

## Re: "It's uncertain whether intelligence has any long term

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-07/0422.html>

---

**From:** Glen M. Sizemore ([gmsizemore2\\_at\\_yahoo.com](mailto:gmsizemore2_at_yahoo.com))

**Date:** 07/23/04

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 2004 22:11:48 +0000 (UTC)

There is ample evidence that "intelligence" has had considerable  
> > *long-term evolutionary advantage.*  
>  
> *HT: For those species who possess it, intelligence (given an*  
> *appropriate*  
> *definition) has probably been a selective advantage.*  
>  
> *GS: You might want to think about whether or not it makes sense to say*  
> *that "intelligence" is a thing that can be possessed. You might also*  
> *want to think about how it is that one has license to define*  
> *colloquial terms as one wishes.*  
>

HT: Words are your servants – not your masters.

GS: Tell it to Wittgenstein.

HT: In technical discourse, it is routine to stipulate definitions for words. For instance, Einstein defined 'time' as what clocks measure and 'distance' as what measuring rods measure.

GS: Curiously, or not, so did colloquial speakers, although they probably had other things to say as well. The point is – and I might as well get right to it – that with colloquial mental terms like "intelligence" we must discover their "referents." If we simply state what "they" are (and might we not find that they are not things at all?) then we are merely superimposing our assumptions on what should be treated as something to be discovered. In psychology, and related disciplines, this has been disastrous. The notion that any concept is OK if it can be given an operational definition is the single reason that mainstream psychology is such a joke, and "evolutionary psychology" is just a handmaiden to cognitive psychology (which IS mainstream psychology now).

HT: What he concluded about time and distance relates only

sci.bio.evolution: Re: "It's uncertain whether intelligence has any long term

to the definitions he stipulated, but he wasn't asserting that other definitions are not possible or valid.

GS: Yes. But these were straightforward definitions, and they were ones that were forced upon him and anyone before him that tried to build a clock. The definitions that psychologists, and others concerned with behavior, give for terms simply reflects their philosophical assumptions and these are, when it comes to behavior, a product of theism and animism.

HT: Without making it clear what