Re: "Inductive intelligence" or a "generalist" cognitive bias in

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2008−05/msg00092.html

- *From*: cognomad@xxxxxxxxx

- *Date*: Tue, 27 May 2008 18:31:59 −0400 (EDT)

> I think of logic as simply the order we have
> cognized in the manner in which we cognize order.
> But for me, this process is itself largely
> ANA−logical in nature, which is why it's so
> hard to computationalize.

Yes, the Induction process, formalized by Bayesian (probabilistic)
logic, although I add a whole new dimension to it by considering
"partial" occurence, or the degree of match (similarity &
difference): http://scalable−intelligence.blogspot.com/2008/04/intelligence−pattern−discovery.html
It's only hard till you know how to do it.

> Yes. Like similarity and difference themselves, abstruse
> and obvious are pretty much in the eye of the beholder.
> And yet, this something that is pretty much in the eye
> of the beholder is at the very heart of most ampliative
> inference, don't you agree?

Not the way I treat it, my definitions of both similarity & complexity
(order of generalization) are perfectly formal, see the link above.
You do need intelligence to recognize intelligence, but this doesn't
make the process of recognition any less formal.

> "All forms of reasoning are nothing but comparing". (Hume)

I'd add projection :).

> 3. It allows for a naturalistic indeterminism in that one can
> surmise that once an event sequence or feature has become
> cognized
> it is easy to appreciate how one might then have the option of
> following the sequence or conforming to the feature or not,

> and
> thereby becoming less determined by it, i.e., aware of more options
> than prior to the cognition. Another way of saying this is that
> it lends itself to the suspicion that there might well be an
> inverse correlation between ?being cognizant? or ?being rational?
> and ?being determined?.

> If you don't like determinism, tough.

> Perhaps. But that hardly constitutes a counter to the rationale
> I have offered for why I suspect there might be a chink in your
> metaphysical armor.

Just because Reaction is separated from Action by many levels of
generalization doesn't make the process any less deterministic.
The only "metaphysical armor" I have is my concept of Meta−Evolution:
http://scalable−intelligence.blogspot.com/2008/04/entropy−evolution.html
I consider Cognition itself a higher form of evolution in this
framework.
Boris.

.