

Re: A Million Parrots (OH MY GLEN)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-06/0004.html>

From: David Longley (*David_at_longley.demon.co.uk*)

Date: 05/31/04

Date: Mon, 31 May 2004 23:56:21 +0100

In article <fa69ae35.0405311353.362953e8@posting.google.com>, Eray Ozkural exa <erayo@bilkent.edu.tr> writes
>feedbackdroids@yahoo.com (dan michaels) wrote in message
>news:<8d8494cf.0405241119.3df017cf@posting.google.com>...
>> "Glen M. Sizemore" <gmsizemore2@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:<58184467b23640ecf27ffde5475072d5@news.teranews.com>...
>>
>> > *GS: It is radical behaviorism that champions the existence of "mental
>> > imagery," you savagely stupid bumpkin.*
>> >
>>
>>
>> *Now now Glen, be nice. Every now and then, I accidentally read one of
>> your posts*
>
>*That's a mistake.*
>
>> *I know you guys have "terms" for everything [eg private behavior, or
>> whatever you want to call it],*
>
>*They don't.*
>
>> *but the question is ... can YOU*
>> *personally perform mental imagery? And can you describe it to the rest*
>> *of us?*
>
>*It does not matter whether they can. It matters whether they can*
>*explain.*
>
>*It's easy to see that they cannot. A behaviorist explanation does not*
>*suffice for it is restricted to description of I/O and not the*
>*cognitive function or algorithms (specific mechanisms to implement*
>*these functions), see my previous comments about "protocol stack*
>*theory of mind" or "Strata Theory–Theory of Mind" (which is the new*
>*name).*
>
>*"Visualizing a blue cube", on the other hand, requires us to*
>*distinguish clearly what the "hallucinatory" aspects of vision are as*

> *constrasted to perceptive.*

>

> *I can, for instance, visualize a solid color, say of blue, in a
> meditation state, and actually see this color as if a blue light was
> projected on my closed eyelids. I suspect many others can. It does not
> matter what you can, it matters what you can explain with a scientific
> theory. Buddhist priests can visualize much better than either of us
> can, alas they don't have a reasonable explanation. Neither do the
> behaviorists.*

>

> *Best Regards,*

>

>---

> *Eray Ozkural*

This has all been explained to you several times now, and in some detail too. That you keep repeating the same old nonsense is just testament to the remarks made elsewhere that you are prone to behave both irrationally and incorrigibly. It's something we are all prone to (alas).

However, for an insight into just how this can take over almost completely (for a while at least), see the following post and the links the author provides:

<[http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=l9quc.23221\\$nn7.17910@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com](http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=l9quc.23221$nn7.17910@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com)>

His post to sci.cognitive was (prima facie) courageous. Your post, however, is just irritating given what's been explained to you before.

So much for "cognition" eh?

--

David Longley