

Psych.: w/ many permutations of many diverse "things": the only way to provide a general alternative better view will be a full-fledged paradigm shift
Discussion

With so many permutations of so many diverse "things": the only way to provide a general alternative **better view AND APPROACH** will be WITH a full-fledged paradigm shift:

What is offered must have a host of better characteristics and better ways, all related clearly to a better empiricism. [**SPECIFICALLY: I am speaking of/for PSYCHOLOGY** -- the number of characters allowed in a title didn't allow for the inclusion of that full phrase (though the same type of thing may at times be required by other sciences) .]

A full-fledged PARADIGM CHANGE: **Better assumptions**; stricter & very established/agreeable and **actual empiricism**, well-defined, **with a definition true for ALL sciences**; better KEY BEHAVIORAL **foundations/clear grounding (in terms of: behavior patterns) for all cognitive processes**; clear NEW observations sought (i.e. **major discoveries sought**) VIA NEW observation methods; & with **clear better-empirical verifiable/falsifiable HYPOTHESES** . This is what I seek to offer with :

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-Shift-for-PSYCHOLOGY> (see its major References and the Project Log (Updates) for this Project; **the major References, hundreds of pages long, will provide you with a perspective and approach -- a "how-to" FOR all of that.** Given its better empiricism, a concrete basis is also provided for General Artificial Intelligence -- all that is found and seen can be "mechanized", is programmable.)

[This all is VERY serious "business"; **it really is an all-or-nothing proposition.** If you see major problems with large portions of Psychology throughout its history, you better "go with" what I present; otherwise the long-standing situation WILL remain the same; I think you may well be able to imagine how and why that could be true (all the various myths of how things [otherwise] could/will come together NOT WITHSTANDING -- these are true myths, not based on any empiricism).]

Dear

I agree with you (and as I have previously with Orlando M Lourenço) , where you now both have indicated Psychology is in a pre-paradigmatic state (is an "immature science"). I can likely also see your point about Kuhn's position on "rapid shifts" of paradigms; THAT may well be too stark: I would imagine that some good actual full-fledged paradigm might well not be seen as totally "mutually exclusive" of other views -- rather, just putting at least many aspects of earlier findings in a better (and progressive) fuller, larger context; and such being the case at least (or especially) if we ARE going from a pre-paradigmatic state to a paradigmatic state.

I do think, though, that **A major paradigm is needed** -- as you may also be implying (hopefully). I believe a start is a full and constant **appreciation for, and commitment to, true minimal empirical groundings and foundations for EVERYTHING: all concepts, constructs, processes, and models:**

THAT founding/grounding being (minimally) ON: KEY direct observable overt phenomena (in the case of humans (and other animals) these phenomena would be in terms of clearly seen, and thus rightfully definable, behavior **PATTERNS**). **This would yield seeing behavioral phenomenon clearly of the nature of biological patternings, and then it is more than conceivable that behavior patterns PER SE -- "just 'behavior' " alone -- could be seen as providing all of its own best "contexts", for defining and understanding other related behavioral phenomenon (other PATTERNS) **;** this would constitute the fields of Psychology (or, basic Psychology). And, recall: **ALL is as directly seen or as well-founded (as indicated), and thus rightfully implied. Behavior PATTERNS are themselves a full-fledged aspect (or rather, subarea) of BIOLOGY ITSELF and, as such, explanations will for the most part be found within that sub-area itself (making much neuroscience "support" and inter-discipline "amalgamated" views for the most part "off track" (since that is almost always basically speculative, and not well integrable into a good, tight science)).**

**** FOOTNOTE:** This is the nature of classical ethology, of great animal studies.

A PARADIGM SHIFT in Psychology: A well-founded perspective, well-justified & an approach with the BEST POSSIBLE concrete grounding is NECESSARY FOR AI Discussion

A PARADIGM SHIFT in Psychology: A well-founded, well-justified perspective and approach & an approach with the BEST POSSIBLE concrete grounding is NECESSARY FOR AI (artificial intelligence) and especially AGI (artificial general intelligence). WHY?? They must have everything in **good empirical terms (empiricism always in the best possible way -- ALL having clear referents AT LEAST observations clearly related to KEY directly observable overt behavior PATTERNS) _AND_ the concrete referents of the the concepts and of the total conceptual structure of the entire theory (perspective and approach) MUST BE TRULY EXPLICIT. BECAUSE ONLY THIS IS WHAT WILL BE PROGRAMMABLE ("mechanized", to use an old term).**

Psychology does not even need to try to understand any such proposed well-founded behavioral science paradigm shift BUT RATHER -- on the bases of unproven assumptions and the poor history of psychology, all providing extreme biases, as well as likely falsehoods AND with much of that CERTAINLY BUILT ON mere MYTHS -- they will **continue to bumble along, doing what they already do.** They can easily continue to ignore possible/likely improvements and **even as all the related concepts and the structures are all consistent with each other AND with central facts and with the DEFINING OF a coherent paradigm shift.** Psychologists cannot even "move their minds" enough to understand ANYTHING about such major shifts -- **they cannot understand even one "piece" (ONE concept) as it is in the new system .** Psychologists can happily continue to **simply-believe** any perspective/approach that they believe they have found useful, and which they believe will continue to be useful, even as it "progresses" in ways that it does. **BUT: None of this is related to better empiricism;** PERHAPS they are providing better (and more) statistical findings that are good for an insurance actuary (and the like), BUT NEVER PROVIDING FOR A CONTINUOUSLY PROGRESSING SCIENCE..

AI People (and esp. AGI People), see:

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/Does a FULL NEEDED REAL paradigm shift FOR PSYCHOLOGY also provide an advanced view for General AI2](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Does_a_FULL_NEEDED_REAL_paradigm_shift_FOR_PSYCHOLOGY_also_provide_an_advanced_view_for_General_AI2)

and

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/Why Generalized AI needs to establish a concrete foundation of developmental levels stages](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Why_Generalized_AI_needs_to_establish_a_concrete_foundation_of_developmental_levels_stages)

Dear

I thank you for the thoughtful and insightful responses. I have no problem at all viewing present Psychology (General and Developmental) as pre-paradigmatic "science" -- and I do wonder if any such thing could even be considered a real science (I think not). This view of it being pre-paradigmatic is very, very likely what I should have fully realized and made explicit all along. Looking at it that way, it should be even more helpful to see a proposed actual paradigm (like the truly full-fledged one I put forth, at length).

I realize I provide answers to my own Questions; I do have some good answer oftentimes, and really use Questions and Discussions and even my Answers to others' Questions and Responses as opportunities to write short essays on the matters I do feel I already have something to say about (and all that turns out to be related to my "grand view" -- the paradigm). [Actually, through this "method", I have written, in essence, a long book -- about 800 pages at this point. This, sort of by "bouncing off of others" (at least indirectly) was my method for this. Yet, nothing keeps others from offering other answers or further answers -- though, perhaps as you say, some bias is put in from the beginning (what I see as a good "bias", though).]

Thanks again.

P.S.

Kuhn, who I have always seen as having a only a partial (that is: just a "some-parts" understanding) of a paradigm, still seems at least in the direction of being correct in some noteworthy ways. According to Kuhn :

An immature science is preparadigmatic -- that is, it is still in its natural history phase of competing schools. Slowly, a science matures and becomes paradigmatic. (End of short summary of some of his views.) [It will be clear I do not fully agree with these views, in particular: the " 'natural' history" part.]

I would say that preparadigmatic is **not yet science at all** and characterized by flailing and floundering UNTIL a paradigm is found (and RATHER: actually, this should be done **NOW** and with any necessary efforts: **FORMULATED**). Preparadigmatic is nothing good, clear or even "natural"; it is a **state of insufficiency**, failing to provide for making clear sustained integrated progress (and even, as indicated, I would say: **unnecessary** -- see my delineation of the characteristics of a paradigm * to see why this situation in Psychology is unnecessary and INEXCUSABLE, because clearly you **MUST** be doing paradigm definition the best you can, clearly and respectably). _AND_ we are not talking about progress in one vein (sub-"area"), but **some interpretable, agreeable findings for the whole field -- a necessary condition of HAVING ANY sort of general SCIENCE AT ALL**; obviously **Psychology does not have that and should not be considered a science** just because people in that field **want to say that** and **supposedly aspire in that way** [("aspire" somehow -- usually essentially

mythologically, irrationally, and just "hoping beyond hope" (as people say))] In short: that state of preparadigmatic should not be tolerated; **major efforts should be clearly going on to improve from this state immediately ("if not sooner", as they say -- i.e. this SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE SOONER).**

Since I think **I DO KNOW at least many of the characteristics of a paradigm** (presented elsewhere, for one: in the description of the "... Ethogram Theory" Project *) **AND since mine is the only paradigm being "offered up"**, Psychology people should damn well take full note of that and fully read and come to a reasonable understanding of my perspective and approach -- all that leading to clear, testable hypotheses that, IF SHOWN CORRECT, would be of general applicability and importance and very reliable (in the formal sense) and , thus (as I say): agreeable. IN short, **I OFFER THE ONLY FULL-FLEDGED GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY PARADIGM and if someone is in the Psychology field and really cares about science, they must take note (and fully assess it)** (no reason for any exception): Minimally, all must "see" AND READ:

Article [A Human Ethogram: Its Scientific Acceptability and Importanc...](#)

and

Book ["Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory"](#)

thanks to what you have pointed out, barring any "competition", **my paradigm should be studied and fully understood -- NO REASONABLE SCIENCE CHOICE ABOUT IT. It stands alone in Psychology, as a proposal for NECESSARY "ingredient" for SCIENCE.**

* FOOTNOTE (this footnote is referenced-to twice in the essay above): **The characteristics of a paradigm** are presented the Project referred to: <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-Shift-for-PSYCHOLOGY> (in particular, in its description)

Dear

I consider neuroscience as typically only indirectly (and usually only very vaguely) related to behavioral science, behavioral science (aka Psychology) being (or seeking to be) the science of behavior patterns AND corresponding environmental aspects <-- **ALL "biggies" of each** (the KEY behavior patterns AND the main environmental aspects) at **some key times** having central/determining KEY aspects which are **OVERT and directly observable**. This is **an empirical standard (and THE necessary empirical standard of ANY science)** that neuroscience-and-behavior can rarely achieve. I view most neuroscience, at best, as weak supporting evidence. I take a similar attitude with regard to inter-disciplinary explanations.

I believe my perspective (theory and approach) is as relevant as it has ever been and it only recently has it become researchable -- with respect to some central KEY now-testable hypotheses. Over the last few years I have formulated what were rough qualitative predictions in 1985 into clear predictions (hypotheses) that may be directly testable (but likely requiring eye-tracking technology, etc. , because of the subtle nature of the most relevant, meaningful, and important behavior pattern changes involved during ontogeny -- the unfolding that largely determines what we (humans) are).

I see Psychology as having made the opposite of progress in the last couple of decades (with the

unsubstantiated and unsubstantiable mere beliefs, having the status and quality of myths; examples are the "embodiment" theories and enhancement theories, and inter-disciplinary theories, with connections made on the basis of ad hoc theorist intuition -- all of these not the way of science AND all this is NOT science).

P.S. My theory subsumes the work and findings of John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth (yet specifically owing them nothing directly w/r to their topics, findings and concerns; though well aware of those, my main sources are Piaget and classical 'animal' ethology).

Dear

While there are diverse areas of psychology, MANY rely on a core type of perspective (basically similar and essentially VERY similar) and a distorted/biased sort of approach WHICH IS FUNDAMENTALLY in existence and ESSENTIALLY TRUE OF THEM IN GENERAL. IN CONTRAST to what you say, Diane Sunar, most know there are major areas of generality (of scope) in some major fields of Psychology: There IS a basis for what is called "General Psychology", not to mention that there is a crucial basis to what is known as "Developmental Psychology". I will admit that some sub-areas seem to operate well. (I like much of the research on the Memories, for example.) Others (other areas -- conceived of and seen as large encompassing areas), especially those related to grand theories, are best characterized as I did above.

I do not fully support Kuhn because his view and assessment is incomplete -- it does not really explain change, but just crudely describes it (and, at times/points inaccurately or wrongly). This seems to aid and support the SCIENTIFICALLY un-justified/UNSUPPORTABLE "excuses" which many in status quo Psychology are then further encouraged to "take up". I will again say (as I have in other posts) more that affirms and supports the statement I made in the first paragraph: the crucial **empirical (AKA science) definition** of Psychology (the **major areas of the field, in any case**):

Psychology is (or seeks to be) the science of behavior patterns AND corresponding environmental aspects <-- **ALL "biggies" of each** (the KEY behavior patterns AND the main environmental aspects) at **some key times** having central/determining KEY aspects which are **OVERT and directly observable**. This is **an empirical standard and THE NECESSARY (absolutely required) empirical standard of ANY science**. If these elements cannot be clearly defined or at least clearly (reliably, agreeably) pointed to **_AND_ CLEARLY BEING MOVED TOWARD**, then "things" (some key 'sciences' of Psychology) **are out-of-whack to an extent THAT THE ENTERPRISE CANNOT BE CONSIDERED SCIENCE NOR LEADING TOWARD ANY SCIENCE**. --> Science must both **start with, and continue with, key empirical foundations ALWAYS**.

Those who enjoy the status quo Psychology are frequent excusers of "just the way Psychology is". This all is based on insubstantial, poor, and weak set of excuses for WHY WHAT IS NECESSARY IS NOT DONE. These excuses are not excuses AND NO SUCH "EXPLANATIONS", for any valid reasons, need to exist. It is basically propaganda (of the "don't-look-behind-the-curtain" sort), distracting from decent conduct.

The support for propaganda comes often comes from unthinking, tacit acceptance of assumptions, views, and approaches -- and with there being a common buckling under the "authority" of the professors and the "weight" of history. AND: There are, of course, vested reasons some have for being excusers of/for status quo Psychology (many are already "in it", afterall).

Again, the "excuses" are "beneath" (less than) weak; they are **improper -- not only NOT science, but anti-science.**

I offer a necessary "ingredient" for ANY SCIENCE of Psychology

Discussion

Much of this is quoted from elsewhere, but I think deserves its own thread:

Kuhn, who I have always seen as having a only a partial (that is: just a "some-parts" understanding) of a paradigm, still seems at least in the direction of being correct in some noteworthy ways. According to Kuhn : An immature science is preparadigmatic -- that is, it is still in its natural history phase of competing schools. Slowly, a science matures and becomes paradigmatic. (End of short summary of some of his views.) [It will be clear I do not fully agree with these views, in particular: the " 'natural' history" part.]

I would say that preparadigmatic is **not yet science at all** and characterized by flailing and floundering UNTIL a paradigm is found (and RATHER: actually, this should be done **NOW** and with any necessary efforts: **FORMULATED**). Preparadigmatic is nothing good, clear or even "natural"; it is a **state of insufficiency**, failing to provide for making for clear sustained integrated progress (and even, as indicated, I would say this situation is: **unnecessary -- see my delineation of the characteristics of a paradigm * to see why this situation in Psychology is unnecessary and INEXCUSABLE, because clearly you MUST be doing paradigm definition the best you can, clearly and respectably**).
AND we are not talking about progress in one vein (sub-"area"), but **some interpretable, agreeable findings for the whole field -- a necessary condition of HAVING ANY sort of general SCIENCE AT ALL**; obviously **Psychology does not have that and should not be considered a science** just because people in that field **want to say that** and **supposedly aspire in that way** [("aspire" somehow -- usually essentially mythologically, irrationally, and just "hoping beyond hope" (as people say))] In short: that state of preparadigmatic should not be tolerated; **major efforts should be clearly going on to improve from this state immediately ("if not sooner", as they say -- i.e. this SHOULD HAVE BEEN DONE SOONER)**.

Since I think **I DO KNOW at least many of the characteristics of a paradigm** (presented elsewhere, for one: in the description of the "... Ethogram Theory" Project *) **AND since mine is the only paradigm being "offered up"**, Psychology people should damn well take full note of that and fully read and come to a reasonable understanding of my perspective and approach -- all that leading to clear, testable hypotheses that, IF SHOWN CORRECT, would be of general applicability and importance and very reliable (in the formal sense) and , thus (as I say): agreeable. IN short, **I OFFER THE ONLY FULL-FLEDGED GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY PARADIGM** and if someone is in the Psychology field and really cares about science, they must take note (and fully assess it) (no reason for any exception): Minimally, all must "see" AND READ:

Article [A Human Ethogram: Its Scientific Acceptability and Importanc...](#)

and

Book ["Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory"](#)

Barring any "competition", **my paradigm should be studied and fully understood -- NO REASONABLE SCIENCE CHOICE ABOUT IT. It stands alone in Psychology, as a proposal for a NECESSARY "ingredient" for SCIENCE for Psychology.**

* FOOTNOTE (this footnote is referenced-to twice in the essay above): **The characteristics of a paradigm** are presented the Project referred to: <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-Shift-for-PSYCHOLOGY> (in particular, in its description)

My view of, and approach to, cognitive development, including qualitative shifts (explained), could be understood, except for " ... BUT ..."

Discussion

My view of, and approach to, cognitive development, including qualitative shifts (explained), could be understood, except for " ... BUT ...". If one could indeed rightfully leave one's still-grounded imagination to "open up" to real possibilities, then my perspective and approach is beyond possible, but something that should inspire trying for new and more-significant DISCOVERIES. But, one is literally side-tracked or stopped by " ... BUT ... " <-- that inherited basically from UNFOUNDED Western biases and philosophies (many which make assertions that are not only not founded or grounded but also, from a perspective of Biology, LIKELY FALSE).

Moreover, I do present clear testable hypotheses ALL to establish a good foundation for understanding (this is what the big most-empirical DISCOVERIES would lead to). One would just have to "believe" to understand the perspective and the value of TESTING THE SPECIFIC HYPOTHESES. If, "by chance", any of the notable hypotheses were proven true, I have little doubt that the researcher(s) would be awarded the Nobel Prize (in "Physiology or Medicine ", like was the case for Tinbergen and Lorenz).

See:

Article [A Human Ethogram: Its Scientific Acceptability and Importanc...](#)

and

Book ["Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory"](#)

and

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY> (especially the Project Log, aka "Updates") [ALL THIS is my "gift" to/for YOU.]

Simple, but ignored: What is good for General Artificial Intelligence is good for Psychology ; and, if not good for one, not good for the other

Discussion

Simple, but ignored: What is good for General Artificial Intelligence (AGI) is good for Psychology (true understanding): this is **SIMPLY** (and this could not be more simple or clear) **BECAUSE** if the findings are clear (founded, grounded, and in-perspective), **THEN** AGI can use the findings for creating true artificial intelligence. **IF NOT** (clear like that) **THEN** the "findings" are not rightly or fully understandable for/by **ANYONE** (including students of Psychology).

My paradigm for Psychology **IS GOOD FOR BOTH** (<-- for an example)

Psychology should work for this; no need to beg AGI on "following suit".

[It should not only be the case that Psychology can follow "Information Processing" (theory research, and findings) , but **ALSO** that Information Processing ... should be able to follow Psychology. I assert that there is no reasonable counter-argument to this -- and that should tell you something. (I am "listening" here for a counter-argument, though.)

P.S. To make the case of my assertion true, one (of course) has to know **HOW**; it is the goal of my writings (on my 'system') to show the "how", as well as yielding important, good testable hypotheses.]

Dear

Thanks for your question. The answer is: Psychology. It has, by definition, supposed to be the science of behavior. The field has been around for over 100 years, but has yet to develop an outlook and approach that could be considered a legitimate science paradigm. To put it in more concrete terms:

Psychology does not strive for, or achieve, a **necessary good level of empiricism** (its "empiricism" is , in a sense, 'fake', too indirect: in particular, **inadequate FOR clear interpretation of findings** -- for very strong inter-observer reliabilities). Good empiricism **requires** that everything must be grounded in, clearly founded in, **key directly observable overt phenomenon**; there must be, **for every concept, in any theory or model**, some key directly observable overt phenomenon from which **EVERY BEHAVIOR** pattern discussed/"covered" clearly **STEMS: AT LEAST at the INCEPTION of any significant new behavior pattern(s)**, there **MUST BE key directly observable overt phenomenon that define them (and THEN, some continuity from THAT must be shown)**.

My system provides for meeting this empirical standard, an empirical standard that, at the core, **DEFINES a SCIENCE** or is obviously **ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY** for science. My outlook and approach is a science paradigm for Psychology. It appears it is a "first" for General Psychology. No reasonable scientist or psychologist could disagree with the standard set (much less dispute it). If **Ethogram Theory** is "wrong", it is **NOT "wrong"** for the empirical standard set (and this standard supposedly works **"within"/for this theory, for ALL allowed concept/model development**).

Dear

You ask, " How you see this triangle, or the Psychology - Technology link? (the most important keyword in this link is the one of consciousness)". I consider the overlap of necessary Psychology conceptualizations and between these in Psychology and necessary developments in AGI to be most notable and quite substantial (NOTE: regarding some of the major conceptualizations for Psychology: some are still needed by way of new observations and THE clearer actual patterns there yet to be truly or reasonably-fully discovered) *. My Project <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Developing-a-Usable-Empirically-Based-Outline-of-Human-Behavior-for-FULL-Artificial-Intelligence-and-for-Psychology> will clearly indicate at least many major facets of this *.

Regarding consciousness, see my recent answer (of today) to:
https://www.researchgate.net/post/Is_consciousness_still_mysterious

I use the term "good" to refer to the way empiricism is done, indeed. This "way" is just insisting on clear, reliable and seemingly valid links between ALL concepts AND/with (minimally) some KEY directly observable overt phenomenon -- at some linked time (e.g. in the ontogeny of the organism, at the inceptions of clear, new behavior patterns).

* FOOTNOTE: Also see my Project, <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY> All my work is available on RG.

Dear

My recent response in the thread of the Question,
https://www.researchgate.net/post/Many_things_behaviors_are_explained_on_sensorimotor_bases_but_unable_to_be_shown_at_the_same_time_in_Psychology_Piaget_is_losing_popularity, MAY WELL GIVE YOU an imaginable over-view of what I am talking about related to theory (my Ethogram Theory, in particular).

Maybe to encourage reading of this Response, I will quote a major portion of it here: (I have been in contact with major AGI people about all this)(perhaps since I am quoting myself, I could leave out the quotes -- but I shall do as I usually do):

"My writings are certainly pertinent to ideas about Internal V External world; in fact, my theory and the related testable hypotheses have to do with the concrete bases of abstraction (abstract thought) at their inceptions (also indicated as having happened by soon-coming qualitative shifts in thinking likely with also-observable effects on behavior patterns, though these may be yet more subtle): these concrete (overt directly observable) inceptions of what makes for abstract thought are potentially observable with new eye technology (even in the lab, if you know what you are looking for and are looking at the right times (correct points in ontogeny), in the right way); in any case they occur quickly because these inceptions involve perceptual shifts, which soon become perceptual/attentional shifts -- phenomenon, which occur quickly and may develop at least at first quickly (this making for why they indeed can be literally: seen).

... .. at this point major interest has been from general artificial intelligence people (aka AGI people)) *
....

* FOOTNOTE : AGI people being people who need somethings to properly impel qualitative shifts in

behavior of their "robots", **some (in particular) coming from, or instigated by, the "agent" itself.** (Having a basis for this eliminates at least 3 of 5 major lingering problems in AGI -- and that is SOMETHING. As our understandings have followed information-processing theories in the past, so this may occur again -- if the AI people are the first to try to apply such things as I outline.)"
(end quote of myself, from that other thread)

Some of this seems clearly pertinent to your concern of: " ... the machines that must developed themselves, ..."

I would add (do add) here in THIS thread that AI and **AGI people have a great advantage in that they can guess and then test their guesses quickly.** I should also mention that the "perceptual shifts" I speak of (**in the human**) involve conditions of "memory" (the Memories), **this allowing for an "opening" for new input (processing of information) from other/new aspects of the environment (these NOT necessarily present in every instance of the circumstances -- BECAUSE of "memory").** [This completes about the shortest overview I can provide.]

A very "little" P.S. for my friend, Iliescu Dragos : the entire phrase that "ignored" appears in in the title of the "Question" may be deleted (i.e. "Simple, but ignored:" may be deleted). You certainly do some close examination, so much so that I really did not understand your concern here. In any case you have my regards and best wishes.

Many things ("behaviors") are 'explained' on sensorimotor bases (but unable to be shown); at the same time in Psychology, Piaget is losing popularity?

Question

Many things ("behaviors") are 'explained' on sensorimotor bases (but THIS unable to be shown -- in any reasonable empirical way, directly OR indirectly); at this same time in Psychology, Piaget is losing popularity, is this justified? I say NO !!!!!!!

Dear

I absolutely and completely disagree with you with regard to this broad major subject area (actually a foundational area for General Psychology -- thus Piaget's theory is still one of the major ones described for Psychology in textbooks) . Your attitude is of a biased exclusionary (e.g. Skinnerian) nature in this regard (but it is interesting people can come to this nowadays, though perhaps not surprising). This is **well beyond accepting any decline in Piaget's popularity.**

["Doors need to be closed " AND "Methodologies have been used long enough **to change to** different approaches" -- I wonder where such categorical and extreme reasoning comes from.] One would certainly have to state more for any such reasoning (people like Skinner are not found so acceptable nowadays -- i.e. those delimiting the field for no clearly real, good reasons). In fact:

EEK ! I fear from the motivations one would have for having such a response (i.e. wanting to "close the door" on any major long-standing theoretical perspective and related approaches -- which is **well beyond just having reasons for accepting any decline in popularity**). [I dare not state what such an attitude also brings to mind (especially given where you now reside.)]

I am sorry; I am soliciting responses, but maybe expect SOME I can "see" (understand or consider). But, yours is not one of them. Sorry. Yet **sincerely: Thanks for responding anyway**, for perhaps it at least shows some significant attitudes that are "out there".

... Anyway, I would say: types of observations that could very well be very important ARE NOT YET DONE today, even some likely just requiring the modern eye-tracking technology (and related computer assisted analysis). Thus, I think this might add to what you have heard about and considered regarding observation. Studies related to such new sorts of investigation could find the concrete bases of the overt-covert link (and the integral relationship of the two). <-- I have outlined how in my neo-Piagetian perspective and approach (all my writings are available here on RG).

Quick P.S.

What I added to this content (above, in response to Mehri Takhvar) in another thread, may be helpful if I add it here: (quoting myself from that other thread):

"[I should] mention that the "perceptual shifts" I speak of (**in the human**) **involve conditions of "memory" (the Memories), this allowing for an "opening" for new input (processing of information) from other/new aspects of the environment (these NOT necessarily present in every instance of the circumstances -- BECAUSE of "memory")**. [This [(together with what I wrote, above)] completes about the shortest overview [of my "system" (view/approach)] I can provide.] "
(end quote of myself)

Dear

You are most welcome. I like your strong spirit and dedication and your finding of apparently a host of related topics. Something I find most useful is to be more phenomenologically-oriented than topically-oriented, even to answer the questions related to one's topic(s) -- at least for the ultimate empirical bases or foundations (to this full extent, I am an empiricist). The ultimate goal is to see at least some things "as they actually ARE", as the Buddha would say. I hope you will forgive my frequent attempts at advice-giving (maybe at times to people who do not need it).

WHY should Psychology CARE about Ethogram Theory?
Question

For one reason, and maybe a more direct one, it has to do with issues of the nature of visual working memory and visual long-term memory (very important, general issues). For a great Article on this, see: Article [Visual memory, the long and the short of it: A review of vis...](#)

Now, in order to use my writing to best effect, let me basically quote a letter to the author (quoting myself):

First, the letter's Title: " [From where] do some top-level discriminations (familiar/recollection [come]"; now continuing:

"Dear

I am a "top down" guy (the most top-down there is) and a complete empiricist and guy that defines Psychology (or at least his Psychology) in terms of behavior patterning and environmental/circumstances aspects ONLY -- i.e. these environmental.../behavior patterns aspects IS ALL . I am a neo-Piagetian and believe that, with new technologies (e.g. eye-tracking and ancillary machine processing), we can literally discover the concrete bases (i.e. directly observable overt behavior patterns in situ), AT LEAST at the inception of each KEY new set of significant behavior patterns related to major cognition and major cognitive processes developments. I believe thus we can actually identify the bases of qualitative shifts in levels/stages [(i.e. completing Piaget's theory (basically, his Equilibration TYPE 2 -- the "balance" between stages) by finding the primary bases of stage/levels qualitative changes -- and all most empirically: in the end, I provide PIVOTAL concrete testable (verifiable/falsifiable) specific hypotheses TO PROVIDE THE real FOUNDATION of THIS NEW THEORY)]. To put it in other words, the Ethogram Theory tells and shows a way to find the concrete grounding (foundations) of abstraction and abstract thought itself -- these major cognition and cognitive processing phenomenon.

This, indeed, would be one "place" (quite literally) where some major bases of familiarity and recollection BEGIN. To come to an understanding of my view/approach, a rather substantial amount of reading is involved and necessary (a LOT of it with respect to its foundational differences with some modern baseless assumptions (replaced in ETHogram Theory) and to, correspondingly, contrast it with modern approaches to research; the rest of the writing is to as clearly as possible contextualize where/how these KEY changes occur IN BEHAVIOR PATTERNS ... (the nature of and development of the Memories are also always involved) AND I OUTLINE THE NEAR-SPECIFIC NATURE OF TESTABLE HYPOTHESES (which finally comes up in my writings, where I most-clearly "channel" biology). 800 pages: Two hundred of the pages come from the original 1985 treatise AND from two other major old papers AND, then, the other 600 pages are recent essays written in the last 2-3 years (necessary to put the Theory in context, as indicated, and then to get to rather specific hypotheses).

Anyway, here is how to get to my writings: [(someone's reading, understanding, and "belief in" this system may be essential for real progress in Psychology, and it finally becoming a true science (as empirical as any); it is "at your feet" and just a several select others, I place this Theory and all the related writings for a chance of beginning the seeking of much more clarity and of major advances in Psychology; THAT IS IMPORTANT)] :

See, 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)

Sincerely, with great respect, Brad Jesness

P.S. The main reason for this P.S. is to direct you to the final 100 pages of recent essays (not among the 512 pages you already have been directed to); these are very worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf "
(end quoted of myself)

Do you now understand some major reasons WHY Psychology should CARE about Ethogram Theory?

Dear

On the positive, I can say that, in some rather insignificant bit-parts, there is [/maybe is] some correctness in your answer (e.g. in some sub-areas of Psychology). BUT, with regard to the outlook of MOST psychologists I very largely otherwise disagree with you; AND, as is, their perspectives and approaches are most probably NOT the way psychologists should be. Humans cannot, no matter how trained, fully express their "thoughts, feelings, motivation by speech". Very good examples here are in perception and in emotion -- where we most OFTEN CANNOT indicate what we are doing (either as/how we perceive or about why emotions come up in the "first place"); you may not be well-aware of how little control we have of emotions, at least at their first-coming-up, AND some of which can come up due to subliminal effects AND others, such as those involved in blushing, are not EVER under our control. (There surely is a distinction between emotions and "feelings", scientifically speaking.) And thus, we cannot repress or control (or report) all this from/through thought, AND EVEN MUCH LESS THROUGH SPEECH.

I am sorry to say that I find your "ONLY man ..." outlook either wrong or unacceptable or useless (whatever the case: and thus distracting). It is arrogant and presumptuous (though as many philosophers historically have been -- and you have "inherited" this, AND often even without ever any clear evaluative thought, have "soaked" such views/pseudo-'assumptions' up). I could take a better perspective by citing and describing recent, modern findings about animals (and all the aspects they have that are so very much like us), but I think I will "take it on" another way:

You say: "*Homo sapiens* can also express his thoughts, feelings, motivation by speech and other animals can not". There is a little, really VERY LITTLE -- and about never in full context needed for understanding -- which we can properly understand and express, even about ourselves, as an individual instance of the species. In addition to ways of seeing things through perception and in addition to having limited to no control over emotional responses (or "seeing" exactly what they are and are for): about all major behavior patterns occur/begin-most-significantly before speech, and this includes cognition, cognitive process, and representation. (You don't really think a human being is/or can be guided by learning to develop qualitatively different levels/stages of thought in a proper well-adaptive hierarchical manner (and universally, no matter how poor the parenting) do you? Nor can this be seen as any act of will, obviously. In fact, there is no good observable overt evidence for EITHER (NONE).

[(By the way: I consider "motivation" basically a secondary topic adding nothing to help do basic observation OR experiments.)]

Psychologists are VERY BAD thinkers and for one thing: NEVER assess their basic assumptions NOR consider more-likely OTHER assumptions because of the "only man ... " junk. I do all this for them in my writings; you must have read very little of my work. Also psychologists are MOST FREQUENTLY ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE WITH THEIR "EMPIRICISM": Good empiricism requires: that ALL concepts [/conclusions and assumptions] be MINIMALLY : DIRECTLY RELATED TO SOME **KEY** directly **OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS** (or phenomena [patterns]) -- I add the last parenthetical phrase, so this outlook is correct FOR ALL SCIENCES. Psychologists often do nothing even close to this (so their studies "look wrong" to the reasonable real scientist, from the "get-go")

Psychologists DO have enough sense at least to attempt to get behavioral evidence and USUALLY only for superficial topics get self-reports from Subjects -- or for at least about the last 75 years.

I would challenge you to cite some "only man ... " evidence that could be considered useful for finding and understanding the basics. I also find it odd and curious that you think of an ethogram as "a tool", psychologists could acceptably or reasonably "take on", if only they wished and want to; it is a MUCH larger "trip" to get to the point where any major ethogram of key behaviors can be understood, and taken on (THOUGH I DO TRY TO DO THIS IN MY WRITINGS, all of them: there are 800+ pages there, spanning decades of compiled observation, at then, thought) ; and then, one should know or come to realize that there are certainly many basic careful observations to be made **FIRST** to discover the evidence for the start (inception) of major human behavior patterns. [A decent psychologist MUST see things in terms of behavior **PATTERNS** (not simply "behaviors"); and typically new behavior patterns are grounded in other "surrounding" behavior patterns and actually in (a new part of) some previous (aka "old") behavior patterns: THIS is classical ethology -- which almost no one even knows of, nowadays (AND THIS IS NOT PROGRESS).]

So many in "Western" society just "will" to consider whatever they want to consider, and then, simply sit back in their armchairs and think it through (without the supports any good extensive thinking ABSOLUTELY REQUIRES). They desire only to "define" as they will and, NOT as in science, letting the Subject do essentially all the defining; "Western" man/people think little about using inductive reasoning "up front", though any scientist would say that good, reliable, systematic, and "agreeable" (reproducible and testable) OBSERVATIONS ARE ABSOLUTELY THE FOUNDATION OF ANY SCIENCE; and then, after really very little practical or possible experimentation, they should return to fundamental (foundational groundings) IN OBSERVATION. Too bad psychologists just provide "lip service" to all the rock-solid required principles of science.

Dear

Thank you for you Answer and your concerns.

You say: " *psychology theories* reflect the possible richness of the parts " (end quote) . A NEW theory in a new paradigm can mainly only be rich in its possibilities, VIA adherence to excellent founding principles and BIOLOGICALLY congruent and consistent assumptions, and the promise of better connection of concepts to phenomenology, i.e. better (more true; TRUE ENOUGH) EMPIRICISM : this last feature accomplished by clear grounding of all concepts (including ALL concepts in any model), and having all-testable hypotheses, IN/linked-to some clear **KEY reliable directly observable overt phenomena** (exactly like other sciences) ; these phenomena are in psychology: behavior patterns

and patterns of these patterns. Changes in **KEY FUNDAMENTAL BEHAVIOR PATTERNS** must be clearly related to **KEY developments in ontogeny** . Thus, IN ADDITION to reliability (often inter-observer reliabilities in the needed OBSERVATIONAL AND INDUCTIVE work finding that which may be KEY and shown as such), there must be VALIDITY: basically showing some extremely likely connections (and hypothesized, then [hopefully] likely discovered to be apparent) and **thusly relationships between earlier KEY behavior patterns and later behavior patterns shown ***. (Science, as most have heard, is not only reliable observations BUT ALSO YIELDS PREDICTIONS, this being the "heart" of VALIDITY.)

Now on the matter of an ethogram. I do very well know what one is, have no mistake about that. The thing is: IT CANNOT ALL BE DONE AT ONCE, just because of the way it is "defined". In actuality, it must be realized (as in other good science) that ALL particular behavior patterns are very much defined BY other clear behavior patterns (in more general terms: phenomena) "surrounding" them (preceding, concurrent or following) -- such contextualizing is crucial and one of the 2 major foundations of empiricism itself (this foundation being the **foundation _IN_ OBSERVATION**; the other foundation being the **connection of ALL** concepts (of course including hypotheses) **_to_ DEMONSTRABLY clear** overt observable phenomena) *; AND, **THIS WAY, the Subject defines all** concepts. [(I do think the fact that ALL behavior patterns that are related to an ethogram cannot be done at once is so apparent to any and all people that I need not directly argue for that, though I have indicated (implicated) how the full concept will end up being honored, above and as I continue, below.)] Now, since all cannot be done at once, I think (like Piaget) that cognitive developments basically are a CONTAINING SYSTEM for most everything else that is significant (e.g. emotions, developments of the Memories -- and realize that **the Memories being**, by their definitions (even in the present), **EXPERIENCE ITSELF (!!)**). So, THE cognitive developments in child development (ontogeny) is a good way to start : discover the basic phenomena (behavior patterns) behind cognition and cognitive processing **INCLUDING THE CONCRETE BEGINNING BASES at the inception OF ABSTRACT THOUGHT ITSELF (<-- something classical philosophy now basically FORBIDS even the consideration of) [(I necessarily END the nature/nurture dichotomy, basically by hypothesizing a bit more (additional) integral (and occurring later in childhood than modern psychologists ALLOW) subtle innate guidances (perceptual "shifts"), yielding CHANGES IN subtle but overt and observable behavior patterns (likely only now discoverable with new technologies, esp. eye tracking and related computer analysis technologies))]** .

Now your writing concerning " Psychological [(Psychological)] refers to phenomenological or information processing *theories* of mind" (end quote): I would say YES to phenomenology and even to information processing models as long as my rule about the grounding and founding in directly observable overt behaviors is strictly abided by. About "theories of mind": FORGET THEM: this is related to philosophical garbage (which basically is presumptions from biased thinking without sufficient bit-by-bit (piece-by-piece) GROUNDING -- such grounding that is IN REALITY necessary in response to the recognition of the limitations of our Memories (not the personal ones, but the Memories that have been researched, and where good findings exist)); we cannot pretend to observe a little and then think a lot to "think things out" (NEVER, EVER) because it is exactly such mistakes that has lead to (and continues to be "behind") unproven, likely-false pseudo-"assumptions" and presumptions (biases, e.g. "only Man ..." junk) -- VERY MUCH INCLUDING NOT ONLY THEORY BUT [(of course, relatedly)] RESEARCH APPROACHES; **THIS PRESUMPTUOUSNESS IS THE BARBARIC NATURE OF MUCH OF CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHY -- and bad theory and research have been (AND ARE) the consequences.**

About your statement, " behaviours in an *ethogram* are usually defined to be mutually exclusive and

objective": I say: objective (i.e. all possible empiricism and demonstrated reliability and validity) certainly BUT OTHERWISE THEY (behavior patterns) ARE AS THEY ARE, AND ARE OFTEN NOT NECESSARILY MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE AT ALL (though they sometimes, of course, ARE) (this all relates to the classical ethological way of **defining** behavior patterns **in terms of** the behavior patterns which surround any given behavior pattern -- and thus basically ground it, **like other things which develop and operate in Biology (behavior is BIOLOGICAL -- something one must profoundly realize to be a behavioral SCIENTIST)**; SO ONE SHOULD NOT BE EXPECTING OR SEEKING ALL BEHAVIOR PATTERNS AS BE MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE, BUT (in fact) expect and look for exactly the opposite, for GOOD REAL DEFINITIONS -- for things being defined by the Subject itself.

*FOOTNOTE (this footnote referred to (used) twice): Principles (biologically congruent) allowing for intermediate yet-to-be-well-shown processes may have to be involved (invoked), in some cases.

Possible in psyc. (& science): a top-down view, but from a slightly different angle, THIS a bottom-up view, simultaneously, w/r to same phenomenon?

New question

Can't we see, as a useful outlook for Psychology: having (as a scientist) a most top-down view, but from a slightly different angle, a most bottom-up view (at the same time): and, these outlooks WITH RESPECT TO THE SELF-SAME VIEW (and the SAME behavior/phenomenon patterns) ! ?

That is the way I can see the KEY particular concrete investigable aspects (hypotheses) of Ethogram Theory, with its "perceptual shifts" being the inception of a qualitatively new ways of thought (NOTE: there are clearly-stated testable hypotheses concerning these "perceptual shifts" IN THEIR CONTEXT(S) FOR triggering and for starting the developments of KEY aspects of cognition, in particular: qualitative shifts in thinking during ontogeny). SOME perception, thus, can be seen as the beginning of major thought, thus beginning "the top" and being "top-down". At the same time, except for sensation, there is nothing as quickly-occurring and rather short-lasting as perception -- and this is the other way my view of perception can be seen in Ethogram Theory; here, the latter view, is the way perception typically is viewed, and being a view (perspective) best then "seen" as being of a "bottom-up" nature, because of much that "follows on" "to greater 'heights' " -- BUT THIS and THE OTHER VIEW BOTH being realistic with respect to the Memories AND, here with the latter view: a way to try to actually and really ground (and well-found EMPIRICALLY via direct observations), our understanding of some of the KEY nature of abstraction and abstract thinking.

I wonder whether this dual (apparently oxymoronic) view of several behavior (or phenomena) patterns can also be good for other Psychology understandings (other than major cognitive developments) and perhaps even be good in other sciences. Perhaps just such an outlook, that may seem it cannot be true, may be a way more routinely to surmount human limitations, the ordinary limitations of human thought (and then, of course, of language and speech). Goodbye dualism (wrongful dualisms).

[P.S. This most surely is not Marxism or like it; it is actually consistent with Buddhism: "shaking off" old conceptualizations, as they are overly "deterministic" actually skewing the way things are "seen"

and being unwholesome-ly limiting and THIS new view then likely opening us up to a broader view, giving a better view of real context. (Rough example: "A wise man knows what he knows and knows what he doesn't know" (this rather familiar example may be Confucius, but is certainly of a Buddhist nature, as just described)) . ALSO, readers should know that to see the essays divided up into paragraphs, click the Question "Title".]

Does anyone have a conceptualization of, and found a good use for, naturally-occurring experiments in behavioral science (particularly Psychology)?

Question

In phenomenology related to Psychology, I believe I have seen sets of related-similar circumstances, **occurring in nature** which contrasted (**differed**) **seemingly only a single way**. At least some of these appeared to be replicable. Isn't this **as good as a lab experiment** (with the experimental and control groups)? Before you say "no", be sure to weigh the possible biases or skews (for other VERY notable reasons) in your operational definitions, THEN judge the case of problems with finding-and-seeing with/in "[replicable] sets of related-similar circumstances, occurring in nature which contrast in seemingly only a single way". THIS is what I am calling here a natural experiment (and what others in the rather distant past, decades ago, I believed also termed such happenings).

Should such natural experiments be more prominent in our science of Psychology? (Einstein did not create the eclipse to test his theory, did he?)

I wish I could provide an example, but I just took note of some such and never wrote down the details; I cannot imagine beforehand all the questions I might ask HERE on RG. Perhaps someone else can provide an example -- but I will not hold my breath. **YET: I KNOW one could find several notable examples in classical ethology** -- the work Tinbergen, Lorenz, and Karl von Frisch won the Nobel Prize for in 1973 [(the Nobel Committee had to -- and in the future would have to -- put behavioral science accomplishments in the category of "Medicine and Physiology")]. But continuing: ... After all, this classical ethology group did essentially (and I mean essentially) define behavior patterns in terms of OTHER surrounding or preceding behavior patterns (and related co-varying environmental aspects) -- which were there or not (thus like experimental and control groups), contrasting the 2 otherwise similar, at-least-near-identical situations/circumstances (i.e. their clearly observable environmental aspects and related behavior patterns and the variation). [**The behavioral patterns context can OFTEN be as clear, or clearer, than the 2 sets of differing environmental aspects; IMAGINE THAT !! (Also, some behavior pattern changes are due to internal changes, e.g. hormones in the "animal" -- which also can be measured.)**]

[RG now only allows an apparently fixed set of descriptors for any Question; there are MANY THINGS MISSING, e.g. species-typical action patterns AND innate action patterns. They used to allow people to type in some of their own terms, and took that under advisement.]

Dear

... as you say " you are telling us how to answer ". Damned right, to the extent I can (why WOULDN'T

ONE DO THIS??: why would one pretend great-than-is true uncertainty and a lack of knowledge one actually has?); I leave it to people to answer IN LIGHT OF MY CONTRIBUTION; if this is "too much", from such good motivations/intentions as mine, I can only suggest Twitter and the like. ALSO: I cannot leave "seeing" things or figuring things out entirely to ANY in, or affected by, the iPhone generations. ALSO, I am old and know a lot. **I do note that you are quite old yourself, so do not take what I just wrote above or that below, personally.** YET: You do know you are on researchgate, don't you ??; questions of professional people should not always start "from scratch".

Did you know, on average: iPhone, etc is checked 80 times a day, and consumes 49 full days of each year. Result: the mindlessly lost.

Just FYI: The support of, and actions to test, the perspective and hypotheses of Ethogram Theory :
Any?
New question

Asked May 16 in the project [Human Ethology and Development \(Ethogram Theory\) : A Full-Fledged Paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY](#)

Just FYI: The support of, and actions to test, the perspective and hypotheses of Ethogram Theory : NO SIGNIFICANT RESPONSES KNOWN [OF]. You, if you have the knowledge, discipline, AND with at least a friend with needed resources (and ancillary knowledge of how to use, and interpret results from, needed tools) COULD BE THE FIRST. (The repercussions cannot be over-imagined; there would be a multitude, with an entire new basis for understanding, congruent and consistent with Biology: Behavior PATTERNS AND behavioral patterns in behavioral pattern complexes "defining" (truly defining) each other AND THE BASES IN/ON WHICH **TO LITERALLY SEE INTERPRETABLE CHANGES in THEM** that result in important new behavior patterns we all need to know about to **understand the CONCRETE BASES of cognitive developments** (all this -- perspective and findings -- quickly eliminating needless and value-less nature/nurture debates).)

[The lack of explicit support has not deterred me because (1) there is no other behavior pattern/environmental aspects outlook to explain the same things Ethogram Theory attempts to, and would explain, if its clear hypotheses were tested and shown correct -- and it is more than plausible. (2) Ethogram Theory is fully-empirically based, as well as ONLY behavior pattern/environmental aspects-based -- two related matters -- and this is reviving a good perspective and approach and fully realizing (and always significantly showing): real, actual empiricism (concrete, directly observable overt **foundations, minimally**). (3) There is **NO SUBSTITUTE for behavior patterns understandings** -- in a REAL sense, that is the "rock bottom" final analysis (accomplishing coming to full real understanding: and an understanding being NEVER possible by/through neuroscience findings alone, no matter how detailed (because you need to SEE behavioral correspond-es; understanding involves BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATION, [and ALWAYS returning to that as well]); AND other explanations of behavioral abilities in terms of "embodiment" or "enhancement" are (as an excellent peer review has shown) **NEVER ABLE TO BE FOUNDED, OR** in any way **GROUNDED ON, CLEARLY BASED ON, _KEY_ agreeably-connected (reliable and importantly validity) DIRECTLY-OBSERVABLE OVERT PHENOMENA** (these OTHER approaches also **gravely lacking in overt BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATION**, lacking empiricism). I know of no place else to turn, except to decide that many understandings are impossible (that, not an option in my thinking; though some philosophers, those who distract and "de-rail", to ruin science, may smile).]

I present all this to minimize the attitudes, "well let's see how this goes". DESPITE THE iPhone, life and problem solving is not just a passive "observational sport" and GABBING (over-"sharing", lacking discipline and self-control) will not make it happen.

IT ISN'T "GOING"; yet that itself indicates NOTHING. To have things happen some people must ACTUALLY DO SOMETHING (I am 65 yr. old and with no resources -- that, only becoming more and more progressively true; I may soon be dead and may never know if anything ever happens -- though I am sure this final fact has much less bearing and influence than arguments I have made). Any who care can find the 100s of pages of justification, contrasted with the status quo, using better assumptions and better, more empirically founded developing-concepts: ALL a promising, biologically-consistent **view WITH testable hypotheses** (and all here on RG). [All this is not to mention that such concrete understandings would be "mechanize-able" for AGI (General (true) artificial intelligence) -- which could be overall for better or worse.]

Can we all welcome humans to the "animal kingdom", as biological organisms in every regard?
New discussion

I am talking about the **biology of overt observable behavior patterns** PER SE (no neuroscience AND no biology as "understood" presently as "related to behavior" [(actually, presently through "THOUGHT-OUT" models, by-analogy -- and OVERLY MUCH)]; I am talking about nothing "under the skin" involved (e.g. biochemistry, etc.)), just **behavior patterns alone** -- starting with **PATTERNS IN BEHAVIOR BEING RECOGNIZED AND MORE SOUGHT THROUGH FUNDAMENTAL BEHAVIORAL OBSERVATION. Literally seeing these patterns in/as SYSTEMS OF A BIOLOGICAL NATURE** (e.g. in their **inter-related nature AND DEVELOPMENT** (ontogeny) and in-line **with fundamental biological principles**, like homeostasis -- but the "application" of such principles NOT conjured up through thought or preemptive models (preemptive to fundamental observation which itself VERY LARGELY "will do" (<-- this fundamental: observation and RETURNING FREQUENTLY AND ALWAYS TO OBSERVATION AS in all real and proper science)); AND, all this shown and demonstrated, as **everything** is to be, to exercise actual empiricism: then **ALL** will be at least **clearly related to directly observable overt behavior patterns (and FINALLY INTELLIGIBLE** (including ALL thought and thought processes)). AND, in the proper reliable showing : all is following, and actually **IN**, discoveries **from/IN observations**.

And, in so doing: **SHOWING ORGANIZATION FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES OF A BIOLOGICAL SORT (in behavior ITSELF)**. AND, THIS WAY OUTLINED FOR ALL BEHAVIOR, MANIFEST OR PROPERLY INFERRED, the latter also from good bases OBSERVED. [ONLY philosophy would indicate any part this proposal as impossible and that philosophy IS FALSE.]

Don't be mistaken: Darwin wasn't enough; biology and classical ethology was not enough; [strange] attempts at good empiricism were not enough; and, philosophy has been and continues to be largely harmful.

Maybe the "torment" I offer (and have offered for some time now) might (by chance or good luck) be

the final nudge needed. If my "system" of thought/principles/assumptions is needed SO BE IT !!
In any case, INSIST ON THE BIOLOGY OF BEHAVIOR [PATTERNS].

P.S. I welcome all help with better editing, like with the use of parentheses, but otherwise (for clarity and meaning) as well. **Also, be sure to click on the title of this discussion to see the paragraphs (which is quite helpful); other ways of expanding to the whole essay shows no paragraphs, unfortunately .**

If humans are so "complex", is it always harder to understand human behavior [patterns] than to understand similarly functioning patterns in animals?

Question

If humans are so "complex", is it always harder to understand human behavior [patterns] than to understand similarly functioning patterns **in other animals**? NO !!

Of course not: we see as other humans see and, to some notable extent, what they see; we hear what they can hear; we smell what they can smell; we understand the types of things they are trying to understand and master; and we understand (roughly) what they are trying to accomplish at each stage of life ('stage' both in the strict sense, of the ontogeny that is child development, and otherwise). **WITH RESPECT TO NO OTHER ANIMAL DO WE HAVE THESE COMMONALITIES TO USE AS PART OF OUR UNDERSTANDING.**

Then, how is it that all this does not help us; I, for one, am not willing to believe that we are yet otherwise extremely complex to any point of not being able to come to understand humans (ourselves). [(In most cases, claims of complexity can be regarded as simply indications of confusion* (and ignorance) -- and not necessarily anything more. And, the confusions are often not necessary at all, even in the first place.)]

FOOTNOTE: Try the proposed word substitution ("confused/confusion" for "complex/complexity") and see.

Let me explain:

It is as if bad philosophy has put a "spell" (actually: blocks and limitations, over-generalizations and other wrongful mental behavior patterns, aka "thought") on us that incapacitate our moving forward, thinking along/upon more constructive lines such as (in small part) indicated above [(but much more clearly indicated, and then outlined, in other parts of my writings)]. We very much too often ask "what have the philosophers thought?" when, frankly, that hardly matters at all (they may have had some point sometimes at some junctures but, with their same body of philosophy, they commonly very much over-"define" (notably wrongly and falsely), and then overgeneralize their 'position' to make unsubstantiated CLAIMS -- yet these thought-out armchair claims are accepted!! BIG EXAMPLES OF THEIR WRONGFULNESS COME UP in statements beginning "ONLY Man can ... ". And this is in addition to THEM saying in other ways (which I am now characterizing in vague outline and obviously paraphrasing): only some 'this' or 'that' [way] will work or only some 'this' or 'that' can be the "way it is", as they "determined". They analyze any single words they choose (e.g. how we can supposedly

"understand" our "will" or understand certain particular other things) as if any of these are well established concepts, when they are not; THEY then "define" other things and move on from there, both of these wrongful ways [further] making a fundamental breach with empiricism and then necessarily also with science (AND all this CAUSES CONFUSION (and it should be clear it is based on ignorance)).

Those large aspects of many, many of the philosophies are not only incongruent with science, but lead to unnecessary confusions (on larger "related" topics, like "consciousness" -- something they go on to develop ideas about, based on their initial "definitions", all that yielding the "complex" "understanding" and then also "finding" that which "cannot be understood" (e.g. the " 'hard problem' of "consciousness" " -- [a problem I see as nonexistent from another standpoint]) .

Isn't grounding all interactions (& our understanding of particular interaction) best done by better understanding the Memories as EXPERIENCE ITSELF?

Question

Isn't grounding all interactions (& our understanding of particular interaction) best done by better understanding the Memories AS (being) EXPERIENCE ITSELF? I see this as one of the 2 consistent common groundings for properly coming to an understanding of concepts we come to have as a being, and this includes the development of not just bare simple concepts, but even the development of contingent SETS of such concepts, AND it includes that which come of the developed and developing Memories which allows for abstract thinking -- abstract concepts and abstract processing. Let me elaborate on this first type of thing:

First, realize: By the definitions of the Memories (our basic types of memory, all rather well defined by EXISTING research already), there is no way not to see EXPERIENCE as the operation of the Memories themselves (and THAT is EXPERIENCE ITSELF, literally true BY THE DEFINITIONS in modern perspectives and research). AND, CONCEPTS MUST BE ALL BASED ON THIS. Thus as experiences "grow" and as application of our concepts (defined by interaction with environments: social and/or otherwise, linguistic and/or otherwise) become (to the extent that they can) more widely seen as relevant and applied, this simply occurs by way of the simple forms of associative learning (the definition of such FORMS something that can be well agreed on); NOTE: All this eventually will only suffice WITH the second set of required groundings "emerging" for prompting MAJOR developments in ontogeny (see below) -- those influencing attention and learnings A LOT. Yet simple associative learnings seem to partly work (for a lot of the more bit-by-bit development) given evidence OF the existence of concepts/representations/ways-of-looking in the first place (such as its there, at least at later levels of child development). **_AND_** these very simple associative learnings are **ALL** that would **needed at the major points in development, in addition to the base perceptual/attentional shifts (described below). In a sense, yet still, they will be THEN AND THERE all that's needed -- those simple learnings STILL being ALL of what's necessary to "put things together" even WHEN THE SECOND SET/TYPE OF MAJOR FACTOR IS FOUND AND SEEN** (and as and when such shifts are occurring). Yet, so far (i.e. the above) would not provide a complete picture of human learning and development . AT BEST, the Memories as they are at any point and associative learnings are still just "half" the picture (as already has been indicated). BUT: **What's the other "half", at least more specifically/functionally? :**

These other major necessary factors are basically the capacities (or capacities within capacities, if you like) developing with very subtle innate guidances (which are not-unlikely and certainly possibly, at least for a time, quite situation-dependent); these, of course, leading to some of the most major developments of the Memories and HERE, of qualitatively new learnings (still combining with the "THE knowns" and with each other JUST THROUGH THE SIMPLE ASSOCIATIVE LEARNINGS). These innate guidances are at first just sensing more: THAT OF _THAT_ which is _THERE _IN_ any given concretely definable situation (where more adaptation is needed). This is reliant upon and given also the way our Memories have already developed (given our past learning, and earlier innate guidances, the products of which have become well-applied and consolidated (etc.) and all which yields "the time(s)" for some new types of learning) . And now (from the good processing and consolidation ; and discriminations here, perhaps just associative learning as dis-associations) giving us, in a sense, a new or greater capacity in working memory (through more efficient "chunks" and/or some situations-specific "trimming" of the old chunks, and both WITH CHANGES IN OUR _WAY_ OF CHUNKING (and realize: this may not preclude other adaptive reasons for an adaptive increase in the effective capacity of working memory (WM)). The details of the nature of the periodic innate guidances:

What is newly, or at least now truly sensed, sensed as "the-more": that is sensed (and at least glanced at, if not gazed-upon) in a situation or situations, will lead to new perception of at least something more in the scope of "what's there". This will rather quickly go to perceiving more and then to perceptual/attentional shifts (applying some of our past-developed categories and processing to the new "material" -- AND at such also-adaptive points offering more "material" to refine or moderate one's responses/interactions). Here, there will be more in WM , and thus provide more that can be "associated-with" via the simple forms of associative learnings (now, with some new content: new parts and likely new wholes). These developments might be quite situations-specific at least at first, but they may develop to be concepts of rather great scope -- observations and other research which may well be possible are the ONLY things that will clarify all this. All we can say is that this will be some sort of BASIC KEY species-typical cognitive developments (with their inceptions, as indicated) during ontogeny [(birth to 18 yr. old, minimally 5 MAJOR hierarchical levels or stages are historically seen (but with several modern theorists hypothesizing phases within each level); all this can be seen in the overviews of great classic theories, still the most prominent in textbooks of General and Developmental Psychology)]. This very outline of this sort of process has NO limits (except human limits) and it includes the abilities to know, have, and use abstractions, INCLUDING contingent abstractions (holding true in just only some sets of apparently similar circumstances; AND, eventually, with ontogeny and the development of sufficient abstract abilities, ALSO enabling the ability to think and classify across **previously differently-seen [(i.e. seen as different)]** circumstances -- putting such complexes together in a concept -- this sort of thing including the most sophisticated abstract concepts and processing there is) : in some ultimate ("final", "rock bottom") analysis this all is possible because of demonstrable development and changes in the Memories, WHICH CAN BE RESEARCHED (as other characteristic of the Memories HAVE BEEN researched to date); AND the inceptions of new MAJOR LEVELS (those being with the "perceptual shifts" ...) can also be directly observed and researched, using the new eye tracking technology (and ancillary technologies) -- and this will greatly guide one to fruitful research on the Memories.

The reasons, likelihood, justifications, better assumptions involved in having this viewpoint and understanding, AND the qualitative changes that which are developed this way (basically starting with key, adaptive "perceptual shifts") is what I spend much of my 800 pages of writing on: 200 pages, written some decades ago, and some 600 pages, written just in the last three years -- a lot of this latter being the job I did not finish back in the late '80s (and I really had no reason to pursue until the

development of new technologies, esp. eye tracking and related technologies, came into existence to allow for testing my hypotheses). I also have take great pains in these latter writings to contrast this perspective and approach as thoroughly and completely as I could with the status quo perspectives and approaches in General Psychology and Developmental Psychology . And, to show all the ways this [what I have dubbed] Ethogram Theory is better in so many, many ways, including in its basic foundations, clearly more empirical (as directly as possible) than any perspective and approach heretofore.

I both show in details what is wrong with the "old" and much more likely correct and useful -- and more than plausible (and Biologically consistent and plausible) -- through this new general view. **(Again, I provide related testable hypotheses -- verifiable/falsifiable.)**

You will be able to see this new approach as better empirically than any other. Related to this: the great benefit that the FIELD of study is ALL clearly and firmly based (grounded/founded) on just 2 "things": (1) directly observable KEY overt phenomena (behavior PATTERNS, here in Psychology) and (2) on certain clear directly observable and present aspects of circumstances/situations (aka "the environment) active in KEY past developments and/or present now. This is simply the **return to the original and intended definition of Psychology _AND_, frankly, is THE ONLY WAY TO BE BEST-EMPIRICAL. (Think about it: NO MISSING CONNECTIONS.)**
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

There is now a Preface to this long essay in this Question. The Preface is the **most recent Update in the Project Log of "Human Ethology and Development (Ethogram Theory) : A Full-Fledged Paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY "**

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

and

also the most recent Update in the Project Log of "Developing a Usable Empirically-Based Outline of Human Behavior for FULL Artificial Intelligence (and for Psychology)"

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Developing-a-Usable-Empirically-Based-Outline-of-Human-Behavior-for-FULL-Artificial-Intelligence-and-for-Psychology>

Dear

Thanks for your remarks. They didn't hurt ; they help indicate the dimensions of our Memories : Present; "mind-reading", and for the future; of-the-past. (Still all clearly grounded in the present.) Indeed this helps illustrate the great representations intimately involved with/in the Memories -- yet even these things many seem to forget or not to take into account .

No real (or possible) dualism for the Memories, but for convenience, mistakenly, or in-reality.

Alternative to JUST neuroscience: JUST BEHAVIOR [Patterns]
New discussion

Alternative to JUST neuroscience: JUST BEHAVIOR [Patterns]

JUST the close empirical study OF BEHAVIOR PATTERNS can/could yield an account of ALL that is developing, MISSING NO CONNECTIONS (one can fully believe this if one is an empiricist aka science person; if you do not see this, think about it again and again and think only of possible findings in phenomenology and not in terms of ANY theory (you may invoke principles)).

There are obviously problems (to say the least) **connecting** brain activity to most important behavior patterns.

And, as an alternative: the **study of BEHAVIOR _AS_ BEHAVIOR** is **empirically connecting the phenomena** we are seeking to understand (behavior patterns). (Behavior patterns do "instrumentally" connect to other behavior patterns.)

The extreme reliance on neuroscience to support results in behavioral science is, for most important behavior patterns, an extremely crude source of support (terribly limited and ambiguous) .

That behavioral scientists put so much "stock" in neuroscience, frankly, just shows their **desperation** (as do "embodiment" 'theories' and "enactment" 'theories', for that matter -- but , with those 'theories', **developing ideas in desperation elsewhere**, other than using brain activity).
WE NEED:

The REAL ALTERNATIVE to what is actually a strange reliance on neuroscience (strange because it is crude and provides close to no guidance about relationships between actual, important behavior patterns).

PLUS we need a REAL ALTERNATIVE to weird untestable theories, mentioned above, too: Same answer to both problems: Learn how to study BEHAVIOR PATTERNS _AS_ BEHAVIOR PATTERNS. If it is possible to do this thoroughly, there will be NO LACK OF CONNECTIONS (one set of phenomena to another). I believe this is possible and **TRY TO THOROUGHLY OUTLINE HOW AND WHY (and contrast my view and approach -- in every way -- with status quo approaches) in my 800 pages of essays, all basically ON THIS better view and approach.**

To gain entry to a thorough **COMPLETE** explication/exposition of such an alternative, see (for all the needed guiding links) the **Question and the follow-up Answers** to:
https://www.researchgate.net/post/Isnt_grounding_all_interactions_our_understanding_of_particular_interaction_best_done_by_better_understanding_the_Memories_as_EXPERIENCE_ITSELF
(probably not the best Title for this Question.)

In the follow-up Answers (to this question), I provide **links to Projects that, IN PROJECT LOG UPDATES, include basically a Preface to the Question here (starting this thread), but much, MUCH MORE.**
The linked contents gets you to "everything".

What is the nature of the fundamental requirements for one to conceive and develop General Artificial Intelligence (AGI)?

Question

What is the nature of fundamental requirements for one to conceive and develop General Artificial Intelligence (AGI)?

I would think, at the core, would be a modeling of the great adaptations of the actual human itself: its body, its senses, its responsiveness-es, its abilities, AND the abilities in cognition (representation and processing) that develop progressively and over EACH stage of ontogeny (largely: ages 0 - 18 yr. old) - - and with the latter influencing not only thought, but other responsiveness-es (e.g. the emotions; in other words, then: emotional development).

Now, you can start and stay with a good understanding of the human OR you can see the human as you see it and actualize your own hypothetico-deductive systems to have it progress in all relevant behavioral abilities.

Let's say you pick the first of these options (which I think is wise). Then what you need is a basic understanding of the human: human body, human senses, human responsiveness-es, and human abilities (INCLUDING those making "qualitative leaps" in their developments, during ontogeny -- these latter making up much of the "cognitive system", which can be conceived as the most-major AND central organizing system (as Piaget did) for all significant behavior patterns). Given all this, what else is needed? :

It should be clear that ALL faculties/basic abilities and responsiveness-es AND representation-and-thought abilities (including those "higher abilities": which "emerge", unfold and develop with ontogeny) **MUST BE GROUNDED CONCRETELY, specifically: clearly related to directly observable overt phenomena** (behavior patterns). **ALL OF IT.**

Unless so-concretely "seen" (seen as at least related to key clear overt or overt-and-developing behavior patterns), it will not be possible to "mechanize" (here: program a machine) without being one with god-like insights. In other words, **there will be NO AGI WITHOUT at least a basic (TESTABLE) understanding of ALL these fundamental behavior patterns (and their concrete "anchors", BOTH THOSE patterns continuing or now presently active, AND those key**

behaviors-and-circumstances active _AS_ the KEY POINTS of KEY DEVELOPMENTAL HAPPENINGS -- these creating new unfolding, lasting, and expanding representations and abilities). (These latter are **also** understood as **clearly relating to some most-important directly observable concrete phenomena** (behavior patterns, with corresponding situational aspects) and **thus** these also being "anchors" and, by virtue of some clear significant ongoing/continuing effects, they **CONTINUE** to be "anchors").

Now, does this mean the AGI developer needs no good thinking of just his own? NO. Unrefined inductive understandings (guesses) may be tested. And, proximate causal-type relationships can be hypothesized between THIS behavior pattern and THAT (even using some good hypothetico-deductive system, BUT this system must AT LEAST PRINCIPLED, IN TERMS OF LIFE (BIOLOGICAL) PRINCIPLES (e.g. a basic one: homeostatis)) [(I also suggest using the terminology of classical ethology, presented as-to-be-used in my earliest long paper.)]

The great news, of course, is: **AGI People can test their overall system** major-aspect-tried by major-aspect-tried **over and over and thus be much facilitated in making corrections.**

Now, what may be your final question: Where does one find such a wholly empirically-based, concrete-based understanding of behavior patterns/responses TO BEGIN WITH. Answer: I do my best to offer such a system through my "Developing a Usable Empirically-Based Outline of Human Behavior for FULL Artificial Intelligence (and for Psychology)" PROJECT and my " Human Ethology and Development (Ethogram Theory) : A Full-Fledged Paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY" PROJECT. And, I believe, that considered for being in the most-empirical terms and the most-concrete terms, the writings associated with these Projects are the best offered today. **

Start at my Profile, [Brad Jesness](#) and then look for those 2 just-named Projects (and see all Log Entries, aka Updates under them). Also see 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, when reading

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

, also see the Project Log of this Project to see many important Updates.

P.S. Plus, for a final 100 pages of recent essays (not among the 512 pages in the collection of recent essays, you already have been directed to), yet also very worthwhile essays composed after the 512 - page Collection , see them in this pdf:

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

**** FOOTNOTE: ** IMPORTANT NEWS **** : I recently presented summaries of my "system" that clearly indicate **2 types of basic and likely needed (and real) CONSTANTS**: some **constancy of our Memories faculties (on the more-purely endogenous "side")** AND some **constancy OF THE PROCESSES** always involved in learning and development (**most clearly and presently involving aspects of the external world**), these simply based on the fact that the simple, well-defined FORMS of associative learning are intimately and always involved in all behavior pattern change (NOTE, here, that **what is constant IS THE FORM**, which otherwise differs enough in content to be seen (or have

to be seen) as "different"). (Also NOTE: the **constancies of the Memories seem also** at least mostly a matter of **"forms"**, **though some clear abiding numerical limits (properly delimited) may [always] apply here and there (everywhere?)** -- and, thank goodness for the latter: because we likely need somewhere always in the system some complete certainty, i.e. to some numerical degree.)

Dear

One neither can, nor needs to, "understand how the brain works" -- just THAT it does work and THAT is shown in the behavior patterns produced in response to environmental aspects -- both (the behavior patterns and environmental aspects) continuously progressing and accruing (and, also, along with these: the Memories changing and progressing). AND, there are KEY "times" (circumstances) where the types of "things" (specifically: levels of concepts) possible make great leaps (during ontogeny) -- these are major achievements **in terms of all the terms just mentioned AND related to the emergence and development of qualitatively new ways of perceiving and then _attending_, and then new ways of learning.**

There is NO WAY to "understand" the brain except IN THE VERY TERMS of BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, etc.(above) (with the great assist of development (ontogeny) -- the outline of this ontogeny described by me in detail, elsewhere in my MANY ESSAYS (800 pages), and those essays also describing the changes in all the other things I noted, in a more integrated and detailed manner). To continue: Behavior patterns, etc. (just mentioned) including: understanding the associated developments of the Memories (the Memories being EXPERIENCE ITSELF) AND understanding how the set of environmental aspects, as subjects of attention, allow all the aspects (associated with each and all terms, noted above) to differ and develop and accrue over child development (ontogeny). SEE: [https://www.researchgate.net/post/Alternative to JUST neuroscience JUST BEHAVIOR Patterns](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Alternative_to_JUST_neuroscience_JUST_BEHAVIOR_Patterns) for more on my perspective (vs neuroscience).

As a mental exercise:

Please try to explain how other than through behavior patterns and responses that one could "understand the brain" -- it is like a bowl of jello, showing patterns of electrical activity (in and of itself, just kind of like a light show), **BUT all its activity surely related to, and only understandable (other than like a "light show") by, behavior patterns and responses.**

Dear

Same message to you, except it seems you may have some appreciation for memory (which is actually: the Memories -- and those being experience itself). Otherwise all my remarks above are relevant to you as well.

Not always when it seems you can't "get there", is it actually the case one can't "get there"; in other cases, one can't, with hopeless bad questions.

New discussion

[Note: none of this is my full answer, nor does contain what I personally would see as sufficing for a

full answer (e.g. for a science field). The content, below, just, AS NECESSARY, "frames" the Question stemming from the Title -- to an extent it must be "framed" to be anywhere close to being reasonably asked.]

We have to be able to clearly embrace and then forecast the possibility of good Answers (to certain Questions), i.e. where we can/could achieve more understanding "there", and "see" those Questions for which we cannot (and, perhaps never could or ever will) -- doing all this, judging neither too quickly or slowly either way (in some cases, especially). This is kind of an adjunct to: "a wise man knows what he know and knows what he doesn't know". All this is harder in societies "swamped" with "information" and, at the same time, "swamped" with "well-advertised" falsehoods and attitudes and terrible (for-the-worse) power brokering (and this does not even mention iPhones, technology, and related bad habits, though these, I guess, we can suppose we can get rid of -- because those are not an "issue" of (or inherent in) any of these questionable Questions at hand).

I welcome anyone able to add/elucidate by expressing how we solve these problems (questions about questions) when we have to determine : [how -- under what circumstances -- and when] that the Answer may be forthcoming OR that no real or "solid" Answer will come.

Any guidance clearly or definitively pointing out the characteristics of each (in realistic, clear way(s), but in an appropriately-considered and appropriately-encompassing way(s), using appropriately broad-minded conceptualizations, AND GROUNDED (OR AT LEAST CLEARLY FOUNDED) IN real EMPIRICISM (relevant phenomena being, or clearly "stemming" from, direct observation of overt OBSERVABLE phenomena (with no non-empirical OR non-justifiable gaps -- and with no gaps in the the important sense that, at the very least: none not supported be established, completely-well-known and good empirically-based PRINCIPLES of the field)); this all would be of help (and we may be able to come to equally good empirical views as much of the "no-goes" as of the questions with potential (good)). These answers may seem to (and do) span a huge range, but whether it is destined some Questions are "no-goes" and others are fine MAY also show some distinct more-appreciation of "constellations" of conditions -- and thereby we MAY be able to make some progress with this OVERALL question, and thus respond properly to different kinds of questions (i.e. after developing more INSIGHT and wise attention of "general realities"). [I do not think it unlikely that any individual Answer to this Question will seem, or be, incomplete; it is beyond hard-to-imagine that an Answer would be useful (usable) in the form presented by some individual FOR ALL FIELDS. But, surprise me/us (<-- I do not consider THIS impossible).]

Oh, no: it looks like I have become a philosopher (a label I never want); let's just say I am open to examining large, inclusive questions RELATED TO GOOD EMPIRICISM (and believe to (or "just to") some extent that is possible).

Until there's an understanding (science) of behavior ____ all ____ IN [terms of] BEHAVIOR, there will be no General (true) Artificial Intelligence
New discussion

More correctly and more-fully stated: Until there's an understanding (science) of behavior [PATTERNS] ____ all ____ IN [terms of] BEHAVIOR [PATTERNS] (in seeing how, in the organism's behavior patterns, other behavior patterns ARE DELIMITED, contextualized; and, in-effect: DEFINED -- i.e. in terms of [existing or once-shown-existing] behavior patterns [(with, **minimally**: overt, directly-observable patterns **at the inception** of any **KEY** (necessary) behavior patterns)]), **there will be no General (true) Artificial Intelligence**. [(This is also the best, and may very well be the only, solution for Psychology, itself, also.)]

READ the NEXT 2 SENTENCES CAREFULLY: This is rationally, realistically, and logically a "no-brainer". (There is **NO** reasonable alternative, in fact: **NO** non-"partly"-and-"philosophically"-based, non-"metaphysical" counter-argument. In other words: there is **NO empirically or scientifically acceptable counter-argument**.) And, my clear **empirical** outlook and approach is the **ONLY** "game in town" (PLUS, it is more than plausible, **_AND_** it is **fully testable**, as well). **Just think it through**, especially the AGI people (given the hopelessly "adrift", irrational, and unprovable (unempirical) nature of Psychology **THUS FAR** (past and present -- and making **NO** noteworthy progress)): I have less hope for Psychology theorists and researchers than for AGI (artificial general intelligence) folks.

Follow my lead, or go nowhere. See my pertinent Projects, under my Profile and their References and Updates (Projects Logs). It is all there.

General Psychology: How can you "get" the specifics correctly, if you don't have a clearly legitimate, good overview (or "bother" with that)??
New discussion

Well? I see a **_ partial model within a context of an unknown AND/OR unestablished nature as worthless JUNK** . Isn't that assessment what is likely the CASE and, in fact, isn't such a "trumped up" * view/model necessarily UNTRUE? ; and, **regarding the necessarily untrue [part] : in my view, that is a certain consequence**.

AND: How about if one takes **NO personal responsibility** for the overview one uses (and thus lacks full understanding and appreciation for it, and is blinded TO perspective)???

[I say: Such as either of those sorts of persons should just "give it [(the 'profession')] up" and find a new one (and an actual one). **It is a "Western" myth that any starting point can lead to a true view: just TRY to justify THAT viewpoint** (actually, please DON'T; THAT'S just more philosophical nonsense and confusion/misguidance -- as well as additional professional/science misconduct; rather: **REALIZE** the alternative). Need I even have to say it again?: I can help.]

[[* Footnote and P.S.: Isn't it convenient that the **"trumped up"** phrase seems so much more meaningful nowadays, and likely shall for all time? /// And also note: an underscore was added after the word "a" in the first sentence to attempt to make up for a **regular RG misprinting** in the synopsis, where the **first bold-ed word is always run-together with the previous word**.]]

P.S. PSYCHOLOGY: what is biological will always be biological; behavior patterns are biological

functioning (and this includes ALL behavior). Nothing will be just-as-you-think [it is]; rather: with a well-"centered" MIND (thought), through a perspective which is disciplined by-principle to be empirically realistic (AND your view abiding by the relevant principles), some things will be AS YOU PERCEIVE (_AND_ agreeable and verifiable AS IS , or falsifiable) -- and that's as good as it gets (bit-by-bit, as it WILL BE). I have provided (demonstrated) such a view and approach, tossing out the philosophical and making biology INTEGRAL to all Psychology (those interested can read my writings, all here on RG).

Memory Theorists and Researchers in BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE should take note of how Important I see their Subject and Topics.
New discussion

If my encompassing (General Psychology,) central (starting/"containing") view, with its approach, was adopted (and, especially, if the view and the predictions were verified -- and it **IS fully and truly verifiable/falsifiable**: providing such testable hypotheses), THEN the subject of, and the topics of, **the_ Memories would BY FAR be one of the very most important and central topics in all of Psychology**. (Perhaps you should explore my writings, to support YOURSELVES.)

In my "system" (conceptualization of the biology-of-behavior (per se)): The Memories, basically (and in effect) are EXPERIENCE ITSELF. (Memory Theorists and Researchers in BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE should take a close look (and read), just for their "self-interest" -- not to mention in the interest of real empiricism and science itself. Yet, somehow, I still fear to "hold my breathe" waiting on this: it is just THAT messed-up Western views (poorly-based and poorly-founded philosophies) and Psychology are.)

Since we always MODEL our Subject FIRST, we must be VERY careful HOW we model for the sake of real and best Empiricism
New discussion

Let me say a bit more. A starting perspective MUST be **core-observation _AND core-principle founded, and grounded on that which is minimally clearly related to directly observable overt phenomena**. These are absolute requirements for empiricism, for science. And remember: **_your Subject, NOT YOU, should in-true-effect define every word and concept and the structure and nature of every set of concepts** (much of all this following new observation and NEW DISCOVERIES). **A strict, abiding, perspective of this quality is REQUIRED FOR ANY AND ALL SCIENCES.**

If you do not start like this and stay like this, your sets-of-hypotheses/theory AND your approach will be contaminated (specifically: false w/r to reality) in some ways, and more and more, and lead you away from finding things as the really are.

[P.S. NO need to try to "define" terms (providing generalities) or to define "realities" (boundaries). THIS IS NOT THE "JOB" OF A SCIENTIST _AND_ IS ACTUALLY NOT POSSIBLE to any notable extent through thinking alone. And yet, with this (doing as I indicated), there can be some real and good science related to anything ...]

There is no reasonable and sound counterargument or major perspective. I actually view this Discussion (so far, as I have presented it) as quite beyond discussion. I see it as a foundational Law of Science. (Yet, there are those who seek science, or seek to progress their 'science', who violate this LAW every day.)

To see my view & follow my approach: ALL you need is a reasonable imagination for the developing Memories & a reasonable idea of nature-AND-"nurture"!
New discussion

To see my view and follow my approach: ALL you need is a **_reasonable imagination for the developing and developed Memories _and _a reasonable idea of nature-AND-"nurture" -- an actual confluence : WITH THOSE (that):**

You may well be interested in my perspective and approach, the significant contrast with OTHER modern perspectives on the basics of General Psychology and Developmental Psychology, and the way I change things (including MAJOR long-held basic assumptions (actually pseudo-assumptions/presumptions)) to REAL **biologically consistent** ASSUMPTIONS (and the reasons), making my approach truly appropriate. AND, I claim **better empiricism** because **EVERYTHING**, at least at its inception (and then in on-going clear ways), is **_grounded and founded in directly observable overt behaviors**.

And, look how I do it, this best way to do it and to be fully-empirical, as basically just described. The result: I can give **testable hypotheses** to test the view of the basic (and I do mean basic) "perceptual shifts", these being VERY meaningful in the contexts of the developed and developing Memories -- and then "leading on":

My perspective and approach, with a **_full theory which is a paradigm for Psychology** (General and Developmental Psychology), posits new yet-to-be-discovered "perceptual shifts" (soon becoming perceptual/attentional shifts) which are the bases for Piaget's stages (the bases of Equilibration Type 2 - the "balance" between stages) [(basically, just **completing Piaget's theory**, as he himself knew was needed)]. AND, at the same time (as it would) it provides the concrete, discoverable NOW, in the present (with modern technology), directly observable overt behavior patterns which lead the **_organism itself** (going through the stages/levels of thought, necessarily hierarchically-related) TO impel changes: To generate changes in what it responds ITSELF, changes regarding important aspects of the environment it responds to (innately guided shifts in existing behavior patterns **_to "see" more**; most of this occurs from infancy to 18+ years old (i.e. with child development (ontogeny)). **These levels/stage shifts are the very inception of abstract thought itself.**

READ:

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

y 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

NOTE: It is best to **read it all**. It is all about the "same thing" and required (giving the **_starting points of today to really understand**).

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

Discussion

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.]

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

(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-spatial) 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.

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

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?

Question

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.

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.

Also see my assessment of the following, in my Comment under it (also: an alternative to All THAT is offered, of of course):

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

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

Discussion

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.

A P.S.

Since not everyone looks at Updates (the Project Log) of my Projects, and here, in particular, the Ethogram Theory Project, let me quote my recent Update that (in part) refers readers back to this present Discussion Question:

Good Empiricism only from a full-fledged BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE (behavior patterns per se and "just" that for ALL grounding): a new rightful behaviorism.

Behavior PATTERNS will show a full biological order, beyond that which we can "otherwise" conceive -- AND, no matter what we do (as well). ONE MUST EXPECT: Behavior patterns are a complete, cogent, coherent true full aspect of Biology : a point of view rarely attempted recently (because of a lot of truly bad history), but now (with technology) with new possibilities. Behavior patterns will well-explain the constituent behaviors and other behavior patterns (inter-patterning, if you like). So behavior itself, plus regard for the Memories (which is regard for EXPERIENCE ITSELF, i.e USE OF patterning of past behavior-patterns-in-environmental circumstances (in a broad sense)), will explain ALL.

Like classical ethology: behavior patterns literally, basically circumscribing (AKA DEFINING) behavior patterns.

I will not repeat what I wrote elsewhere but just give you a link: [(this link is to THIS, PRESENT

Discussion Question -- so no need to click it here.)] :

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Logic_with_empiricism_greatly_favor_the_cognitive-developmental_view_of_Ethogram_Theory_the_only_choices_require_involve_a_break_with_empiricism...

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]?

Discussion

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?

New question

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?

New discussion

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?
Question

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

(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 mis-

guided 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.)

ANSWERS TO OTHERS QUESTIONS, below:

NOTE: My Answers in the thread,

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Can_philosophy_help_to_innovate_and_develop_scientific_theory are not shown (go there to read them).

Paradigms: Is it time for a shift in the paradigms that make up psychology or a revelation of the theories that the paradigm already supplies?

Dear

I offer a full-fledged paradigm shift for General Psychology and Developmental Psychology. The paradigm shift provides: (1) **new, better-justified (more-likely-true) ASSUMPTIONS**; (2) **NEW OBSERVATIONS SOUGHT** (to be made) AND (3) **NEW WAYS to make those observations**; (4) **new standards for good, real empiricism** and (5) new, **unique (and wonderful-if-true) testable (verifiable/falsifiable) HYPOTHESES -- of GREAT consequence if true** . This paradigm shift (which **more than satisfies Kuhn's criteria**) is provided via the Project on Ethogram Theory and all the References -- major papers and the BOOK -- and other material notes or links noted via the Project Log (aka Updates). Here is a **link to the Project** and, below that, find **the 2 links to the major writings** (all related and over 700 pages long). First the Project link:

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

and now the links to the MAJOR References:

Article [A Human Ethogram: Its Scientific Acceptability and Importanc...](#)

AND

Book ["Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory"](#)

Also, for a **quick overview of the major basic ideas**, see the Question,

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Does_a_FULL_NEEDED_REAL_paradigm_shift_FOR_PSYCHOLOGY_also_provide_an_advanced_view_for_General_AI2

AND _ MOST IMPORTANT _ , WITHIN THAT Question, NOTE ESPECIALLY: the link provided there for the real "meat" of a quick overview -- AND here is THAT link, also repeated here-and-now:

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

I assure you, if you want to understand what a paradigm shift really looks like, read these works (noted above; about 700 pages); even, if for some reason you "disagree", that at least you will have learned what is involved in a **Psychology paradigm shift -- MUCH more than you can learn from Kuhn** (as perhaps reflected by the 5 points in the first paragraph of this Answer).

P.S. This paradigm shift ENDS all the nonsensical nature vs nurture debates; it provides concrete empirical bases for ABSTRACT CONCEPTS AND ABSTRACT THINKING (allowing psychology to be fully empirical, not to mention, well-grounded and well-founded **); AND all understandings are in terms of behavior PATTERNS (and not separate or distinct "behaviors") -- which is in accord with us being biological organisms (<-- known for organized SYSTEMS). PLUS, much of what now referred to as "learning" is recognized expressly as changing QUALITATIVELY, following along with qualitative changes in concepts and thinking during ontogeny. (Psychologists today, in reality, OFTEN do not know what they are talking about when invoking a "learning" explanation.) I hope I have provided enough to spark your interest.

Final, true understandings will be in terms of behavior patterns and not "brain activity" (of course: what are the final referents in a science of behavior?). Psychology as the **science of behavior patterns and associated environmental aspects** is not dead (though it has been dying); this paradigm shift salvages this soon-to-be SCIENCE.

** FOOTNOTE: Psychology better adopt the changes proposed **or General AI will** (and, once again, 'outside' "information-processing theories" will lead psychology). **Here's the reason:** only the system presented with Ethogram Theory is **concrete enough and clear enough to be "mechanized"** -- not to mention: **to be understandable (so the agreement science typically finds among its practitioners can be present).**

What is instinct?

Dear

I have described the "higher" innate guidances which occur during the ontogeny of the human (ages 2 - 18+ yr. old). It is basically a neo-Piagetian theory that COMPLETES Piaget's theory in the most major ways needed (well recognized as big holes in his theory by Piaget himself: an account for Equilibration Type 2 (the balance between stages -- to switch or not to switch, to put it crudely), which he accounted for ONLY by saying : the stage shifts occur "with maturation". He knew this 'explanation' to be grossly inadequate (in good part explaining why his last book was on equilibration).

What that-which-yields-stage-switches may be (and likely are) and what they are likely like in their nature (because of what may be effective and very integrated and integrable, YET effective for the development of higher concepts and higher thinking) is periodic timely "perceptual shifts", leading soon to perceptual/attentional shifts (and to the development of our "higher" concepts, etc). As simple

as this, IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORKINGS OF OUR MEMORIES AND THEN IN THE CONTEXT OF WORKING MEMORY (in the appropriate environmental circumstances/aspects), suffices and is FAR more helpful than limiting -- it INCREASES LEARNING, rather than significantly limiting it in any way (one of several stereotypes broken by the perspective -- not to mention the complete elimination of the nature/nurture problem).

There are no known shortcuts in how to come to understand this because, though well-justified and well-based (empirical, AND with directly empirically testable hypotheses about directly observable overt phenomenon/behavior), it involves huge changes in usual/typical ways of thinking (a full-fledged, true paradigm shift). Here are the readings necessary to come to know this perspective and approach (more truly empirical than any system/theory presently existing):

Article [A Human Ethogram: Its Scientific Acceptability and Importanc...](#)

AND

Book ["Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory"](#)

Dear

The second one. Also, that which is instinctual may or may not appear in the entire lifetime of a member of a species. Also, innate action patterns (species-typical behavior patterns, species-specific behavior patterns) MAY EMERGE during ONTOGENY (during child to adult development). [Look up the terms I just mentioned; find some good ethology book (e.g. Ethology, The Biology of Behavior by I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt); then read MY WORK -- much of it here on RG (100s of pages, all relevant to your interest, with respect to the human).]

The first definition you cite, strangely uses the word "aspirations" -- this would have to be understood in the context of development and experience (and innate action patterns would certainly be only part of the "story"). Also in the sentence, " ... complex hereditary behavioral acts characteristic of individuals of a given species ... ", the word hereditary is unnecessary, given the rest of the sentence -- it is likely there just to be "loaded" with false implications. (They could have just said **behavioral acts characteristic of individuals of a given species.**) **AND (also basically contrary to definition #1): That which is innate, may not be complex (e.g. sneezing)(AND there are other specific and more interesting examples HERE, including basic emotions). Some of the most significant instinctual behavior patterns (ALWAYS GOOD TO INCLUDE THE WORD "PATTERNS") may kind of start VERY simple [(when not viewed in the total CONTEXT (prominently including consideration and knowledge of the Memories (formal specific capacities, with species-typical content (some which may be considered qualitative))]; AND, "simple beginning behavior [PATTERNS]" MAY _TYPICALLY_ or always result [in a species] in very complex behavior patterns, even when not starting with a ANY COMPLEX pre-formed pattern ALL OF ITS OWN . NOR are innate action patterns just characteristic of necessarily just one species (e.g. all apes are very similar in terms of innate action patterns).**

So: I see "complex automatic behavior" as a quite inaccurate characterization (both the word "complex" and "automatic", and especially when 'defined' with no further contexts indicated; also "behavior" without the word "PATTERNS" following it is SUSPECT (especially in the context of the definition of instinct, aka innate action PATTERN)). As indicated in several ways/places, above, they are not automatic (the fact that some may not even show themselves is telling, here; but I noted other factors also showing this first definition as simple-minded); while what is due in PART to innate guidance (instinctive behavior patterns) may typically or always DEVELOP into something complex,

they (at least in a sense) do not necessarily start that way (i.e. complex: not in the way this definition implies (implied, at least through/by their serious fundamental omissions)) and A DEVELOPMENT into something complex may be more than typical -- all one needs is some decent appreciation for ontogeny. SO:

The first definition reflects both ignorance and stupidity and plays "into the hands" of those with historical (i.e. long running) BIASES which have crippled and continue to cripple behavioral science. The nature/nurture "junk" and false dichotomy, IS A SERIOUS PROBLEM (both for science, and culturally). I won't "soft pedal" this.

Does the human intellect have finite capacity?

Dear

We likely have a finite capacity to improve our knowledge and perspectives in a very general way (with-MANY/across-many subject areas, notwithstanding there seem to be some exceptional people in these regards, and that is good -- and there may be "a way" here !). BUT, because we can almost 'always' [(but: see last paragraph)] improve the **quality** of knowledge and, perhaps to a lesser extent -- and somewhat related to quality improvements -- **clearly to some extent increase the AMOUNT of knowledge** in an area(s) of specialization * , and all this seems to be able to go on and on and on in a specialized area or related areas: that makes our "capacity" quite limitless (or so-seeming to other humans, **and so-seeming: IT _IS_** ; but see the end of the next paragraph and the third).

We now know that not-needed knowledge is now "trimmed" from the brain -- opening up some capacity there (and this occurs over and over, over time); AND (plus), the "chunks" in working memory become better and better with development **and discipline (including persistence/constant striving)**; all this allows for repeated and continued improvements of the sorts I just mentioned. All this goes on for at least a long time (several decades).

... But, then, there is aging and old age.

* FOOTNOTE AND: There is **always the discovery of 'bolstering' related environmental aspects** (after all, we are always [(assuming we are really communicating)] talking about : a recognized subject area actually IN the world -- and there are more and more such discoveries, **no matter how much abstraction is involved**). [NOTE: Abstraction can be grounded (in KEY ways: seen founded) in the concrete (in theory) : empirically, in directly observable overt behavior/phenomenon. Accepting and realizing this (in Psychology, ETC.) may well involve a new perspective -- and maybe a BIG one (like a paradigm change). This IS important to come to realize and there are needed empirical findings, based on good testable hypotheses, needed here.]

What is the best way/method to measure conceptual understanding?

My Answer:

Just because "conceptual understanding" is some kind of term, what it refers to is so outrageously variable and of various natures that it makes no sense at all to consider it one "thing". (This way of thinking has its major examples in bad philosophy -- which is most of philosophy.) Thus (in any case), your question cannot be reasonably answered; maybe a large text of special answers to topics that come under the question, but given the grossly inadequate way Psychology is, there would be rather arbitrary divisions and from that no one would be able to piece together any significantly useful general answer.

"Conceptual learning" might be a topic that is a little more able to be dealt with just because that is the way psychologists have attempted to address the issue, BUT finding some generalities only in only some "types" of cases would that be significantly useful; this amounts to: in some subsets of cases some rather crude qualitative generalities can be stated.

A word or term does NOT make something a "thing" in a very useful or intelligible sense. Relatedly: One problem is that "learning" is not all one type of thing; there are qualitative differences in 'learning' with development (ontogeny) -- a topic modern psychology has not come to grips with hardly at all (just look for discussions of "learning", "learning", "learning" with no SUBSTANTIAL qualifications or typology). We need answers to many questions about species-typical behavior and response PATTERNS, but Psychology has yet to become a science (just look for all the missing references to "PATTERNS" and any real or good empirically-founded/grounded patterns). This outstanding problem is relevant to all topics (concepts) mentioned in this Answer. [This last paragraph is likely the best partial answer to your question I provided.]

What are the best methodologies of research in science ?

My Answer:

Seems like people are always looking for pat answers to questions so big as to be not actually understandable (not good questions) (and thusly for the "answers" -- also not understandable, if a GENERAL answer is even attempted). <-- This is just a critical way to say: "it depends."

Artificial Intelligence - just a type of optimization?

Dear

In contrast to the view you present to us, true AGI (General Artificial Intelligence) people have to find all the reliable and important KEY species-typical behavior patterns and do as they do "mechanically", but appropriately, as specifically triggered in types of circumstances (by aspect of the environments) AND in different ways at different points in the ontogeny of the system [(this including developing true and hierarchical (hierarchically-related) patterns of responding/learning over time -- in some sort of NECESSARY sequence, with likely some contingent "trimming down" of earlier behavior patterns)]. This is not remotely just optimization, but you can see how it could surely involve some of that; but this is a "far cry" from just optimizing some "systems" of more questionable origin, which is what

some of the people you speak of may be doing, using their own hypothetico-deductive systems, somehow reasoned out, from some "things" (perhaps, from poorly founded models and maybe, even worse, by being problematically compounded by being "by analogy").

Is consciousness still mysterious?

Dear

You ask:

"Is consciousness still mysterious?".

Not to me. Read my works to know my view and approach and you will understand how this is the case (and cannot be seen otherwise by any hopeful behavioral scientist -- one seeking the appropriate, actual, fullest application of empiricism).

While " we [can] know what are probably the key explanations ", there are lines of discovery involved to have the needed reliable and valid perspectives on a lot of things "here" (on consciousness). (BIG examples: finding the correct ways to fully understand THE TRUE AND CLEARLY EMPIRICAL BASES OF "abstraction" (abstract thought) -- something I clearly, plausibly, (and testably) provide in sufficient detail via the outline in my work. (**All my work is available on RG**) .

Dear

You ask: " Why do we need a conciseness at all? " and you point out: " AI programs do not have it, and they work. "

Must we have the concept of consciousness (and at its various levels)?: technically (ironically): NO. But, understanding is likely great increased if we do have this concept (and that of "states of consciousness") in Psychology, as so fully related to phenomenology these concepts are -- and also related (though perhaps not quite equally) to the activity of true general AI "machines", with their changing responsiveness and responding (including changes with "machine ontogeny").

... Dear

It is questionable if we could fully understand the impacts (or full nature) of a true AGI machine without even here having some concept, such as "consciousness", etc. We can make machines that are well beyond any person's single set of abilities to fully comprehend (and this is not to mention the collective effects of experience -- even if all were somehow "known" to us). This is all the more reason for some concept such as "consciousness" etc.: it could well be useful in AGI as well as, for similar reasons, for understandings in Psychology.

And, perhaps equally: the idea of unconscious behaviors or influence. But know that many good cognitive psychologists do not think anything really (i.e. necessarily always) IS "unconscious", THUS the concept of pre-conscious expands to fill this void. [I happen to agree with this latter perspective and see it as best and most fully promoting science and the fullest (most real) application of

empiricism. To me (and those others mentioned): There is consciousness and that which is pre-conscious (even some of which may never be ever clearly "triggered"). (And, on the other hand, if THIS (that which is preconscious/unconscious) has its effects, it is "there" "outwardly", as they say.)]

Dear

Interesting topic and view; AND, I am "there" (see my site at mynichecomp.com , for evidence). But since the Eastern view is itself all-embracing, and does nothing to hurt or limit a "Western view" (at least in any way I can see), I see fit to just have the "Eastern" view; I still can understand "Western" ideas (as they are clearly apparently intended to be understood), though I am often dissatisfied (and seemingly rightly and usefully).

What would be the first step to create a common language for different disciplines?

Dear

With regard to putting or piecing findings from different disciplines together: There is only one correct way and that is to **discover findings providing a concrete, TRULY-EMPIRICAL "bridge" between them, phenomenon where each of the 2 disciplines together or both have distinct empirical contributions which apply** (see below for the only decent definition of empiricism, just referred to **twice**). This is the best one can hope for, and often that will not or cannot happen (either, perhaps for unclear reasons). But if you are "stuck" like this you may well have to get out of that morass as part of reasonably continuing -- though great discoveries can "speak for themselves"). [(More on the "positive side": sometimes, in some cases, such a "bridge" can be found in naturally occurring phenomenon/findings.)]

Just as importantly: Any "other way" of connecting the findings of different disciplines is going to be involving human intuition, in ways that are "beyond" mere reasonable, testable, verifiable hypotheses (the latter, the **ONLY** way human "guesses" ultimately are appropriate) and these other sorts of guesses are not only **VERY** likely to be incorrect but to be **MAJOR** dead-ends and/or distractions (maybe long-term or long-standing), and damaging to scientific progress. (I know of a field pretending to be a science that has been in such a bad situation, just described, for its entire history, and that is Psychology.)

All good [or real] progress, allowing for continuing or continuous progress, I believe involves **true empiricism**: where each and **every construct is, at least in KEY ways, and at some time, in a way(s) (verified/agreed upon) clearly and notably founded/based/grounded in directly observable overt phenomenon -- patterns of phenomenon. ONLY** such gives you the other hallmark characteristic **OF good science (aka good empiricism)** and that **IS** what was just mentioned: allowing for continuing or continuous progress (if you do not yield **THAT** at least your "last step" was wrong or incorrect).

Dear

What would be the first step to create a common language for different disciplines?

Systematic, reliable observations ("agreeable"; showing very high inter-observer reliabilities): all, at least, clearly grounded or founded via some direct observation of overt phenomenon [patterns] (or some such we seek, in a principled, empirically-founded way, being empiricists).

I have for-sure relatively low regard for interdisciplinary studies BECAUSE they, at least very typically, cannot meet the above standard _AND_ there is no legitimate way (for the purposes you describe) to do that, except to ALSO here do as indicated above. This standard really applies not only to science, but to any areas of Study where there is clear, abiding motivation(s) (just about any legitimate area of study).

The "best channels" between disciplines often, and likely rarely, can be created "at this level". But, if you can do it: go for it, FOR SURE. Really, all I (and similar empiricists) say is, to put it raw-ly and simply that : ALL that is required is simply that required for good (understandable, useful) communication -- and without that you do not have much that is not just momentary. I would be willing to listen to a counter-argument for this, but doubt that there is one (at least one sufficiently agreeable and understandable). "Things" are as they are, in some Reality we hope to approach closer to together, and nothing more or less.

All causal questions answered through experiments?

Dear

You ask [are]" All causal questions answered through experiments?", then you indicate some reservations about experimentation (in some cases). You do not address how observation is both more fundamental and even more important, overall. So:

I would add to your own questioning here that OBSERVATION by ITSELF can show reliable sequences _AND_ which could well, and [at times] likely more well, relate to causal relationships; and, at times the observations may be all there is (e.g ask Darwin): ALSO: Just see the studies of early ethologists who were very well able to find important behavior patterns in the CONTEXT of other behavior patterns (from finding, by observations, the "original" patterns first and then doing further observation of what's there); admittedly, some of this (in fact, as much as possible or practical) would be followed up by very needed (and possible) experimentation, but NOT always. PLUS: There are "too many" limitations to experimentation, for that to provide us with good understanding (EVEN the understanding of causal matters) ; actually experiments alone do NOT themselves create a lot of understandability (for more, read on below). [These ethologists I spoke of are the only behavioral scientists of a Psychology-nature (I am quite sure) to ever win a Nobel Prize. *]

In fact, many have said (rightly, correctly), and DO say, that observations are much more needed (FIRST, anyway) AND _they_ are foundational to any science. They are needed to find where there is some kind of key relationship(s), i.e. in order to locate important/possibly-important sequences, which must be known in the first place _AND_ then also needed to make further connections (after and between experiments, for some contextualizing and understanding -- never does experimentation embody all of this).

What one **for-sure needs, ALONG WITH OBSERVATIONS**, is demonstrable **reliabilities** (inter-

observer reliabilities) AND some ability to predict some pattern of phenomenon from some "original" pattern of phenomenon -- which, in essence, is **validity**.

Reliable observations (and, **AT LEAST -- AT key times (<-- but, often, that is all) -- also valid ****) is what really and truly ties things together; and it is what gives us the context and reason to experiment. Then, often : more observation and then more experimentation

[I am not sure that the reservations you expressed about some cases that may not amenable to experimentation, i.e. I am not sure there are necessary limits THERE. But there are a lot of reasons, otherwise, we MUST always have sets of, just basically, observations.]

I would also like to express full acknowledgement and appreciation for/of Orlando M Lourenço' s Answer.

* Footnote: Quoting LAWRENCE K. ALTMAN on the Nobel Committee's selection in 1973: "**The Nobel Committee's Physiology or Medicine Prize has rewarded three zoologists for teaching man what could be learned from simple observation of the birds and the bees.**" [NOTE: "simple observation" -- yet these studies are vital and ground-breaking.]

** FOOTNOTE: Sometimes, seemingly, underlying processes (following some principles of operation related to key observations) are not only not subject to any direct experiment, but may not be related to any DIRECT observation (it is a tough world we live in -- a tough "nut to crack", as they say). All that basically "saves us" in these cases is the justified, in-contexts, correct-labeling of PRINCIPLED underlying processes, processes of a sufficiently distinct nature or type, AND "believed in" on a reasonable basis. THEN: This all is okay, if you find you can continue on (demonstrably). [Sometimes, it seems, even Physics does not meet this necessary standard -- and then "they" have troubles and "things" are NOT okay.]

Dear

Thank you for the nice jpg. The counter-factual just looks to me like a control group (a part of an experiment that, in some way or form, is a requirement for experiments).

What is the relationship between 'Artificial Intelligence' and 'Artificial Consciousness'?

Dear ...

You say: " The question concerns ontological, epistemological, methodological and praxiological relationships. " Well, this is just plain too MUCH, TOO VARIED, AND too COMPLEX [(somehow)] A "WAY" to approach the Subject, IF you are indicating all 4 must be done and all had in mind (actually, that would be simply unrealistic -- based on the science on the Memories, which has good evidence, indicating what I just said already, that exists already). For your question, " What is the relationship between 'Artificial Intelligence' and 'Artificial Consciousness'?", you really need just a fully empirical perspective on the human (ultimately THE Subject), **BROADLY CONCEIVED** (what you might call:

praxiological). AGI (artificial general intelligence) is supposed to thoroughly model the human in major senses, after all; AND, you will not otherwise get answers out of "thin air" by just thinking and imagining <-- hopefully I would have to say no more here -- but to say it another way, quickly from another angle: I will say you/we simply do not know enough.

I agree with H.G. Callaway that " It seems doubtful that we should regard consciousness as a kind of *knowledge* " BUT, contrary to a proposal Callaway seems to make, consciousness does not demand language underpinnings for many of its forms.

I would caution Wolfram Rinke, who says

"... I believe you find a lot of different answers based on different views and philosophical interpretations". THE IMPORTANT THING PHILOSOPHERS LOOSE TRACK OF AND QUICKLY (and referring no doubt to many different thought contexts, each of which we would need lessons on) is: THAT IS NOT WAY TO GO ANYWAY. Please, "Western" men/people, try to let the Subject define the Subject and don't act like you don't know the existence and importance of inductive inference, OR act like foundational observations are not key to starting any study, and surely before any decently conceptualized experimentation (AND even more well-founded such contextualized study BEFORE one has any opinion: often not only grounded in observation, but going back to real systematic, observation [demonstrably shown as reliable (with: demonstrated inter-observer reliabilities)], again and again -- with observation being much more important at almost all times than experimentation (especially experiments of a "trumped up" nature)).

I do a great deal to address and answer things that are very relevant to "consciousness" -- obviously (if you read me), and it all indicates consciousness is very varied, yet may be somewhat delimited empirically at any point (e.g. in ontogeny) on some major sorts of specified matters. My OUTLOOK and APPROACH is as thoroughly empirical as possible (and enough to be clear); it does take about 800 pages of reading my writings (all available on RG) to "get it", though. Since this thread seems destined to "go philosophical", I will (likely much to your relief) have little more or nothing to say here. I have said it.

Dear ...

I am afraid I am of the view that **shunning** philosophy (**EXCEPT good analytic philosophy** which deeply involves itself with science, or other clearly consistently-motivated OTHER Subject areas) **IS THE THE CORRECT THING TO DO**. I believe there is a VERY good reason for why nowadays over 50% of philosophers consider themselves, and try to be, **ANALYTIC** philosophers. The **rest of philosophy is overly armchair-based and incongruent with and inconsistent with science** AND a menace. "Define", "Define", "Define", yielding endless **multiple pseudo-"interpretations"** AND **EXTREME, AND EXTREMELY WRONGFUL (either wrong or false), DUALISMS**.

It seems for those philosophers who remain **rogue** (i.e. the rest of them, other than SOME good analytic philosophers), **any particular word that SEEMS to refer to something distinct may well be deemed so, even when there is NO EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FOR THIS**; thusly, something can be an **issue** for them (and one they can come to **no generally communicable agreement** on with others) - it is effectively of the standing (status) of undisciplined child's play.

If you want a longer and more detailed retort (with a **LOT of specifics**), see **my Answers to the Question (in the thread)** :

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Can_philosophy_help_to_innovate_and_develop_scientific_theory#

[view=5cd20ba5f8ea5275016384fe](#) (I have participated there for 2-3 years. Most traditional philosophy has been defeated THERE for claiming to be of ANY good/good-use to ANY SCIENCE, in reality -- CLAIMS notwithstanding.)

EEK, EEK; YUCK, YUCK, YUCK. You put all your efforts into **thought which is not reasonably (more bit-by-bit) grounded and you use your thus-damned mindes to come up with garbage (garbage in, garbage out)**. Essentially: blither/blather, blah, blah, blah. You cannot force one to "play your game", and it IS, in essence, a game -- and that is all (perhaps as complex as chess, but who cares).

Dear

I will look at no model which is not grounded/well-founded at each step **_AND_ THIS REQUIREMENT HOLDING FOR EVERY SINGLE CONCEPT** in the model (or actually involved in the model), with the **ONLY** exception(s) being some underlying processes, yet to be well-defined, **BUT** any of those must be **CLEARLY RELATED TO** truly empirically-related **PRINCIPLES ACCEPTED BY ALL**. If your model was like this, I would like to know about it (if it had some value to my study areas) -- and it would have some real and recognized usefulness, that demonstrated **AS science itself** ; see my posts in the other thread I have referred to **for a general definition of science, (i.e. true of ANYTHING that is really scientific)**.

For something (any concept or any relationship between concepts) to be well-grounded and well-founded, it must be related **MINIMALLY** to some **KEY (pivotal) directly-observable [set(s) of] overt phenomena (showing inter-observer reliabilities** -- all necessary science reliabilities), these phenomena found (in space and time) together, **AND** these being very likely related to **OTHER** (later) phenomena, **EQUALLY WELL-DEFINED** (scientifically defined, as is the case for that first set(s) of phenomena) -- the relationship of the 2 separate sets of phenomena constituting **VALIDITY**.

No aspect (e.g. concept or relationship(s) between concepts) of ANY MODEL should precede/pre-date some excellent, clear agreeable observations (the nature of "agreeable" observations being scientific, as described above)

Dear

Any "consensus" (agreement) not related to well-founded, scientific concepts (and somehow reliably demonstrated clearly or proven) are less than meaningless to me. Philosophers have for 100s of years been largely a menace to science and good thought -- we would all know if a case otherwise was true. Many philosophers have absolutely no significant experience with, and using, **GOOD EMPIRICISM** (see my post, above, and those in another thread I refer to, also in one of my posts above), thus they are "out of the game".

But, if this "stuff" is all a person does, and he/she knows nothing else, they and I shall have little to dialog about (but just mainly the deficiencies in/of the thought).

Dear

You want to be "unhindered" in your ways; I understand. I will now go (leave this thread); I cannot think I have anything more to say (and my assessments can neither be well-considered, or argued against, anyway, by your ilk). NOTE:

For your information, I have reviewed Anderson's ACT Theory and that is often used as the system for being the basis of General Artificial Intelligence. Thus, I likely know more that pertains to computer science than anyone here (or likely to come here). ALSO SEE my grand offerings to computer science, so all your more poorly grounded and poorly founded models can be properly disposed of:

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Developing-a-Usable-Empirically-Based-Outline-of-Human-Behavior-for-FULL-Artificial-Intelligence-and-for-Psychology> .

Like I just said though, I am going so you can enforce basically a philosophy-only policy to NO avail, like 100s of years of history have shown us. The philosophers, again, will surely have no meaningful success, but may once again distract and misdirect others, resulting basically in "noise" and a waste of time -- continuing the record of most philosophy at being a menace.

Is the Relation Between Working Memory and Long-term Memory True?

My Answer:

Dear

Here is a paper I just recommended publicly :

Article [Visual memory, the long and the short of it: A review of vis...](#)

How are experimental (psychology) tasks validated?

Dear

You are asking , "how experimental tasks in psychology and cognition are created and validated". I will remark a bit on that. One should, of course, start with operational definitions that are "real", that is: well-linked , particularly clearly and simply* linked to WIDELY-recognized and agreed-upon behavior PATTERNS ; and, for this status, these behavior patterns must be well-grounded and well-founded, clearly related* or relatable* to some behavior patterns that are both overt and directly observable. All this is proper and should increase the chances (to say the least) that your results will be reliable (replicable) -- this is the reliability matter. (Do not be "shy" about using inter-observer measures of reliability; these are often BETTER than often-accepted statistical "reliabilities" (e.g. $p < .01$, etc.).)

After showing good reliability, the major and ultimate standard for validity IS THE ABILITY TO **PREDICT SOME OTHER LATER IMPORTANT overt directly-OBSERVABLE phenomena (behavior patterns) and/or phenomena clearly and simply* RELATED* TO overt directly observable PHENOMENON** (behavior patterns)(so, in other words, THAT WHICH is/are the

Dependent Operational Definition(s) in your study should **somehow _BE_, OR be simply* related* to clear overt directly observable phenomena, OR simply* and clearly TIED-TO such key phenomena -- simply* and clearly relatable* to the relevant directly observable overt behavior patterns.**

[(Basically: "simply" and "relatable" meaning (in all instances these words were used): involving just simple, accepted and agreed-upon principles and/or processes ONLY.)]

There are other sorts of recognized validity, but the one I just indicated, is the one that is really at least ultimately sought and is the one that is truly valued and most valued.

P.S. Dear

My apologizes for editing my Answer, above, several times, for thoroughness, TAKING A WHOLE HOUR doing so. I strove to give you an answer that would "hold up" IN ANY SCIENCE (nothing special to Psychology).

...

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

My Answer:

If GOOD philosophy is about science, then it is best termed "science" -- to most clearly indicate what it REALLY IS (in Reality): science (for this WOULD be a consequence of it truly being "good") .

__AND__ : forget any "implications" of any "philosophy" and thus do not term it "philosophy" OR see what it "says" by 'virtue' of seeming as "philosophy", thereby irrationally seeming to add something in some special way. (If it is about science AND GOOD, it IS science and nothing "more"). By the way, this is related to ANY philosophy about science -- though if it is not good, what it is "in"/"for" science, or what it is "saying" about science, will not be clear and how to revise it so it is actually good (and comports with Reality) may not be an easy task. BUT THEN: If "fixable" and when fixed, it will simply BE SCIENCE (AND, as just indicated) (and then also, when "fixed", it will not be distracting, off-track, irrelevant mumbo jumbo -- with some ulterior motive involved) .

AND

People who keep on asking whether something that ALMOST ALWAYS FAILS to sufficiently specify or well specify [any 'concept' dealt with] OR that fails empirically, by-any-reasonable standard, to specify "IS A SCIENCE?" is simply as silly as silly can get.

Keep in mind: you can always go to church, if you have such inclinations -- which, what do you know, philosophers also have "church"-related pseudo-'issues' often not "settled" 'in' the philosophies EVEN UNTO THEMSELVES !!!!!!!!!!!!! !

AND

Dear

I have 800 pages of writing here on RG; you are welcome to read a bit of all the specifics and find what you need. Perhaps the GENERAL definition of science, below, shows some inspiration.

Dear

You say: " Of course if you cannot nail down basic concepts, it is hard to talk about a scientific stage, it may only be pre scientific". Yes. You can "take what you got" OR immediately start applying the clear conceptual requirements of science, so that then you have science. Immediately. It is your choice. Constantly the same question seems like a matter to be satisfied by church attendance or something similar (maybe join a local posse).

Science, here's IT:

ALL science refers to the ability to replicate KEY OVERT OBSERVABLE circumstances and KEY OVERT OBSERVABLE PHENOMENON THAT, obvious to ALL (in a fully agreed-upon way), are necessary for best understanding later replicable overt observable circumstances AND corresponding later proximately-related key overt, observable PHENOMENON patterns (so both "sides of the equation" are taken care of, so to speak) -- BUT, ALSO this may well imply some more-than-believable mechanism(s) for some linkage(s) which would be of some reasonable nature, but that may not be fully or clearly discovered YET (<-- BUT _HERE_ SOME CLEAR PRINCIPLES NEED TO BE UNDERSTOOD AND ALSO NEED TO BE INVOLVED). [ALSO NOTE, in any case, that things on BOTH sides of "the equation", cited as KEYSTONES of science (necessary for your declared, well-grounded, and in-good-part established -- and thus widely agreed-upon -- view/approach), _MUST_ rely fully on now-present (or at the key time, present) variables that are overt and directly observable.]

ALL THAT is the minimal empiricism for science.

Dear

The claim that philosophy is a science is preposterous (perhaps the fact that people have asked about this for centuries and there is still no satisfactory answer on this basic "starting" question should give one a clue or hint; it basically is like we cannot even START to consider philosophy as a science -- and this has been the case forever).

And, your statement, that philosophy (or anything) is an " all-encompassing search for knowledge accumulation": "All-encompassing" in its literal/absolute sense is humanly impossible.

I would stomp most philosophy out, if I could (and maybe I have: I probably have over 100 essays detailing short-comings -- and, some of the essays seem to present what is incontestable). I have shown most philosophy (other than the exception of some analytic philosophy) for what it is, and it is nothing good, but (in fact) can be clearly shown to be often seriously (and long-lastingly) destructive (it is in a contest with religion for most destructive -- though, no doubt, religion may be a big part of philosophy). Philosophy may certainly be a major part of what is right now literally killing us -- so I can show little "patience" here. Though, by the way, religion and philosophy can keep one "hopeful" -- so "hopeful" (or wrongfully doubting) that they do NOTHING in response to most-major and even FATAL problems (e.g. "jesus will fix it").

If this is "okay" with you keep on " 'keepin' on" but consider you may be a collaborator on making for the up-coming (now, near certain) disastrous (and painful, loaded-with-suffering) extinction of

ourselves (or, at least: our : "mortal coil", hah, hah).

I suggest people chose an alternative to philosophy (or, surely (in my view (if I must have one here)): you shall go to "hell".) "Soft-pedaling" everything seems to be a hallmark of our culture (many of the world's cultures); do you really think this will "work"? IS THIS A SERIOUS QUESTION, IS THIS A SERIOUS ANSWER??. I would ask people to "act now", but I sincerely believe most have absolutely NO CLUE HOW.

AND, I answer:

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](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)

Dear

What you said: So it is said. Now show it and prove what you are talking about is something different from the concrete-in-sensible-sequential observations AND IS OF VALUE. I will tell you, frankly, that what you said is meaningless to me and it sounds a bit like a parrot (as so much of what people "know" does).

Actually, just for your interest: I intended my post for another thread (in particular: [https://www.researchgate.net/post/Can philosophy help to innovate and develop scientific theory](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Can_philosophy_help_to_innovate_and_develop_scientific_theory))

Dear

I more get your "drift" until you get to the "complex" part: complex, if it is so, is "earned" in unique or specific individual contexts (and where all can OR could -- in theory -- observe that being the case: and only then see 'complex' "things" in any way possibly correctly, only after a lot of work; fortunately this does not come up validly terribly often because of its association with "dead ends"). "Complex" (and this is easy to find and verify) is often a term used for deception for those desiring to mislead or to hide actual ignorance -- and one will probably note the second use as most serious and perhaps most prominent. This latter use is much related to confusion and academic/intellectual (and personal) dishonesty. If the word "complex" is used broadly or quickly this is likely the case.

Real complexity takes a good long while to learn about (and see it in some kind of proper way, and still it may at least most often be related to confusions -- some perhaps quite justified); otherwise (VERY much, in general), if you don't START simple, you don't start correctly EVER -- this being based on the principle findings about the nature of working memory (if not on wise experience) and on some respect for what IS science. I.E. ONE _MUST_ START SIMPLE.

NOW: On the other hand, THAT IS VERSUS "following" your initial "drift", the closest to "implied axioms" I ever get ever (and I watch myself as closely as possible) are relevant biological principles --

and I do **NOT** see them as **implied** (in science, if something is there at the beginning it is not hard to see -- communication and agreement on key matters is the foundation of science). If there are some "things" so mysterious at the start, that is suspect; what is just recognized as "there" from the start and is only seen by philosophers is probably a matter of confusion -- perhaps from insufficient real connections to reality. (For an example of off-tract philosophy, take the matter of "consciousness" which is only confusing when OUT OF CONTEXTS.)(Can there be such axioms really existing as fundamental and be so mysterious?; I doubt it (based on reasons about the nature of working memory and the nature of learning with ontogeny AND based on the actual nature of science) -- no matter what ANYONE says (and I do mean ANYONE).)

It is quite amazing that a person with a community college background would (supposedly) have so much doubt about a person of my age and standing; maybe you need to write a couple of books, like I have, to better establish your position (or even to have one good to share on such matters as you supposedly address HERE (in this thread)). How could you say the following to ME: "you don't care for what I say is partly art which is complex and therefore requires some effort"? [(Back when I joined researchgate, your background would not likely have made the qualifications.)]

Making sure I am on-topic: I DO admit that I see even the subject/topic of this thread foolish. I would say that philosophy, unless it is well-founded analytic philosophy -- which involves UNDERSTANDING OF ANOTHER SUBJECT AREA __AND__ A SCIENCE -- is NO science at all.

Realistic and critical thinking

Dear

I like the Question and think I understand most of it; it seems well-worth asking. I will give one possible [partial] answer (just one, but maybe a good one):

I would recommend that a person (for good self-esteem and satisfaction) take on a formal, clear Subject (like a science, but there are also other fields here) __AND__ take it on personally (personally evaluating everything), and from "scratch", and built it [(your view and approach)] to be a good empirically-based summary of some important "reality-space". This you can do and no one will bother you UNTIL you share the view and approach; but, if you wait long enough, you will find you have enough to "fight back" with (in response to nay-Sayers). That is the only noteworthy answer I have found for myself.

What are some good ways to represent large paragraphs of text for performing automatic abstractive summarization?

Dear

I would say: come to understand a system of representation (visual representations or visually-related

representations in the Memories) AND, when looking at the "system", appreciate and also properly process the hierarchical relationships between major sets of such representations (active in a given set of circumstances, aka environmental [aspects]). [I may seem to be "talking" mainly about the visual, but humans are VERY visual -- and it is hard to imagine much not related to that.]

[NOTE: "Hierarchical" is often not well-understood; it does not just refer to building on earlier "pieces" BUT some change, refinement, integration and consolidation of those "pieces"; __AND__ THEN also (in a true hierarchy) some new significant guiding and often occurring (re-occurring) sorts of aspects of concrete realities (qualitatively similar in any given level/stage change, and qualitatively similar across circumstances) EMERGE with ontogeny. This is as with sophisticated, well-contextualized innate guidance [(with each stage)] of perception then attention; these are good part of what it added for something to be (or forming) a true hierarchy.]

If you can correctly model all this THAT IS SOMETHING and that seems clearly related to representing "large paragraphs of text for performing automatic abstractive summarization" in-reality -- if I get your meaning. This is what I, as a unique developmental psychologist and stance empiricist, propose AGI (true artificial intelligence) people incorporate as a processing into their robots.

How can teaching make world a better place to live?

Can teaching make the world a better place to live? NO, not in certain subject/'discipline' areas, given the way teaching is done now (today) (and in the memorable past); I am thinking of the behavioral 'sciences'. The students could all just as well take up religious studies ! (See my recently added Question/Discussion for more on my view; that Discussion was just begun today:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/General_Psychology_How_can_you_get_the_specifics_correctly_if_you_dont_have_a_clearly_legitimate_good_overview_or_bother_with_that)

Dear Orlando M Lourenço : I agree with a whole lot of what you cite and say. But regarding "The best teachers are those who teach their students in a way that leads students to dispense with their teachers" : I ask: In the behavioral 'sciences' (especially and particularly, Psychology): How is such a "dispensation" sufficiently, and thus meaningfully, possible/practical in colleges and universities today?

Dear

I agree with you, given the proper "qualification":

"We all stand first on the shoulders of those ... before us" [and of our professors/teachers, as you say] and students should **understand** THIS -- understand, in the sense of what's "there" they, themselves, can properly **REALIZE (and properly adjust), IN-CONTEXT** [(and NOT simply " 'know' [-of-]-to-'understand' ", which is as 'understanding' is commonly (unfortunately) 'seen'-and-done; this latter sort of 'understanding' IS fallacious)]. I just now added a related P.S. to that Discussion/Question I began today (a P.S. just for Psychology) -- see my last answer, above, for the link.

Again, you said "The best teachers are those who teach their students in a way that leads students to

dispense with their teachers" : AND (again) I ask: In the behavioral 'sciences' (especially and particularly, Psychology): How is such a "dispensation" sufficiently, and thus meaningfully, possible/practical in colleges and universities today? (This has become an appropriately harder question.)

What is your definition of the word 'theory'? and How would you describe a 'Scientific Theory'?

Dear

A **scientific theory** is in a real sense where **YOU define nothing**. You note, acknowledge and abide-by principles that are necessarily applicable (e.g. homeostasis to Biology subjects) and **APPLY THEM (ACTUALLY: make sure they are seen as they ARE "in" the subject of study (in simple, clear phenomenology))**. Otherwise: agreeable, reliable, and verifiable **simple phenomenology (AND the natural, easily-SEEN, [minimally] OVERT-observations-BASED patterning thereof) is described, using organization the SUBJECT ITSELF provides. THAT IS IT. THAT IS true EMPIRICISM, aka "scientific" theory: All must be apparent (to any guided to see), and found reliable, _AND_ at least has the hope/"promise" of it validly predicting some other phenomenon pattern (also of the sort just noted: simple, agreeable ...). (Basically: prediction ITSELF is a most important sort of validity.) [[VERY MUCH RELATED to all I just said: I have provided a GENERAL (true-of-all-sciences) definition of SCIENCE; seek and ye shall find it.]]**

The **rest of "theory" is loaded with philosophy(ies),, contrary to true empiricism and science, and is of "no account" (no value truly moving forward) -- most certainly eventually (and likely quite soon), a DEAD END.**

[If the truth hurts, let it "hurt" very good, well, and HARD. I do speak "the truth", BECAUSE I in no way "DEFINE" IT. Many (most all) of the old-time (and still 'current' ("used")) philosophers and their philosophies be damned. Nobody just "well thought-out" ANYTHING ["in" their mindes] and **seeing any such thought yielding some/something good** , i.e. some "good" definition or some conclusion seen as "good" AND YET just -- as far as one can tell -- a product-of-such "thought" : **_THAT_ 'SEEN' as GOOD is most serious DELUSION (with ignorance as its common aid).**]

Dear

Not to be "defining" is my very POINT. Thus, I deny your request. Clear?

Thought must be taken so bad-thought is not done.

What is logic? Why need we logic?

Dear

Why do we need the environment? Why do we need our Memories? Why do we need water? Why do we ask questions such as this one you asked? BIG CLUE: modern thinking IS outrageously and unjustifiably DUALISTIC: There is this and there is THAT, so why not allow ourselves to ask about either (this or that)?(and then, basically, "ask" about anything, no matter how far off the so-called "level

of analysis" is). (I believe my response may be one of the better overall responses to your question, though some philosophers may be able to conjure "more".)

You also make some statements that are incorrect or gross over-statements:

You say: " Subjective world only has subjective information. " Try to explain and justify THAT. Much of what we should know to be more rational ourselves may be subjective knowledge of some people RIGHT NOW.

You said: " ... objective logic? Obviously is cause-effect law that produces all events or things or matters in objective world " Really? And, that's it? (How about simply knowledge of important properties of things, and why they are important? -- often in ways not seen as cause-and-effect, in any clear or reasonable sense. Here is an example: Food is often good tasting, so ("therefore", if you like) we are inclined to eat it.)

If you want to say something wild, like " Human beings holds the objective logic via subjective logic only. ": Why not try RATHER: we come to know actual (ultimate) Realities only by way of our conventional realities. A good correction, I think, for you to make. Plus, "ditch" the dualism(s) -- it fails.

Dear

And because of what you last said, which indeed is true: Should we be asking "why we have something" that, if we did not have it, we would be extinct? It might make sense in the sense of "why" for discovering its development, no doubt parts at a time (as Yaozhi Jiang says: it develops -- though (I believe) it is never, in notable significant ways, ever absent). ALSO notice we all are automatically "translating" Yaozhi Jiang's Question because:

"Logic" is just a FORM (kind of like: rectangle). If you have invalid premises, it yields garbage; certain things can well be rectangular, others not. We all automatically know "logic" is not what he meant.

Overall conclusion: The actual Question, therefore, which Yaozhi Jiang tried to ask, would have to be translated into "why do we have sound thought?" (which is really the Question I and several have been responding to all along) . But, even with that translation, it is true that, if we did not have it, we would be extinct and thus asking "why", as if we could figure that KIND of thing out as some kind of distinct whole concept, all-at-once, and IN GENERAL, is (again, as so many similar instances) an un-true way to think about things, basically by "biting off more than one can chew" (that is to say: trying to/pretending-to (irrationally) "stuff" more in working memory than will fit) -- which is the fundamental error of philosophy (making most of it worthless **or worse**); this practice necessitates and leads to incorrect, serious over-generalization.

"Sound thinking" is also just a type of thing (a "form") -- one cannot investigate "types" of behavior patterns UNLESS they are distinctly true and real types * (basically: biologically)(our actual Memories need that sort-of/degree-of "help") and, even then, the answer is not going to come in one "fell swoop". Everyone must move to love true empiricism more (with an "eye to" some key directly observable, overt phenomenon always) -- otherwise, at best, people do not know what you are talking about (and maybe you don't). Agree?

* FOOTNOTE: This is something Psychology, it seems, cannot learn; on fundamentally NO legitimate bases, they have models (conjured up hypothetico-deductive systems -- with "conjured" being very much the correct word). Perhaps it is best to view Psychology as one of philosophy's worst examples (or worst systems) (rather than pretend philosophy is not involved) -- its "concepts" have been "hammered on" and, at times, slightly shifted over and over and over, with basically no improvement (almost always bad, much like philosophy; similarly a product of "the minde" -- armchair "drifting" 'thought'). I have dedicated my life of 65 years (or at least 50 years) to Psychology, yet see most of it as, at least largely, of either little good (relative to what may become the real thing _and_ become of that) or of no good. Basically, the same in nature for its 100 yr+ history. (My favorite areas, the Memories and Development, are only slightly researched and wrongly concluded about; there is a "kernel" of good "hidden" in each of these areas, though -- i.e. even some likely good findings, which I have been able to locate.)

Dear

Logic is a "form". It is a good form, and necessary, but has no substance unto itself [(that is why there is the additional word, "sound")]. [I have known/realized this for many decades and seen no evidence otherwise -- and there is NONE even officially because, as I say it is, is as it is represented by philosophers themselves.] Anyone who thinks/says there is more to it is incorrect and likely not a good or independent thinker.

Dear

It seems to me that kind of a good analogy is: morality is to ethics AS logic is to soundness (but this certainly is NOT a perfect analogy).

Is there a limit to computing power?

Dear

You ask: "Is there a limit to computing power?" My answer for you is simple: ONLY if there is a limit to EXPERIENCE. If experience is never fully constrained, then the one word answer to your question is "no". You may benefit from reading my Projects, including my AI (AGI) Project:

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Developing-a-Usable-Empirically-Based-Outline-of-Human-Behavior-for-FULL-Artificial-Intelligence-and-for-Psychology> (see the References and the Project Log, aka Updates _and_ ALSO SEE the related Human Ethogram (Ethogram Theory) Project).

Why don't we protect all animals equally?

Dear

In my mind and assessment, people are just dyed-in-the-wool evil, when it comes to giving appropriate consideration of, and kindness of/toward, other sentient beings. It is simply inexcusable: wrong, largely-intentional cruelty PLUS serious maladaptive indifference; and, for many, add-in: ignorant and stupid mindlessness, also. All this has extreme negative consequences on our treatment of each other as

well [(e.g. not only is there near-constant war, but our wars ALWAYS INVOLVE WAR CRIMES (in the formal sense of Nuremberg, etc.); we also facilitate this to-the-maximum AS WE KILL AT A DISTANCE (e.g. drones/bombs, etc.).)] (Almost nothing indicates a budding psychopathic personality in a child "moving toward adulthood" than animal cruelty -- and that "says it all".)

I have held (in the main) this opinion and assessment for decades. The only thing helpful about this dismal situation is that it makes it easier not to worry about people (BUT THIS HAS NO BEARING ON WORRYING ABOUT OR CARING ABOUT THE EARTH ...).

An extreme effort (of which I do not believe we are capable) is (actually: would be) necessary to stem the indifference and cruelty, described above. It may be fortunate for many others that our species may indeed make itself near-extinct by 2050 * ; maybe the ones of us that are left can be a bit more decent.

* FOOTNOTE: maybe some pandemic will get "thrown in" to exacerbate this mega-downfall -- such diseases may well like "bad weather". (I say we all "kiss our *****" goodbye, thankfully.)
[(I still give to some human causes, e.g. free children's hospitals, habitat for humanity, and some legal organizations/foundations. I give more to animals; I eat NO MEAT OR ANIMAL PRODUCTS that is not from organic AND KINDNESS (free range, etc.) sources; feedlots can be seen as MAJOR SIGNS OF OUR EVIL [(along with war crimes)], those frequently being otherwise "involved" (it upsets me more than a close person's funeral to even think of it). **Spread the word; you may even re-tweet me, if you do that sort of thing. Doubt not the clear judgement of your own judgement.** I support absolutely NO cruelty in animal research and support the abandonment of any that does not meet this standard -- as "bad" spreads to more bad, "good" spreads to good: making the absolutely minimal "good efforts" I have described GOOD. Also, included (likely NOT un-relatedly) in our "good efforts", let's see what we can do to stem war crimes, at least to some great extent. Oh, yea (lest I forget), let's really actually do many things to limit climate change, if only to demonstrate our possible decency -- heretofore VERY RARELY SEEN, "at best" -- EVEN if we find the situation is hopeless.) More-"partial" answers are of, and for, cowards; and, as the US president would say (attempting meaningfulness): "for losers".]

Have a good day, "fellow" "vermin": REALLY (in-reality and showing the consequences) . [P.S. Cogent counter-arguments to any of "the above" welcomed -- good luck with that.]

To put my view in a more friendly and constructive way (encompassing the above)(and with some Answer):

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/Reality as it IS NOT provides both carrots and sticks as the metaphor goes](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Reality_as_it_IS_NOT_provides_both_carrots_and_sticks_as_the_metaphor_goes)

Is Chalmers' so-called "hard problem" in consciousness real?

My Answer:

The so-called Chalmers' "hard problem" is mental machinations (air-chair philosophizing) with insufficient empirical groundings for ANY decent conceptual considerations. It is ill-defined and in real contexts is explained away (certainly not holding up as the "problem" is presently submitted); it is explained-away BY real details of necessary attention, varying in adaptive ways in various real situations (including varying with ontogeny) -- it is not to be seen as any "nature of the being" phenomenon, unless you seek perpetual ignorance/delusion.

What is the best life lesson you have ever learned?

My Answer:

Best lesson of my life:

There seems to be no organization or institution "dealing" with humans or human understanding which (likely for cultural/philosophical/political/societal reasons) is not grossly inadequate. My focus is on education and human-understanding issues and topics in institutions of higher learning, where most or all (all the important ones) ARE "FULL OF IT" -- doomed, inadequately empirically grounded or founded DEAD ENDS (some of this due to the insistence on their OWN "definitions" and some related to space/time and imagination constraints). (The power structure makes for sweeping institutional problems of the nature that students cannot, or certainly cannot likely, overcome; and, students have at least not overcome them to-date.)

I do offer big-time solutions : just go to my Profile and see the last half dozen or so Discussions/Questions (Profile --> Research --> then Questions)

The largest and most important part of MY answer to this Question (beginning this whole thread) is:

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/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](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Humans%20deal%20so%20poorly%20with%20things%20with%20any%20intellectual%20structure%20that%20most%20all%20seems%20to%20have%20the%20status%20of%20a%20game%20Can%20you%20see%20this%20too)

Dear

You say "Do not judge at all. ". Then, perhaps you should try having no pain and no concerns for (of) yourself -- that would be in-line (truly) with that absolutely ridiculous general statement; and, perhaps you have forgotten that judgments can be good/helpful/useful.

The best meaning I can make of such a statement (yours) by itself is: NOTHING. That is being most generous to you. Perhaps you should learn some more useful and important definition of "judge". Perhaps you can come to connect more of your thinking with activity (AND JUDGE how well that works).

[Perhaps come to realize how my last answer may relate to you.]

Dear

Although I, myself, am not very comfortable with my response to Christian G Meyer, I cannot in good conscience say much that is different. I could say that his intention (kind of/sort of) may have been good (peaceable), BUT here on researchgate what we say is supposed to be substantial (and not what we would say in passing conversation with acquaintances or any "knee-jerks" of thought).

I could add (to make some feel better): Many of us have to better operationalize our definitions and concepts (relating them to repeatable actions, with repeatable results, and almost all of that will have to do with better observations of our subject matter; generalities of any good use will not be easy to come by (but perhaps by referring to areas of action we may lacking -- since some of them are quite sweeping)).

Your response w/r to him has gotten several "Recommendations"; that should make him feel better. Perhaps you should feel sorry for me (my own Answer may have made me suffer more).

Dear

Let me draw your attention to my awareness and knowledge of Buddhism: <https://mynichecomp.com> (that is MY site with MY comprehensive summary of ALL the words of the historical Buddha and I show my full and clear understanding of them). SO:

Also: Realize: It is much better NOT to quote out of context. (Frankly I do not recall the Buddha stating the words you quote (and I have read then all -- the entire Pali canon -- many thousands of pages); but, in any case, he would have been saying, in effect: judge with discernment AND NOT "never judge" (the Buddha was a very responsible man (a real existentialist) and would not say to NOT engage in anything constructive, that allows one to see things as they are; he also knew enough to always speak in quite clear contexts). [(One should do a thought experiment and try to **discern** something without using something one very, very well could call **judgement**. I will admit that there are "somethings" (in the cognitive processing of an animal) that may seem like "just discerning" which may precede good judgement.)]

By the way, you shall only flail, if you try to pretend your original statement (I criticized) is really anything sensible or useful (except maybe for a rabid dog or such). Be happy with the blind (basically thoughtless and "touchy-feeling") support you have. Even the Bible never says anything that stupid. It says, in effect "judge as ye shall be judged" and "judge not ..." FOR SPECIFIED REASONS. (P.S. By the way, if the Bible did say "never judge anyone ever", I could not possibly care less; so that was just FYI, in case even the oft-ridiculous Bible might help your perspective.)

Such a very short, non-contextualized and non-understandable statement such as you made ("Do not judge at all. ") is unfit for ResearchGate, even as it is. I believe you should act (write) more appropriately. (I often think that if all that was required for a doctorate was the level of communication-and-understanding OFTEN shown on RG, most everyone in the general public would be operating at the level of a "doctor of philosophy" (i.e. Ph.D.). Really. But, take some "comfort" in the following: RG appears to be a place, very often, for those with a brief bit of time on their hands to "spout off".)

P.S. A major goal of a Buddhist is to come to see causality, the conditions for something that follows to occur -- everywhere, for everything. It is hard to see how one could do this without judgement (judging). And, we look for causality for everything even though it is also said that things have no inherent nature: that latter view just, in effect, meaning : we (or, rather, THAT which 'causes' you/US) always have a role in 'seeing' as we 'see' -- call it "human nature", if you will.

I also Answered:

In my particular subject area, Psychology, the most important "thing" I have learned is that most all of it (yep, most all of Psychology, generally) is very poorly empirically-based (to say it most gently and kindly) and, even as it "moves forward", it is unacceptable as a science and is NOT a principled science -- not even really a science; and these "folks", as bad off as they are (and as they should clearly see and realize), they do not well-examine alternatives citing a clear concrete empirical bases for all understandings (and, needless to add (because it is actually redundant): TESTABLE, CONCRETE, clearly grounded and founded HYPOTHESES) . If interested, for details see the following (or any large segment of my 800 pages of writings here on RG): :

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

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 counterparts 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 corruption term in your opinion?

Dear

Truly it is impossible to answer your Question. It is simply too "general". What "corruption" is depends on the context in which the word is used. You 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 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 that we can have a meaningful discussion). Many words not only indicate just aspects, but sometimes ASPECTS of multiple (and VARIED) circumstances OR sometimes even just occasional things ACROSS-circumstances -- that very well possibly being 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, sometimes] otherwise) -- this is just basic necessary empiricism (for science or communication (intelligibility)).

I could say all this many times to philosophers with regard to MANY words for which they seek meaning BUT WHOSE MEANING VARIES A LOT, depending on the circumstances. This problem of "defining" everything, together with the likely-related problem of dualism, ARE THE DOWNFALL OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION and certainly the MAJOR IMPEDIMENT TO SCIENCE/EMPIRICISM
**.

[Obviously, I am not saying the problems are unique to you or blaming you (or at least not blaming just you).]

** 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

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