

Is it incorrect to consider brain akin to computer?

The GLP aggregated and excerpted this blog/article to reflect the diversity of news, opinion and analysis.

The human brain contains 86 billion neurons, underlies all of humanity's scientific and artistic endeavours, and has been [repeatedly described](#) as the most complex object in the known universe.

So, [Eric Jonas](#) and [Konrad Kording](#) wondered, what would happen if they studied the chip in the style of neuroscientists? How would the approaches that are being used to study the complex squishy brain fare when used on a far simpler artificial processor? Forget attention, emotion, learning, memory, and creativity; using the techniques of neuroscience, could Jonas and Kording comprehend *Donkey Kong*?

Recently, the duo [uploaded their paper](#), titled “Could a neuroscientist understand a microprocessor?” after [a classic from 2002](#). It reads like both a playful thought experiment (albeit one backed up with data) and a serious shot across the bow.

Critics might argue that [the brain is not a computer](#). It is messier in its architecture, [fundamentally different](#) in how it deals with information and memory, and comes with a body attached. All true, but the point is that the chip's myriad differences should make it *much easier* to understand than the brain.

Read full, original post: [Can Neuroscience Understand Donkey Kong, Let Alone a Brain?](#)