

## Re: The Identity Theory of Mind

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-09/0775.html>

---

**From:** Lester Zick ([lesterDELzick\\_at\\_worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net))

**Date:** 09/24/04

Date: Fri, 24 Sep 2004 18:38:47 GMT

On 23 Sep 2004 15:17:25 -0700, [zzbunker@netscape.net](mailto:zzbunker@netscape.net) (ZZBunker) in [comp.ai.philosophy](mailto:comp.ai.philosophy) wrote:

>[lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net) (Lester Zick) wrote in message  
news:<4151cbee.32163082@netnews.att.net>...  
>> On Wed, 22 Sep 2004 11:33:30 -0500, Paul Bramscher  
>> <[brams006\\_nospam@tc.umn.edu](mailto:brams006_nospam@tc.umn.edu)> in [comp.ai.philosophy](mailto:comp.ai.philosophy) wrote:  
>>  
>> >Wolf Kirchmeir wrote:  
>> >  
>> >> Paul Bramscher wrote:  
>> >>  
>> >>> The Sophist wrote:  
>> >>>  
>> >>>> Paul Bramscher wrote:  
>> >>>>  
>> >>>>> Since most philosophical theories of the mind appear to be  
>> >>>>> astoundingly inbred (relatively small number of constantly  
>> >>>>> referenced writers, and all Western/white/academic), there are some  
>> >>>>> important missing critiques to the identity theory:  
>> >>  
>> >> [...]  
>> >>  
>> >>>>  
>> >>>>  
>> >>>>> Apparently you have not actually read extensively from the literature  
>> >>>>> you denigrate. Certainly Parfit is aware of these issues, and the  
>> >>>>> Churchlands show more than a bit of sensitivity to them.  
>> >>>>  
>> >>>>  
>> >>>>> Literature doesn't solve this problem. One should take a theory and  
>> >>>>> point it toward empirical evidence. Don't just point toward a theory  
>> >>>>> or piece of literature as an ends to itself.  
>> >>  
>> >>  
>> >>>> Ah, but for philosophers, the literature is the important thing.  
>> >>

>> >Which is odd, since the great philosophers the followers constantly like  
>> >to reference are -- themselves -- the counter-examples! At some point  
>> >they left the library, set aside a book, and engineered their own  
>> >theories -- for better or worse.  
>> >  
>> >I'm not anti-literature (in fact I'm currently sitting in a large  
>> >research library in North America). It's just that you need to set it  
>> >aside at some point and budget your time. I'm more allied to the art of  
>> >design & building, rather than deconstructing or analyzing as an ends to  
>> >itself. The best sources of my own inspiration are other builders and  
>> >engineers, not analysts and intellectual forensics specialists. :-)  
>>  
>> >How does one engineer the right without deconstructing the wrong? Why  
>> >do you think theories of the mind are so inbred and keep coming up  
>> >with the same tired nonsense?  
>  
> >It's most likely that Philosophers prefer science-fiction  
> >to science, and scientists prefer treatises  
> >on Lepto-Quark positivism to thinking, Politicians  
> >prefer photo-ops with Bill Gates to engineering,  
> >and Literaturists prefer 4000 year-old decaying  
> >religious slums to minds.

There's some truth to this, ZZ. But I'm more inclined to think that academics, politicians, etc. prefer these kinds of esoteric solutions because the public prefers them whereas the public is bored silly with conventional philosophical wisdom because philosophers and politicians are really just talking heads blowing smoke, either explaining the obvious ad nauseum or indulging in turgid nonsense.

Regards – Lester