

## Re: The Hard Problem for Behaviorists

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-10/0696.html>

---

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

**Date:** 10/26/04

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 2004 15:29:50 GMT

On Mon, 25 Oct 2004 23:36:41 +0200, "JPL Verhey"  
<[matterDELMinds@hotmail.com](mailto:matterDELMinds@hotmail.com)> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>  
> *"Lester Zick" <[lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net)> wrote in message*  
> *news:417cea1f.12509043@netnews.att.net...*  
>> *On Sun, 24 Oct 2004 23:51:04 +0200, "JPL Verhey"*  
>> *<[matterDELMinds@hotmail.com](mailto:matterDELMinds@hotmail.com)> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:*  
>>  
>>>  
>>> *"Lester Zick" <[lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net](mailto:lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net)> wrote in message*  
>>> *news:417c4d5a.8236674@netnews.att.net...*  
>>>> *On Sun, 24 Oct 2004 11:53:15 +0200, "JPL Verhey"*  
>>>>...  
>>>>> *To Lester, sentience is the result of "differences between material*  
>>>>> *differences". Non-sentient things like a rock, are what they are*  
>>>>> *only*  
>>>>> *as*  
>>>>> *the result of "material differences". My problems with this are:*  
>>>>>  
>>>>> *1. There is not distinguished between the "material" as seen on the*  
>>>>> *video-screens, and the "material" that is the input material*  
>>>>> *from-which*  
>>>>> *the "material" on the video-screen is created. So there are two*  
>>>>> *"materials":*  
>>>>  
>>>> *Well, JPL, I don't quite understand what you're objecting to here.*  
>>>> *I've always drawn a distinction between material inputs to*  
>>>> *differences*  
>>>> *and material outputs from differences. Material inputs are material*  
>>>> *differences and material outputs are material differences. But so*  
>>>> *what?*  
>>>> *I've always made this clear or at least thought I had. The only*  
>>>> *difference between them is that material consequents of differences*  
>>>> *between material differences are logically divorced from antecedent*  
>>>> *material differences. So I don't see the problem.*  
>>>>  
>>>> *Maybe because you don't see the problem with \*material\*, which I tried*

>>>to explain to you. You just keep restating those things as if you are  
>>>totally aware and fully informed of the nature of material. I tried to  
>>>make the point that in fact you, me, and everybody else for that  
>>>matter,  
>>>have very little idea what material really is, what we can claim to  
>>>know  
>>>about it's nature. It appears you have sort of a deep faith in  
>>>"matter"  
>>>as the rock and building block for your further theory on sentience as  
>>>"differences between material differences". Which or what differences  
>>>remains unspecified, but that is not a big sin. But your term material  
>>>keeps re-appearing in your equations as a devine decree where  
>>>questioning its nature and what we claim to know about it with  
>>>certainty  
>>>cannot be challenged. For you, material is just material – period.  
>>>When  
>>>you say above: "Material inputs are material differences and material  
>>>outputs are material differences.But so what?".. is a good example of  
>>>that. It appears that materialism still has a grip on you. ;-)  
>>>  
>>>To say it even more brutally – when you use the term material, I think  
>>>you have no idea what you are talking about. Sorry for sounding like a  
>>>lil' David ;-)  
>>  
>> Well, that's exactly what you sound like and pretty much what I'd  
>> expected you'd sound like once you understood my contempt for  
>> philosophers of all stripes. Some are better intentioned than others,  
>> but in terms of production, they're all pretty much just assholes,  
>> behaviorist and non behaviorist alike. Science is an alien realm to  
>> philosophers. They all just talk in circles and wave their hands and  
>> pretend they're talking importantly about important issues. However,  
>> they have no special evidence for this; so, they just keep talking and  
>> hope no one will notice.  
>>  
>> I'll tell you one thing I know about matter that you claim to know but  
>> don't: matter is defined in terms of differences.  
>  
>What you mean with "matter is defined in terms of differences"? You mean  
>we that \*define\* matter as such, or the nature of matter independent of  
>our definitions?

I mean just what I've explained previously: There are various levels of differences and the compounding of differences between differences etc. And I assign the definition of matter and material interactions to the level of differences alone.

>> For mechanical  
>> purposes in relation to processes defined in terms of differences  
>> between differences such as sentience, that's all science needs to  
>> know. You want to understand matter in all its nuances, go ahead. No  
>> one's stopping you. It just doesn't have any bearing on the

>> *differential cognition or the mechanics of intelligence.*

>

>As for your contempt for philosophers, I don't see any science in the  
>statement "sentience is differences between material differences".

Nor apparently do you see any science in the resolution of Russell's paradox through differences between material differences. If you don't wanna look you aren't likely to see.

>That's why I feel it is legitimate to discuss it philosophically, or  
>just critically.

I have no idea why you seem to think these terms are somehow synonymous. Looking at something philosophically just means you're blowing smoke and moving mirrors. If you look at something critically you do so according to some standard of criticality such as the self contradiction of alternatives. That's the method I employ. But that's about as far removed from the practice of philosophers' stones as science is from philosophy.

>> *Now, I have been working on the problem of differences and differences  
>> between differences in material terms. However nothing you've asked so  
>> far has had any bearing on these considerations. I just keep repeating  
>> answers because you keep addressing issues repetitiously without  
>> adding anything new. You make certain claims and I respond to your  
>> points in whatever terms necessary.*

>

>It's of course OK, Lester, that for you what I say has no bearing on  
>what you say, and the reverse is true for me. There is nothing in your  
>responses that shows me that you at least understand the problem I see  
>there, and hence all your "answers" are to me just repetitions of what  
>you said already.

It would help if the issues you raise weren't quite so repetitious. I routinely explain the justification and significance of differences and differences between differences and you routinely move on to more advanced topics like the nuances of matter and cross eyed vision.

If you think material interactions, matter, and cross eyed vision are mechanized in terms other than differences and differences between differences etc. I suggest you say and move on to explain what and how.

>> *I just don't see cross eyed vision  
>> and duplicate tactile sensations as significant or especially relevant  
>> to the mechanics of sentience.*

>>

>> *I suggest you spend less time complaining about how little I know  
>> about questions you can't answer for yourself. Obviously I know more  
>> than you do and to put it bluntly more than you're ever likely to know  
>> or to find out for yourself about matter, sentience, and intelligence.*

>

>Well, *apparently it is the right conclusion for you. And I'm very near*  
>*the conclusion that you are simply not able to reconsider your*  
>*assumptions about matter, especially the assumption that you know enough*  
>*about it to make the statement that sentience can only be defined as*  
>*"differences between material differences". It's a shot in the dark.*

It may be a shot in the dark, but it's a correct shot in the dark whose justification has been explained for the last time. If you see no reason to ponder that justification, then I suggest you just ignore it and move on to more advanced topics to ponder philosophically.

Regards – Lester