

Re: Darwin, Evolution, the Animal Kingdom, and Man

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-12/0081.html>

From: Lester Zick (lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 12/03/04

Date: Fri, 03 Dec 2004 15:50:14 GMT

On Thu, 2 Dec 2004 23:55:25 +0000, David Longley
<David@longley.demon.co.uk> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>In article <41b04a5f.69613881@netnews.att.net>, Lester Zick
><lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net> writes
>>On Thu, 2 Dec 2004 22:36:57 +0000, David Longley
>><David@longley.demon.co.uk> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>>
>>>In article <41affd03.62730149@netnews.att.net>, Lester Zick
>>><lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net> writes
>>>>On Sun, 28 Nov 2004 15:56:16 GMT, lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net
>>>>(Lester Zick) in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>On 28 Nov 2004 01:12:27 -0800, cantueso@dieznet.com (cantueso) in
>>>>>comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>lesterDELzick@worldnet.att.net (Lester Zick) wrote in message
>>>>>>news:<41a0bf12.12119545@netnews.att.net>...
>>>>>>> On 20 Nov 2004 11:16:43 -0800, zzbunker@netscape.net (ZZBunker) in
>>>>>>> comp.ai.philosophy wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Directed evolution isn't the issue. The issue I raised merely concerns
>>>>>>>> whether man is categorically different from animals and explanations
>>>>>>>> for those differences.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>it would depend on your definitions and on your intentions, because
>>>>>>>>>in fact you would be looking for MEANING and the direction of your
>>>>>>>>>question is metaphysical, not biological; or who would establish the
>>>>>>>>>criteria?
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>It also depends on the issue I raised which wasn't directed evolution.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>For those who are interested in what the original issue of this thread
>>>>>>>>>>>was, it was that Darwin's principle of natural selection and evolution
>>>>>>>>>>>>of man from animals did not, as is often assumed, contradict the idea

>>>>*that there are categorical differences between man and animal. What it
>>>>contradicted was creationist religious and mythopoeic explanations for
>>>>those differences.*

>>>>

>>>>*Regards – Lester*

>>>>

>>>>*The above is worse than the sort of revisionist nonsense which folk like
>>>>Dennett have found themselves egregiously rewriting over the years
>>>>(Chomsky is another – and there are many others). Each of these
>>>>"intellectuals", having written extremely erudite (but naively arrogant)
>>>>disparaging nonsense about what people like Skinner have empirically and
>>>>practically contributed (he, like Chomsky just didn't understand what he
>>>>was reading). He's subsequently found himself working his way back to
>>>>Darwin in a vain effort to "rediscover" what Skinner and his students
>>>>practically revolutionised psychology with back in the 1930s.*

>>>>

>>>>*You should make an effort to find out what naturalised epistemology
>>>>really amounts to (and replaces), just as you should try to grasp where
>>>>behavioural and molecular genetics is going to take us.*

>>>>

>>>>*If Dennett is true to his word, he'd recognize this as fair criticism*

>>>>

>>>>*David, allow me a little question since the people you choose to
>>>>reference are not confreres of mine and probably not of yours.*

>>>>

>>>>*How many instances of the empirical control and prediction of behavior
>>>>are there in the history of EAB which do not involve animal training?
>>>>If the answer is none or nearly none, it becomes intuitively obvious
>>>>to the casual observer what the science in EAB amounts to, that it
>>>>only refers to the control and prediction of training regimens and
>>>>not behavior in general. This is why behaviorists in general and you
>>>>in particular have to campaign so diligently with your naturalized
>>>>nonsense to obscure the fact that the only thing you can control and
>>>>predict are animal training regimens and that EAB would be more
>>>>appropriately referred to as EAT.*

>>>>

>>>>*Regards – Lester*

>>>>

>>>>*The animals that concern most people are managed by legislation and
>>>>policy. For academic insights into this, see the Applied Analysis of
>>>>Behavior (journal of). For more rough and ready insights, see the work I
>>>>have referenced in our CJS.*

>>>>

>>>>*To carry on writing nonsense, just keep your head up your rectum.*

Thank you for evading a simple, straightforward question, David. I think we can now all plainly see what behaviorism is and entails.

Regards – Lester