

Re: Challenge to the behaviourists, #1

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-09/0378.html>

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

Date: 09/13/04

Date: Mon, 13 Sep 2004 10:27:58 +0100

In article <Hg61d.5531\$0h7.227458@news20.bellglobal.com>, Allan C
Cybulskie <allan.c.cybulskie@yahoo.ca> writes

>

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

> news:UFJeeFOILORBFw0Z@longley.demon.co.uk...

>> In article <I231d.3921\$0h7.161138@news20.bellglobal.com>, Allan C

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

>>>

>>> "Lester Zick" <lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message

>>> news:41406a9d.54913759@netnews.att.net...

>>>> On Thu, 9 Sep 2004 00:26:39 +0100, David Longley

>>>> <David@longley.demon.co.uk> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>>>>> You and many others here have the "arity" wrong, and

>that

>>>>> leads to metaphysics (which is all most of our folk psychology amounts

>>>>> to).

>>>>>>

>>>>>> When you talk of "intelligence", what are you referring to, and how?

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Fascinating. Is there an echo in the room? Having just asked

>>>>>>> behaviorists to explain the intelligence in intelligent behavior,

>>>>>>> behaviorists then turn around to ask what intelligence is in

>>>>>>> intelligent behavior?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Yes, I noticed that. When I asked them to tell me what intelligence

>meant

>>>>>>>>> to them, they basically asked me what it meant to me [grin].

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> No, *we* actually do know what we are talking about when we talk about

>>>>>>>>>>> "intelligence",

>

> Then you should have been able to answer the question: "How does one

> determine under the behaviourist notion whether a behaviour is intelligent

> or not?"

>

There's no *then* about it at all.

Once again you rather tiresomely show that you haven't understood what's been written, ie what it refers to (and you haven't questioned your assumptions either). If you're going to learn anything useful about these matters you're going to have to accept that you have some deficits to start with. In your case they're substantial so *you* need to do some work.

Start by taking your "question" apart linguistically and try and find out what's a "behaviourist" would say is wrong with it. There are enough pointers in this (entire) post alone.

--

David Longley