Guiding Probabilistic Logical Inference with Nonlinear Dynamical Attention Allocation

Cosmo Harrigan^{1,2} and Ben Goertzel² and Matthew Iklé³ and Amen Belayneh^{4,5} and Gino Yu⁵

¹ OpenCog Foundation, ² Novamente LLC,

³ Adams State University, ⁴ iCog Labs,

⁵ School of Design, Hong Kong Poly U

Simple PLN Experiments

Based on two Markov Logic Networks (MLN) test examples from Tuffy project (<u>http://</u> <u>hazy.cs.wisc.edu/hazy/tuffy/doc/</u>)

- smokes (below)
- RC1000 (research paper classification)

<pre>// Predicate definitions</pre>	Friends(Anna, Bob)
*Friends(person, person)	Friends(Anna, Edward)
Smokes(person)	Friends(Anna, Frank)
Cancer(person)	Friends(Edward, Frank)
// Rule definitions	Friends(Gary, Helen)
0.5 !Smokes(a1) v Cancer(a1)	<pre>!Friends(Gary, Frank)</pre>
0.4 !Friends(a1,a2) v !Smokes(a1) v Smokes(a2)	Smokes(Anna)
0.4 !Friends(a1,a2) v !Smokes(a2) v Smokes(a1)	Smokes(Edward) Cancer(x)

(a) MLN program

(c) Query

Simple PLN+ECAN Experiments

Information provided in Smokes and RC 1000 examples is precisely the information needed for inference. No role for attention allocation.

Attention allocation is useful largely for guiding inference toward relevant information.

Therefore

To test attention allocation in ECAN + PLN, one should modify standard MLN test examples via adding extraneous information

eats(Anna, cheese)
tasty(cheese)
derived_from(cheese, milk)

... and then optimize parameter space.