

Re: death of the mind.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-07/0485.html>

From: Lester Zick (lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 07/27/04

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 2004 18:36:14 GMT

On Tue, 27 Jul 2004 18:23:06 +0100, David Longley
<David@longley.demon.co.uk> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>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>...

[. . .]

>>> *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?*

If by behavioral science you're referring to the work of behaviorists,
allow me clarify the problem by rephrasing the question:

Does it not bother you that so many of the people with imaginative
ideas about the mind have such a poor grasp of the work of those
whose only idea regarding the mind is to deny the mind and mental
effects altogether?

Cast in such terms, the only surprize is that anyone with imaginative
ideas about the mind would pay any attention at all to the work of

sci.cognitive: Re: death of the mind.

behaviorists and not that they don't pay sufficient attention to qualify their opinions as authoritative.

*>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.*

If behaviorists deny the mind and mental effects, what other accurate accounts of what is the case are relevant? You may not appreciate having the significance of behaviorist science interpreted without your approval. But apart from denying the mind, you have nothing to contribute to the subject of imaginative ideas regarding the mind. The science part of what behaviorists contribute to behavioral science doesn't show anything except that you can and do train animal behavior effectively whether or not there are minds and mental effects.

Regards – Lester