

## Re: death of the mind.

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-07/0483.html>

---

**From:** David Longley (*David\_at\_longley.demon.co.uk*)

**Date:** 07/27/04

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 2004 18:23:06 +0100

In article <fa69ae35.0407270148.88c4913@posting.google.com>, Eray Ozkural exa <erayo@bilkent.edu.tr> writes

> "John Hasenkam" <johnh@faraway.> wrote in message

> news:<41050c89@dnews.tpgi.com.au>...

>> "dan michaels" <feedbackdroids@yahoo.com> wrote in message

>> news:8d8494cf.0407252021.66067bcf@posting.google.com...

>>> "John Casey" <kjcasey@hotkey.net.au> wrote in message

>> news:<410422ee\_1@news.iprimus.com.au>...

>>>

>>>

>>>> *So hard to convey a mental concept using words with shifting*

>>>> *meanings. Have you ever read the Matter Myth by Paul Davies?*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> *This isn't actually related to your question to Eray, but I've always*

>>>> *had the feeling that PD was really just a fundammentalist masquerading*

>>>> *as a scientist. Whadyathink?*

>>>>

>>>> *Well he did win the Templeton Prize, I think that is the name. It was for*

>>>> *improving communication between science and religion ...*

>>>>

>>>> *For that matter, I wonder about the real motivations behind Penrose.*

>

>*Me, too.*

>

>*He seems to claim the solution to the mind/body for himself. Hence,*

>*the philosophical arguments based on Godel's results, etc. He's a*

>*physicist: he will surely prefer the mind to be a wave function,*

>*rather than a computation which the computer scientists know better.*

>

>*Regards,*

>

>--

>*Eray Ozkural*

Does it not bother you (even a little) that so many of the people with imaginative ideas about "the mind" have such a poor grasp of behavioural science?

sci.cognitive: Re: death of the mind.

It isn't that they've studied it and don't \*agree\*, rather, it invariably seems to me to be the case that they just don't get the important facts right. Conversely, those who \*do\* seem to be able to give an accurate account of what is the case (whether they \*agree\* or not) don't seem to say the things about "the mind" etc that the former group do.

Do you think there might be something to this (genetic fallacy: Ad Verecundiam, Ad Hominem)? I reckon the problem outlined above is the work of the intensional idioms. Have you discovered what those are yet?

--  
David Longley