

## Re: Religion center in the brain

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2006-09/msg00058.html>

---

- *From:* "Glen M. Sizemore" <[gmsizemore2@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gmsizemore2@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 12 Sep 2006 17:42:04 -0400
- 

K: Christianity dominated Western thought for thousands of years before Darwin traveled the Galapagos Islands and published his systematic observations. Will you say that Christianity begat Darwinism?

GS: No. And Darwin did not argue that his view was a reaction to Christianity.

K: On historical pendulums, Wundt investigated covert psychological activity and psychophysics before radical behaviorism insouciantly ignored all cognition as irrelevant to behavior.

GS: Radical behaviorism holds that "covert psychological activity" is important, and is a proper subject matter of psychology, even though it can only be known by inference. After being in psychology as a student and instructor for more than 20 years, I still don't know what counts as a cognition. You imply that it has critically to do with what can be introspected, but most of what cognitivists talk about is not observed – the product is allegedly observed, but the processes themselves are not so in general. BTW, I don't normally associate Wundt with psychophysics, but I'm not an expert on the history of psychology. Certainly structuralism was one of the most spectacular failures of all time.

K: The humanists then came along to point out that human beings have goals that pigeons and rats do not have,[]

GS: The term "goal" is not terribly useful, but to the extent that it is simply a sloppy way to refer to reinforcement, nobody would deny that the reinforcers for humans are often different from those of rats and pigeons.

## Re: Religion center in the brain

K: and Wertheimer, after having discovered the magic trick to a stereoscope declared that Titchener's atomism was "sterile and beside the point".

GS: I don't get the point of this. Are you somehow comparing behaviorism with the structuralism of Titchner?

K: Chomsky told Skinner that his precis on language development was woefully inadequate,[]

GS: Unfortunately, Chomsky's review had almost nothing to do with Skinner's position, and Chomsky never read Verbal Behavior. Anyone who has read both his review and Skinner's book already knew that, and Chomsky admitted that he never read the book to Searle. You were saying?

K: []and why; Chomsky's theory was later supported by the discovery of Broca's and Wernicke's areas in the brain. Now in 2006 on Usenet a handful of behaviorists troll sci.cognitive and object to the neuroscientific approach to the study of human behavior. Such is the history of scientific progress.

GS: The discovery of Broca's and Wernicke's areas do not show anything more than that behavioral function is mediated by physiology. No behaviorist that I know of objects to neuroscience, but plenty object to the silly conceptualization that has been foisted upon it by cognitive "science."

K: Neuroscientific investigation has supported several inference based theories – Ewald's opponent process theory of color vision, for example – and is developing an explanation of what happens in the brain when learning occurs, which includes "memory encoding/levels of processing" theories from cognitive psychology as well as classical and operant conditioning theories from behaviorist psychology, which are actually complimentary theories.

Re: Religion center in the brain

Re: Religion center in the brain

GS: And nobody objects to the hypothetico–deductive method when it is applied at the right time and within a context of conceptual clarity. This hardly describes mainstream psychology.

K: All this, despite the naysaying of the choleric Usenet few... some of whom have apparently been reduced to dishonestly misquoting others or taking their statements out of context in an apparent attempt to win a tangential argument. Instead of seeking common ground you and Wolf argue semantics.

GS: I didn't misquote you. Saying that "perception is physiology" is basically the same as saying that "seeing is in the brain." I paraphrased you, not misquoted you. There is no need. What you say is stupid all on its own. There is no denying that it, however, the majority position.

K: And of course if all else fails, Al Bundyism would dictate that one metaphorically whip out his manhood and wave it around, Daddio.

GS: I didn't mention my manhood. I am your intellectual superior and I have no desire to literally subject you to the power of my manhood.

Still Your Daddy,

Glen

"Kali" <kali@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:MPG.1f70d733ed3817669896c0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:MPG.1f70d733ed3817669896c0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

In <4506f7b5\$0\$14688\$ed362ca5@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Glen M.

.

Re: Religion center in the brain