

Re: The fun with the "categorization"

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-07/0138.html>

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

Date: 07/09/04

Date: Fri, 9 Jul 2004 16:26:06 +0100

In article <J9yHc.14705\$Cr5.7867@fe2.news.blueyonder.co.uk>, MrPat
<mrpat@blue-g46?.invalid> writes

>

> *"David Longley" <David@longley.demon.co.uk> wrote in message*

> *news:mTvy7kKWxp7AFwWf@longley.demon.co.uk...*

>> *In article <WkvHc.13257\$Cr5.10923@fe2.news.blueyonder.co.uk>, MrPat*

>> *<mrpat@blue-g46?.invalid> writes*

>>>

>>> *"David Longley" <David@longley.demon.co.uk> wrote in message*

>>> *news:ingzGHBrNP7AFwI3@longley.demon.co.uk...*

>>>> *Has it occurred to you that it might suffice just to look more closely*

>>>> *at what the experimenters are actually doing, ie their methods?*

>>>> --

>>>> *David Longley*

>>>

>>> *Well the extracts from the essay only give a brief overview of the*

> *method;*

>>> *they don't go into details.*

>>>

>>> *If you haven't read the second extract (quote) from the essay about*

>>> *unconscious thought have a look, it is a short quote: how come people may*

> *not*

>>> *be consciously able to solve the triad of words, but they can state*

> *whether*

>>> *it is soluble or not. It would appear that this is only possible because*

>>> *they are dealing with the semantics of the problem at some other level*

> *than*

>>> *conscious thought and this is how they know the problem is soluble or*

> *not.*

>>> *Otherwise explain how you think they know.*

>>>

>>> *I'm open to learn more about this and your viewpoint, if you aware of the*

>>> *details of the method in this experiment or similar priming type*

> *experiments*

>>> *where the presence of unconscious 'processes' are inferred by the*

>>> *experimenters, how would you criticize them? Please don't launch into a*

>>> *generalised statement about intensional language and lack of control of*

>>> *variables using language that is too technical for me. See if you can*

sci.cognitive: Re: The fun with the "categorization"

>start
>> >with simple primitive concepts that I understand and build on from
>there—I'm
>> >not an expert.
>> >
>> >It maybe that to do that is too onerous for you to attempt, but it would
>> >help me to further understand these type of experiments and your
>viewpoint.
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> <http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Frag.htm>
>
>I've had a look at this before; I got the gist of it, but it was very
>technical.
>
>>
>> Let's see if you can understand how this is related to the work outlined
>> in the articles in the May 2002 issue of the JEAB entitled: A Tribute to
>> the Harvard Pigeon Lab (1948–1998).
>
>OK, I found the entry. I will take my time having a look at it, and think
>about it, and then maybe get back to you about it. But, I hope it is not a
>load of ideologically motivated speel about behaviourism and includes
>perspectives other than radical behaviourism about what went on in the
>Harvard Pigion lab.
>
>>
>> <http://seab.envmed.rochester.edu/jeab/articles_selected/index.html>
>>
>> If you're not an expert, what makes you so arrogant?
>
>I'm not, but I think this is one of the problems you and Glen Sizemore have,
>and this is why most of your posts result in slanging matches. All you seem
>to be capable of doing is stroking people who agree with you and slanging
>off anyone who you think does not totally agree with your position and
>Sizemore is the same. Is this some sort of behaviourist experiment on
>Usenet?
>
> What makes you
>> think there's a way of talking about matters outside of familiar folk
>> psychology which isn't "technical* other than your ignorance?
>
>This technical language you talk about is based on the refinement and
>elaboration of basic primitive concepts which most people share which are
>derived from what you call common intensional understandings that people
>have about the world, which are then elaborated and refined as specific
>meanings within the discourse of radical behaviourism. How else did you
>learn all the technical language in your subject; you were not born with it.
>
>All I'm saying is that you should try and be more adaptable, and in

sci.cognitive: Re: The fun with the "categorization"

- > *explaining your position to non experts and even other experts not immersed*
- > *in the behaviourist discourse, you should try and establish some common*
- > *understanding and then build on that. In other words reverse engineer the*
- > *process you went through in acquiring all your technical words.*

Then perhaps you should look into this:

<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Frag.htm>
<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Cropwood.pdf>
<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/CatA1990.pdf>
<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Regimes.pdf>

<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Sm-97apr.pdf>
<http://www.longley.demon.co.uk/Workj97.pdf>

and *then* see:

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/r161.pdf>

(and more recently):

<<http://www.renewal.net/Documents/Research/Understandingwhataccredited.pdf>>

See press and parliamentary coverage

<<http://society.guardian.co.uk/mentalhealth/comment/0,8146,1047852,00.html>>
<<http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/cm200203/cmhansrd/cm031110/text/31110w25.htm>>

- >
- > *If you don't see that this is the only way to persuade people as to the*
- > *merit of your position then you are completely ignorant concerning how to*
- > *communicate your knowledge to others, so that they can understand you.*
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > *It seems*
- >> *to me that what you should be doing is acquiring some expertise in a*
- >> *field that you currently have little grasp of, and the way to do that is*
- >> *to master some of the "technical" language!).*
- >
- > *Right so unless someone speaks in exactly the code you use they don't*
- > *understand anything, don't be such an arrogant idiot.*
- >

I'll let someone else enlighten you on that and some of the rest of your nonsense.

Re: The fun with the "categorization"

sci.cognitive: Re: The fun with the "categorization"

--

David Longley