

Re: Peterson's Death Sentence

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2005-01/8129.html>

From: John Fields (jfields_at_austininstruments.com)

Date: 01/29/05

Date: Sat, 29 Jan 2005 13:34:03 -0600

On Sat, 29 Jan 2005 15:55:11 GMT, "Kevin Aylward"
<salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk> wrote:

>John Fields wrote:

>> On Fri, 28 Jan 2005 21:05:22 +0000, John Woodgate

>> <jmw@jmwa.demon.contraspam.yuk> wrote:

>>

>>> I read in *sci.electronics.design* that John Fields

>>> <jfields@austininstruments.com> wrote (in

>>> <ue4lv01fl22is149t831nus45049ksn66n@4ax.com>) about 'Peterson's

>>> Death Sentence', on Fri, 28 Jan 2005:

>>>

>>>> *Something like that. The rainbow analogy may be a little strained*

>>>> *unless you consider the colors as an array of discrete wavelengths,*

>>>

>>> *That seems to me to be completely backwards. The *colour* doesn't*

>>> *look like discrete wavelengths; it looks like a continuum. Same with*

>>> *consciousness, unless you define it in such a way that it's limited*

>>> *to Homo sapiens.*

>>

>> ---

>> *Yes, that's the point I was trying to make. That "color", even though*

>> *it may _look_ like a countinuum, really isn't,*

>

>*Yes it is. Dah...colour is expressed by frequency or wavelength, both of
>which are continuous.*

Frayed knot. Color is caused by an electron's dropping from one
discrete energy level to another, thus generating a photon which
carries off that quantum of energy and vibrates at a particular
wavelength.

>

>>and consciousness, even

>> though it may also look like a continuum is really discrete in that

>> before it can be recognized as consciousness, it must cross some

>> threshold.

>

>This is simply speculation. I disagree completely. There is no evidence

sci.electronics.design: Re: Peterson's Death Sentence

>whatsoever that consciousness has a threshold. There are good arguments
>against such a view.

Yet, in an earlier post, you stated:

"Complete nonsense. We only need you be concerned about a "life" after
it has first become *conscious*. Before something becomes conscious it
is no more than a carrot. What *makes* a life, that needs
consideration for its *own* sake, is a brain. Period."

Which seems to indicate that you _do_ consider there to be a period
before which consciousness occurs and a period after. Such being the
case, then there must necessarily be a threshold between the two
states, that threshold being when consciousness occurs.

I don't believe you can support both viewpoints simultaneously, so
when do you suppose you'll waffle back to your earlier so-firmly-held
belief?

--

John Fields