

Re: Religion center in the brain

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2006-09/msg00046.html>

- *From:* fburton@xxxxxxx (Francis Burton)
 - *Date:* 14 Sep 2006 19:18:21 GMT
-

In article <45087d88\$0\$24213\$9a6e19ea@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Wolf K <El_Lobo_Viejo@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Presumably an organism could perceive a visual stimulus even if it (the organism) comprised only a head (on a hypothetical life-support system if you like)? The rest of the body is not needed for perception to take place.

This is a rather odd statement, considering that we can and do get visual information from touching an object. Eg, shape, orientation.

Of course, but what I was trying to do was to pare down the hardware requirements for some still-meaningful subset of perception. The fact that people without fingers can no longer handle objects doesn't prevent them from perceiving them visually.

So what is the minimum hardware needed to allow visual perception? A brain and an eye would be sufficient, I think. To demonstrate to other organisms that perception had taken place, a fluttery eyelid might also be necessary.

Your question makes no sense without a clear and well-defined notion of "perception." You imply that some sort of response that signals that "perception" has taken place is necessary. OK then, try this:

I think my question makes =some= sense, but maybe not as much as you appear to be demanding.

The minimum hardware is a light sensing diode connected to some activator (eg, a switch that turns on a light or closes a bell ringing circuit, or whatever.)

Re: Religion center in the brain

That's fair counterexample.

But I don't think that's what you consider as "visual perception." I suspect that you have responses like "I see a tree" in mind when you refer to "visual perception."

Show the disembodied eye a picture of a tree with the question printed underneath: "Is this a tree? One flutter for no; two for yes." Repeat until convinced (or not) that perception is taking place (in the eye-brain).

This discussion is wandering all over the place and getting nowhere because the posters have differing notions of "perception", which is bad enough. But it gets worse: most change their notions every time they write another sentence.

Oh dear – have I done the same without realising it? :-)

Francis

.