

## Re: Neural netss (was Re: death of the mind.)

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-09/0862.html>

---

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

**Date:** 09/27/04

Date: Mon, 27 Sep 2004 00:19:17 GMT

On Sun, 26 Sep 2004 18:34:45 +0100, David Longley  
<[David@longley.demon.co.uk](mailto:David@longley.demon.co.uk)> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>In article <[4156e19c.25346264@netnews.att.net](mailto:4156e19c.25346264@netnews.att.net)>, Lester Zick  
><[lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net)> writes  
>>On Sun, 26 Sep 2004 14:47:56 +0100, David Longley  
>><[David@longley.demon.co.uk](mailto:David@longley.demon.co.uk)> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:  
>>  
>>>In article <[41546748.1463442@netnews.att.net](mailto:41546748.1463442@netnews.att.net)>, Lester Zick  
>>><[lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net)> writes  
>>>  
>>>[...]  
>>>  
>>>>Did you mean to answer my question, David, or merely babble on  
>>>>evasively the way evolution has conditioned you to behave?  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>We're all a product of our genetic and environmental histories Lester.  
>>>>  
>>>>Sure, David. That's hardly the issue. Some of us are also products of  
>>>>under achievement, neurotic envy, and deliberate malice. It's called  
>>>>whining.  
>>>>  
>>>>There are all sorts of consequences and there are all sorts of folk  
>>>>psychological names for them. This *\*is\** very much the issue, but as  
>>>>always, your metaphysical obsessions render you oblivious to this.

Well, David, I have an idea. Why don't you discuss your issues with those who are interested in them and I'll discuss mine with those who are interested in science.

>>>>What some of us try to do is share the more productive consequences of  
>>>>those histories with others. Some of us *\*do\** appreciate that we are  
>>>>animals, and as creatures of our environments (cultures) we also  
>>>>appreciate that there are benefits to be shared from how we have been  
>>>>trained.  
>>>>  
>>>>At times, you've shown brief moments of lucidity. You should work on

sci.cognitive: Re: Neural netss (was Re: death of the mind.)

>>>those, trying to let others help you to increase their frequency at the  
>>>expense of the metaphysics and other forms of abuse which usually  
>>>characterise so many of your posts (and I suspect your behaviour  
>>>elsewhere).

>>

>>David, all you want is to horn in on subjects in which you have no  
>>expertise or competence.

>

>Like other researchers I am certainly aware that there are matters which  
>require considerable further research. To that extent, there is an  
>element of truth to that, except that you, as usual, put a perversely  
>neurotic gloss on it.

There's certainly some kind of gloss. Unfortunately, what I've found  
is that trying to deal with behaviorists on a normal level just leads  
them to act like assholes (Glen's word, not mine).

>> I fully expect any day now for Glen to  
>>announce that differences and differences between differences etc.  
>>are the missing link in materialism and behaviorist psychological  
>>explanations.

>>

>>Regards – Lester

>

>Maybe you should act on that as one of those moments of lucidity.  
>You've been told repeatedly to look into what is referred to by "the  
>stimulus control of behaviour".

I've been told to do a lot of things repeatedly. I rarely do things  
I'm told to do repeatedly.

> To that end you were advised to find out  
>about the Lashley–Wade hypothesis as a start.

I started to check out the Lashley–Wade hypothesis. Then I found that  
you and Glen were the primary sources. Guess what? I didn't bother to  
check any further.

> You currently ignore what  
>you're told, and that's how deluded people behave.

Well, David, I think you'll find that deluded people behave in a  
variety of ways. Some even train rats and pigeons and pretend they're  
people.

> They really don't  
>want to know or have their neurotic behaviour exposed as that would mean  
>having to learn something new, which is risky. Such folk come up with  
>all sorts of subterfuges in order to sustain their delusional behaviour.  
>They don't, won't or can't readily learn from the experience of others.  
>This is why I compared you to Ken Collins.

Re: Neural netss (was Re: death of the mind.)

sci.cognitive: Re: Neural netss (was Re: death of the mind.)

Oh, please. Glen's in love with thermo, not me.

> *It's also why I suggested,*  
> *rather vainly I suppose, that you studied "Two Dogmas of Empiricism",*  
> *especially the last third (the Quine–Duhem thesis) and how the ceteris*  
> *paribus caveat in conjunction with the hopelessly mentalistic semantics*  
> *of our folk psychology, \*is\* the folk psychological metaphysics which*  
> *you're obsessively, and fruitlessly peddling.*

David, if in your wildest imagination you think I have any capacity to give up science for the study of Quine's manifold dogmas of empiricism you might just as well go back to the contemplation of ovate spheroids and their connection to second law of thermodynamics.

Regards – Lester