

Re: the liver and the brain

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-09/0187.html>

From: Lester Zick (lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 09/05/04

Date: Sun, 05 Sep 2004 15:04:18 GMT

On Sat, 4 Sep 2004 21:27:35 +0100, David Longley
<David@longley.demon.co.uk> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>In article <4139f9ab.7231107@netnews.att.net>, Lester Zick
><lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net> writes
>>On Sat, 4 Sep 2004 12:16:34 +0100, David Longley
>><David@longley.demon.co.uk> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>>
>>>In article <41392480@dnnews.tpgi.com.au>, John Hasenkam
>>><johnh@faraway?.invalid> writes
>>>>
>>>>"dan michaels" <feedbackdroids@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:8d8494cf.0409030853.7911b8bf@posting.google.com...
>>>>> >In contrast, since ungulates pop out into the world being able to walk
>>>>> >and run within hours, I was also wondering that their visual systems
>>>>> >might also be similarly advanced, as compard to humans and other
>>>>> >animals like you mentioned. Do they have to "learn" what a lion looks,
>>>>> >or might their visual systems already have some hard-coding regards
>>>>> >this?
>>>>
>>>>>To come at this from a tangent, it is interesting to recall studies showing
>>>>>how axons for varous senses, after injury, can end up projecting to regions
>>>>>other than their "programmed" targets. Auditory axons will project to visual
>>>>>areas, perhaps explaining the echo location noted in some blind individuals.
>>>>>Not many studies on this but the few are surprising in their results.
>>>>>Results such as these suggest a top down guidance of axonal projections, but
>>>>>I'll freely admit I find that very spooky.
>>>>
>>>>>John.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>What's even more "spooky" (although predictably so) is the far more
>>>>>prevalent (and unquestionably demonstrable) empirical finding that
>>>>>people (cf. Michaels, Zick, Ozkural, Legris, Savain, Navega etc as a
>>>>>small but sadly representative, sample) make the "connections" that they
>>>>>do make – *and yet fail to make far more useful and reliable others*.
>>>>
>>>>>What should attract more interest than it does is the fact that people,

>>>as a rule, so tenaciously hold onto, and mutually reinforce their naive
>>>intensional heuristics or prejudices despite abundant (*extensional*)
>>>evidence to repudiate or replace them.

>>>

>>>How people align themselves in their public responses to the above
>>>assertion can, I suggest, be taken as a fair, pragmatic & extensional
>>>indicator of their scientific acumen.

>>

>>This is hardly remarkable, David, whether for the reasons you cite or
>>because the people involved think they are correct. You fail to note,
>>however, that you are in exactly the same category as those you
>>stigmatize and chastize. You fail to explain why your own verbal
>>behavior is any more original and less slavishly imitative than that
>>of others. You're a behaviorist. That's the bottom line. We already
>>knew that. And nothing you've said so far has shed any light on the
>>subject of behavior as defined by behaviorism as a first cause.

>>

>>Regards – Lester

>

>No Zick, you presumptuous, irritating thought–disordered troll–idiot.

>

>Whilst what I said most certainly *does* apply to me, a less
>presumptuous, less thought–disordered, more attentive and astute
>individual than yourself would surely have grasped from the available
>evidence, that there's a fundamental, and importantly *relevant*
>difference. Unlike you, I've spent over thirty years doing research, and
>therefore, relative to you (and some of the other presumptuous idiots
>with uninformed critical opinions here) it's *therefore* more likely
>that I've got something more informed and worth paying attention to
>*relative to* some others posting here on these matters.

David, I'm beginning to wonder exactly what the hell you and Glen have been doing for the last thirty years or so. What's therefore more likely is that except when you train animals you don't have a clue as to what you're talking about.

>Whether or not I'm a behaviourist really is quite besides the point.
>That you along with some of the other ignorant troll–twits here have
>such a hard time grasping that *in spite of the evidence*, is why I say
>you're a presumptuous, irritating thought–disordered troll–idiot.

No. In your and Glen's case the fact that you're behaviorists is exactly the point. You've learned nothing in the last fifty years and have nothing to offer behavior analysis except trite and stale materialist bromides.

>Happier now you've been fed <g>?

I'd be a lot happier if I could see some evidence of innovative thought on your part.

sci.cognitive: Re: the liver and the brain

Regards – Lester