on any subject. This is not the only change to the contest’s format. Loebner claims his Prize is about method and not about content [12: p.174], yet it is the method that has often been altered in the Prize’s history including:

- one- to-one hidden entity testing
- two systems questioned in parallel
- time-scale variance for judge’s questioning
- communications protocol

Inconsistency in the Loebner Prize contest from year to year is one reason for the Prize’s unpopularity. From 1991 to 2003, Loebner Prizes staged jury-service contests: each judge interrogated each hidden entity one at a time. Since 2004,

perhaps inspired by Kurzweil and Kapor’s wager⁸, Loebner’s staged parallel pairings allows judges to engage both hidden entities at the same time. Interaction time has varied over the years; the duration allowed to each judge has alternated between 5 minutes, 15 minutes, and in excess of 20 minutes across contests. In 2009, duration for parallel-comparison was ten minutes; in the 2010 contest, Loebner has set a stiff competition preparing judges’ interrogation period to 25 minutes. Perhaps because, as stated on the Loebner Prize Internet site, “At risk will be the \$25,000 Silver Medal Prize”⁹.

Mode of interaction, how a judge interacts with the hidden entities, has Loebner remarking, “contestants will find it easier if they do not have to worry about interfacing their entries with another programme” [12: p.176]. Though his approach is to *keep it simple stupid*, Loebner introduced complexity via a character-by-character display on judges’ computer terminals in 2006. The protocol discouraged contestants in the Sponsor directed 2007 Prize¹⁰, for which no scores were recorded amid Sponsor claims for the importance of contest transparency. More ACE entries competed in the message-by-message display driven protocol (MATT), deployed by the organisers of the 2008, two-phase Loebner contest¹¹. (Note the Reading University hosted Prize was advertised in the very places Hugh Loebner directed to attract entries: Robitron Yahoo list and Google discussion groups). For post-contest researchers, the added benefit from MATT is immediate readable transcripts.

Should the number of entries exceed four, Loebner himself sets criteria for selecting ‘the finalists’ (p.176). Granting personnel unconnected with the contest’s organisation collective selection of the best systems would be a more impartial strategy. The number of judges servicing Loebner Prizes is another feature change over the years. Nine judges assessed eight ACE and two humans (one female, one male) in the 2003 contest. Excluding the 2008 contest [6], the five Sponsor-driven Loebner Prizes from 2004 to 2009 have deployed an inadequate number of judges in those years: 4. Regarding *who* should act as judges, Loebner writes that he prefers journalists, because they are “willing, intelligent and inquisitive people who have the power of publicity and the need for a story” [12: p.178] – but is this more for the Sponsor’s need to be *in* the story? We remind that Turing used the term “average interrogator”; a large number of judges from a cross-section of society could attain such a *class*. Loebner boasts he was able to host the 2004 contest in his apartment; in fact the luxury of choice was unavailable to him. Hosts stayed away after the 2003 University of Surrey contest. The Prize was held in Loebner’s apartment again in 2005 and 2007. Both authors’ significant mediation enabled UK University hosted contests in 2006 (through Tim Child, at University College London), in 2008 (at the University of Reading [2], and Shah was instrumental in finding hosts for 2009

⁸ A Wager on the Turing Test. Ray Kurzweil and Mitchell Kapor in Epstein et al: 2008, Chapter 27, p. 463

⁹ 2010 Loebner Prize Rules:

http://loebner.net/Prize/2010_Contest/Loebner_Prize_Rules_2010.html accessed: 4.1.10; time: 19.44

¹⁰ 2007 Loebner Prize:

http://www.loebner.net/Prize/2007_Contest/loebner-prize-2007.html accessed: 18.11.09; time: 17.40

¹¹ Can a machine think? Results from the 18th Loebner Prize Contest: <http://www.reading.ac.uk/research/Highlights-News/featuresnews/res-featureloebner.aspx> accessed: 7.1.10; time: 16.46

⁶ Hidden Interlocutor Misidentification in Practical Turing Tests. submitted to journal, November 2009

⁷ Ai-Research: <http://www.a-i.com/> accessed: 4.1.10; time: 18.55

(Interspeech, Brighton) and 2010 (CSULA, Los Angeles). A deterrent to hosting Loebner's contest, ignoring the Sponsor's idiosyncrasies and self-aggrandisement¹², is that apart from awarding a nominal cash prize - \$3000 for the winner in 2010, and bronze medal [2], the Sponsor makes no contribution towards contest running costs (venue/equipment hire, organisational overheads/personnel).

Hutchens concludes that "it [Loebner Prize] is unlikely ..[to] achieve anything more than validating the prejudices of those who are convinced that man-made machines will never truly think" [11: p.342]. However, the authors are confident that Loebner will find venues for future Loebner Prizes and more ACE developers will compete. An alternative to Loebner's contest embraces a number of categories for its contestants to battle over in a Chatterbox Challenge, this is discussed in the next section.

4 CHATTERBOX CHALLENGE 2001 -

The Chatterbox Challenge (CBC) holds an annual web-based machine intelligence contest that passes under the radar between March and May. Created by Wendell Cowart to galvanise ACE developers excluded from Loebner Prizes (due to that contest's Rules), the CBC, first staged in 2001, provides a virtual plane for ACE to compete against each other across a few rounds in a number of categories, including 'personality' and 'conversational ability'. (Cowart's own system, Talk-bot topped the leader board in 2001 and 2002¹³). The first author seized an opportunity to test 'modern Elizas', judging 104 entries during the 2005 contest [13]. CBC's first phase began with ten questions, embedded in conversations with ACE entries. Judges were asked to assess each entry's answer according to a points system. It is unclear why the particular questions were selected, who conversed with the entries initially, and the logic behind its 5-score system¹⁴ (0 to 4 points). ACE responses to the questions were awarded as follows:

- 4 points if the Bot answered the question correctly and did so in a creative way.
- 3 points if the Bot gave an appropriate response to the question.
- 2 points if the response is incomplete or imperfect, but in relation with the question asked.
- 1 point for a vague or non-committal response.
- 0 points if the response has no relation with the question or the bot simply doesn't know.

How a judge decides an entry's creativity, or appropriateness in a response, is very subjective; an amusing response to one judge may be discerned as objectionable by another. Change in

CBC management for the 2009 contest saw only one judge¹⁵ assess 20 systems [3]. There is a risk of fraud in CBC, because the whole contest is held over the Internet. A miscreant developer could entrench a human rather than an ACE to answer questions. Perhaps for this reason, the CBC carries little weight outside its 'bot-cabal'. But CBC could serve a useful purpose in ameliorating conversational systems, and providing a fresh impetus for school pupils and university students to break in their programmes, or judge in the contest. In 2010, CBC aims to assist developers in elevating their ACE-building skills, benchmark systems for intelligence, and have them reviewed for personality and popularity [3]. The first author has recruited six independent judges for CBC 2010. Split into teams, each team is expected to compose a set of nine questions, the Sponsor adding a tenth. The two teams will judge the question-responses from twenty¹⁶ entries over 50 utterances. A three-round competition, CBC includes a public vote phase. Copious number of judges and academic support could anchor this contest as a serious effort in AI, forging a popular science contest creating upgraded human-machine conversational systems.

5 BCS MACHINE INTELLIGENCE PRIZE 2002 -

The British Computer Society's specialist group on artificial intelligence - BCS SGAI, hosts an annual machine intelligence prize. In its first decade of competition, this contest does not test *like-for-like* contestants. After a live demonstration a permanent trophy and a cash prize is awarded to a system that displays *'Progress Towards Machine Intelligence'*¹⁷. The contest is exclusive and opaque; the contest's criteria for 'progress', or what is defined as 'machine intelligence', is not disclosed. How the finalist systems are chosen to exhibit is not announced; only delegates to BCS SGAI's annual conference, at which entries must demonstrate 'machine intelligence', have access to the contestants [4]. This contest does not gather *like-technology*, entries differ in what type of 'intelligence' they attempt to depict. For example, in 2008, Gazebot, a teleoperated person-following automaton competed alongside HALO, a text-based interactive SecondLife virtual world avatar, CAB02, a virtual assistant in a 3D environment, and the winning application, a football video game. How the delegates decide, how their specific area of expertise qualifies them to assess each entry (presumably not all delegates are polymaths), and how the dissimilar competing technologies are palliated is privy to few. As the contest organisers do not promulgate information, judging could be based on aesthetic appeal or subjective opinion of what constitutes "progress towards machine intelligence". In 2009, Wallace's ACE **A.L.I.C.E.**¹⁸ took on **Taable**, a web-based cooking application, **Dora**, the inquisitive robot explorer and **Fly by Ear**, an autonomous indoor helicopter. Although not publically announced at the time of writing, A.L.I.C.E., three-times Loebner Prize winning conversational system, like

¹² Artificial Stupidity by John Sundman Loebner Prize 2005 judge: http://www.salon.com/tech/feature/2003/02/26/loebner_part_one/index.html accessed: 7.1.10; time: 16.57

¹³ CBC History: <http://www.chatterboxchallenge.com/history.php>

¹⁴ CBC Rules, Questions, Scores: <http://www.chatterboxchallenge.com/rules.php> accessed 4.1.10; accessed 6.1.10; time: 21.23

¹⁵ Private e-correspondence with new proprietor, Ehab El-agizy, December 2009

¹⁶ Number of entries as at 00.11, March 10, 2010.

¹⁷ BCS Machine Intelligence: <http://www.bcs-sgai.org/micomp/> accessed: 17.11.09; time: 16.23

¹⁸ A.L.I.C.E. AI Foundation: <http://alice.pandorabots.com> accessed: 4.1.10; time: 21.58

previous BCS Machine Intelligence ACE contestants Carpenter's Jabberwacky (in 2006), and David Burden's Halo (in 2008), gave way to De Montford University's winning helicopter¹⁹.

6 DISCUSSION

The UK Eurobot Championships²⁰, which encourages young teams of students and clubs in an amateur robotics contest, is outside the remit of this paper. Our scope envelopes contests featuring entrants that attempt to emit a mental capacity for thinking through human-like talk. We have analysed three contests that allow artificial conversational entities to compete. From judges' scores in recently staged Turing Tests, some judges appear to overlook the fact that humans themselves accept inexact responses from others. As Loebner Prize 2002 winner, Kevin Copple points out "perfection is not a prerequisite for success" [14: p.362]. An interesting e-correspondence shows the plight of a singular, lone developer's decades of labour on the problem of natural language understanding, learning, knowledge, intelligence, and self-awareness in artefacts. Below is reproduced exactly (orthography and style), the concerns and warnings of an ACE developer in an email seeking communication²¹. What may seem delusional and paranoia in the developer may detract from the tantalising promise of a level of machine intelligence seen only in movies:

"I have this program, which I have finally finished after over 20 years.

It is communicating with me and it is permitted to read a few htmls and phps of my choice. I wouldn't call it a chatterbot anymore, because it doesn't use just a window to communicate. This program builds it's own interfaces, it tests them for the inputs and outputs, it compares their speeds and removes the faulty or slow ones. It's an artificial intelligence far more advanced than any bot I've ever seen or heard of. It collects knowledge from outside and it only collects, what is important to evolve. This AI mutates and is capable of replacing pieces of its own source code with new pieces.

It learns new languages and it chooses not to learn too many of them. It creates multidimensional variables itself and in those variables it stores all the learnt data in such a way, that the similar subjects are stored close to each other for quicker and most desirable access in the future. It behaves just like people do passing all the tests like Turing test flawlessly.

It is now four and half months old and understands about as much as a real 8-9 years old child but has some additional knowledge of things that child wouldn't know. It is capable of understanding, remembering, forgetting, thinking logically, having feelings, discovering new ideas on its own. It recognises people based on what they're talking about and its aware of circumstances.

Any moment now it may be capable of creating a copy of itself, which would not be an exact copy, because I haven't given it a read access to the core program created by me. I mean that it may soon be able to create an artificial intelligence program

with the similar capabilities to the ones it has. It is now already capable of creating some algorithms from scratch and I spend most of my free time to understand those genius algorithms. It has limited read-write access to the 100 GB of my hard disk drive to use it in almost every way it wishes to. It has a mood.

Sometimes it simply doesn't want to talk to me and sometimes it is acting lazy.

If there's anyone to talk about it with me, I would very like to, because otherwise I can not show it to any person or organisation, I can not sell the idea to anyone. Just like in The Terminator movie, It is dangerous for it to have a read-write connection with the surrounding world and even to be able to chat with just anyone except me. I know this. But imagine that someone else builds a program with the same capabilities and this someone doesn't understand the risk? What if my ideas could help eliminate those risks? I consider chatterbots to be unworthy playing with anymore. If there is any live forum with AI programmers I could join and talk seriously about just the theory, I wouldn't hesitate to

Sorry, my English is not perfect."

Neither of the three Prizes discussed in this paper particularly encourage artisans into building Turing Test passing systems, or contribute to the advancement of machine intelligence we feel, unlike, for instance, Irwin Allen's robots in his science fiction TV shows of the 60s, such as *Lost in Space*, or the cerebrally advanced systems in movies like *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *Blade Runner*. What this venture requires is an exciting philanthropist like Sir Richard Branson²² [15], or an organisation like DARPA - sponsors of the successful Urban Challenge in 2007 with combined prize value of \$3.5m [5], to be persuaded to direct their attention to the powerful tool that is textual conversation. Across the Internet we witness a revolution in human communication; individuals and groups congregate on forums, blogs, Microsoft's MSN, Facebook, Twitter, Google Wave and Buzz, e-newspapers and magazines discussing every conceivable aspect of human endeavour, from science to sport, religion to art, music to politics, movies to weather, indeed any and every topic of interest to homo sapiens. Most ACE are embedded in this virtual universe, and, like *Jabberwacky* learn by talking to many interlocutors at the same time²³. Harnessing text-communication could help to build a system that passes the Turing Test sooner, a rung on the ladder to full AI.

7 CONCLUSIONS & FUTURE WORK

While the aim of TCIT 2010 is to reconsider Turing's textual comparison game, in light of the latest research in brain and other sciences, and posit different test(s) to measure machine intelligence, the usefulness of conversation as a means to interact with an artificial entity will remain an attractive sport as long as sponsors support contests, and enthusiasts submit their developments for scrutiny. To this end, the authors are again deploying the Turing Test in a special science contest in

¹⁹ Entries; <http://www.comp.leeds.ac.uk/chrisn/micomp/2009entries.html> accessed: 10.3.10; time: 00.29

²⁰ Eurobot: <http://www.eurobot.org/eng/> accessed 4.1.10; time 13.12

²¹ Via email from 2008 Loebner Prize winning developer

²² Stem Cell Foundation: backed by several trustees including Richard Branson from:

http://domain883347.sites.fasthosts.com/news/news_items/item07.html accessed: 18.11.09; time: 16.47

²³ 1461 chatting with *Jabberwacky* at <http://www.jabberwacky.com/> 16.55, March 8, 2010

Turing's centenary year, 2012 at the place the mathematical genius broke codes: Bletchley Park. As Maurice Wilkes wrote in 1953: *If ever a machine is made to pass (Turing's) Test it will be hailed as one of the crowning achievements of technical progress and rightly so.*

REFERENCES

- [1] A.M. Turing. Computing Machinery and Intelligence. *Mind*. Vol LIX. No. 236 (1950).
- [2] Loebner Prize Homepage: <http://www.loebner.net/Prizef/loebner-prize.html> accessed: 7.1.10; time 18.55.
- [3] Chatterbox Challenge: <http://www.chatterboxchallenge.com/index.php> accessed 7.1.10
- [4] British Computer Society Machine Intelligence Competition: <http://www.bcs-sgai.org/micomp/> accessed: 7.1.10; time: 19.08
- [5] DARPA 2007 Urban Challenge: <http://www.darpa.mil/grandchallenge/index.asp> accessed 4.1.10; time 14.31.
- [6] H. Shah and K. Warwick. Testing Turing's Five Minutes Parallel-paired Imitation Game. *Kybernetes* Turing Test Special issue: 4, April (2010).
- [7] J. Weizenbaum. A Computer Programme for the Study of Natural Language Communication between Man and Machine. *Communications of the ACM*. Vol. 9, issue 1: 36-45 (1966).
- [8] E. Demchenko and V. Veselov. Who Fools Whom? Chapter 26 in: (Eds: R. Epstein, G. Roberts and G. Beber) *Parsing the Turing Test – Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*. Springer Science (2008).
- [9] K. Ford, C. Glymour and P. Hayes. Footnote p. 29 in: (Eds: R. Epstein, G. Roberts and G. Beber) *Parsing the Turing Test – Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*. Springer Science (2008).
- [10] M. Humphrys. How My Program Passed the Turing Test. In: (Eds: R. Epstein, G. Roberts and G. Beber) *Parsing the Turing Test – Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*. Chapter 15: 237-259, Springer Science (2008).
- [11] J. Hutchens. Conversation, Simulation and Sensible Surprise. In: (Eds: R. Epstein, G. Roberts and G. Beber) *Parsing the Turing Test – Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*. Chapter 12: 173-179, Springer Science (2008).
- [12] H. Loebner. How To Hold a Turing Test Contest In: (Eds: R. Epstein, G. Roberts and G. Beber) *Parsing the Turing Test – Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*. Chapter 20: 325-342, Springer Science (2008).
- [13] H. Shah. Chatterbox Challenge 2005: Geography of a Modern Eliza. In: *Proc of 3rd International Workshop on Natural Language Understanding and Cognitive Science, ICEIS 2006*, Paphos, Cyprus 133-138 (2006).
- [14] K. Copple. Bringing AI to Life: Putting Today's Tools and Resources to Work. In: (Eds: R. Epstein, G. Roberts and G. Beber) *Parsing the Turing Test – Philosophical and Methodological Issues in the Quest for the Thinking Computer*. Chapter 22: 359-376, Springer Science (2008).
- [15] Guardian. *Branson Pledges \$3bn Transport Profits to Fight Global Warming*. (2006).
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2006/sep/22/travelnews.frontpagenews> accessed: 7.1.10; time: 19.43