

## Re: The Hard Problem for Behaviorists

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-10/0210.html>

---

**From:** David Longley (*David\_at\_longley.demon.co.uk*)

**Date:** 10/09/04

Date: Sat, 9 Oct 2004 01:33:47 +0100

In article <41672d49\$0\$44069\$5fc3050@dreader2.news.tiscali.nl>, JPL Verhey <matterDELMinds@hotmail.com> writes

>

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

> news:VXb+6tFOwuZBFwVw@longley.demon.co.uk...

>> In article <4166d548\$0\$44099\$5fc3050@dreader2.news.tiscali.nl>, JPL

>> Verhey <matterDELMinds@hotmail.com> writes

>>>

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

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

>>>...

>>> [unrelated statements produced by DL's answering machine]

>>>

>>>> Biologists study animal behavior in nature (that's what my

>>>> occupation

>>>> would be if I were a scientist), behaviorists study human and animal

>>>> behavior, behavioral psychotherapies are developed and used – even

>>>> with

>>>> autism successes are reported I read. Is there anything that Skinner

>>>> would have to complain about nowadays???

>>>>

>>>> Yes, there's plenty he complained about. He saw modern cognitive

>>>> psychology as a disaster as do I and Glen. You don't seem to have

>>>> cottoned on to the \*magnitude\* of the problem I am referring to.

>>>> Perhaps that's the problem, ie that you just can't believe that

>>>> things

>>>> could be as bad as I am saying. But they are.

>>>>

>>> "Perhaps", perhaps.. but in fact I have never made claims or

>>> statements

>>> here about the state of affairs, good or bad, concerning cognitive

>>> psychology or AI for that matter. My main interest is philosophy of

>>> mind

>>> and related matters.

>>

>> if you'd followed up the references I gave you, or if you'd read my

>> quite succinct explanations here, you may have picked up why

>> philosophy of mind comes down to empirical behavioural science. That

>> *some people don't behave as if this is true does not mean that what  
>> they are doing is an exception, it just means that what they are doing  
>> will not, unless it's conceptual analysis of the terms and relations  
>> used \*within\* the Experimental or Applied Analysis of Behaviour,  
>> usually amount to much if anything. I have been telling you that you,  
>> and some misguided philosophers simply don't understand why this must  
>> be the case, and in a free world, people are free to do things that  
>> don't amount to much. I've also said that whilst this may have no  
>> scientific merit, it may well have other, lets say literary, or  
>> entertainment value – much like music or theatre.*

>

>*Finally you start to get it DL. Most of us are here for brainfotainment,  
>of different sorts. So are you, although you claim otherwise and like to  
>be the Messiah trying to save a few poor souls in the name of science  
>and truth. May God bless you. I'm not here to do science, I'm here to  
>talk with others and exchange ideas. Yes, it's open and free – not a  
>good place for \*you\* to be in. You're better off in the rigid regimen of  
>prisons and controlled behavior experiments.*

>

>*For you to know that it is your limbic system that reflexively forces  
>you to endlessly peck the keys of your key board and give all of us more  
>brain candy, thusly allowing us to be the contingencies that control  
>your behavior.. must be a terrible thing to realise for you. No wonder  
>you compensate your helplessness and predicament with those desperate  
>efforts to control your contingencies by insulting them, ordering them  
>to do things differently and "learn" from you, the Mozes begging his  
>people to listen and follow the Master to the Promised Land.*

>

On the contrary, I am well aware of what you are doing – but clearly you are not. This is what I'm criticising. It's how people like Ken Collins behaved. You delude yourself, abuse others, and when criticised for behaving obnoxiously, just trash the newsgroup because you can't have your own way with impunity.

--

David Longley