

Re: A Million Parrots (OH MY GLEN)

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-06/0024.html>

From: Eray Ozkural exa (erayo_at_bilkent.edu.tr)

Date: 06/02/04

Date: 2 Jun 2004 11:33:41 -0700

Please see how Longley-bot's post has nothing to do with any of the points raised in my post. You guys are still talking to this maniac. Stop responding to him! You are only feeding the troll.

David Longley <David@longley.demon.co.uk> wrote in message news:<p2ahidXVg7uAFw8U@longley.demon.co.uk>...

> In article <fa69ae35.0405311353.362953e8@posting.google.com>, Eray
> Ozkural exa <erayo@bilkent.edu.tr> writes
> >feedbackroids@yahoo.com (dan michaels) wrote in message
> >news:<8d8494cf.0405241119.3df017cf@posting.google.com>...
> >> 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,
> >

sci.cognitive: Re: A Million Parrots (OH MY GLEN)

> >--
> >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=19quc.23221\\$nn7.17910@newssvr31.new
s.prodigy.com](http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=19quc.23221$nn7.17910@newssvr31.new
s.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?*