

Re: death of the mind.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-08/0245.html>

From: Allan C Cybulskie (allan.c.cybulskie_at_yahoo.ca)

Date: 08/07/04

Date: Sat, 7 Aug 2004 09:52:13 -0400

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

> *In article <[Rb3Rc.44109\\$Jq2.2048676@news20.bellglobal.com](mailto:Rb3Rc.44109$Jq2.2048676@news20.bellglobal.com)>, Allan C*

> *Cybulskie <allan.c.cybulskie@yahoo.ca> writes*

> > *No, you don't understand. It isn't a matter of "positing" anything.*

> >

> > *If you aren't positing that behaviourism is the best explanation of mind,*

> > *why in the world are you arguing with people who claim that it isn't?*

> >

> > *Again, that's a question you should think about more carefully instead*

> > *of assuming you already know.*

Actually, it's a question that you should answer, since it's a question
about YOUR motivations and intentions. I do not assume that I know the
answer because I have no way to determine with 100% what those things are
for you. To claim that I can is just you demonstrating yet again the flaw
in the behaviourist approach to mind and intelligence.

>

> > > *What*

> > > *you're reporting to this newsgroup is no more than the fact that *you**

> > > *"fail to see the use of" what you have been told. You're just making a*

> > > *public statement of your ignorance (something you've been doing from the*

> > > *outset).*

> >

> > *No, actually. What I'm saying is that so far my folk psychologist and*

> > *philosophy of mind ideas have been successful enough that I see no reason*
to

> > *abandon them in favour of your radical behaviourism unless you can*
show --

> > *which you have not -- why your view actually works better.*

>

> *That's what I said. You don't even understand what *you* post. Given*

> *that, it's unlikely that you read what *others* say with any more care!*

I am the ultimate authority as to my intentions and goals. Again., all you

do here is demonstrate the flaw in your view.

>
> >
> > >
> > > *Nobody is obliged to educate you, but you should expect people to point*
> > > *out *that* you're ignorant.*
> >
> > *Not unless they can prove it. Which you have not.*
> >
>
> *You're an idiot.*

This looks suspiciously like something completely unlike evidence that I am either an idiot or ignorant.

David, all you do is prove that your behaviourist approaches are not terribly strong. Your attempts at negative conditioning — by calling me "ignorant" or "an idiot" — would only work if I actually felt a need to take such comments from you seriously. Since you have yet to demonstrate why I should, they do not have any impact on me. I react far better to actual reasoning and evidence than insults anyway.