

More of my Questions/ Discussions

Not Psychology for Psychology, but open, tough, thorough, true, fully phenomenologically-based real empiricism for all explanations and understandings

Not Psychology for Psychology, but open, tough, thorough, true, phenomenological empiricism: finding **overt directly-observable patterns as the bases or foundations or clear beginnings of everything.**

This is the way for commitment to science in Psychology, NOT making analogies, copying and "applying" apparent forms, making presumptuous models (BEFORE FINDINGS), over-generalizations, inventing new terms (e.g. "meta"-[whatever] NOR "executive [whatever]" NOR even: "social learning" *); and, no unsupportable concepts, such as those that extend sensori-motor phenomenon TO later developments (in supposed ontogeny) JUST BY SELF-GENERATED ANALOGIES. <-- These all help fill fictitious gaps in constricted, untrue "observations", not real gaps in good observation and understandings; they are self-supportive (supporting your own ideas) and correspondingly VERY LIMITED and, in the long run, "dead ends". Yet these are ALL almost exclusively the various methods USED today by theorists/researchers in Psychology (here characterized from the perspective of empiricism); these methods lead to more bad methods, more poor false concepts, and false "understandings" -- no matter how apparent or real or "necessary" these may SEEM ; from the perspective of ignorance and its limits, many things NOT WELL-ESTABLISHED may seem good; things not clearly related to phenomenological patterns and thus real empiricism may seem good: ignorance (including lack of considerations) can lead to heart-held perspectives that cannot be distinguished from all that which seems "real", to you, BUT this is that which is delusional from a fully-empirical standard. Such bad "theories" still may seeming convincing, if one is not open to finding clear, REAL support for everything -- when things are viewed wrongfully (not open to the nature of real science AND true phenomenology itself, as indicated above, AND __THAT__ ONLY).

If you have to get out of the time-frame or "space" of the lab to possibly see things, DO IT ! It is not the case that you have to have YOUR limits; look for that which is true, which properly naturalistically "circumscribes" any real limits/definitions. You may even find some phenomenon with real limits IN the lab use-able, if you have a developed, supported view and thus have a true (e.g. biological/patterned) outlook on behavior PATTERNS. BUT: "Define" nothing yourself.

Empiricism IS science, NOT your experiments or the "Labs"

* **FOOTNOTE:** The scientific unit-of-analysis in Psychology is the individual (i.e. single) human, PERIOD -- no matter how fun or seemingly useful group-based concepts may SEEM. No real science drifts from one unit-of-analysis to another as its CORE SUBJECT AREA (Psychology does this and then artificially combines them for explanation of the individual). [Psychology is certainly a work of "high fiction", amazingly varied, "compiled", and contorted, but do not confuse this for any "sophistication". AND: Do not succumb to "multi-disciplinary" "explanations" or neuroscience "explanations" either. Understanding behavior can most certainly be a science into and onto itself -- and

anything else is very, very suspect (if you do not know much about key behavioral patterns that exist or how they are related, this gives you a clear sign that Psychology has YET TO START as a science, in its overall actual area: BIOLOGY (and legitimate Psychology is the biology-of-behavior -- just behavior, behavior, per se -- and the inter-organization of THAT (where "surrounding" behavior patterns THEMSELVES mainly define other behavior PATTERNS; and, if you do not think this way THEN HOW SHOULD YOU EVALUATE YOUR THINKING? -- this would be a VERY big question for you).]

[All my writings, here on RG -- over 800 pages, in length -- conform to this view, above.]

Making my perspective on major cognitive developments during ontogeny MORE PALATABLE:

Seeing 'things' anew can be seeing "new things" -- and sometimes be such as that during stage shifts. (This is an Update to my Ethogram Theory Project, as well.)

The natural development of the Memories (integration, consolidation, generalization), THEN major changes are impelled, IN _THAT_ FINAL PREPARED CONTEXT, MAINLY by what literally is OR has the status of perceptual shifts: you immediately start seeing **new concrete aspects of situations (new things) and/OR you see-anew concrete * aspects (THUS: new 'things' or sets of things, also 'things') in an entirely new context; _EITHER involve new gazing and looking (as the concrete manifestation in behavior patterns).** (This new perception naturally results in, i.e. moves to, attending to these very (exact) new things (new or, equivalently, things in a holistically new context) and THEN new learnings going from there.) With either sort is a perceptual shift -- and it "just happens" when the organism is prepared. (So: seeing old concrete aspects anew is just as dramatic as seeing completely new elements/objects in situations, **in effect**. But know that **seeing completely new concrete aspects is a possibility that must not be ruled out, at least in some "applications" of the new sort of "template".**) These perceptual shifts ARE the inception of each new stage of cognitive development, there being at least 5 of these stages in human child development (ontogeny), and those with phases (some major current theorist/researchers say 2 major phases per stage). In any case, "the purpose" and result is new abstract thinking abilities (grounded empirically as indicated AND as they must be since adaptation to environments is the whole nature of the things). The perceptual shifts (and, they are of that nature: of perception) **are the major key literal inception of each new level of abstract representation and abstract thinking abilities.** It is with new abstraction abilities that each of the 5 stages is **qualitatively different**. AND that new level of thinking becomes common, across many and different situations/circumstances (as well as likely involving **a perspective, of the Subject, that may ALSO be across times and circumstances in the first place, at first appearance (in the individual instance of "seeing" leading to understanding) -- the result of significant development of the Memories ** (much underestimated now).**

AND, the really (other) good news (nothing hard here) is that other changes involve ONLY the simple sorts of associative learning: sensitization, habituation, classical and operant conditioning (BUT, NOW, we have the proper contextS).

* FOOTNOTE: "Concrete" means directly observable and in its nature completely overt. This is the basis of what new (or anew) is "seen" and of the behavior patterns "seeing", BOTH. (The latter is often largely just shifts in sets of behavior patterns, this dramatic enough to at least seem like new behavior

patterns, and possibly best conceptualized as such; the former may involve imagining contexts (real context, real enough to be in the Memories) across space and time, to make what newly seen or seen anew (to be seen or in a greater context see-able).)

**** FOOTNOTE:** When one examines the definitions of the various Memories, these definitions (themselves) indicate that the Memories (the several different ones, working together) constitute basic EXPERIENCE ITSELF (integrally and always "used" as major contextualization by "working memory").

The "translation" of my Perspective on Psychology (my ethology) TO the field of General Artificial Intelligence

(see one of my last, previous posts for the perspective on Psychology)(not really much translation involved, in the following):

The aspects of my perspective that are typically missing in AGI's (artificial general intelligence) ideas of "cumulative learning" [(see "Cumulative Learning", By Kristinn Thorrisson et al)] include:

True Hierarchical learning -- which is more than a new category and a responses using and building on existing behaviors PATTERNS of otherwise of the same nature (as those used in the past). (Note the thinking always in PATTERNS -- it is thus that behavior patterns show detectable changes, which are the new behavior pattern itself AND by which behavior patterns are defined (as in classical ethology) -- i.e. DEFINED BY THE PATTERNING OF BEHAVIOR "SURROUNDING" THEM.) Then realize: True hierarchical learning ADDS new elements (in the behavior/response pattern), which shifts some key pattern(s) _AND_ which promote (IS) fuller sensing/perception of the key aspects of the situation(s) BY the Subject -- literally PERCEIVING NEW CONCRETE ELEMENT(s) (as indicated, **AND these may be across several times and across several circumstances -- especially later in ontogeny; such is the power of SOME of our Memory systems; we simply must use "more imagination" here, both the Subjects and as researchers/theorists**). The sub-elements (lower level elements OF the previous responses to "such" situations) may change in their nature as they are used differently (e.g. "tagged" or "typed"), or at least when associated with new-different circumstances; some may certainly be truncated or dropped out (think: new "chunking").

Foundations in PERCEPTION -- yes, THAT kind-of basic process. It is with/in perception (and later, attention FOLLOWING THAT) that provides for (IS) "new elements which promote full sensing/perception of the key aspects of the situation BY the Subject literally PERCEIVING NEW CONCRETE ELEMENTS [(or elements in a distinctly new context)]". Resolving that seeing SUCH new things and JUST THAT (see above), as the foundation of each new level of abstracting ability (i.e. abstraction) -- THAT is a major seemingly paradoxical set of "things" which simply must be resolved ("bucking" the philosophies of the past).

Ontogeny involves a new type of learning at each stage, unfolding in response to (or included in the response to) NEW elements of the concrete situations/circumstances (and, **given the sophistication of**

some of our Memories: this can be across times and spaces.) Here, it is important to see/find TRUE ANALOGIES (not just "trumped up" analogies). These are doubtlessly useful in generalization to "other" circumstances -- seeing other situations similarly better by seeing MORE there "too". PLUS: We must get rid of the idea that **"learning"** is always the same type of thing IN ACTION; **it changes qualitatively there, BY VIRTUE OF CONTENT, AND CHANGING RESPONSES TO THAT.** Ironically, in my system , in another sense, all learning is the same in that it conforms to **simple associative learning patterns**-- that is all that is needed (or likely), given what else is going on. [Of course, good integration, consolidation and generalization of earlier behavior patterns must occur before "moving on" from one stage-type ("level"-type) to the next.]

Thus, the AGI machine must contingently, after previous developments and integration/consolidations/generalizations, SEE MORE) BASIC [(here meaning: additional)] ELEMENTS OF THE SITUATION. And, JUST THIS, provides for moving in-key-part(s) the whole system -- allowing more abstractions (things seen conventionally as "more abstract"), and THUS yielding more refined responses (whether they are specialized or not -- to some extent an open question -- BUT THEY ARE NEW w/r to the important sets of **overt, express, explicit circumstances (AT LEAST clear at the inception of such a new sort of processing)**). Likewise the **BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, AT LEAST AT FIRST ARE ALSO overt, directly observable and clearly expressed.** It is important to realize that although initially overt, directly observable and expressly and explicitly seen IN patterns of behavior, such overt-ness of direct, observable overt evidence of change may be short-lived, as the Memories change and incorporate the new (new type) of learning behavior (perhaps VERY quickly) (This is why, for humans, eye-tracking technology and associated technology (e.g analysis software) likely have to be used.)

Given the distinct limitations of short-term memory (I should say "working memory") and the LACK of limitations of other Memories (e.g. visual-spacial) make it **understandable that small changes in response (including PERCEIVING) must be able to yield BIG changes in understanding;** this is why **this perspective and theory make sense (and ONLY something like it could make sense).** AGI simply must figure out such ontogeny as I have described AND DO IT. In AI you have the great ability of trial-and-error, quickly and over-and-over, that allows for a fair amount of guessing (I would guess) - - and give the "locality" of the beginning of new patterns in behavior COULD (in theory, with a thoroughly educated view/approach) BE GUESSED AT. But none of this is possible without an appreciation for True Hierarchical Learning during ontogeny -- very, very likely occurring in qualitatively different stages. The machine must make ITS OWN analogies, and only such analogies are appropriate (as has been the case in science "forever").

Something very much like I propose (above) OR attempts at AGI (as is and has been the case with Psychology) can continue-on, basically the same way as they have been for decades -- i.e. no big progress (as is acknowledged, again and again in the AGI field).

Here is the main part of the meaning of the above writing, shorter, and perhaps, clearer:

The natural development of the Memories (integration, consolidation, generalization), THEN major changes are impelled, IN _THAT_ FINAL PREPARED CONTEXT, MAINLY by what literally is OR has the status of perceptual shifts: you immediately start seeing new concrete aspects of situations (new things) and/OR you see-anew concrete* aspects (things) in an entirely new context, either involving new gazing and looking (as the concrete manifestation in behavior patterns). (This new

perception naturally results in, i.e. moves to, attending to these very (exact) new things (new or, equivalently, things in a holistically new context) and THEN new learnings going from there.) With either sort is a perceptual shift -- it "just happens" when the organism/machine is prepared. (So: seeing old concrete aspects anew is just as dramatic as seeing completely new elements/objects in situations, in effect. But know that seeing completely new concrete aspects is a possibility that must not be ruled out, at least in some "applications" of the new sort of "template".) These perceptual shifts are the inception of each new stage of cognitive development, there being at least 5 of these stages in human child development (ontogeny), and those with phases (some major current theorist/researchers say 2 major phases per stage). In any case, "the purpose" and result is new abstract thinking abilities (grounded empirically as indicated AND as they must be since adaptation to environments is the whole nature of the things). The perceptual shifts (and, they are of that nature: of perception) are the major key literal inception of each new level of abstract representation and abstract thinking abilities. It is with new abstraction abilities that each of the 5 stages is **qualitatively different**. AND that new level of thinking becomes common, across many and different situations/circumstances (as well as likely involving a perspective, of the Subject/machine, that may ALSO be across times and circumstances in the first place, at first appearance (in the individual instance of "seeing" leading to understanding) -- the result of significant development of the Memories (much underestimated now)).

AND, the really (other) good news (nothing hard here) is that other changes involve ONLY the simple sorts of associative learning: sensitization, habituation, classical and operant conditioning (BUT, NOW, we have the proper contextS).

* FOOTNOTE: "Concrete" means directly observable and in its nature completely overt. This is the basis of what new (or anew) is "seen" and of the behavior patterns "seeing", BOTH. (The latter is often largely just shifts in sets of behavior patterns, this dramatic enough to at least seem like new behavior patterns, and possibly best conceptualized as such; the former may involve imagining contexts (real context, real enough to be in the Memories) across space and time, to make what newly seen or seen anew (to be seen or in a greater context seeable).) All of the other AGI concerns, of course, are also concerns.

I have tried to understand what may have made the original (fuller) version of the essay (the beginning Discussion 'question of this thread) difficult for some to understand. I decided it is/was likely the lack of the following understanding:

When one examines the definitions of the various Memories, these definitions (themselves) indicate that the Memories (the several different ones, working together) constitute basic EXPERIENCE ITSELF (integrally and always "used" as major contextualization by "working memory"). That view of the Memories may help the understanding of my overall view and approach. Substituting

THAT perspective when one see "the Memories" mentioned (in sentences) perhaps helps people from seeing the content of that original version "drifting around".

Renaissance for PSYCHOLOGY, as the study of behavior -- a lot of that, but JUST that (per se)

I believe the following outlook can lead to a **Renaissance** of Psychology as the **study of behavior** **PER SE** -- in this way, just indicated, like Skinner's attitude BUT VERY DIFFERENT. [(By "behavior per se", I mean ALL concepts stem from the following: AS the first distinctly relevant behavior patterns are FIRST DISCOVERED, they SHOW **distinct concrete signs**, i.e. are related to **clear DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT phenomenon (behavior), at least at some key time in the development** (ontogeny) of the organism. Thus relevant behavior patterns for some concepts of what's involved in behavior -- many important ones -- may only have evidence observable for a time and then "go underground" as thought : concepts and thought processes. (ALSO, see the paragraph below for more on this, because the overt directly-observable behavior patterns may be quite subtle.) This point of view is also greatly aided by realizing that, BY THE DEFINITIONS of the Memories, they in effect constitute EXPERIENCE ITSELF; then you have the limits of working memory combined with the vast capabilities of other of the Memories, e.g. visual-spacial memory, making such a perspective an inevitability, given one has any regard for empiricism at all.)]

Of course, for obvious reasons and for basic empiricism: One can make very a useful, strong case for the application of the basic principles of BIOLOGY to behavioral patterns (e.g. homeostasis) and this includes **also expecting to see patterning and inter-relationships of behavior PATTERNS ****, just as we see the composite working of parts within organs as well as multiple organs working-together. (THUS we could see behavior patterns, large and small, showing a "biological nature".) **__SO__ in talking about the "biology of behavior", I am referring to the patterning (and inter-patterning) OF BEHAVIORS PER SE** (as clearly indicated in the 1st paragraph, above) : I very much believe that not only can **_THAT_** be a good and real science, but it is **hard to imagine that behavior patterns could otherwise be well-understood : Behavior patterns, being that which in-good-part define composite behaviors AND related behavior patterns _AND_ this is, perhaps often ,THE ONLY WAY OF DEFINING THEM WELL.** [(All this may well mean going out of the space and time-frame constraints of any laboratory situation and "set up"; on the other hand, many studies in laboratories together and put in good perspective (properly conceptualized) may, themselves, lead to the ability/skill of finding eye-tracking evidence for the inception of all key behavior patterns, even in the space/time-period constraints of the "lab" ***; THIS INCLUDES SEEING THE FIRST, INCEPTION, of behaviors "behind" abstract thought.)]

See:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_phenomenologically-based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings_and_the_Answers_following_that_Discussion_Question for elaborations/clarifications. AND:

READ:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286920820_A_Human_Ethogram_Its_Scientific_Acceptability_and_Importance_now_NEW_because_new_technology_allows_investigation_of_the_hypotheses_an_early_MUST_READ

and

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory

and

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory>
(see the **Project Log of this Project** to see many important Updates)

ALSO (not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "book", you already have been directed to) the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking) .

FOOTNOTE: Strange underscoring (underscores: " _ ") are found in a few places in the Article to compensate for researchgate leaving out spaces in their display of the short "synopsis" of the Article they show (in the "listings"); I thought underscores might be better than seeing words run together.

**** FOOTNOTE: TRUST NO RESEARCH, THEORY, OR FINDINGS THAT DO NOT DESCRIBE THINGS IN TERMS OF BEHAVIOR ____ PATTERNS ____ .**

***** FOOTNOTE:** The hypotheses generated by/from the Ethogram Theory, associated with the point of view presented here, could (with the proper knowledge development and, thus, with context in mind), hypothetically, all be verified within a more-or-less standard laboratory situation.

Do we lack imagination for how great our imagination (representation of "things" AND ACROSS CIRCUMSTANCES/SITUATIONS) can be?

Do we lack imagination for how great our imagination (representation of "things" INCLUDING ACROSS CIRCUMSTANCES/SITUATIONS) can be? Why would this NOT be the case? There ARE profound reasons to expect biases and for "things" to be overly situationally-concretized :

Two big (and near-certain) reasons: [(Don't be offended or discouraged; all this (below) simply means the vast majority of us -- and certainly the VAST majority of behavioral theorists/researchers -- are lousy phenomenologists, lousy existentialists, and lousy empiricists: all curable conditions.)]

(1) we are frequent **dualists, pitting THIS against THAT, as 2 necessarily disparate TYPES of "things"**, when they may well not be (and, in fact, often aren't). One big example here is nature vs. nurture.

(2) From philosophy (our historical/cultural background) we tend to identify **just-named things (things simply with names) as if they are truly real (and things "unto themselves")**. A prime example here is our idea that we "use" 'our' memories, when (in fact), by the definitions of the Memories themselves, they constitute EXPERIENCE ITSELF [(and neither is "used" by us OR us by them, in any traditionally conceptualized deterministic manner)].

These 2 very strong tendencies yield profound biases against what we can IMAGINE we can represent in so-called "memory", especially real aspects of "things" found ONLY, and found meaningful, only

considering (or across) MULTIPLE circumstances/situations (aka MULTIPLE "sets of circumstances"). If abstraction (abstract thinking) abilities depend on just such things (such a combination of actual experience and represented circumstances), THEN : given our biases, we may well see "abstractions" as unconnected to concrete realities -- when this is most certainly NOT the case (if you are an empiricist). There may be multiple and even diverse circumstances involved in conceptualizing/representing an abstract concept (but yet allow their SHOWING in concrete aspects of these situations AND in our RESPONSE __PATTERNS__). _AND_ SUCH SITUATIONS MAY WELL BE "HANDLED" BY the Memories (the different faculties that HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED), objectively speaking. But, we cannot allow ourselves to "think of that". Here is some of the "un-faced" very-likely realities:

There may very well be some innate guidances of perception/attention differing (or emerging) FROM stage-to-stage (levels, if you like) of child development (ontogeny) that ALLOW FOR THIS, i.e. that which involves across-circumstances and multiple-circumstances, FOR key representations ("imagination") and conceptualization. And, that innate guidance is highly likely -- though contradicted by many, many (even most all) modern perspectives (**BUT NOT CONTRADICTED BY EVIDENCE**)!! IN FACT: This view (MY view, just expressed) is **highly likely** just **given the limitations of working memory** that seem to be always present -- and just that alone [(so, not even too much thought need be involved here, to see this point; **also note: the awesome capacities OUR OTHER "memory" faculties have** -- as even shown to a great extent in "lower animals", allowing for sophisticated and selective "memories")].

All my writings here on Researchgate represent all the real possibilities of our imagination AND THIS LIKELY REALITY OF THE NATURE OF OUR DEVELOPMENT. And, **I contrast this thoroughly with modern views and assumptions AND outline the full set of empirical consequences stemming from our such very-possible characteristic (species-typical) abilities/capacities/guidances. AND: Included among the consequences (repercussions) of this VIEW, just expressed, include some TESTABLE (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses** -- well-supporting my perspective (and approach): Ethogram Theory . Read the 800 or so pages I have written about all-of-the-above, and get back to me.

P.S. For an example OF **ALL THE BAD AND WORST PRACTICES** (dualism/concrete-ism), see my review of "Abstract concepts and the suppression of arbitrary episodic context" in my SECOND Comment after that article. Here is a link to the article:

Preprint [Abstract concepts and the suppression of arbitrary episodic context](#)

The above link is provided only for the purpose of giving you a bad example, an example of a study with bad practices (illustrating both the major ills I describe in the Question beginning THIS thread) -- and the Comment (my second one) that tells you how and why.

Logic with empiricism greatly favor the cognitive-developmental view of Ethogram Theory; the only "choices" require & involve a break with empiricism.

Using any sound premises, where there is thought to be an overt accompaniment to all significant

behavior change (i.e. they just don't "pop out") AND clear aspects of environments/situations/circumstances that the behavior pattern(s) are a response TO: only these outlooks can be considered empirical or scientific. SUCH are the ONLY decent premises.

Then, with logic, you get sound results, which are absolutely consistent with the cognitive-developmental perspective and approach and the clear hypotheses of Ethogram Theory. While there may be a possibility that this theory does not clearly or fully indicate the clear answer (i.e with the guidance of the hypotheses possibly being insufficient), all logic and soundness are still AS YET consistent with it (and only it). ALL existing alternative theories can very arguably (I'd say: only arguably) be seen as INVOLVING BREAKS WITH EMPIRICISM (and what an empiricist would see literally as breaks from reality -- as well as LOSING the ability to reliably communicate).

It is the way I suggest modern "behaviorists", believing behavior patterns and inter-patterning by themselves can AND do/will provide a full and cogent -- and possibly even practical -- view of this aspect of Biology: behavior patterns. I.E. Indeed, Psychology CAN BE the "science of behavior [per se]" and there are empirical perspectives to see some of the major phenomenon AND good hypotheses and methods to see key aspects, as well (in the Ethogram Theory perspective and approach).

Here is presently the way I suggest people get "there":

First, here is a paper that may be of clear relevance to the position (a good understandable start -- that is to say, not my writing) :

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335362910_Situational_systematicity_A_role_for_schema_in_understanding_the_differences_between_abstract_and_concrete_concepts?isFromSharing=1

THEN: I think you might benefit from looking at my perspective on the changes in what "environments" literally PUT TOGETHER can change qualitatively the behavior patterns see with development. This ends up with a situation (regarding concepts/abstraction) indicated in the following:

First, I believe my ANSWER to "What is philosophically indisputable?" (https://www.researchgate.net/post/What_is_philosophically_indisputable) and then (after that) consider:

Do we lack imagination for how great our imagination (representation of "things" AND ACROSS CIRCUMSTANCES/SITUATIONS) can be? (https://www.researchgate.net/post/Do_we_lack_imagination_for_how_great_our_imagination_representation_of_things_AND_ACROSS_CIRCUMSTANCES_SITUATIONS_can_be) Obviously, we DO.

and then, after THAT:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Renaissance_for_PSYCHOLOGY_as_the_study_of_behavior--a_lot_of_that_but_JUST_that_per_se

(THEN, if you want more: follow-up with all the references cited in that last cited (above) Discussion Question (a LOT of reading, but you may find many reasons to like it, as it reveals understanding).)

Basically, I believe we can come to an understanding of the cognitive-developmental "container" (true and logical organization) and then rather easily and more validly add in the emotions (as additional,

and important, patterning). This was basically the position of Piaget and neo-Piagetians and their cognitive-developmental proposals. And, now, with the clear associated testable (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses of Ethogram Theory we have proposed patternings (and how to find them); and this can be clearly seen as what finishes Piaget's theory, where he himself knew it was incomplete (w/r to his equilibration type 2 **: the happenings with/from THAT, being previously (and up to now) ONLY referred to as "maturation").

See <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY> , where the basic aspects (components) are "flushed out" (and see the Project Log, aka the Updates). In the ultimate analysis you will see that the proposed cognitive-developmental system has just 3 sorts of aspects:

ALL the Memories, all the various memory faculties we have (some of the basics, well researched) -- integral : the Memories themselves, by THEIR ACKNOWLEDGED definitions constituting EXPERIENCE ITSELF.

The "emergence" of innate guidances as perceptual (perceptual/attentional) "shifts" "in" behavior patterns : this new patterning being the first INCEPTION (i.e. just the beginning) of each new stage of thought (abstraction) and with clear (though subtle) directly observable overt behavior patterns (likely requiring eye tracking and computer-assisted analysis -- and being poised to see these based on substantial and sufficient knowledge of ontogeny heretofor).

AND

simple processes of associative learning (classical conditioning, operant conditioning, habituation, and sensitization)

** FOOTNOTE: Equilibration type 2 is a sort of homeostatic "balance" between one stage-type behavior and ["going to"] the next; this is, as opposed to equilibration type 1, the "balance" between assimilation and accommodation. If you doubt the existence or importance of moving toward understanding equilibration type 2, then see Piaget's last book translated into English, PROMINENTLY including the discussion of THIS, most obviously:

The Equilibration of Cognitive Structures : The Central Problem of Intellectual Development, University of Chicago Press (January 1, 1985) . He very much knew that yet having to answer about this, and saying more that just "maturation" was a major aspect of his theory to finish.

How Psychology students can end up doing MUCH LESS READING ... [now a Discussion needs a question mark?; must be hard for programmers to keep busy]?

Yes, less reading, if students of Psychology simply require that ALL that they bother to read/read-about in this "discipline" should be that where behaviors are discussed clearly, **and in clear terms OF BEHAVIOR PATTERNS -- and basically just THAT (such patternings) BEING [substantially]**

ALL. (History will show that the rest -- unless you are an advertiser, or maybe a "social psychologist" - will go down the toilet.)

P.S. "Models" not integrally based-on and/or directly facilitating the seeing-of the ACTUAL BEHAVIOR PATTERNS DO "NOT COUNT". "Mechanisms" not integrally of a biological (and behavior patterned) nature DO "NOT COUNT". You may skip those.

Dear

Any discussion of, or research on, "behavior" must be talking about EACH OR ANY "behavior" as a **behavior pattern(s)** -- _otherwise the definition of "the behavior" is contrived and **false** from the beginning. Behavior is an aspect of BIOLOGICAL functioning (and it is OF NOTHING -- NOTHING we can know of -- which is MECHANICAL; nor can it be just-"modeled" or otherwise dealt with as desired, in "blocks", ETC., ETC. -- these are necessarily dead ends); biological behavior, any portion OR set of it, has to be (BY its biological nature) seen as it is, and as **empirically established and ALWAYS**, with respect to **SETS OF BEHAVIOR IN PATTERNS**, OR you have not properly identified "BEHAVIOR", **_PERIOD_**. **There is absolutely no sound basis on which to argue that the study of Psychology cannot just be based, and clearly-based (IN ALL KEY (necessary) WAYS), on directly observable OVERT BEHAVIORAL evidence *** (i.e. for ALL its foundations and for its continued progressing understanding). [(If you can't do it in your lab or in YOUR time-frame, that is NOT A PROBLEM OF THE SCIENCE; this cannot be used as an argument to conceive of "behavior" in some "other way"; this would be YOUR problem and, I am confident, simply shows a lack of creativity.)]

If it looks like Psychology has not even begun as a science, then THAT is simply the WAY IT IS (100 years of garbage, notwithstanding); No PATTERNS ..., THEN NO PSYCHOLOGY (as the study of behavior). PLUS, arguing from BIOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES, there is NO reason that behavior per se should not show ALL THAT IS NEEDED _BY ITSELF_ (i.e. per se): found, just that way, TO SHOW a more-and-more understandable, growing, progressive continuous body of findings. One should NOT -- because there is no reason to -- believe that discovered, well-found behavior patterns will fail to clearly and integrally relate to each other and to OTHER behavior patterns, etc. etc.; no inter-disciplinary studies are absolutely necessary (and OFTEN are not good, but rather distract from clear, real science); and, no neuroscience "findings" are absolutely always clear or always clearly present -- quite the opposite (and NOT NECESSARY, anyway, as just indicated).

*** FOOTNOTE: Just try to build a cogent, logical, and sound argument for how the "study of behavior" needs more than discovered/discoverable and empirically-related BEHAVIOR PATTERNS. It is impossible,** but by basically needless and/or false references to "practicalities"; these are YOUR "practicalities", NOT **THE** practicalities -- just given sufficient creativity, as I (with my writings) HAVE DEMONSTRATED. [See the type of hypotheses I have indicated one can have, or come to, from the very perspective and type of approach I have clearly outlined; and, they (the hypotheses) are ALL in testable form (or in near-testable form -- needing just some obvious clarifications, in specific instances) (they ARE verifiable/falsifiable). All my hundreds of pages of writing explicating, justifying, elaborating my view-and-approach, and contrasting my view-and-approach to present concepts and theories ARE AVAILABLE HERE ON RESEARCHGATE (and ANY legitimate behavioral scientist has to fully appreciate the view -- or "default to" garbage theory and garbage research, and clearly fail with respect to empirical considerations).]

Dear

Yes. It is the "case" for the most part, **_and essentially**, that Psychology has been and is "garbage". (The lazy, though highly-opinionated, person may stop reading HERE.)

If there is no true, fully empirically based (i.e. founding or grounding) of ALL concepts and constructs in DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, there is no real science. Psychology basically skipped the discovery and necessary observations portion (beginning any science), affecting all discussion and views and approaches. Thus we find Psychology NOT being in any reasonable terms of BEHAVIOR PATTERNS. **This being the case**, then Psychology has been denying that it is (and that it is nothing but) a study of an aspect of biology, denying its very necessary essence (denying the most basic outlook, to have ANY valid, growing and progressing, output); this basic outlook, I insist on, is **necessarily** needed, i.e. MUST be there. Still, (as is), psychology CAN BE OF **_SOME_** LIMITED PRACTICAL USE : I would cite Psychology's use in/for strictly limited purposes, for advertising and some applied social psychology and for some indication of the partial validity of some interventions. BUT: To the extent Psychology has not truly been in fully congruent terms with BIOLOGY, it is warped, distorted, and of very limited use (again: perhaps it has been of use to advertising or social psychology -- just to know "something" in any semi-understandable terms, to [statistically] "know" ANYTHING whatsoever useful by being just vaguely interpretable). Psychology, not seeing it can usefully (and MORE THAN possibly) use JUST BEHAVIOR PATTERNS ("behavior") to understand "behavior" in general, will, in time, show itself to be a largely and basically ridiculous set of points of view -- and views that just deter empiricism, science. and communication (3 highly related "things").

To me the "acid test" is the clear **fully empirically grounded findings of BEHAVIOR PATTERNS and the relationships of their elements and their inter-relationships (and then discussion would use those very terms in a central manner -- and work continuing from "there")**. **Lacking that**, there is **no chance of a clear and continuously progressing science**. Up to now, as far as I am concerned, there most certainly has been very little science and what there is has been is corrupted with a priori (poorly based) "models" and pseudo-assumptions, and otherwise just studying segments in self-interested and self-limited terms, and "integrated" "however"; **SO INDEED, OVERALL, Psychology is not and has not been a science**.

[(Assumptions that are not well-founded OR even founded in any way like true assumptions would make 100 near-worthless years possible -- AND all this related to a couple of things I discuss in the next paragraph.)]

I would just as much like to talk religion (NOT) as to pretend good science, where in the most basic ways it does not exist. Philosophy, though supposedly "left behind" and supposedly of very limited effect, unfortunately remains of great effect (anywhere you see "ONLY man ..."; OR believe "only 'learning' ", or think in terms of nature and nurture as separate "things", etc.). Also the apparent limits of the space and time frame of the lab (AS CONCEIVED) has made the framework of any of the SUPPOSED "science" VERY LIMITED, also.

I would/could just as well talk with some religious extremist as to talk with ANYONE happy with the "science" of Psychology. Merry Christmas !

Hasn't it become clear, for 25 yr+, that Gen. Artif. Intell. is stymied in its progress because of the lack of development of science in Psychology?

Hasn't it become clear, for 25 yr+, that Gen. Artif. Intell. is stymied in its progress because of the lack of development of science in Psychology?

I think that it is clearly the case that General Artificial Intelligence (AGI), though showing much cleverness and much use of good, organized knowledge bases, is otherwise still almost exclusively operating on BRUTE FORCE (large memory capacities of modern computers enabling all other "considerations" made by the AI machines -- often just based on statistical frequencies of certain "behaviors"/responses). It is recognized by leaders in the AGI field (e.g. Kristinn R Thorisson et al) that there is NO working artificial general intelligence (none), not even any clear persuasive beginnings of AGI -- NO key "seeds" of its existence -- though LONG SOUGHT.

As it was once shown, Psychology could benefit greatly from Information Processing Theories (E.G. Anderson's ACT*), basically the work of computer scientists. This was, as those persons developing Information-Processing theories showed us, how well certain principles (e.g. spread of activation and developed procedural memory) WORK for good information processing (and at least for some limited responses); aspects of this information-processing, some of its significant 'workings', were shown useful to model memory-and-learning processes of the human; major aspects of IP seemingly operated as do aspects of human memory -- for any sort of ease and efficiency and effectiveness. In the 80s, Psychology demonstrated in solid Memories research showing the same sort of processes IP found efficient, effective, and SOMETIMES fully sufficient to use in their computer simulations of human thought.

I think it is fair to say that Psychology got as much as possible out of THAT (such modeling), demonstrably matching similar human activities in some good Memory research. The models and the related findings were consistent with well-known and well-established aspects of the Memories, as well, as they should be.

Now, one would hope that AGI could benefit from Psychology. BUT, at least for the most part, the findings of Psychology have been of little effect and offered little guidance. I submit that if there was a significantly better Psychology (the SCIENCE) today, that would show somethings that AGI clearly would be trying to incorporate. But, RATHER, the case is that notions of abstract conceptualization and associated processing of 'the abstract' (such imaginings) and the role of emotional reactive processes are all largely "done" just by using AGI researchers' intuition -- being no better (or worse) than the intuitive "understandings" in Psychology itself. Psychology has offered no systematic guidance and there is none such to be found.

This is all due to NO PROGRESS in finding any certain (or any clearly agreeable) empirical foundations for how such processing and processes actually come to be OR how they development. Specifically, Psychology's concepts and models and notions of much of the most significant processing and processes still have **no clear empirical bases**, those **empirical bases (as in all sciences) having to be: DIRECT OBSERVATION OF clearly KEY, related PHENOMENON** (in the case of humans,

these phenomenon being key behavior patterns). These are yet to be discovered, with regard to major types and processes of thought, **AND we even have yet to find any clear indicators of these** -- i.e. **_ANY_ clear empirical bases of the KEY nature of the processing and processing involved, whatsoever.** The answer will clearly have to involve the understanding of the human's lengthy cognitive ontogeny and, I believe, coming to see-and-understand -- in OVERT directly-observable behavior patterns -- the INCEPTION of such processes and processing (for, arguably, only those beginnings will be clearly observable, and that which is observable may well be subtle). I have outlined the perspective and the approach and the sort of testable hypotheses one could formulate (all the related 100s of pages of writings available here on researchgate). What is needed can be (and best be) supplied simply by good, coming-to-be-systematic observations OF BEHAVIOR PATTERNS themselves, with no aid necessarily needed from any other field. There arguably is enough behavioral patterning in overt behavior itself -- something easy to believe IF ONE CAN contemplate BEHAVIOR PATTERNINGS AS A CLEAR ASPECT of a regular and organized set of happenings, UNTO ITSELF, as is true of many other specialized areas of BIOLOGY.

Humans deal so poorly with things (with any intellectual structure) that most/all seems to have the status of a game. Can you see this, too?

Humans deal so poorly with things (with any intellectual structure) that most/all seems to have the status of a game. Can you see this, too? (Very likely you can.)

I am writing ("talking") about the intellectual structures used to frame things for initial understanding **_AND_** [(usually very (too much) relatedly)] that which is "used" to come to further 'understandings' (especially of human and animal behavior). While this may be most clear (and even fundamentally) in the social sciences areas, it has manifestations in every area of human thought-and-endeavor .

Not only does "defining" and "thinking" ABOUT major topics (definitely even in science) seem to have the status of a game (with rather artificial rules and limitations --- or, at least, poorly based/founded rules and limitations, where assumptions or pseudo-assumptions have been and are "lost track" of) BUT (also) ALL seem to come to recognize it as such, but simply do not know what else to do (i.e. there develops the "idea" that all is [inevitably] bunk (B.S.) -- and THAT is all there is).

I do not think this problem can be dealt with generally, but very gradually (stemming from individual efforts and results which are recognized -- as has been clearly the case in the past, in history). Fundamentally, and phenomenologically, this problem is for individuals (each, themselves) to deal with (as ALL well-understood things are and will be). And, then (as just indicated), only with appropriate recognitions is the gradual (overall/societal) progress made (with the individual still centrally involved ALWAYS, but now with supports).

BUT, AT LEAST FOR "NOW":

Can you see how pathetic this is and how pathetically it continues?? Recall, the most important part of the solution involves YOU. For me: it is very hard to imagine anything but extinction, but believe me when I say I do not consider it my fault and, in notable part BECAUSE, I do not consider central things in my life (themselves) and growing experience (and/with understandings) to be "bunk". If you want

yourself and yours to live anything like a good life (if that is still possible) you must know THINGS yourself, and take responsibility YOURSELF. We need more of who to recognize and emulate, but most importantly we need true existentialism (whether you "succeed" or fail) -- for persons with ANY role.

This, I suppose, is my "prayer".

What do we mean when we say an animal consciously and "actively" DOES something; we often do not have a real answer (that truly adds something) do we?

What do we mean when we say an animal consciously and "actively" DOES something; we often do not have a real answer (that truly adds something) do we?

Often, at least with humans, we speak of "metacognition", but this is just a way to emphasize (or exclaim) that we "know we know" and that we (and at least some other animals) can deliberately represent things together and manipulate these representations. The problem is: the last phrase (represent things ...) is all of any substance we are saying. The "meta" stuff is just some insistence that we REALLY, REALLY "know we know". BUT, OBVIOUSLY, SUBSTANTIALLY, THAT IS NOTHING (**no added value** or direction or meaning) !! Moreover, it is the **homunculus** that we, in the behavior sciences, have been told to eschew (and should know we should), because it is **irrationally and unhelpfully** the "person-within-the-person" -- like distracting oneself with oneself (and I can think of other metaphors). This **simply begs the question**, and if this in any way satisfies you, it only shows you are a **hypocrite and a fool. Especially and particularly because** there are **alternative** views where NONE of the "meta's" are necessary for (or within) cognition (that is well-conceptualized) and THESE "meta's" are NOT needed for explanation: See **Ethogram Theory** and learn it to save yourself from this active IGNORANCE, which is a disgrace to science and which many now show. I am absolutely sick of such behavioral scientists, just as I am sick of those who theorize about supposed phenomena THAT SEEM TO OFFER NO WAY TO TEST IT ! Examples are the "embodied"-cognition "theorists" and the "enhancement" theorists. AGAIN, in science, this is **ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE** and for all good reasons such "theorists" and related "researchers" should cease pushing this perspective (which is obviously poorly based and a rampant analogy of, and metaphorical "extension" of, Piaget's Sensori-motor Period -- and is ultimately based on the **UNFOUNDED AND UNLIKELY pseudo-assumptions** that "most all is learning" AND (much relatedly): the view that "the 'innate' is all present at birth or in infancy" (<-- and THAT is it). AGAIN, neither perspective (mentioned above) is scientifically acceptable; and, as FOR the former type of case cited, here again there is an **ALTERNATIVE theory WITH TESTABLE (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses**, INSTEAD; and again, this is Ethogram Theory (which DOES have **concrete hypotheses** connected with everything). [(These problems (above) cover at least half of what I hate about modern Psychology AND HAVE OFFERED REPLACEMENTS FOR.)]

Want to get ahead of the "retarded(stymied)-Psychology" 'curve':

See AND read:

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/Renaissance for PSYCHOLOGY as the study of behavior--a lot of that but JUST that per se](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Renaissance_for_PSYCHOLOGY_as_the_study_of_behavior--a_lot_of_that_but_JUST_that_per_se)

(THEN, if you want more: follow-up with all the references cited in that last cited (above) Discussion Question (a LOT of reading, but you may find reasons to like it).)

Basically, I believe we can come to an understanding of the cognitive-developmental "container" (true and logical organization) and then rather easily and more validly add in the emotions.

See and read <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY>, where the SAME basic aspects (components) are "flushed out", if only by better relating and "unfolding" them. (See the Project Log (i.e. all the "Updates")).

In any case, both my human cognitive-developmental perspective, including with an ontogeny -- with TRUE hierarchical developments (a hierarchy IS NOT SIMPLY WHAT YOU READILY THINK A "HIERARCHY" IS; thus, I describe a true hierarchical development).

Most importantly READ the foundational papers:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286920820_A_Human_Ethogram_Its_Scientific_Acceptability_and_Importance_now_NEW_because_new_technology_allows_investigation_of_the_hypotheses_an_early_MUST_READ

and

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory

ALSO (not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "book", you already have been directed to) the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf

P.S. The other Psychology that "off the top of my head" I abhor is: Relational Developmental Systems Theories (including the 'Bioecological Approach' and sociocultural theory) . My perspective and approach are also in clear opposition to these hodgepodge Relational Developmental Systems Theories (including the 'Bioecological Approach' and sociocultural theory) -- which have no clear system and represent subjective researcher intuition (**the 'researchers' are the "relaters"**)(these are the misguided inter-disciplinaries). And, to all I have opposed so far, I would also add most of those with theories related to SUPPOSED (i.e. simply, crudely, and "however"-imagined) EVOLUTION. I think I know the way out of all this mess (all this unacceptable thinking, outlined above).

The mentioned disgraceful "theorizing" occurs because these psychologists, too (like the other camps described), cannot imagine a **distinctly and clearly, full-empirical-founded and grounded Psychology** (MEANING ALL THE CONCEPTS, CONSTRUCTS (and models presented) concretely grounded (and then, of course, with related testable hypotheses)).

I say simply and rightly: DAMN THIS present-day un-empirical CRAP; you CAN now "just

stop", now that a better alternative is PRESENT (and you just need to read, think, and look): In regular (respectable) science: Failure to do so (examine an alternative carefully) is not scientifically justified, cannot be justified by any principled behavioral scientist. This last statement is of science, and for science, and not a simple opinion. It is time to "tear me down" or "boost me up". (Certainly there are "enough" of you to find some for the job, just as it would be for the same situation w/r to other sciences: in science, you do not have a choice; this is not to mention that all the THEORY's aspects should provide livelihoods for several (or many) analytic philosophers.)

Dear

The part of your Answer (to my Question) saying, "A person's awareness or perception of something" adds nothing for any clarity OR of any information and is most certainly not as clear as my position, which is well-based, as largely (and centrally) FOUNDED or GROUNDED on just the concrete-in-sensible-sequential observations OF OVERT directly-observable behaviors .

The part of your Answer stating "The fact of awareness **by the mind of itself** and the world" [(bold added)] is clearly the **homunculus** , again (in another easily-apparent and obvious guise); the homunculus (person-within-the-person) is unhelpful and yet an [apparently] effective distraction (as I said, before, instituting a distraction of oneself essentially BY oneself, which is of course IRRELEVANT -- wasting precious "mind-space" (or as I should say : working memory)). Apparently, somehow (and I no longer can even imagine how), some can see that as some sort of answer; I cannot and no one should.

I am aware of the citations you give. I never bothered to read the Article you cited at the end because it appears it would be worse than unhelpful and a poor 'understanding', judging from the abstract. "Consciousness" is no big problem and nothing to be a confusion (or to have to make things up about), if simply defined in its CONTEXTS (<-- very much take note of the plural) AS, I submit, it MUST; it, being "just there" in contexts, makes one wonder if it really needs to be brought up at all. Behavioral scientists could likely just a well throw the word away (and be no worse for it -- and possibly better off).

The following quote from the abstract of that last cited Article makes it clear it is of a very (and, again, needlessly) confused nature: " Human consciousness emerges on the interface between three components of animal behavior: communication, play, and the use of tools. These three components interact on the **basis of anticipatory behavioral control**, which is common for all complex forms of animal life." [(bold, added)] AGAIN, obviously, there is the homunculus, though perhaps here it is a bit more subtle somehow. That it IS a homunculus is supported by some idea (again in the abstract) of a "second reality" . And, the following quote is obviously of no merit (and that is saying it kindly and to say the least): "The interaction between communication and play yields symbolic games, most importantly language; the interaction between symbols and tools results in human praxis." There, in the first part, is an at least somewhat outrageous claim (at least by itself). That first part is followed, after the semi-colon, by an outrageously strange (and likely false even as-is) general statement (that is: the one about praxis)(does this author even know what "praxis" is ? -- though I, too, had to look it up). [(Somewhat ironically, I write about TAXIS BEHAVIORS -- which is a TERM in ethology which is quite useful: Something, just about anything, about this latter TERM would be more useful and would have to be well-established through the strict sort of empiricism I abide by).]

(I have been talked into reading "bad stuff", though I do not think there is any reason for me to read this

Article, given it is apparently so far "off" in its nature.)

Warning to mechanistic thinkers: Without appropriate, KEY necessary safeguards, you are in conceptual trouble (& to put it simply: irrational). OK?

Warning to mechanistic thinkers: Without appropriate, KEY necessary safeguards, you are in conceptual trouble (and simply stated, you are irrational). OK? (I have had to criticize 2 such Abstracts -- which was all that was provided -- in just the last few minutes.)

see my Comment to the following Abstract as an exemplar:

Chapter [Bridging the Gap Between Philosophy of Science and Student M...](#)

I do a similar-type response to "embodiment" and "enhancement" 'theorists' in Psychology; I might as well warn them at the same time. And, those who write of/speak of "executive functions" (OR "meta-cognition" OR 'meta' this-or-that) in 'explanations' in behavioral 'science' have an at least somewhat similar problem.

[Please know that my Title here ends with an "OK?" JUST BECAUSE for some strange reason RG requires a question mark at the end of a Discussion title.]

Consequences of not looking into and understanding Ethogram Theory: "ridiculous", and disastrous and ignorant; and all this is needless: can you see?

Consequences of not looking into and understanding Ethogram Theory

(1) We will never truly understand behavior patterns (and their patterning) as an aspect of Biology (which they should come to be considered, **in and of "themselves"** -- and which is UNDOUBTEDLY POSSIBLE, given what we have NOT done) **

(2) We will lack points of contact which really exist with other animals (and continue to be confused, at the same time we are arrogant, ignorant and unwise fools) -- and this referring just to one consequence which is due to the lack of science; but there is more:

(3) We will facilitate and hasten our demise as a species (including, THEN, a more likely and rapid possibility of extinction); we will cause or hasten the demise of of other species.

** FOOTNOTE: I do firmly believe in a biology of behavior PER SE ("just behaviors")(and it is more than reasonable to assume such). This is to say and to say it in a general, yet cogent, way: behavior patterns ARE an aspect of BIOLOGY __AND__ with all the behavior patterns there are -- and there are a lot and literally **PLENTY** -- we will come to see, discover, and find good foundations and grounding for ALL concepts and constructs etc. (e.g. related models). ALL concepts and constructs etc. will come to be based/founded or clearly grounded or having a CLEAR START in the OVERT OBSERVABLES: directly observable behavior PATTERNS, FURTHER PATTERNS, MORE AND MORE PATTERNING -- this patterning and new patterns and patternings of patternings ENOUGH BY ITSELF, not only to explain and understand behavior, BUT [also] to BETTER UNDERSTAND the subject areas of behavioral sciences (at least all areas where cognition is involved -- and THAT is

everywhere). [(What I describe is simply the required [level of] empiricism NECESSARY FOR ANY SCIENCE.)]

(1) - (3), it can be quite clearly and easily "argued", will be the result of the stubborn, and actually UNTENABLE, ALTERNATIVES: The alternatives lack the kind of good foundations I have indicated and are not "things" that will lead to progress (like real science). AND, with 'vision', one can see them leading to inevitable DEAD ENDS: that which is not empirically founded will never come to magically be truly and well empirically founded "**by itself**" (**things do NOT "come together 'by themselves'**"); inter-disciplinary "mixing" of things, through non-existent intuition -- YET THIS IS STILL "SUPPOSED" -- will not help; the relation of neuroscience to behavior [patterns] will not become apparent through haphazard behavior-stimuli-presentations and associated EEG, PET, MRI (etc) readings.: All this is fairly easily argued or shown to be IRRATIONAL, and especially if we just start doing something correctly.

I "wash my own hands clean" of the irrational (untestable and unverifiable), stagnant perspectives and approaches -- ALL less than anything truly empirical (and NEEDLESSLY SO). Psychology is now MUCH more a game than a science, and this will become fully and absolutely CLEAR, and more and more clear, if the perspective and approach I have outlined, explicated, justified, and full argued for in MANY WAYS (over 800 pages of papers and essays, over decades) are adopted. Only this "option" (really more a reality than an option) will lead to real science and to progress. AND, NOW (with eye tracking and computer analysis technologies), we may have all the tools we need to see, and see much more, and "go" from there.

P.S.

From <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/theory-knowledge/201601/the-is-psychology-science-debate> :

How Psychology Fails as a Science ...

The reason many are rightfully skeptical about its status is found in the body of scientific knowledge—psychology has **failed to produce a cumulative body of knowledge that has a clear conceptual core** that is **consensually agreed upon** by mainstream psychological experts. The great scholar of the field, Paul Meehl, captured this perfectly when he proclaimed that the sad fact that in psychology:

theories rise and decline, come and go, more as a function of baffled boredom than anything else; and the enterprise shows a disturbing absence of that cumulative character that is so impressive in disciplines like astronomy, molecular biology and genetics. ...

Kenneth Gergen:

... the core problem with the field is that it is “**pre-paradigmatic**”, which means that psychology **completely lacks agreement from the experts about what it is and what it is about, what its foundational theories or even frameworks are, what its key findings are**, and how it fits with the rest of the body of scientific knowledge. The fact that psychology has been around now for almost a 150 years and **remains pre-paradigmatic is undeniably a very serious threat to the field's status as a real science.**

... Thus, the reason psychology fails to be a science is because it **fails as a coherent system of knowledge that maps the relevant portion of the world**. To see this obvious fact, ask 10 different psychologists the portion of the world they are trying to map when they use the term psychology and you will get 10 different answers. **If you can't even define the territory, you can't develop consensual knowledge about it.**

...

And it is here that psychology falls down in ways that physics, chemistry and biology do not. And it is in that sense that psychology is not a real science.

P.S.

I/we can do much better than Psychology today: Quoting a Reply to another's Comment about an Article -- hard to find, and which you would likely not see, unless I quote myself HERE: [(There is a bit of over-lap with the original statement of the Discussion, beginning this thread, but that is somewhat edited and the statement below also includes much more.)]:

I provide a good, possible way of doing MUCH better: Real Empiricism, where all concepts, constructs, etc (models, and "on up") are clearly based on agreed-upon, directly observable, overt behavior patterns -- these beginning in a way simply AND PROVIDING pivotal CONCRETE testable (verifiable/falsifiable) HYPOTHESES related to the KEY observations needed for grounding/foundings of, or the START of, MUCH important behavior (broad sense) patterns that follow upon such beginnings, AND of the related concepts/constructs, etc.: NEW truly KEY (very important) patterning in behaviors . The involved "perceptual shifts", in clear effect, causing subsequent KEY changes (some, after the inception of new behavior patterns, becoming not fully overt and requiring some obvious inference). Let me quote myself, from the Discussion, and then go on with MORE:

I firmly believe in a biology of behavior PER SE ("just behaviors")(and it is more than reasonable to assume such). This is to say and to say it in a general, yet cogent, way: behavior patterns ARE an aspect of BIOLOGY __AND__ with all the behavior patterns there are -- and there are a lot and literally **PLENTY** -- we will come to see, discover, and find good foundations and grounding for ALL concepts and constructs etc. (e.g. related models). ALL concepts and constructs etc. will come to be based/founded or clearly grounded or having a CLEAR START in the OVERT OBSERVABLES: directly observable behavior PATTERNS, FURTHER PATTERNS, MORE AND MORE PATTERNING -- this patterning and new patterns and patternings of patternings ENOUGH BY ITSELF, not only to explain and understand behaviors, BUT [also] to BETTER UNDERSTAND the subject areas of behavioral sciences (at least all areas where cognition is involved -- and THAT is everywhere). [(What I describe is simply the required [level of] empiricism NECESSARY FOR ANY SCIENCE.)]

In my writings I go on to indicate and describe what may well suffice as the nature of what initiates (is the INCEPTION of) each qualitative level/stage of new conceptualization and new (more abstract) processing. This processing can very possibly (even likely) be initiated with KEY "perceptual shifts" (quickly becoming perceptual/attentional shifts). YET all that is newly "perceived" is literally directly observable, overt, and concrete aspects of given settings (<-- often PLURAL, with the Memories

involved in linkages). These can be seen (if they indeed exist) using eye tracking technologies (perhaps with computer assisted analysis). (See a recent piece of another's research I have recommended, showing the extreme sensitivity of eye tracking to subtleties in OVERT behavior patterns, not otherwise see-able:

Article [Anticipating a future versus integrating a recent event? Evi...](#)

I have described eye tracking as a kind of "microscope" for Psychology.

Perceptual shifts, being innately guided basic-type perception (much like other basic perception (see Montemayor et al)), but which occurs in particular environments that are particular situations or circumstances, where new things can more-adaptively be 'seen', OR (basically similarly), some "things" 'seen' in a very new way -- and these shifts reflected in NEW: glancing, then gaze, then attention And, like all basic perception, these perceptual shifts would occur quickly (seemingly instantaneously phenomenologically) in such situations/circumstances (YET would be 'seen' with the new eye tracking technologies).

Wouldn't experimental psychology (lab setting) necessarily bias us AGAINST seeing some SKILLS available & against thinking of multiple circumstances?

Wouldn't experimental psychology (the "lab" setting) have a necessary bias AGAINST the existence and availability of some SKILLS & against any thinking of (across/about) multiple circumstances?

I contend: There are some skills developed (or discriminated) across circumstances or between circumstances, that develop over more time and/or more circumstances (usually both), than can be detected or manipulated in the "lab" (using presently used procedures, at least) . AND, there may well be thinking of concepts FORMED (naturalistically) ABOUT existing or not existing "things" AND/OR (also) relationships (relatedness (or NOT)) which involve mentally comparing [representations] between situations/circumstances that are very important in REAL, ACTUAL conceptualizations and thinking (in real "internal" phenomenology -- though **based on ACTUAL EXTERNAL SITUATIONS/CIRCUMSTANCES that could be seen if OBSERVATIONS were more realistic and [(relatedly)] imagination about imagination was more reasonably thorough**). WE CANNOT SEE THIS (presently); we may NOT MANIPULATE THIS action by the organism IN THE LAB.

There is no doubt we (including AT LEAST even older children) **must, can, and do these things BUT WE CANNOT DETECT (measure)(yet, at present) any KEY behavior patterns related to such activities AND we cannot, and will not be able to, fundamentally manipulate such activities.**

It is quite possible (if not likely): MOST HUMAN THOUGHT, realistically OR naturalistically considered, IS THEREFORE IS NOT THUS CONSIDERED (at all, or at all realistically) IN THE "LAB". (Thus, the existence of the homuculus (or humuculi) of executive control and all the "meta" this-es or "meta" thats -- NEITHER strange type of concept NECESSARY IN ETHOGRAM THEORY.)

This IS NOT A LIMITATION OF SCIENCE or OBSERVATION, but a limitation of the lab and of typical experimental psychology.

Based on testable particular hypotheses from Ethogram Theory:

I should add that [still], based on the nature of the Memories, at least THE INCEPTION of each new qualitatively different level/stage of cognition would occur at some KEY times and "places" "locally" in circumstances, i.e. could be seen within the time/space frame of the lab: AS DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS -- and these discoveries, by using new sophisticated eye tracking (and, perhaps, computer-assisted analysis) technologies (<-- these basically being our "microscope"). BUT, you would have to know what to look for in what sort of settings _AND_ (at the same time) be able to recognize the KEY junctures in ontogeny and the development of learnings that THESE shifts (starting as very basic and essential "perceptual shifts"; then becoming perceptual/attentional shifts) WOULD OCCUR.

P.S.

Here (below) is some research on abstract vs concrete words and how they differ in situational specificity IN THE WAY I DESCRIBE IN THE QUESTION BEGINNING THIS THREAD. (Ethogram Theory does not just hypothesize about qualitative shifts in cognition and thinking BUT THE SHIFT POINTS are **directly related to the development of abstract thought in particular too** (this is at least a good part of what-about-and-why the qualitatively-different/new thinking-"inducing" perceptual/attentional shifts occur, adaptively speaking, and for the new level of cognition and processing which finally results) -- thus I would expect the nature of the concrete vs abstract concepts to be like in this Article):

Preprint [Situational systematicity: A role for schema in understandin...](#)

One should note the MESS of different and unclear and uncertain and not-clearly-specified notions about "abstract abilities", OTHERWISE (i.e. not related to the similar perspectives, above).

Psych. Theorists/Researchers: My Last-Posted Question maybe could have been titled, "There will never be a science of Psychology" & another Question

Psychology Theorists/Researchers: My Last-Posted Question maybe could have been entitled, "How there will never be a science of Psychology" -- if there is not enough initiative, optimism, knowledge, thought, observations and creativity. That Question was:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Wouldnt_experimental_psychology_lab_setting_necessarily_bias_us_AGAINST_seeing_some_SKILLS_available_against_thinking_of_multiple_circumstances

NOW, another Question (**based on the above**):

Who is most like Skinner, a **typical Psychology researcher OR someone who takes a perspective and approach like I describe** in my Human Ethology Project and related writings ? (You should read

quite a lot of that Project and the References and the Project Log "Updates" and locate the near-specific testable (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses.)

I am going to give you the answer to the Question just posed : a typical Psychology researcher ! Now, I encourage people to **come to see how and why** that is so. [(My approach requires stricter empiricism, much more than present-day research (though you may have imagined or thought of the comparison being the other "way around"), so **THAT IS NOT A REASON**. In fact: My Human Ethogram approach is developed in such a way that ALL concepts will be thoroughly grounded/founded/or starting in **DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS** -- and, in that regard, I am more like Skinner (or, at least, as he **INTENDED** to be); but, compared to Skinner and his "objectiveness" or "empiricism", Ethogram Theory is much more thorough, realistic and open (and ecologically valid and Biologically consistent) and seeks to leave **NOTHING** that could be important out -- including that from the possibilities of scope of the Memories -- **as related to what is SEEN** and related to high-quality research on the Memories).)]

But in a lot of **other crucial and major ways** the **typical psychology researcher IS much more like Skinner** (think: time/space constraints, controls, and lab "simulations" being as and what they really are). **AND**, in those ways, being like Skinner, **IS NOT GOOD**.

Psychology (& Researchers/Theorists): If you don't always meaningfully speak in terms of BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, you offend yourselves, Biology, & science

Psychology (& PSYCHOLOGY Researchers/Theorists): If you don't always meaningfully speak in terms of **BEHAVIOR PATTERNS**, you offend yourselves, Biology, Darwin, & science (and empiricism), and communication, itself. [(Of course key **actual-in-phenomenology important (KEY) aspects of circumstances (corresponding to the very key behavior PATTERNS)** are always associated -- aka environmental aspects)]. And, to be a science ALL CONCEPTS, CONSTRUCTS and ALL THE LANGUAGE used in Models must relate to behavior patterns which, **AT LEAST** at their beginning, their inception/their "start", **MUST BE CLEARLY AND AGREEABLY** (replicable): **FOUNDED OR GROUNDED OR STARTING WITH OBSERVABLE, OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, in clear definable circumstances (with centrally important (key) environmental aspects)** -- in a clear way corresponding to any noted behavior PATTERNS -- **OR WHAT YOU ARE DOING IS NOT SCIENCE**.

BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, always; key clearly associated environmental aspects, always; and agreeable (replicable) findings (of behavior patternings and environmental aspects) **ALWAYS: with NO MODEL not equally clearly founded in terms of JUST these very BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, ETC.**

Tell me how the field could possible be correct (a real science) without all this. This is nothing more than the absolute minimum standards for all science (though "behavior patterns" would be replaced with the word: "phenomena" in other sciences). **THIS MAY HAVE TO BE **** YOUR DISCUSSION ******

Just your "aping" of a isolated method(s) is **NEVER SCIENCE**; it is **NEVER SCIENCE** just when that

is what you want (but apply to it as a pretender). For the **WAY**, see:

[**THERE IS NO CHOICE, UNLESS YOU CAN PROVIDE A CHOICE, WITH ALL THE CONNECTIONS INDICATED -- AND WITH ALL THAT YOU WILL HAVE testable (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses, and some replicable results.** Otherwise: WISHING DOES NO MAKE THINGS SO.]:

Learn an empirical paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY (heretofore pre-paradigmatic):

Read :

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_phenomenologically-based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings_and_the_Answers_following_that_Discussion_Question for elaborations/clarifications.

AND:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286920820_A_Human_Ethogram_Its_Scientific_Acceptability_and_Importance_now_NEW_because_new_technology_allows_investigation_of_the_hypotheses_early_MUST_READ

and

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK)

and

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory>

(see the **Project Log of this Project** to see many important Updates)

ALSO (not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf

(you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking) .

Nature & bases of abstract thought & processing can't continue to be unknown; we must relate each inception to key directly observable overt behaviors

[No matter how poor a writer I may be, the following needs to be asked thrice, under three different Projects, including "Prescription for Psychology to Become a Science"]

The nature and bases of abstract thought and processing can't continue to be unknown or confusing; we must relate each inception to key directly observable overt behavior patterns (and corresponding environmental aspects, or rather: often aspects of multiple circumstances). These are the EASIEST and yet , I believe, some of the BIGGEST "PROBLEMS" we yet have to solve (STILL, to-date) : SUCH very CENTRAL SETS OF DISCOVERIES THAT MUST BE MADE and they have not yet been well-

attempted; there is NO reason such searching for the key observations, looking to establish key discoveries, cannot be attempted, especially now, with modern technologies (eye tracking , etc.); there are ways to solve this sort of problem which we have had historically and in philosophy and within the limits of our "labs" (at least given conceptualizations thereof) -- all these negative views, placing artificial limits on theorists'/researchers' imaginations. **

These are central problems for Psychology in general and for General Artificial Intelligence.

I have proposed, as something central to discovering such "starts" for each level/stage: doing better for ourselves, with recognizing/developing a better or more open and true conceptual structure, for self-understanding, basically: trying/having a much better imagination about imagination _AND_ seeing our Subjects, themselves similarly, having the Memories (imaginations) with the needed spans and scopes, across and between sets of circumstances -- all in a real empirical concrete phenomenological way (and clearly a possible way). (Again, this is for ourselves, for really recognizing all the capacities of the human and the Subject; this would be coming to see that our imaginations (the Memories) can very well "time travel" back and forth through represented circumstances (in the "mind's eye") TO see aspects that only in those multiple contexts (which may superficially seem to be quite different) are VERY meaningful -- where only there (altogether considered-together) -- ARE MEANINGFULNESS-es resulting in abstract understandings, and abstract terms and processes (<-- thinking in/about such multiple circumstances and in those terms).

[Any notion that ANY concept does not have an important basis in concrete circumstances OR (similarly) the unfounded, self-limiting notion that some abstractions (abstract terms) are not related to ANY specific sets of real features of situations or circumstances IS FALSE AND DEBILITATING. Even the strangest of our abstractions MUST be founded/grounded/or starting-IN directly observable overt behavior patterned responses (circumstances, properly considered). The old-fashioned arrogant, yet very limiting, way of thinking of many historical philosophers MUST BE ABOLISHED. The old-time thought is neither empirically or biologically sound.

** FOOTNOTE: [(Also, by the way, it is even quite conceivable that some discoveries of some key situational circumstances (even if, also, related to more) and related to key pivot points for/of some behavior patterning shifts and the new beginning understandings of "things" of/in KEY circumstances may even be possible to make in the lab [settings].)]

Dear

I am well aware of the nature of psychology and with many psychologists' clinical "bent" (not really my "thing"). I, myself, as a college teacher of psychology and as a theorist, am interested in the basic science issues needed to be addressed for the foundation of Psychology (General, Developmental) as a science. I see the key core science problems and look for answers to those. I see the nature of "abstraction" (abstract thought: abstract concepts and processing) as a MAJOR FOUNDATIONAL PROBLEM, yet to be well-addressed. I do put forth my perspective, here, which will hopefully help.

With the too many trends in Psychology, how did 2 central perspectives, developmental levels/stages & ethology, get at least nearly totally lost?

There are clearly too many perspectives (I'd say: things "conjured" **) in psychology for any student of the field to make a clear decision about which to accept (no matter how hard one works at it). How can this become more under control so there are not so many diverse and conflicting/competing factions which lead to fractionalization (even decimation), if the circumstances remain the same? And will THIS become a permanent problem (the TREND of trends)? THAT is exactly ONE of the reasons for the MAJOR Question I asked:

With the too many trends in Psychology, how did 2 central perspectives, developmental levels/stages & ethology, get essentially (and at least nearly) totally lost?

(These perspectives, and related approaches, could provide REAL rather clear findings, yielding boundaries or needed outlines -- much better than close-to-nothing/"anything" which seems to "go" today.)

*** AND, related to that: Why is there not an "issue" OF the matter of **behavior PATTERNS** -- a term necessarily related to things biological (like "behavior") -- that is basically totally UNUSED? ***

I believe these problems cited are not only "food for thought", but reasons to think again **AND to think anew** (I believe my Projects and References can lead the way).

** FOOTNOTE: **Basically aimchair-wise** : some having math involved and others not (NOTE: math is present and can be found in many places, but it is not magic or necessarily even important and certainly NOT necessarily meaningful IN THE CONTEXT of real concern, because that alone/itself does not necessarily reveal anything clearly THERE, ironically -- perhaps something yet to become better understood; for example: perhaps someone could come up with a good numerical estimate of the number of each kind of insect there is: what does this mean?, that is: what does this necessarily tell you that provides guidance for furthering any important knowledge -- except on how good some can make good numerical estimates? In Psychology, let me liken this to the statistical frequency of words, and those who "go" from there. I have seen truly ridiculous psychology researchers who basically claim an human innate ability to calculate word statistics; hey, if you believe that, then you'll believe anything to promote any view that seems to PROMOTE __YOU__ and your view -- which would be a consequence of the overall situation I have described above, and be evidence indicating my view is VERY likely correct.)

Understanding of our "realities", of various situations & circumstances, provide all "executive control" -- eliminating strange concepts (homunculi)

STORED EPISODES, visual-spacial memory, IMAGES, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS: JUST such is what gives us our understanding of our "realities", of various situations & circumstances, __AND__ THUS (as such, simply AS THEY ARE) providing all perspectives INCLUDING what seems like "executive control" <-- We must eliminate SUCH strange concepts (homunculi)(the homunculi also including all the various related "meta"s, which are similarly dispensed with as unacceptable notions). **ALL these persons-within-the-person, imaginary concepts, are SCIENTIFICALLY UNACCEPTABLE. PERIOD. No other point of view on these poorly-founded concepts could be argued. (They are just "necessities" OF BAD THEORY.)**

Understanding provides perspective and at key times (with ontogeny) "yields forth" some further direction through some newly emerging basic perceptions (perceptual shifts) WITHIN BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (and then attentions). THIS PROVIDES ALL THE NECESSARY "MOVING FORWARD" (for cognitive abilities and "abstraction"). THERE IS NO homunculus HERE. THIS IS A SCIENCE OUTLOOK.

Start to "get here" by seeking to discover reliable (agreeable) and shown-valid BEHAVIOR PATTERNS -- PATTERNS BEING an absolute necessity of our "behaviors" being biological functioning. Your ignorance can be gauged by your "DISTANCE" FROM THIS NECESSARY VIEW (a foundational assumption). AND, this is why there is, at yet, no real science of behavior [patterns] -- NO REAL PSYCHOLOGY (and that you cannot argue against this, shows the real predicament !!)

Learn an empirical paradigm (and a real paradigm) for PSYCHOLOGY (heretofore pre-paradigmatic):

Read :

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_phenomenologically-based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings_and_the](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_phenomenologically-based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings_and_the_answers_following_that_Discussion_Question) **Answers following that Discussion Question** for elaborations/clarifications. AND:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286920820_A_Human_Ethogram_Its_Scientific_Acceptability_and_Importance_now_NEW_because_new_technology_allows_investigation_of_the_hypotheses_early_MUST_READ

and

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK)

and

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory> (see the **Project Log of this Project** to see many important Updates)

ALSO (not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf

(you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking) .

P.S.

Is there any more I can say? Looking at my writings as a whole: not really; but I can provide another pointed partial SUMMARY (sort of like the one beginning this Discussion), but this one from a somewhat different perspective : the perspective of the experimental "lab" researcher:

Addressing experimental psychology.

It really is a question of how to hone-in on a set of circumstances as really seen by a human subject, other than just starting with premises one conjures up or has simply thought up, based on SOME pattern, but not carefully based on discovered and known behavior patterns -- i.e. those seen in careful, replicatable, shown-valid observations. To me, a basic requirement of beginning science is to show that one validly sees (in situ, so to speak) some real reliable and shown-meaningful behavior PATTERNS.

By the way, I DO think the nature of settings (circumstances) AS USED TODAY in the "lab" is sufficient for some good research — for example, a lot of research on the basic characteristics of the Memories. The generality and time/space frame of the lab seems sufficient to work for that area of basic research (and, I wonder, what others). But, largely, for "bigger" Questions, it does not work.

So, in these regards, I still have to say: Dear Experimental Psychology:

Do you really think the “reality”/environment right before your eyes and which you are able to produce and manipulate is MUCH like the pertinent and likely real environment (actually: the circumstances AS SEEN) that is thought of by all humans IN THE MAIN in such a setting?

Do you really think the “reality”/environment directly before your eyes (and as intuited) is MUCH like a real set of circumstances that is dealt with, thought of by Subjects and, moreover, _AS_ IT IS THOUGHT OF BY ALL SUBJECTS?

Probably, you will realize, in many regards and for many purposes: NO !, it isn't.

But why, then, do we act as if this (the “apparent”) is based-TRUE and think that we can build/simulate/represent circumstances in the lab which are seen as the same (we believe to be essentially the same, and of the same import) as key circumstances AS actually seen, AS actually compared and AS actually thought-of functionally (for action or responses) in real life by real people?

**Most good science research would be too strong to require statistics (even "ask" Piaget)
New discussion**

True, good, correctly-approached SCIENCE is in the MAIN (or for the most part) ___VERY___ agreeable (**THAT** replicable, (essentially completely replicable), and with shown-validity). This itself (what I just said) is a case for how Psychology needlessly remains "in the toilet" as far as being "science" is concerned. CASE CLOSED; NO MORE NEED BE SAID (unless you feel compelled to "philosophically" insist that "people are completely special" [(and basically beyond reason)]).

NOTE to RG's dictionary: Replicable IS A WORD, SEE:

<https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-1-d&q=replicable> ; ALSO, DEAR RG, there IS a TERM: "innate action pattern" -- now ignored AND disallowed by YOU (RG). AND: In fact: One cannot use the word innate in any recognized term or word (search term) on RG AT ALL !!!!! -- but don't even get me started, there is so much ***** here. (A few years ago, one could in-effect "nominate" (just use) search terms and RG would at least consider or "look into it".)

What is wholesome?; what is good? Have I done good? [Do you ask "Have I found the wholesome and done good?"] ?

- Asked December 15, 2019 in the project [Core Buddhism](#)

The following is based on the words of the man, the historical Buddha; nothing typically thought of as religion is involved. I believe you may find it helpful.

"[When one] has clearly seen with correct wisdom as it really is, this dependent origination and these dependently arisen phenomenon, it is impossible that he will run back to the past thinking: 'Did I exist in the past? What was I in the past? How was I in the past?' OR that he will run forward into the future, thinking: 'Will I exist in the future? Will I not exist in the future? What will I be in the future? How will I be in the future? Having been what, what will I become in the future?' OR that he will now be inwardly confused about the present thus: 'Do I exist? Do I not exist? What am I? How am I? This being -- where has it come from, and where will it go?' ..."

"... the Dhamma [(the Way)] has ... been well-expounded ..., elucidated, disclosed, revealed, stripped of patchwork, this is enough for ... [one] who has gone forth out of faith to arouse his energy thus: 'Willingly, let only my skin, sinews, and bones remain, and let the flesh and blood dry up in my body, but I will not relax my energy so long as I have not attained what can be attained by manly strength, by manly energy, by manly exertion'..."

"... Considering your own good, ..., it is enough to strive for the goal with diligence; considering the good of others, it is enough to strive for the goal with diligence; considering the good of both, it is enough to strive for the goal with diligence."

"Do not think about past, future, or present existence. To be fortunate upon death: You have, in life, through intentional actions earned merit (& generated & changed/created kamma). And, thus to be so fortunate, in life: you have engaged in what you have to do ..." "[He who] understands as they really are the gratification, the danger, and the escape in the case of the 5 faculties [(the 'senses')], then he is called a stream-enterer, no longer bound to the nether world."

"... [He is] "liberated by non-clinging", "one whose taints are destroyed", "one who has done what had to be done ... reached his goal." "... utterly destroyed the fetters of existence, [become] one completely liberated "

"Through dispassion [his mind] is liberated. When it is liberated there comes the knowledge: 'It's

liberated.' He understands: 'Destroying birth, the holy life has been lived, what had to be done has been done, there is no more for this state of being.'"

" (1)–(2) the purpose and benefit of wholesome virtuous behavior is non-regret; (3) the purpose and benefit of non-regret is joy; (4) the purpose and benefit of joy is rapture; (5) the purpose and benefit of rapture is tranquility; (6) the purpose and benefit of tranquility is pleasure; (7) the purpose and benefit of pleasure is concentration; (8) the purpose and benefit of concentration is the knowledge and vision of things as they really are; (9) the purpose and benefit of the knowledge and vision of things as they really are is disenchantment and dispassion; and (10) the purpose and benefit of disenchantment and dispassion is the knowledge and vision of liberation. Thus,..., wholesome virtuous behavior progressively leads to the foremost."

"Ignorance is the forerunner in the entry upon unwholesome states, with shamelessness and fearlessness of wrongdoing following along."

"For an unwise person immersed in ignorance, wrong view springs up. For one of wrong view, wrong intention springs up. For one of wrong intention, wrong speech springs up."

"... wrong speech, wrong action ... wrong action, wrong livelihood ... wrong livelihood, wrong effort ,... wrong effort, wrong mindfulness, ... wrong mindfulness, wrong concentration."

"... There is feeling with wrong view as a condition, also feeling with right view as condition ... feeling with wrong concentration as condition and feeling with right concentration as condition. There is feeling with desire as condition, also feeling with thought as condition, also feeling with perception as condition.

... when desire has subsided, and perception has subsided, there is also feeling with that as condition. There is effort for the as-yet-unattained; when that stage has been reached, there is also feeling with that as condition."

"... true knowledge is the forerunner in the entry upon wholesome states, with a sense of shame and fear of wrongdoing following along ... true knowledge, right view; right view, right intention; ..., right speech; ..., right action; ..., right livelihood; ... , right effort; ..., right mindfulness; ..., right concentration."

" [(One in training on the Path)] generates desire for the non-arising of unarisen evil, unwholesome states; he makes an effort, arouses energy, applies his mind, and strives. He generates desire for the abandoning of evil, arisen unwholesome states. ... He generates desire for the arising of wholesome states. He generates desire for the maintenance of arisen wholesome states, for their non-decay, increase, expansion, and fulfillment by development; he makes an effort, aroused energy, applies his mind and strives."

" ... whatever wholesome states there are, they are rooted in diligence, converge upon diligence, and diligence is declared to be chief among them.."

“Whatever strenuous deeds are done, [they] are all done based upon the earth, established upon the earth, so too, based upon virtue, established upon virtue.”

For a comprehensive (and realistic/naturalistic and rational) summary of all the words of the historical Buddha (the Pali Canon), see: <https://mynichecomp.com> .

An addition to THE INVENTION OF SCIENCE ; this added "Chapter", ON PSYCHOLOGY (perhaps not surprisingly)

Since some persons who follow me may not follow my major Project (where this essay, below, is the recent "Update" in the Project Log), I provide as a progression of science a major change in the perspective and approach of basic (General) Psychology and Developmental Psychology (ontogeny):

[(The major Project involved is: <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY>)]:

The perspective and approach I put forward and try to explain, justify and promote is like an extra chapter to David Wootton's EXTREMELY interesting book, **The Invention of Science**; one should see parallels in that book with Psychology of today. Today's psychologists presume and "assume" that what they see as "the environment" (right before their eyes, at any serious moment) is exactly the environment available ("there", present) for any developing Subject; especially important here is the idea that all pertinent environmental aspects that are or can be "operative" for any learning and development, including DURING ONTOGENY, are basically RIGHT BEFORE THEIR (the researchers') EYES; AND, essentially similar relevant aspects of "the environment" (as such) are all that is involved (all that is "there") with (and for) learning and development. There is a grave problem with this. The problem is in opposition to the likely nature of the Memories and how they can likely come to be used during ontogeny.

By a certain point (level/stage) in ontogeny, the developing organism (for now, just think: human) actually compares and contrasts aspects across times and across various sets of circumstances. And this is NOT all or always OR in any way "right before one's eyes" (these being the eyes of the adult researcher). What, to me, is the FACT that we can and do compare and contrast (and distinguish) aspects ACROSS/BETWEEN different sets of circumstances would, now in Psychology, at best (but falsely), be seen as aspects of "the environment" or somewhat different "environments"; BUT it is more than that because we can "see" things (like instances of abstract concepts becoming meaningful and having their meaning) across times and settings (sets of circumstances) that differ more greatly than in many of their circumstantial aspects (aspects OF "THE environment") than now imaginable OR allowed to be imagined: THESE are very different situations ("environments") that are VERY different, and NOT just in their immediately-clear aspects (i.e., in terms of some subset of easily imaginable "relevant stimuli" in "environments", as intuited). How is this possible?: Rather than thinking, as just described (easily seen supposedly involved "environments" and their "aspects"), we

should use some imagination to imagine HOW, via the Memories we have (types now well-researched), very different situations, much more different than those allowed to be imagined today and yet some of their aspects "all-at-once" pertinent; the developing organism (e.g. human child) sees within these more-greatly-different-than-imagined situations (settings) SOME of the SAME KEY circumstantial aspects. These are the bases of the qualitatively different stages/levels of child development AT THE SAME TIME as allowing for more abstract concepts and abstract processing.

The actual "field of experience" of the developing organism cannot be "nailed down" as within ANY as-seen-"typical" set of settings (or typical sets of circumstances therein). BUT: Research on the Memories clearly allows for (or makes very plausible) "seeing" key similarities or key differences ACROSS TIME and ACROSS what seem like VERY different circumstances. For an example: Think of a young (child) gorilla becoming open to detect, and soon see, all the various manifestations of what it means to be the dominant male; imagine the different "environments" such observations of key situations and key circumstances that this might involve: YET TRUE, and as is actually involved. (This would be an instance of an abstract understanding in an ape; it is similarly for us.)

The fact that there is nothing but never-ending and complete confusion about the bases of abstract concepts (and processing) is the most obvious result in human Psychology of the self-imposed (and demanded) LIMITS of Psychology today, I have just indicated. Because of this lacking in THEIR conceptualizations: The Psychologists go so far as to say that abstract concepts have NO particular, no concrete bases. This is absurd (not to mention a complete break with empiricism). The bases for abstract concepts may well be as concrete as for any simple concept. For "justice" and other such "higher" concepts may have particulars seen as well as we see particulars of more immediately-seen concrete aspects of a truck, a car, etc. -- but THE "higher" concepts simply involving imagining things about such different circumstances BUT which, indeed, have some particular clear, related, important concrete aspects (and THIS would be and IS adaptive). Developing children: Comparing and contrasting in "the mind's eye" the different situations and circumstances imaginable and imagined in key ways to compare and contrast them.)

How serious is the problem in Psychology? Well, in addition to being willing to say there are no concrete bases of/for abstractions, there are many that just think such concepts merely emerge from the brain with maturation (a non-behavioral, completely unclear and useless way to look at this matter -- also a break with empiricism). For more, SOON, see below; I shall direct you to my hundreds of pages of exposition, elaboration, and explication (as well as better justifications and assumptions, as compared to other models ("theories")). All these writings are publicly available on ResearchGate

First, let me say a little more, and then refer you to those works:

Working Memory is CENTRAL in my perspective and approach. And, given the definitions of ALL the Memories (including, now, all that can be involved with WM): I believe they (the Memories) constitute EXPERIENCE ITSELF. That indicates how working memory would be central in my new paradigm (an actual paradigm) for Developmental Psychology (which may likely, in time, be a foundation of Psychology in general). It is hard for me to know how to direct you to sample my works (and, of course, ideally then to motivate you to read them all).

One thing that might help "entry" into my system, is the fact that components being exactly the various types of Memories (and, as such, those involved in ontogeny, and Developmental Psychology); THESE _PLUS_ "things" of the same nature as my newly-hypothesized basic "perceptual shifts" mechanisms (for each of the stages/levels, providing for all in core ontogeny, particularly 2 to 18+

year-old persons) are the major types of components.

Another encouraging "feature": I have a strict standard of empiricism in my Psychology: ALL (each and every) concept, construct, and ALL that is involved in any model must have a clear and convincing BASIS (foundation, grounding, or KEY "start") in replicable, directly observable, OVERT behavior patterns, AT LEAST AT WHAT IS CLEARLY THE MAIN _INCEPTION_ of each new stage/level of qualitatively new concepts and processing (thinking). (This is actually just a completion of Piaget's Theory, specifically Equilibration 2 (the "balance" between the stages; determining whether to "move on" to a next stage, from the one you are in). This is the stages-"balance" type of equilibration Piaget said was "due to maturation" AND THAT IS ALL HE SAID. He realized to the end of his life that this was the main unexplained aspect of his theory.)

The hard part to presently believe in my system is the hypothesized "perceptual shifts", since the evidence is yet to be found, i.e. the key phenomena of these subtle key behavior patterns are yet to be discovered. But, yet: I submit, I have near-specific hypotheses, AND soon we can have completely clear testable (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses. Because of subtleties involved this will require observations with eye tracking (and possibly also computer-assisted analysis); then soon we will be literally able to SEE these basic "perceptual shifts"; specifically, I believe, they can be SEEN at KEY points in development and for KEY necessary new learnings (even "locally", in the time/space frame of the "lab"). (As far as behavior patterning is concerned, these KEY behavioral patternings, again, are subtle; for seeing these: eye tracking, etc. technologies are needed (that technology being like a microscope for Psychology).) [(It is very noteworthy that there are recent studies that show that eye-tracking can "pick up" extreme subtleties in behavioral patterns (these studies are referenced in another recent "Update" to my "Human Ethology ... " Project -- THIS present Project .)]

I shall now share what reading (of my writings) I recommend for an explication, elaboration and justification for my perspective and approach (in these writings I also contrast the "fruit" of my view against many existing psychological constructs, models and theories AND contrast beginning assumptions -- mine being more justified and likely). AND: I see enough behaviors patterning to clearly imagine a full science of Psychology, with all needed evidence being IN behaviors PER SE. Psychology's topics of study ARE an aspect of Biology and there should be a biological nature to behavior PATTERNS and patternings PER SE and just that; it makes sense, then, just by knowing all major behavior patterning (all major "behaviors") are necessarily an aspect of Biology they will show major coherent patternings; and there is doubtlessly, as such, enough patterning in "just behavior" to understand all -- everything for a full science. (I am a bit like Skinner, in a way; BUT NOT.)

Here is the grand "entry" to my writings:

Perhaps, first note that THIS essay and the other "Updates" are found underneath the linked heading "Project Log" of the Project (that has its full web address noted above), via the "Project Log" link provided. (And, you may well find the premises/assumptions/foundations of the approach, as outlined in the description of THIS Project (at the top), has many, many now-lacking qualities that ARE described or indicated to be HERE within my system, and many of those characteristics, one should firmly realize, a good system should have.)

Read :

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_phenomenologically-based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings and the

Answers following that Discussion Question for elaborations/clarifications.

AND: READ:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286920820_A_Human_Ethogram_Its_Scientific_Acceptability_and_Importance_now_NEW_because_new_technology_allows_investigation_of_the_hypotheses_an_early_MUST_READ

and

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK)

and

read the Project Log of the " Human Ethology and Development (Ethogram Theory) : A Full-Fledged Paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY" Project to see many important Updates:

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY>

ALSO (not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking) .

Dear AI & esp. AGI: ONLY 1 Psychology indicates some of the critical foundations of abstract concepts & processing (& Psychology, you may now owe me)

Dear AI & esp. AGI: THERE IS **ONLY 1 Psychology** _that **CLEARLY** _indicates some of the **nature and _foundations _critical** _ for abstract concepts & processing (& Dear Psychology, you may now well "owe me"; keep reading)

I provide a theory (major developmental parts yet to be researched) that provides AI and General Artificial Intelligence (AGI) with a **CLEAR (concrete, usable) description** of the **INCEPTION of abstract thought (concepts) and abstract processing**. This, needless to say, will be (is) **ESSENTIAL TO AGI**. (This psychology theory and techniques I describe IS THE **ONLY THEORY** that describes SUCH in concrete **USABLE** form.)

And, Dear Psychology, if you find the procedure I clearly describe and indicate (the research involving eye tracking technologies) and THAT leads to discovering basic **perceptual shifts (which I also describe)**, THEN YOU WILL HAVE TO (at this point) acknowledge ME: IF the clearly **described**

kind of research (eye tracking discovering the **beginning basic perceptual shifts with ontogeny, and associated with developing abstract capabilities**) I indicate CAN be found usable-and-useful for findings that yields the results indicated _and_ **IF, IN FACT, all this IS FOUND, THEN the fact** of the existence of this major foundations-finding **procedure** will be called, "the Jesness principle for empiricism" **. YOU are, at this point, too late for any credit (imagine what Trump would say HERE).

** FOOTNOTE: Ironically my point of view on cognitive development is THE ONLY VIEW that would allow for continued, acknowledged EMPIRICISM (at the real-science level). Thus, I believe (if one thinks about it enough and thinks in any sort of consistent and cogent manner), what I describe **must be true OR good empiricism does not work for Psychology** (which I most-assuredly do NOT believe). Analytic philosophers of science and Psychology should "perk up" on this matter OR argue otherwise (without meta-physics <-- which I cannot see as being anything but presumption or even superstition, and never anything more); I shall take any silence at this point as your concession.

P.S. Dear Readers: After 3 years developing and explicating and elucidating all this (from every angle, including clearly comparing and contrasting "things" with status quo Psychology "theories" and research), if educated responses do not follow (at this point), I shall have to question the efficacy and utility of ResearchGate (and most definitely wonder why I have been here for so long). (YOU do not need me here if all RG is about is b***s*****)

Humans: Are we smart enough to [come to] know how smart we are?

Quick answer : NO (and why on Earth would you expect we are? (or that we on ourselves, by ourselves, naturally would be? <-- sounds like old-time junk philosophy to me). And this will remain the case without good directed science -- and , as yet, some of the very most-central studies are not only yet to be done, but yet to be envisioned or accepted by our near-medieval present Psychology. ([Some of] All that is modern can VERY WELL NOT be congruent with all-else that is modern.)

[(Title of this post intentionally made to mirror de Waal's book title: Are we Smart enough to know How Smart Animals Are?)]

See a good portion of my writings (all available on RG) for more.

Editor/Co-author of my Collected Essays (on behavioral science) Needed (it's on ethology, ontogeny, developmental psychology, and general psychology)

Editor/Co-author of my Collected Essays (on behavioral science) Needed

I have approximately 1000 pages of essays on new, more-empirical perspectives for Psychology (esp. General Psychology and Developmental Psychology -- but relevant and important for Psychology in general). It is all about BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (and associated "environmental" aspects, these _OFTEN_ broadly conceived) and a science of finding the further behavior patterning therein, and a patterning of those patterns, etc.; AND THAT IS ALL : In other words, the writings outline the discoveries likely possible and necessary for a true and full behavioral science of BEHAVIOR PATTERNS ("just behaviors") PER SE ("behaviors" then seen, as must be the case, as aspects of Biology (adaptation) unto themselves); it is much related to classical ethology perspectives and research. RELATED TO ALL THIS: There is an expressed great hope for some technology being the "microscope" of Psychology for good/closer/better and/or NEW observations; there are likely sets of adaptive behavior patternings and associated environmental aspects within quite-possible, if not VERY likely, SETS of situations (with the important "environmental" aspects/circumstances there, BUT the KEY environmental aspects will also be across KEY related/in-some-ways-similar -- and memorable -- circumstances). This is how/where related behavior patterns COULD COME TO BE OBSERVED in situ, AND even seen as they develop : even the subtle behavior patterns, etc., therein, truly-seen and clearly seen and truly and fully discovered _and_ seeing some key adaptive "operations" thereof. AND there is some detailed phenomenology described that allow one to arrive at testable hypotheses and then also indicating how this same basic sort of essential observations shall also naturally PROVIDE the actual ability to test these testable/falsifiable hypotheses.

I am looking for a skilled reader and editor to read/edit my written works AND THEN put them together in a most sensible manner. This person must know the field of Psychology as a whole and must understand possibilities of ontogeny. Also she/he should have a healthy respect and very high regard for KEY foundational observations (always such AS CENTRAL). Know of the Memories (all the sorts, now rather well-researched) as providing for phenomenological EXPERIENCE ITSELF and for connections, as indicated above.

Any one "fitting this bill" AND WILLING, and otherwise ABLE, I would gladly have. Doing such substantial editing/proof-reading/rearranging/publishing is enough for me to see you as a co-author and therefore I would put you as second author on all the book's covers. After publication, you (given details we shall decide upon well ahead of time) shall have a good and fair portion of any money reaped.

Recent Answers to Others Question (newest at the bottom, as is true of all content in these addendums)

Why should behaviour such as - speech, intentions and mental processes be disregarded as unobservable in research?

Dear

You ask: " Why should behaviour such as - speech, intentions and mental processes [be] disregarded as unobservable in research?" In AT LEAST a significant indirect sense the answer is THEY SHOULDN'T ! Every concept should have clearly-relevant directly observable KEY overt counter-

parts at least some time (point) in ontogeny (aka child development). I believe qualitative changes in thought and thought processes have subtle, but overt directly-observable behaviors patterns AT THE INCEPTION OF EACH stage/level of such thought (eye tracking technology, etc. will likely be necessary to capture this; it is what I see as perceptual shifts and then as perceptual/attentional shifts) . (We are thought to have 5 such stages/levels, with several theorist/researchers saying they have 2 phases, each,)

I think the way of dealing with things related to some intentions and to thought processes is to find the early directly observable overt behaviors AT THE INCEPTION OF EACH NEW QUALITATIVE LEVEL OF CONCEPTUAL THOUGHT: I have outlined how this could be done. See:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Renaissance_for_PSYCHOLOGY_as_the_study_of_behavior--a_lot_of_that_but_JUST_that_per_se

AND ALSO SEE the following to get an idea of wrongly self-limiting sorts of thought:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Do_we_lack_imagination_for_how_great_our_imagination_representation_of_things_AND_ACROSS_CIRCUMSTANCES_SITUATIONS_can_be

AND see my assessment of the current deficiencies of current ideas of "abstract concepts" -- at least as limits here are countered by my perspective; specifically see my assessment of the following, in my Comment under it (WITH an alternative to All THAT offered):

Article [Editors' Introduction: Abstract Concepts: Structure, Process...](#)

What is philosophically indisputable?

Dear All

Regarding words and certain "concepts" which are considered : OFTEN _any_ true meaning depends on the context in which a word is used. You often must specify a particular situation or a at least a particular type of situation. We must come to know that just because there IS a concept (WORD), THAT does not mean that word is generally interpretable (or even definable BY ITSELF presently, in any useful way); in other words, we cannot assume a word (just because it exists) refers to any intelligible thing on which we have shared knowledge (and can have meaningful discussion). Many words not only indicate just aspects (but sometimes ASPECTS of multiple (and, in many ways varied) circumstances OR sometimes even just OCCASIONAL things (and "aspects", broadly considered) ACROSS-circumstances or even across several different circumstances . Any of these may very well possibly be the nature of the meaning of many "abstract" words; and, we must not forget this. Multiple (and even varied) situations/circumstances are often key to understanding concepts (abstract or [perhaps, at times] otherwise). Often one cannot validly believe there is a "definable" "essential meaning" to a word unto itself which is worth discussing; and, indeed, perhaps where many truly different meanings are possible -- this really (if we can just "face up" to it) is just basic necessary empiricism (for science or communication (intelligibility)).

I could say all this many times to philosophers with regard to MANY words/concepts for which they seek "essential" meaning BUT WHOSE MEANING VARIES A LOT, depending on the circumstances (one of my least favorite examples: "consciousness" but there are a multitude of examples, likely

comprising most of traditional philosophy). This problem of "defining" everything, together with the likely-related problems of dualism, ARE THE DOWNFALL OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION and certainly the MAJOR IMPEDIMENT TO SCIENCE/EMPIRICISM, at least in the behavioral sciences. SO: Any "general" "definition" given could VERY WELL BE A FALSE DEFINITION _and yet still be considered over and over, and lead to lasting confusion(s) **. [The so-called "hard problem of consciousness" credited to David Chalmers is just such sort of nonsense I just indicated and IT IS NOT A REAL PROBLEM AT ALL for anybody working empirically on decent topics in any related subject-areas.]

The Deleted Profile, author of this Question, presents statements and questions which are UNINTERPRETABLE, for the very reasons I just outlined. One just as well blitter/blather

** FOOTNOTE: See my essay in the Question,

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Do_we_lack_imagination_for_how_great_our_imagination_representation_of_things_AND_ACROSS_CIRCUMSTANCES_SITUATIONS_can_be

Is Philosophy a Science? If yes, what kind of Science?

Is the following philosophy?; it IS what is needed (centrally, at the core) and, if there is no philosophy, then perhaps no philosophy is needed. And, I would argue it is not philosophy, since it seeks only concrete groundings (foundations) and correspondingly offers just concrete (i.e. truly empirical, testable) hypotheses. (It is ALL based on systematic (basically sequential) observations.) Here it is:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/What_do_we_mean_when_we_say_an_animal_consciously_and_actively_DOES_something_we_often_do_not_have_a_real_answer_that_truly_adds_something_do_we

Does epistemology offer specific methodological rules?

My answer:

The tread's Question is: "Does epistemology offer specific methodological rules?" YES. It is called basic, essential EMPIRICISM (<-- that one word suffices) which is finding _overt directly-observable patterns as the bases or foundations or clear beginnings of everything. Also, science requires good inter-observer agreements, FOR THOSE KEY THINGS OBSERVED.

Those 2 things is all you need (but good luck finding the ways to have both with the present-day psychologists all being egg-heads **).

** Footnote: According to Wikipedia : *egghead* is an epithet used to refer to intellectuals or people considered **out-of-touch with** ordinary people and **lacking in realism, common sense** [(bold added)]. In any case, that is what I meant.

What is the difference between empirical truths and conceptual truths?

Dear

You ask, "What is the difference between empirical truths and conceptual truths?". Of course, my view is there should be NONE (no differences (at least, ideally and in some most-important sense -- and as far as we can tell)). I would strongly assert that this view I just indicated is THE one to take.

What is the difference between science and knowledge?

You ask: "What is the difference between science and knowledge? "

I would say: not much, if you do actually know something.

People have brain and mind, and animals do have brain but not mind, what do you think ?

Not trying to be mean, but if one believes other mammals (and birds, for that matter, too) do not have a mind, then it is those who ask if "they have a mind" that are lacking a mind (not to mention the evidence).

Why the artificial intelligence (AI) is dealt nowadays as if it is new??

Dear

You ask, " Why the artificial intelligence (AI) is dealt nowadays as if it is new?? ". Well, General Artificial Intelligence has not yet been done correctly and (according to all the experts) does not exist yet. The added perspectives/"ingredients" needed are what people are TRYING to talk about as new. See my AI Project: <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Developing-a-Usable-Empirically-Based-Outline-of-Human-Behavior-for-FULL-Artificial-Intelligence-and-for-Psychology> There might be clues there, I believe, for sure.

Becoming a good thinker isn't overly complicated.. It's a discipline. Do you agree?

Dear

I agree. But, "disciplined" must include a great abundance of/for (and, perhaps, vision of) clear and definite (for-sure replicable) empiricism for all one's concepts -- this is really a requirement for any good continued communication (as well as for science). Otherwise, I believe discipline for something new (creativity) involves being able to understand and put all relevant thought systems (as they are and as they are understood by their proponents), each one in perspective with others and eventually in some greater perspective (and this last big set of "things" is for people who are relatively young (certainly well-started by middle age)).

Measuring the scientific character of a theory

Dear

For good science-and-theory:

It is basically "proven observation(s)", that is, shown-consistently replicable, **IN definite and equally or better CLEARLY-defined CONTEXT(S)**, and/or clear thus-provable **SETS of such observations** which are as replicable AND in the other ways, just noted, like that (and so also one has beginning replicability going forward with continued replicability): This is the **sign** of true or very good empiricism, **BUT ALSO good and necessary empiricism** (a minimum, required empiricism) **will** always **involve a FULL and clear** (seen as UN-arguable OR very likely becoming UN-arguable) **bases for all concepts, constructs, and everything in any model AND, this means: any and ALL that (concepts, etc.) are defined IN/with (or at least have their clear origin/inception IN) directly observable OVERT phenomena** . It is at that basic level that one must be concerned with verifiability/falsifiability, **NOT ONLY verifiability/falsifiability IN SOME AGREED-UPON WAY** regarding hypotheses, though it will include THAT (with truly good hypotheses) in the larger good context as well.

(One should note that, with this outlook, the experiment is not necessarily the "divine" way of research; in many cases, even when possible, it can be a mere adjunct to observational research necessary for a fuller needed perspective; and, while the experiment may at times be great (when possible), they need not be involved in even some of the best, most-necessary, inclusive research. **And, observations will ALWAYS be the "threads that bind" in any case.** This outlook should be a sufficient outline to **know that the experiment IS NOT "THE scientific method".**)

(There should be NO concepts, much less ANY model, before such good observations; one should consider anything else ""trash" -- and there is a lot of this latter sort of "stuff" in Psychology and the social sciences.)

[(There is no reason to believe that any philosopher (even Popper) likely has the "whole story" on any empirical matters -- they are not sufficiently "connected".)]

What are current and the most controversial problem in biology?

Dear

When you ask your questions about "What are current and the most controversial problem in biology? ... What is your vision regarding the problems that you wouldn't find an answer to?". FOR ME, the biggest oversight is a good idea about the hows-and-whys and then, also, the observations that **BEHAVIOR** (actually: **behavior PATTERNS** <-- and the lack of such a term being near-universal is part of the problem) **PER SE (nothing but behavior patterns ("just behavior")) will have sufficient patternings (patterns of patterns, etc.) to BE A FULL, COMPLETE, AND most-useful science UNTO ITSELF (as is the case with so many other fields/aspects of Biology).**

As clearly a major part of Biology, with it own huge set of special functionalities, THIS SHOULD BE LOOKED AT/ LOOKED-INTO so the that the central nature of behavior patterns BECOMES OBVIOUS. It is not at all obvious now; in fact, anyone nowadays thinking about Biology and "behaviors" is thinking about OTHER BIOLOGICAL ASPECTS of the organism (such as neuroscience, other physiological states, or such) and its/their effects on "behavior". We all need to come to know or remember that behavior-itself was a full and very useful perspective: discoveries here, in fact, gave some behavioral scientists -- called ethologists -- the ONLY Nobel Prize ever awarded to a behavioral scientists (in particular, the ethologists, Tinbergen and Lorenz and Karl von Frisch in 1973): the **Nobel Prize** for Physiology or Medicine for their discoveries concerning animal **behavioral patterns AND THAT IS __ALL__ THAT WAS INVOLVED.**

How much we never fully or clearly processed these achievements of these ethologists correctly (and then went on from "there") is not explicable in any legitimate way. ALSO, with that: "forgetting" about Piaget's stages of cognitive development. These both are the grievous symptoms of a fallen and sick and artificial "science" (fallen away FROM a science of behavior patterns PER SE). These symptoms ARE OF A SICK false "SCIENCE", A SICK PROCESS, that has left the greatest likelihoods for ontogeny of behaviors (and child development) "behind". WE MUST ALSO ASK: how the heck has this happened?, i.e. what is the **systemic problem of Psychology in the colleges and universities** for what I can only see as this OUTRAGE? And the "replacement" over the last 2-3 DECADES has been a basically **false and pretend "science" well-shown to be UNPROVABLE (untestable) and merely speculative**, that is known as "EMBODIED" cognition "theories" (AKA enhancement "theories") -- well-shown in peer reviews as untestable assertions and completely scientifically UNACCEPTABLE. Ironically, it is clear these bastard "theories" are clearly based by-analogy on Piaget's first stage of cognitive development (where all is clearly overt in ways "scientific" psychology can see), known as the Sensori-motor Period . See: web page, link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13423-015-0860-1 , for the thorough and scathing peer review of such newer "theories". Such theories are NOT THE BEST WE CAN DO, because **we can SEE IN MORE (and real) WAYS**, beyond the necessary "lab" situations and settings these defective, phony "scientists" can "see". [And, not only are these "scientists" NEEDLESSLY constrained in their observations, but findings of great and important patternings of behaviors through more thorough, inclusive (broader) observations (and, yes, some "in the field") and thereby findings of more and more significant real, overt patterns **may well also have overt signs clearly detectable IN THE "LAB" ****. It is so damned ironic.]

[(I can also point out, with historical certainty, that thinking in terms of levels or stages of cognitive development was the well-justified NORM in developmental psychology in the 1970s and 1980s (and perhaps into the 90s).)]

**** FOOTNOTE:** See my writings (all available on RG) for more.

[(P.S. Let's see if the RG bonehead "experimentalists" will knock me down a few more points, just as I defend BASES IN OBSERVABLE PHENOMENOLOGY, now simply NEGLECTED; my contributions seem to only lose me points.)]

What happens in the brain when a thought is born?

Dear

You ask: " In order to achieve a full understanding of the biological foundations of consciousness, it may take several centuries, but what do you think? "

I think it depends. If you are thinking in terms of the physiology of the brain, I could well agree with you. BUT, really: NO, not centuries, not even decades.

I have no doubt there could be a **good empirical science of behavior patterns PER SE (i.e. "just behaviors" and that is all)**. This aspect of biological functioning (behavior patterns and patternings of such patterns) showed a good start in the 70s : it was called ethology; but unfortunately ethology is no longer properly understood or viewed (e.g. there is a common belief that ethology has LESS to do with learning than other approaches BUT that is demonstrably FALSE -- IN FACT, just the opposite is true: the more understanding we could get via just discovering (and empirically well-grounding) behavior patterns ("just 'behaviors'"), THE MORE WE WOULD FIND "learning" and this would be REAL learnings and be of essentially different qualitative types of learning and not some artificial and basically fictitious ubiquitous few "types of learning" now imagined; the ONLY learnings now imagined and seen properly are the simple types of associative learning (sensitization, habituation, and at a cruder level of understanding: classical conditioning and operant conditioning); the others have no clear empirical bases (they are very bad science and, actually NOT SCIENCE).

If we study behavior patterns and patterning well and have all our concepts well-founded or well-grounded as/or as connected-to (and, minimally, at LEAST in their inception SEEN, starting with) DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVER BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (basically the same definition of good empiricism is all decent science), MUCH advancement (and continuing advancement) of understanding could occur. But, we first have to rediscover the behavior science that won the Nobel Prize in 1973 ; IT IS THAT "biology of behavior" I have just described. We now basically do not know it.

What is the ideal research design in social science research?

You ask "What is the ideal research design in social science research?" The following described ideal EXCEEDS the standards typically met in the social sciences, but reflects the necessary empirical standards of any regular, real (and continuing) science.

The basic (and general) answer is: proper preparatory sets of observations to show that the research problem is empirically-based (**to a science standard**): that is: **all your concepts** are in some extremely reasonable and demonstrable way **founded-in/grounded-in/[or]starting-from some clear, properly agreed-upon, replicable DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT PHENOMENA** (in the social sciences, this is: KEY behavior PATTERNS, perhaps necessarily related to phenomena of ontogeny (child development)); and, going forward, a properly framed research question will provide some kind of testable (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses, at the same time **keeping true to the explicit foundation and grounding** of the subject matter (and perhaps furthering the grounding standard) . All this, again, being up to a science standard of demonstrable, replicable empiricism and ultimately all continuing to be clearly **based on reliable and valid observations, comprised of sets of KEY foundational direct observations (of overt phenomenon)**. ("Valid" is added for the purpose of the need to show one's perspective is clearly (or very likely) useful (useful, in a broad, agreeable, **principled** sense -- where "principled" clearly means **founded on known/found principles**)). [(The validity matter likely should also have "come up" earlier in this Answer.)] [(Among the principles referred-to are biological principles that would also be seen in behavior patterns PER SE.)]

Nothing less will do. Where one can do science, science should be done -- and this is true of virtually every continuing (going-forward, progressive) field of study.

Editor/Co-author of my Collected Essays (on behavioral science) Needed (it's on ethology, ontogeny, developmental psychology, and general psychology)

Editor/Co-author of my Collected Essays (on behavioral science) Needed

I have approximately 1000 pages of essays on new, more-empirical perspectives for Psychology (esp. General Psychology and Developmental Psychology -- but relevant and important for Psychology in general). It is all about BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (and associated "environmental" aspects, these OFTEN broadly conceived) and a science of finding the further behavior patterning therein, and a patterning of those patterns, etc.; AND THAT IS ALL : In other words, the writings outline the discoveries likely possible and necessary for a true and full behavioral science of BEHAVIOR PATTERNS ("just behaviors") PER SE ("behaviors" then seen, as must be the case, as aspects of Biology (adaptation) unto themselves); it is much related to classical ethology perspectives and research. RELATED TO ALL THIS: There is an expressed great hope for some technology being the "microscope" of Psychology for good/closer/better and/or NEW observations; there are likely sets of adaptive behavior patternings and associated environmental aspects within quite-possible, if not VERY likely, SETS of situations (with the important "environmental" aspects/circumstances there, BUT the KEY environmental aspects will also be across KEY related/in-some-ways-similar -- and memorable -- circumstances). This is how/where related behavior patterns COULD COME TO BE OBSERVED in situ, AND even seen as they develop : even the subtle behavior patterns, etc., therein, truly-seen and clearly seen and truly and fully discovered and seeing some key adaptive "operations" thereof. AND there is some detailed phenomenology described that allow one to arrive at testable hypotheses and then also indicating how this same basic sort of essential observations shall also naturally PROVIDE the actual ability to test these testable/falsifiable hypotheses.

I am looking for a skilled reader and editor to read/edit my written works AND THEN put them together in a most sensible manner. This person must know the field of Psychology as a whole and

must understand possibilities of ontogeny. Also she/he should have a healthy respect and very high regard for KEY foundational observations (always such AS CENTRAL). Know of the Memories (all the sorts, now rather well-researched) as providing for phenomenological EXPERIENCE ITSELF and for connections, as indicated above.

Any one "fitting this bill" AND WILLING, and otherwise ABLE, I would gladly have. Doing such substantial editing/proof-reading/rearranging/publishing is enough for me to see you as a co-author and therefore I would put you as second author on all the book's covers. After publication, you (given details we shall decide upon well ahead of time) shall have a good and fair portion of any money reaped.

P.S.

"Science is knowledge of natural processes based on evidence." [The evidence must be as strong a sort as possible (thereby relating "to the senses" -- i.e relating to something(s) directly overtly observable (though NOT necessarily having their full or most important impacts immediately). We are dealing with Reality as best we can and that is not like a court case. Nor, is it just a presentation of a sort just of our choosing. And, the outlook taken has an eye toward/for predicting other concurrent or later behavior patterns -- thus, for further understanding (a lot of the time the closest we come to real causes is finding reliable, apparently true and meaningful SEQUENCES).] (my additions in brackets)

" ... Clearly if much of our knowledge is analogical [(by-analog)] in origin, it CANNOT be certain, and the real causes of events may ALWAYS escape us." -- David Wootton, author of "The Invention of Science" (all-caps added)

(All my added words, above and below, are more than consistent with Wootton, AS the author of "The Invention of Science" (a book, in paperback, 2016).)

If you see a Principle as, OR "like", an analogy, you either do not understand principles (e.g. Biological Principles), or your 'understanding' is mistaken and wrong.

Apply all this outlook (above) to the phenomena of behavior patterns (and please know enough, and have judgement enough, to look for REAL OVERT DEFINABLE AND REPLICABLE ** PATTERNS ** (behaviors-in-patterns) IN THE FIRST PLACE -- through observations, in case you need to be told) and you get the outline and perspective of my view and approach.

This Discussion post, in another forum, is entitled "**Last call for behavioral science**". (I will explain why):

P.S. In a way my essays have been collected and **published: ON ResearchGate -- YOU, to the extent that is true and appropriate ARE the PEER REVIEWERS, right now -- the writings are most certainly publicly available, able to be judged by any who can judge them.** [(I gathered my writings and put them in a few clear collections (the largest one, outside the 2 old foundational papers, being 512 pages long -- the collections, together, all recent essays of the last 3 years)]. If no one cares to find such "things" as I write about (even if "just there" on RG), I feel I have done the basic start that I can AND MUST hold myself responsible for, and let things "fall as they may" otherwise (and "fall" is the word). Responsibility has come to you.

I have taken the poor response I've gotten so far as a NO, NO, NO (basically, your response, or LACK THEREOF, is often saying: "I am already happy with my outlook and making money or reputation

(fame) and/or getting a doctorate, so [yawn] forget you"). I know an experimental psychologist who has written a new good book on experimental psychology (I read it) and he got and he has gotten precisely THAT response from colleagues when he presents any of his "hard-hitting" critiques.