

Re: The Hard Problem for Behaviorists

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-10/0211.html>

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

Date: 10/09/04

Date: Sat, 9 Oct 2004 11:01:34 +0100

In article <6pcem05rrfe0hla4o6s3iu75mtbrqb6fsl@4ax.com>, JXStern
<JXSternChangeX2R@gte.net> writes

>On Fri, 8 Oct 2004 22:45:43 +0100, David Longley

><David@longley.demon.co.uk> wrote:

>>>Philosophy of mind doesn't come down to anything, it either makes a
>>>contribution on its own, or it doesn't.

>>>

>>I don't think you understand what I said.

>

>Sure I understand what you said – the Earth revolves around David
>Longley. See?

No, I don't see. It's certainly not in my post. Any suggestion to the
contrary is entirely your construction. What you write is fantasy.

>

>> When I say it comes down to

>>empirical behavioural science I'm telling you what it practically comes

>>down to. That means it is what we do in those areas, and in my case that

>>comes down to what people do as much as any other animals. If you look

>>more closely into what I am talking about there, the referent is

>>forensic or clinical practice – in all sorts of domains. You simply do

>>not know what I am talking about, and I couldn't care two hoots about

>>whether some ivory tower academic philosopher or "cognitive" or computer

>>scientist agrees or not – they probably just don't appreciate the scope

>>of what I'm talking about if they dispute what I am telling you/them.

>>This comes down to my having access to what's always the most important

>>resource scientists ever have – *data*.

>

>Data is no better without theory, than theory is without data.

Once again, you show you have no idea what I am talking about. I've
provided references to the empirical context, and you haven't bothered
to follow those up.

>

>The idea that behaviorism or positivism is theory-free or

>theory-neutral is childish. It is a theory, and a very weak one.

sci.cognitive: Re: The Hard Problem for Behaviorists

More pretentious gibberish. Firstly, behaviorism or positivism are *philosophies*. Secondly, there is a "theory", you should re-read the post, and find out what epistemology naturalised refers to and thirdly, underdetermination does not legitimize anarchic epistemological relativism of the sort you indulge in. The merits of a theory or "approach" lies in the degree to which it improves prediction and control, is more parsimonious, conservative etc relative to alternative "approaches". You aren't even bother to look at what is being said before you start inanely arguing. This is a sad, but all too common pattern of behaviour these days, and it's one which reaches frustrating and almost pathological proportions in this newsgroup and elsewhere.

Try to get a grasp of what I'm talking about if you have any interest in making useful comments.

--

David Longley