

Re: Robot Evolution

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-12/msg00283.html>

- *From:* "Phil Roberts, Jr." <philrob@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 21 Dec 2006 13:23:11 -0500 (EST)
-

Kent Paul Dolan wrote:

Phil Roberts, Jr. wrote:

I have always thought the Godel argument constitutes a pretty good ARGUMENT against a computational view of the mind.

Why on earth so? All Goedel proved was that mathematics was (necessarily) incomplete, not that it was useless.

Incomplete from the perspective of proving theorems, but not incomplete from the standpoint of the mind's ability to "see" truth.

My knowledge of women is similarly incomplete. That doesn't make that knowledge useless, it just means that I need to check my work pretty carefully before building structures that depend on my being correct.

I have no idea how uselessness enters the picture. The fact that one considers Godel a pretty good argument that "minds are different from machines" (Lucas) is far from useless, particularly if it turns out to be true, in that it would mean that we would finally be able to rid ourselves of the strangehold mechanistic materialism has had on the soft sciences for the past seventy five years

Re: Robot Evolution

or so. I think that would be very useful indeed.

PR