

These are my writings of the last 1yr and 2 months

[NOTE: One or two Questions/Discussions may be repeats from other collected writings; otherwise, this is a new Collection.]

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

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

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

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

Just your "aping" of a isolated method(s) is NEVER SCIENCE; it is NEVER SCIENCE just when that is want you want (but apply to it as a pretender). For the WAY, see:

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

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

Read :

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

following that Discussion Question for elaborations/clarifications. AND:

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

and

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

and

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

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

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

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

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

No matter how poor a writer I may be, the following needs to be asked thrice, under three different Projects, including " Developing a Usable Empirically-Based Outline of Human Behavior for FULL Artificial Intelligence (and for Psychology)" :

The nature and bases of abstract thought and processing can't continue to be unknown or confusing; we must relate each inception to key directly observable overt behavior patterns (and corresponding environmental aspects, or rather: often aspects of multiple circumstances). These are the EASIEST and yet , I believe, some of the BIGGEST "PROBLEMS" we yet have to solve (STILL, to-date) : SUCH very CENTRAL SETS OF DISCOVERIES THAT MUST BE MADE and they have not yet been well-attempted; there is NO reason such searching for the key observations, looking to establish key discoveries, cannot be attempted, especially now, with modern technologies (eye tracking , etc.); there are ways to solve this sort of problem which we have had historically and in philosophy and within the limits of our "labs" (at least given conceptualizations thereof) -- all these negative views, placing artificial limits on theorists'/researchers' imaginations. **

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

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

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

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

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

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

With the too many trends in Psychology, how did 2 central perspectives, developmental levels/stages &

ethology, get essentially (and at least nearly) totally lost?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Understanding provides perspective and at key times (with ontogeny) "yields forth" some further direction through some newly emerging basic perceptions (perceptual shifts) WITHIN BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (and then attentions). THIS PROVIDES ALL THE NECESSARY "MOVING FORWARD" (for cognitive abilities and

"abstraction"). THERE IS NO homunculus HERE. THIS IS A SCIENCE OUTLOOK.

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

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

Read :

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_phenomenologically-based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings and the Answers following that Discussion Question for elaborations/clarifications. AND:

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

and

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

and

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

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

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

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

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

Addressing experimental psychology.

It really is a question of how to hone-in on a set of circumstances as really seen by a human subject, other than just starting with premises one conjures up or has simply thought up, based on SOME pattern, but not carefully based on discovered and known behavior patterns -- i.e. those seen in careful, replicatable, shown-valid

observations. To me, a basic requirement of beginning science is to show that one validly sees (in situ, so to speak) some real reliable and shown-meaningful behavior PATTERNS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"nominate" (just use) search terms and RG would at least consider or "look into it".)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Through dispassion [his mind] is liberated. When it is liberated there comes the knowledge: 'It's liberated.' He understands: 'Destroying birth, the holy life has been lived, what had to be done has been done, there is no more for this state of being.'"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

stages/levels, providing for all in core ontogeny, particularly 2 to 18+ year-old persons) are the major types of components.

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

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

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

Here is the grand "entry" to my writings:

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

Read :

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_phenomenologically-

[based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings](#) and the Answers following that Discussion Question for elaborations/clarifications.

AND: READ:

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

and

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

and

read the Project Log of the " Human Ethology and Development (Ethogram Theory) : A Full-Fledged Paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY" Project to see many important Updates: <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY>

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

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

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

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

And, Dear Psychology, if you find the procedure I clearly describe and indicate (the research involving eye tracking technologies) and THAT leads to discovering basic perceptual shifts (which I also describe), THEN YOU WILL HAVE TO (at this point) acknowledge ME: IF the clearly described kind of research (eye tracking discovering the beginning basic perceptual shifts with ontogeny, and associated with developing abstract capabilities) I indicate CAN be found usable-and-useful for findings that yields the results indicated _and_ IF, IN

FACT, all this IS FOUND, THEN the fact of the existence of this major foundations-finding procedure will be called, "the Jesness principle for empiricism" **. YOU are, at this point, too late for any credit (imagine what Trump would say HERE).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Major Needed Problem-Solving Humans simply apparently WILL NOT DO (seems: there's NO CHANCE; add to list, or argue otherwise, &/or add explanations):

Major Needed Problem-Solving Humans simply [apparently] WILL NOT DO (seems: there's NO CHANCE; add to list, or argue otherwise, and/or add explanations)(other comments may be welcome):

(1) take care of Climate Change

(2) ...

(Also, think of problems in the development of sciences, of other standing human welfare problems that need solving, and /or problems requiring better communication.)

Happy New Year

(I guess the Discussion Question would allow for New's Resolutions, among other things.)

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

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

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

even the subtle behavior patterns, etc., therein, truly-seen and clearly seen and truly and fully discovered _and_ seeing some key adaptive "operations" thereof. AND there is some detailed phenomenology described that allow one to arrive at testable hypotheses and then also indicating how this same basic sort of essential observations shall also naturally PROVIDE the actual ability to test these testable/falsifiable hypotheses.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

P.S. In a way my essays have been collected and published: ON ResearchGate -- YOU, to the extent that is true and appropriate ARE the PEER REVIEWERS, right now -- the writings are most certainly publicly available, able

to be judged by any who can judge them. [(I gathered my writings and put them in a few clear collections (the largest one, outside the 2 old foundational papers, being 512 pages long -- the collections, together, all recent essays of the last 3 years)]. If no one cares to find such "things" as I write about (even if "just there" on RG), I feel I have done the basic start that I can AND MUST hold myself responsible for, and let things "fall as they may" otherwise (and "fall" is the word). Responsibility has come to you.

I have taken the poor response I've gotten so far as a NO, NO, NO (basically, your response, or LACK THEREOF, is often saying: "I am already happy with my outlook and making money or reputation (fame) and/or getting a doctorate, so [yawn] forget you"). I know an experimental psychologist who has written a new good book on experimental psychology (I read it) and he got and he has gotten precisely THAT response from colleagues when he presents any if his "hard-hitting" critiques.

Dear

I thank you very much for your interest.

All of the essays are here on researchgate: Mainly: "A Human Ethogram ..." , the BOOK "Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory" and three Addenda under "Linked Data" (once you get to the BOOK, you'll see). Outside of that, it may be helpful to read the "Project Log" (aka "Updates") under the Project, "Human Ethology and Development (Ethogram Theory) : A Full-Fledged Paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY".

ALL THIS you may get to by just starting at my Profile page and seeing what you can see : Brad Jesness . Seeing some of the other Projects might also give you a beginning perspective (again, all from that Profile page).

Why IS there a bias against inductive reasoning and in favor of deductive reasoning in the social sciences?

Why is there a bias against inductive reasoning and in favor of deductive reasoning in the social sciences?

First, to establish there IS a bias:

It is OFTEN said (really as if it were a defining [damning] condition) that : induction or inductive inference is "made under conditions of uncertainty". Then, in describing deductive reasoning/inference there is typically NO SUCH mention of uncertainty. What? Just because one (or one and her associates) comes up with a hypothetico-deductive system of thought _THAT_ SOMEHOW REMOVES UNCERTAINTY??? This is NONSENSE -- YET this [at least] is a very real AND DESTRUCTIVE "Western" bias: that when you develop some system to think

with/in from WHATEVER actual data, then you, simply because you are now thinking in/with that internally consistent system, you will develop clear hypotheses _AND_ (as the bias goes) THESE WILL LIKELY BE TRUE (as shown via their "testing" -- and, no matter what standard of "testing" you have come up with). (Descartes would have loved this.)

Now look at some of the TRUTH that shows this is VERY, VERY likely an VERY unwarranted bias and it is quite conceivable that the opposite is true: Decent Induction shows more clarity, reliability, predictably, and inter-observer agreements THAN almost all deductive systems.

If in certain circumstances/situations a behavior PATTERN(s) which can be specified and has a directly observable basis, then induction can show GREAT inter-observer agreements _and_ this is sure-as-hell just as strong (actually, likely stronger) a result (reliable, agreeable result/finding (discovery)) than most any $p < .05$ results found when testing hypotheses that come out of a hypothetico-deductive system. All you jackasses that cannot think that way should establish a re-education camp FOR YOURSELVES or have nothing to do with science (other [real] scientists rightfully shun and ignore psychologists at any conference on science, for scientists in general: They sense OR know what I am saying.)

Yet, indeed, this very ridiculous bias leads people to come up with models where ALL concepts are NOT clearly rooted/beginning in directly observable overt behavior [PATTERNS] (I have even read one group of researchers, who wrote a paper on the difficulties of understanding ABSTRACT CONCEPTS, trying to "define" abstract concepts (and thinking) saying: "I think we should develop a thorough MODEL FIRST" (meaning: NOT after findings/data, but develop the model FIRST and, only then, look for the "behaviors". This is empirically unacceptable to an extreme. I believe such thinking would make Galileo throw up.) I have argued that a model cannot be good, unless ALL concepts ARE rooted/founded/based/stemming from directly observable overt behavior (again actually: behavior PATTERNS). The fact that so very, very little research is discussed, during the conception of a MODEL (OR afterward), in terms of behavior PATTERNS indicates an absolutely fatal problem (fatal to any hope for a science of Psychology). Still, today, Psychology is Medieval.

This "Western" society is presently (STILL) so sick (crazy -- like Descartes would likely be considered today) TO HAVE ANY POSSIBILITY TO HAVE A SCIENCE OF PSYCHOLOGY.. "Mere" BUT ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL OBSERVATIONS (and some associated discoveries) ARE NOT SOUGHT. (I believe if Galileo were here, he would say we have not yet made a decent start for a science of Psychology.)

What is true is that we will never, without proper bases and procedures, EVER understand important behavior patterns (and what aspects of circumstance(s) are related to them) EVER. (I shall not elaborate here, since so many want short answers (and ones damned close to those they have heard/"learned")).

Like other parts of my perspective and prescribed approach, this view is UNASSAILABLE !

Let my other thousand, or so, essays reinforce and trumpet what I have said here (they are all consistent with all my points and with each other, and these essays are here on RG).

P.S. Behavior patterns PER SE are an aspect of Biology, and very likely recognition and discovery of behavior patterns can ITSELF (alone) provide a full science. If you think of "Biology" always as something else then recall the re-education I have suggested.

In case you would also like to read another recent related post (though that post, an Answer is in another thread) : If interested, go to

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

and look for my recent Answers there.

P.S. I can refer you to my recent Answer to the Question,

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

for more perspective (and more verbiage).

From <https://www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/deduction-vs-induction-vs-abduction> : "Whereas in deduction the truth of the conclusion is guaranteed by the truth of the statements or facts considered ..., induction is a method of reasoning involving an element of probability." (end quote) Believing THAT statement (with its strong indication of "fact"), then any logical argument (syllogism) is true. And, about PROBABILITIES : What are all the $p < .05$ s in Psychology research about?: Answer : This indicates the chance (probability(ies)) of getting the same results of an experiment if done "the same way" AGAIN. Our problems here are actually DOUBLED (and even more than doubled if you consider the multiple correlations often involved in a single research study); if you see and reason clearly: you have uncertainties with the experiment results themselves and then added uncertainty by the contingency "if done 'the same way' AGAIN".

On the other hand the mostly inductive conclusions in the work of Tinbergen and Lorenz were good enough (actually, most excellent enough, with GREAT inter-observer agreement) to earn the ONLY Nobel Prize for behavioral scientists in the last half century. One of those voting for their Nobel Prize, said of their studies, that their Nobel was all from study and seeing 'behaviors alone.' [No grand human inference or models -- which are so much the crap of today.]

From wikipedia: "Abductive reasoning is a form of logical inference which starts with an observation or set of observations then seeks to find the simplest and most likely explanation for the observations. This process, unlike deductive reasoning, yields a plausible conclusion but does not positively verify it. Abductive conclusions are thus qualified as having a remnant of uncertainty or doubt, which is expressed in retreat terms such as 'best available' or 'most likely.' One can understand abductive reasoning as inference to the best explanation, although not all usages of the terms abduction and inference to the best explanation are exactly equivalent." [Highlighting added.] (end quote)

Since observation can show MUCH more reliability (inter-observer reliabilities) than MOST commonly-used deductive reasoning, THIS PROBLEM of not having the correct perspective on deductions is MOST RIDICULOUS.

philosophyterms.com/inference says : "Deduction (or "deductive inference") is an inference based on logical certainty. It usually starts from a general principle and then infers something about specific cases." (end quote)
Apparently a LOT of sources and people take "logical certainty" to be "certainty".

SO OFTEN STRIVING FOR THE EXPERIMENT IS LIKE STRIVING FOR NONSENSE. Good researchers (like Tinbergen and Lorenz) will know the right time and place to do an experiment to strengthen confidence in results AFTER amassing a clear large body or shown-excellent observations. Too bad so many in Psychology are such "chumps".

Specifically, what the Nobel people said about the work of Tinbergen and Lorenz : Quoting LAWRENCE K. ALTMAN in the Nobel Committee's selection group in 1973: "The Nobel Committee's Physiology or Medicine Prize has rewarded three zoologists for teaching man what could be learned from simple observation ..."

I.E. Largely from observation, NOT meddled with and this involves high quality (well-based) observations and inductive reasoning (with very high inter-observer agreement and these can often be MUCH more reliable than the findings of experiments).

Also, interesting to note: Tinbergen and Lorenz often had one behavior pattern as a proximate cause for certain behavior pattern(s) that followed. This is what needs to be re-learned and abided by or real ethology may be lost. (I.E. DEFINING BEHAVIOR PATTERNS IN TERMS OF OTHER BEHAVIOR PATTERNS -- ALL THESE RELEVANT PATTERNS __THERE__, IF YOU LOOK FOR THEM.)

WE HAVE TO LOOK FOR DIFFERENT key FOUNDATIONAL BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (e.g. during ontogeny) :

Paraphrasing Lorenz (from some text): "This means that to predict behavior in natural conditions it is necessary to know what the animal's innate perceptual and behavioral instructions are (as in Uexküll). In the same spirit, he claimed that without the notion of innate blueprint it would be impossible to study learning (Lorenz, 1965; Lorenz in Schaffner, 1955, p. 144). His argument is that stimulus association needs a releaser to which a conditional stimulus can be associated, and that random response variation alone is improbable because learning almost always results in adaptedness." Such true ethologists would thus very much like the outline of the system (theory) which I present through major References to the "Human Ethology and Development (Ethogram Theory) : A Full-Fledged Paradigm for PSYCHOLOGY " Project.

[This elaboration may have been even better to make in other threads; but, in the other threads I am thinking of, I have a link to this thread, anyway.]

How can a computational framework be developed for "embodied" phenomena & related concepts when we cannot find, replicate or validate such "things"?

How can a computational framework/model be developed for "embodied" phenomena & related concepts when we cannot find, replicate or validate such "embodied" "things" (or, really, that they even exist)?

Dear

It is not too much to ask that you present "the answer" as your answer (from your own self-assessed and affirmed understandings, and in your own words, which may make it (thus) something that may be arguable).

If you just want a "link's war", let me submit: link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13423-015-0860-1

Dear

I have found, especially in Psychology, "complex" really means "confused or confusing", poor understanding (and just providing such). Given the primitive state Psychology is in, that is so very LIKELY.

And, at least (showing some personal responsibility and some clear understanding of your own): you could tell me HOW your "embodied" 'stuff' is reliably seen (replicated/verified) AND (if it is worth going further): how do we not only see that "it" is maybe "something" but also related to other important things?

Dear

I believe there is nothing clearly known in/about "embodied" cognition: what "things" they refer to cannot be understood, well-replicated, or related to what they are supposed to be related to NOR clearly (demonstrably, reliably and persuasively) related to any KEY clear observable overt behavior patterns.

I am NOTHING BUT a strict empiricist, demanding clear directly observable phenomenon (behavior patterns, in Psychology) to found or ground ALL concepts in any conceptualization or model. Every "thing" declared as some "thing" or involving this some "thing" MUST have its basis (inception/foundation/grounding/ or clear "start") CLEARLY related to key directly observable overt phenomenon -- such KEY observations being replicable (the KEY observables showing high inter-observer reliabilities). I do not know what you are talking about. But, to you, I may seem like a new empirical philosopher (though I never think of myself as a philosopher, because of all the damage philosophy has done; moreover, I never conjure things in my mind (armchair-wise) without clear (and replicable) KEY reference to aspects of observable phenomenology (and with corresponding clear aspects of circumstance related to the behavior pattern)).

I have recently read a lot of philosophy and it has done NOTHING for me recently OR ever BECAUSE my strict empirical perspective and approach may well work, and it has associated near-clear hypotheses being testable (verifiable/falsifiable). That is all better than any philosophy (even existing philosophies of science).

If you must consider me a philosopher, use the most effective definition philosophers (actually, themselves) use: their thought system is better than all other pertinent, applicable thought systems; then, in that way (BUT in no way I would declare), I could be considered a philosopher. With regard to all I study, all other claimed-related philosophy IS JUNK. So, please desist from talking in terms of that senseless mumbo-jumbo.

And, we can in no way scientifically understand ourselves or others without "outside" real systematic and ever bit-by-bit well-founded (as indicated).

Still, there is likely NOTHING important that has not been "conscious" -- ask working memory people. I believe, "what is present before consciousness" is nothing important; anything important in behavioral science is not only as processed in KEY ways and, at key points, is not only conscious but things we are aware of.

In short, in effect (and in terms of meaningfulness): "become conscious of the very consciousness it is studying" would be no "biggie" because ALL --at least ALL at some key times -- is related to aspects of circumstances/situations [then] at hand and related directly observable OVERT (concrete) behavior patterns -- that is the foundation or grounding of ALL that is important and is overt at least at the inception of a behavior pattern.

Dear

You may have to read most of my 1000 pages of writings (all here available on RG), so you will be able to see that I am a reductionist in no sense. (<-- this is just what you think because you have not read me).

About your statement "an empirical description of the human visual system will always be confounded by a sensation versus consciousness paradox": Hey, a behavioral scientist wanting to understand behavior PATTERNS and the patterning of those patterns (and so on) does not need to know how vision works, but must just catch consciousness and awareness (with working memory) doing key learning overtly in the world (especially as the qualitative nature of learning itself can shift behavior patterns and change and provide us with abstraction abilities and new ways to think and problem-solve -- this all mainly occurring during ontogeny).

About your statement "If we were to become conscious of each particular moment of sense we could not function (live) in the world but would be apart from it like some sort of machine. Thus we do not 'behave' nor do we HAVE 'behavior patterns' ". --> Well, the good news is that we do not have to (nor do we) "become conscious of each particular moment"; things get automatized, more formally said: through procedural learning. Plus, moreover, one need to be conscious of aspects of the environment only when that is important, to you or to the organism -- the latter which can point your perception and consciousness at key times/points. The bases of all this will show itself in behavior patterns, ETC.

Why do you say "Thus we do not 'behave' nor do we HAVE 'behavior patterns'." "Thus ..." I cannot understand, but can guarantee a non sequitur occurred. You are basically forfeiting the idea that we can understand

behavior from behavior -- which is not only terrible biologically unlikely (behavior must be and is an aspect of Biology, and show such organization unto itself) but also forfeits the idea of understanding by doing the only type of thing we can do to well understand the behavioral system: careful systematic observation (esp. during ontogeny).

Good luck finding good observational evidence that "consciousness and our senses are the multiple, simultaneous pathways of dialog between consciousness and the world." What a mess and in a moment I will indicate why it is needless (and also won't happen). You can't and don't and won't figure out all those things and YOU, either as a Subject or as a Researcher, never need too ; so, the good news is you need not separate things like this and understand components and their nature individually; fortunately it ALL clearly (and clearly for the organism) comes together as clearly important and all-together (holistically) meaningful (at least at key times) in behavior patterns with consciousness and awareness at those key points.

Since you seem to be some sort of philosopher (with a lot of old-time attitudes and outlooks) you should read me to have an altogether better view of the reality of the human -- I.E. how he responds in species-typical manner to circumstances. I really see a problem when one bounces between thinking on "viewpoint" is correct, BUT THEN ANOTHER. I have a full view and its all internally consistent and it involves a perspective that can at all times work. Generally, even at its best, philosophy is not a decent substitute for just a decent perspective on behavior patterns, representing some real core of the nature of a decent study of behavior -- this certainly Psychology should have provided, even to the layman, BUT IT UP TO NOW HAS FAILED, itself and all others My writings are the cure for this "disease".

Dear

For an excellent, high-quality, critical (in the bad way), published and esteemed peer review: link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13423-015-0860-1

The idea of embodied cognition is a simple analogy with Piaget's sensori-motor Period; but, unlike that, it has no decent empirical basis. It is really due having no choice when you have "boxed yourself in" for nothing but poorly founded beliefs (i.e. for no good reasons). The unsupportable stance Psychology takes with pseudo-assumptions, like "all that is innate is present at birth or in infancy", and other ridiculous beliefs is incredible once you see and understand them (a number of additional likely-false beliefs are noted in my writings).

If you can read 1000 pages, I provide a full new strict empirical Psychology, in line with real biological principles. Go to my Profile and find the whole set of essays.

ResearchGate's Emphasis (to the point of clear bias) for Experimentation is a Disgrace to Science

<-- Really, and it was nothing like that when I first joined RG. If only Galileo was alive today, that (the title of this post) is what he would say. RG is about 500 years behind-the-times.

Just as there is a clear time for hypothetico-deductive reasoning (where premises, themselves, have some clear certainty (FROM a body of good, related observations)), there is a place/time for EXPERIMENTATION -- and that NEVER should be "just when you want to do it" and have your "crap shoot". Tinbergen and Lorenz taught us the position you should be in, with a wealth of reliable, related observations, BEFORE an experiment is properly contextualized and then should be done (if rightly possible). It is arguable that in MOST areas of the social sciences, this condition does not hold (this is why I cannot only poignantly cite Tinbergen et al, but can clearly cite Galileo, a real scientist). If you cannot see a topic as having a body of observations that clearly near-fully contextualize a particular clear topic (and questions) AND where you can reasonably manipulate a certain situation and set of circumstances (environmental aspects) THEN you absolutely are not ready for experimentation. Relatedly (and indicating how pitiful and pathetic Psychology is) : ALL terms and concepts in a model MUST BE clearly related to some directly observable overt phenomenon (in Psychology: behavior patterns) OR you have disconnected from a level of empiricism by which what you are doing can be considered a science ! This position cannot be argued against in any scientific way (be mindful the the directly-observable overt phenomenon need not be present; it just has to be very arguable and clear that the foundation/grounding/"start"/or inception of a given behavior pattern(s) must be such clearly related to some directly observable overt phenomenon).

Maybe if you feel hopeless about this: you need a new paradigm (finally, a paradigm for the pre-paradigmatic) and a new theory that will get you to "places" you belong. I offer all that AND clear rewards for taking it on.

You all may have some "Siri" or other device you talk to. I have a Galilean thermometer that I can not only easily read from afar, but that also gives one a qualitative idea of how hot or cold it is. [(I have realized that, for comfortable sleeping, I prefer one ball at the bottom and not two -- and I can see what the case is from several yards away. (I imagine, though, you can just ask Siri -- and, at the time, give away who-knows-how-much personal information.)]

At this point I will wait for a sign that you can "handle" it. I have provided sufficient guidance to the 1000 pages of essays, doing all I can

At this point I will wait for a sign that you can "handle" it. I have provided sufficient guidance to the 1000 pages of essays, doing all can. You may put questions here (under this Discussion), and IFF I feel there some clear indication that you have tried as you should and as you might, I might try (or try again) to provide guidance. BUT, at the very least: FINISH EVERYTHING FIRST. Lastly, for now: the key essential HINTS:

(1) DEFINE NOTHING FOR YOURSELF and LET NO ONE ELSE/ NOTHING ELSE DEFINE ANYTHING FOR YOU (with the "exception", noted next). In short, INSTEAD, COMPLETELY:

Count on the SUBJECT MATTER (JUST count ON all observations OR QUITE POSSIBLE OBSERVATIONS) for ALL PERSPECTIVE, ETC. AND FOR any further perspective or understandings needed, at this point, and for _____ALL_____ fundamental understandings -- including FOR THE DEFINITIONS OF EVERYTHING: terms, perspective, concept-terms or ANY hint of a "model".

(2) Be VERY OPEN MINDED: JUST look to observations AND possible observations to "see" (you can only imagine that there will be patterns therein -- and I indicate the most likely). And count on NOTHING ELSE (anything and everything else you need should follow from that). ACCEPT EVERYTHING POSSIBLE AND/OR INDEED-POSSIBLE FROM THAT REALM, aka from Reality (sequential .phenomenology).

The Method noted under my Profile (and under Research) will not hurt and may help.

Anxious to get "the ball rolling", I offer possible fame if one be my editor and fortune if one defeats me

Anxious to get "the ball rolling", I offer possible fame if one be my editor and fortune if one defeats me. (So one way or another: a studious one should not lose.) The details can be found via this link to a Discussion .

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Editor_Co-author_of_my_Collected_Essays_on_behavioral_science_Needed_its_on_ethology_ontogeny_developmental_psychology_and_general_psychology ,

and my "Answer" posts under the Question,

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

In 1000 pages of essays , I provide a clear outline, and almost a road map, for the perspective and approach (all justified, explained, explicated and compared to what is done presently, and with the necessary alternatives) needed for discovery of KEY behavior patterns, central and basic to (the foundation of) all the best understandings of "behavior". Through the direct observation of overt phenomena (behavior patterns), we CAN see all the KEY overt patterns (and the patterning of patterns, etc.) needed to understand behavior as well as I believe we can. In a "nutshell" : This is ALL done through disciplined, coordinated, direct observation of overt behavior patterns.

I have found a "cure" for a pervasively "sick" Psychology (ineffectual, stuck, non-progressing and, presently, with NO hope of getting out of this "slew of despond") . In other words, I do believe I have found a major "cure" for a serious "disease" that now completely and overwhelming pervades Psychology (the field was similarly "possessed" throughout its whole history -- we are essentially not worse and maybe a bit better, but for sure not better by much and any improvements do not yet matter much if at all for the overall "picture" (I'd say: not better at all, unless we keep learning something good from the series of grave mistakes -- which I can't see; the learning will come only with a new thorough and strictly empirical perspective and that's what I provide)).

**** And, I have put my money where my mouth is (see the post to which this is a Comment). ****

All you need is to be free, from being put it or having to be in a "box", and then have the freedom of thought to fully re-assess and come to a perspective and approach to discover the correct (much closer to actual) basics and bases of all major behavior patterns of interest. It is ONLY SUCH A FREE PERSON THAT CAN SAVE PSYCHOLOGY. My try is good, and thorough, and detailed (to the point of testable hypotheses). Psychology can be the science of behavior PER SE, and being so, be a science onto itself (and every bit as strictly empirical as any of the recognized good sciences).

General Psychology and Developmental Psychology and Psychology , more generally, DO NOT KNOW WHAT A GOOD THEORY IS OR LOOKS LIKE. Let me help.

General Psychology and Developmental Psychology and Psychology , more generally, DO NOT KNOW WHAT A GOOD THEORY IS OR LOOKS LIKE. Let me help.

There may be something or somethings wrong with my theory BUT IT IS A COMPLETE THEORY. You may not "agree with it" (or whatever), BUT the ways __TO__ all needed definitions for understanding cognitive-developmental psychology (ontogeny) are there; and, the basic assumptions all out in the open (nothing implicit); AND it shows the good sense to realize that behavior patterns are an aspect of BIOLOGICAL functioning and attempts to well-show that behavior PATTERNS PER SE can be FOUND __AND__ THOSE behavior patterns alone can be a full science. It indicates how ALL CONCEPTS related to the theory have clear corresponding behavior PATTERNS founded/grounded/ or having a clear KEY start or inception. ALL the necessary KEY behavior patterns (ALL of them begin overt and directly observable) at least at key times/points, and, at least in major ways showing their "start" or inception -- and still obviously a continuing influence on subsequent patterns.

This theory is superior to intuitive inter-disciplinary hodgepodge approaches OR inappropriate, unjustified INSERTIONS (basically based on intuition (again)), just where it seems its needed to further justify some poorly grounded/founded body of concepts. ALL this is really not deserving, or justified, to be called theory. And, FORGET THE BRAIN. "The brain" needs many additional important behavior PATTERNS to match with brain activity (to match with any decent resolution).

My theory is completely grounded/well-founded with concepts based on well-defined behavior PATTERNS (as indicated) and continuing observations made so that clear, explicit testable hypotheses can be generated (and some central ones are) AND TESTED (being, verifiable/falsifiable). The standard of empiricism is like in all good sciences: Everything is to be found and seen to have at least a clear KEY basis (bases) IN DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS. AND, for instruction and guidance: The theory is compared and contrasted with existing "theories"; likewise ALL major prevalent falsely-defined concepts are seen for what they are and, if there are any worthwhile at all, put in in better terms (terms of this theory: and, at least directing the discovery of the better concepts).

Psychology, being pre-paradigmatic, OFFERS students (and professors) of behavioral science with NO actual, good exposure TO ANY DECENT THEORY; BUT here with my writings, you find AN ACTUAL EXPOSURE TO WHAT _IS_ AT LEAST A NEAR-FULL SCIENCE ____THEORY____ (and, perhaps indeed, sufficiently complete, for any gaps to be filled-in in the natural course of bringing it "to life": in the course of the sort of study and discoveries it directs you to).

If you want to have your own or another foundational theory for Psychology, you will have to "match it up" with ALL the aspects this THEORY (a real theory) shows BECAUSE A GOOD THEORY ____HAS____ ALL THESE ASPECTS. At worst, you may see it as very good (internally and externally consistent) "science fiction" -- I dare not underestimate how hard it will be to reject the poorly founded biased views and pseudo-assumptions you have (or have had) to adopt for YEARS (and nothing in Western philosophy help (in fact, you must forget about any and all airchair "stuff")).

If a Psychologist or Psychology student is too lazy to look into this, then they are NO SORT of scientist, nor ever will be !

I am sorry you likely do not have the time, freedom , or persistence and basic understandings, and key abidances to do something like this theory yourself. I do not consider myself smarter than you.

P.S. Let me know if I missed something in this characterization of my own theory. I can tell you that inspirations from Piaget and classical ethology WERE, AND HAVE NEVER BEEN, forgotten BY ME (but they have, for no decent reasons, been forgotten by all prevalent modern Psychology [(by the way : "they" defeated NEITHER OF THESE GREAT OUTLOOKS AND NEVER JUSTIFIED THEIR OMISSION OR IGNORANCE; with regard to at least one of these 2 genuinely GREAT perspectives and approaches, modern Psychology is now IGNORANT OF its MEANING)]).

Another P.S.: Another curiosity, showing the SICKNESS of Psychology: Though the only Nobel Prize (or at least the only one in the last 50 yr) granted to BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST, those being classical ethologists, pure behavioral scientists (behavior PATTERNS were EVERYTHING), YET, though I was a Psych. major in 1973 (the year of the Award), NO MENTION WAS EVER MADE THAT BEHAVIORAL SCIENTISTS RECEIVED THIS AWARD in any of my classes; I am quite sure that it is at least, then to today, never (or extremely rarely) ever mentioned. WHAT, THAT WOULD MAKE GOOD OR DECENT SENSE, COULD ACCOUNT FOR THIS ?? : N O T H I N G ,__ but SICKNESS. Remember THIS and TRY TO THINK OF REAL (organism-defined) behavior PATTERNS and see how bogus it is what you come up with. THERE IS NO RATIONAL EXCUSE FOR THIS; Psychology need not be in a unique category, but it is, and what IT is IS: CLEARLY JUST A DISGRACEFUL GAME (a mere game, with MANY, even MOST, rules being arbitrary).

Addressing some common and serious short-comings in research (and ESSAYS) on Abstract Concepts ...

Addressing some common and serious short-comings in research (and ESSAYS) on Abstract Concepts (I am posting this generically and not in-response to any particular Article, simply to not BE CENSORED by RG):

This is regarding: Outlooks and guidance for research for "finding" the what (and the where, the when, the why, and the how) OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF ABSTRACT CONCEPTS:

What is found in major essays (supposed summarizing some research, though much of it appears to be poorly empirically founded -- to say the least -- and some is not generally agreeable either): IT IS A MESS : an-un-clear and incogent mass of summarized material -- and where related specific papers would not have a chance in hell of clarifying "things". Clearly THE view (given the hidden biases and pseudo-assumptions -- which, to "them" are assumptions) gives the kind of "results" it must. What they typically have yielded is a perspective TOO MUCH (more than makes sense) on the sensori-motor/embodied; AND, it also makes WAY TOO MUCH emphasis on language. Embodied "theorizing" is also there. Vague "brain patterns" are somehow seen as supportive.

Embodied theories are un-empirical (poorly founded/grounded notions -- indeed, just notions or simple mere beliefs) and grossly lack testability. With that, and then their extreme emphasis on language, it makes the TRUE DRIVING REASON OF MEANING almost not considered in accounting for the development of abstract concepts (and processing)

I present a more empirical, cogent, coherent, and testable view in my 1000 pages of essays, available on researchgate. The efficiency, yet sufficiency, of my perspective and approach MAKE IT THE ONLY COGNITIVE-DEVELOPMENTAL system amenable FOR true artificial intelligence (general artificial intelligence, aka AGI). This should tell the Psychologists something.

In my system all concepts are clear and empirical (with KEY, associated, directly observable overt references (behavior patterns) for each and every one (each and every concept)) -- this leading to good testable (verifiable/falsifiable) TRUE HYPOTHESES. Empirical, cogent, internally and externally consistent, AND MEANINGFUL (and also honoring the strongest findings and results in all Psychology: what we know about the Memories).

What many prevalent Psychology papers remind me of is the common characteristics of TV programs on aliens: "so-and-so suggest ..." , "so-and-so's say ..." and the like. And then THEY cite, over and over, the ONE same thing that supposedly most "helps" (language), BUT yet appears to "help" IN MOST ALL WAYS , thus [(it is

indicated)] really DETERMINES (in their view) most all concept development AND with essentially nothing else clearly noted (at least past infancy) -- which makes it clear that they think this "helper" (language) is a primary and proximate cause. Ridiculous and inadequate.

[ALSO: People do not do statistics; meaningfulness takes care of the role required here. THAT is also often there in such papers.]

It IS possible to RIGHTLY AND PROPERLY put much stock in the Memories, the way they are: IMPORTANTLY: both of small effects in the moment (any given moment),

BUT in other regards (think here: the long-term Memories providing MUCH CONTEXT and guidance to cues) GREATLY "EXPANSIVE", providing individual awareness-es OF linkages across situations/circumstances and across times. All, the small and the large aspects are constantly MEANINGFUL to the organism to develop and to work. Meaningfulness is the key to retention and retrieval.

I also am a neo-Piagetian stage theorist, but have finished Piaget's theory by providing clear and empirical bases for EQUILIBRATION TYPE 2 -- the "balance" between the stages. To say what I have done another way: I have provided the when (set-ups), the how, with the Memories -- those, by definition, providing EXPERIENCE (personal phenomenology, ITSELF); and I make clear the adaptive WHY for qualitative changes in concepts and in associated processing. The conceptual structure is testable because all grounding/founding/clear "starts" (inceptions) of the qualitative shifts are not only clear to understand (imagine) (and major ones as basic "perceptual shifts" of a species-typical or species-specific nature), providing us with TESTABLE with GOOD TRUE HYPOTHESES stemming from all that.

MY 1000-pages of all-related writings are available on Researchgate. (This is the sort of "comment" that, if put UNDER a particular Article, WILL BE CENSORED. Do you see that as right?)

(For an example of a summary paper, outlining a slew of such Articles, see Eiling Yee's introductory Article introducing several similar papers, by different authors: Article: "Abstraction and concepts: when, how, where, what, and why?", here on RG.)

Basic Psychology Research Preparation: Isn't the time/space(place) to look for specifics when one knows the time/space they are in

Basic Psychology Research Preparation: Isn't the time/space(place) to look for specifics __ when one knows the time/space they are in? It is proper contextualization (with a correct process and order of exploration/DISCOVERY) that gives one the proper contexts. OTHERWISE: Disparate elements very well may not "put themselves together" (nor will they clearly or decisively indicate their own important fuller context(s) , and guessing will likely not work ; all this is very clear to me; I hope it is clear for you). Think about it; do you really only want to be finding "pieces of the elephant"?? (It surely is incorrect to not have fully considered the possibilities (actually, probabilities), just indicated: in fact, without proper contextualization what you do either verges on superstition, OR IS, superstition (NO MATTER HOW CAREFULLY and seemingly "systematically" YOU DO THINGS (it's just too much mechanically, after your presumptions)). YET SUCH superstitions is what your presumptions and poorly-founded/poorly-grounded "assumptions" and general perspectives now give you -- and that is not a good base from which to operate, unless you work for Descartes and cannot make a living without working for him and would starve if you didn't -- but then science would not be the cause, would it?).)

As I have said before, right now (at this time; at present), you certainly, in no agreeable or reliable or valid way, recognize behavior PATTERNS (and this is easy to see: because you think "divinely" in terms of "behaviors"[/ "stimuli"] and the word 'PATTERN' either does not appear (which is by far the usual case) or that word does not have the needed meaning, agreeability or certainty of definitions) -- which IS NOT OK.

My work (as was Piaget's hope) provides a likely major outer "container" (context) -- and YET this 'broad-strokes' "thing", my theory, perspective, and approach, connects with you (in/at the kind of place YOU DO YOUR STUDIES, the "lab") and does so with concrete well-defined, specific testable hypotheses (with all terms strictly empirically grounded, AS IN ALL REAL SCIENCE).

You need to be able to face this; if still need be: challenge yourselves if you need to "see" this. For the organism, in reality: the actually used/meaningful/full involved "environment" IS NOT RIGHT BEFORE YOU (i.e. "before your eyes", as you just happen to look); AND what you DO look at is NOT READY TO BE EXPLORED successfully based merely and crudely on INTUITION and/or a priori models to supposedly find clear connections and systems (somehow fitting the your a priori models).

A couple most-recent posts where "disallowed" under Questions (or under Answers); these have been moved to Projects

I moved "Who (which) of you academics ...?" TO under the "Human Ethogram ... " Project and I moved "Let me make this simple : No real ontogeny; no behavior PATTERNS, but what you set up & "define". Are You Kidding Me? Are You for- real? " under the "Prescription for Psychology ..." Project . These Projects are at <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY> and <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Prescription-for-Psychology-to-be-IN-FULL-a-coherent-cohesive-and-continuously-Progressing-Science-clearly-and-empirically-well-founded> and , RESPECTIVELY.

In both cases, look under the Project Logs of these 'corresponding' Projects for "Updates" to see those writings. (Frankly: ResearchGate appears to be rather frequently restricting me, in ways that are hard to understand; and, associated with that, they have now, more than once, threatened possible termination. Expect MUCH, MUCH LESS FROM ME.) The following policy RG quotes to me seems to limit some kinds of posts, which (certainly, as enforced) disallow certain types of science writings (some science writing of recognized and esteemed types): (Quoting a piece of RG Policy):

" Q&A is a place where focused and relevant questions and answers are exchanged in a research-focused environment. As you can see in our Terms of Service (Section 4), we ask members not to post broad, vague or non-scientific content. As such, we have removed the content identified below. ..." (end quote) It appears RG sees itself as a sort of research-refining operation (no big changes should or can be put forward).

P.S. At the same time: All sorts of nonsense, we all have seen, they care nothing about.

Psychology: Do we really need essentially another faculty to understand thinking about thinking?

This question is for Psychology: Wouldn't this also mean a faculty for remembering about remembering (seeing about seeing, and who knows what else)?? Couldn't we just have our basic memory processes see and discriminate objects ETC and actions and build images and ideas and plans?; wouldn't THAT be parsimonious way to think (and why would anyone believe anything else)? Obviously, I am talking about "metacognition". [If this question is seen as "unworthy", and goes unexplained, we really are in a Trumpian world.]

To me, there are rather arbitrary rules for those who play games, and it is precisely that which Psychology does. This plague has spread and is spreading : HOW WILL IT BE STOPPED? [(My answer: demanding strict empirical (directly observable) GROUNDING for ALL CONCEPTS -- it cannot be denied that such strict definitions are possible.)) Maybe A BETTER QUESTION WE SHOULD ASK, to quell all this: What is really the nature of all (any, each and all) "EXECUTIVE CONTROL"? -- I will not over-dignify this question by putting the plural "s" on CONTROL.

("Embodied cognition" IS ANOTHER ENTIRE "FIELD" OF SUCH SCIENTIFICALLY DOOMED "stuff" -- all making sure

Psychology does not even approach a SCIENCE -- which many in Western civilization would accept (e.g. see: topic: "natural science" vs. "social science").)

OK, fine. But if we do this the way they are presently doing ABSOLUTELY MINIMAL PROGRESS WILL BE MADE (it is on the level of actuarial 'science' -- you know, like for insurance). And, Psychology will have to be taken off the list of sciences. (One might ask: How is Psychology [supposedly] better than "actuarial science"?)

Dear

This does not really indicate or explain the need for the concept metacognition. I find your response similar to : "I like it, because I really like it" (and that seems to be the "way it is" -- that "SEEMS" is what gets many hooked into what I say are unsupported "meta" notions). Plus: your answer provides no clue whatsoever for an empirical basis for the concept (the strict empiricism I indicated in the Question above). AND ALSO, I say: we don't need this concept for any implications you may be referring to. I say: we can and regularly do "transcend" our own minds and do so routinely as a consequence of abstraction capabilities developed (unfolding) during ontogeny (child development). So the question really is: HOW (with what faculties (preferably already-KNOWN faculties)) does such "transcendence of ourselves" occur?; AND, this clearly seems to me NOT be BE or require any separate, "special" (or even taught) ability (or anything requiring any distinctly separate set of capabilities or faculties), but, rather, would result from the way the Memories develop with ontogeny (and with typical experience, of course). (Our own thinking is just one of the matters we think about "at arms length" (abstractly).)

Reasons OTHERWISE (other than mine, indicated above) for "metacognition" must be provided for assertions you make; since I have parsimony on my side -- and thus you must have more.

Dear Readers

Ethogram Theory (my perspective and approach) explains all 'they' explain and IS much more parsimonious than these other perspectives (and yet there are no reasons to believe my outlook is in any way invalid). AND Ethogram Theory covers a lot more (that needs to be explained). At the same time, it disintegrates any nature/nurture conflict (dualism)(as well as several other irrational ill-founded dualisms) -- something any new, good theory MUST. Plus, concrete most-empirical testable hypotheses are associated with this theory. I rest my case.

For Psychology (& other aspiring sciences & for many/all sciences): Isn't it better to speak & write in terms of "conditions-for" instead of 'causes'?

For Psychology (and other aspiring sciences and for even for good established sciences): Isn't it better to speak and write in terms of "conditions-for" instead of 'causes'?

My answer: Yes. Yes. Yes. Most usually. (Most certainty for a Biological science, like Psychology; HERE I am talking about a science of behavior patterns PER SE (i.e. "just behaviors"). (What is closest to a 'cause' is what ethologists call: proximate causes.))

For some certain persons: If you do not like negative feedback, do not read below the line, directly below.

This present Question is especially for some certain individuals (who I read): The above Question is something useful to think about OTHER THAN philosophy and especially philosophical Questions about "Consciousness" and "philosophy-and-science". Those Questions are useless, senseless, ridiculous Questions that most certainly will lead nowhere (certainly nowhere useful). Consider my present Question instead, for "therapy".

Dear

I do not really even know what you are talking about. I cover explaining ALL cognitive behavior (observable and non-[presently]observable) behavior PATTERNS -- significant aspects of ALL OF THAT. (You obviously have not read ME.)

About the science of behavior PATTERNS (and patterning, etc.): It is more than possible that there can be a science of THAT PER SE (and it is arguable that THERE MUST BE). (The inter-disciplinary crap relies at key times on intuition AND THAT IS UNACCEPTABLE. [Damn it: please give informed replies (RG can be Sooo bad)].)

[I never ever liked Skinner and my college education was in the early seventies; in fact I never did anything but fight against that non-sense. I never even respected him (that English major turned demagogue) . If ANY intuition (e.g. for definitions of "rewards" and aspects of the environment, i.e. "rewards", etc.) is INVOLVED, THEN THAT IS BAD. Do you know what an ethologist is? Between 1980 and 1995 educated people in behavior science did. NOW THEY HAVE FORGOTTEN THIS AND HAVE ALSO (FATALLY) FORGOTTEN ONTOGENY -- ridiculous and absolutely unacceptable ! (Ethologists do not define the PATTERNS; the Subject defines ALL.)]

(P.S. Have you noticed that, even today, "theorists" and researchers define "rewards" and "[aspects of] the environment" and sometimes use the term "reward", etc. GENERALLY as if doing so IS MEANINGFULLY A THING (non-contextualized), just by conforming to a pattern? This is analogous to saying all logic is sound because it is logic. (<-- These are the people most like Skinner.) THAT is how idiotic Psychology, my lifetime field, is today; they cannot even consider, much less answer, the major important questions (e.g. see: nature "vs" nurture); it is DISGUSTING and they have been moving towards nothing good at all for 40+ years. AND THEY BASELESSLY PRESUME (along with intuit MUCH MORE -- stuff damned to complete failure and nonsense which is not

science). I am not trying to win these people over as much as to defeat them and the systemic problem of college education more generally.)

Dear

The word 'cause' is useful in many situations, but not so much in a biological science, like Psychology, or in other biological sciences (like Biology) **. Also, there is a bit of over-contentment with the word kind of generally. Still, I take your point. (Maybe, I have at least shown, and admitted, I am not always completely right; that's ok.)

** FOOTNOTE: It is better to think in terms of "conditions-for", where there are processes NOT very well understood. Biology fields, including Psychology, are where there are typically more things (including important stuff and related stuff) YET to discover; here, there are processes of a biological nature. Something to bolster this position is: There are no "mechanisms" really known in Psychology (and one should definitely not get carried away by/with any idea of "mechanisms", here OR in biological fields). [(Someone I once interacted with said he does not believe in mechanisms, strictly, except for things like clocks. There, in a very general context, I agreed.)] Relatedly: this puts "models" (in biological sciences) in the proper perspective. And, that's important: This also (at the same time) really puts all hypothetico-deductive systems of thinking in their proper perspective (such systems involve things (aka premises) of supposed great certainty, which do NOT come up clearly or centrally, or in necessarily truly significantly ways, in Psychology, but yet come up WAY MORE OFTEN in Psychology writings, many times out of desperation). I often say such thinking should be used only when one is forced to -- this leaves observations central and in their proper role, AND this attitude is a safeguard of a good empirical approach. Here (in this footnote), I may provide things to think about. Karl, yet, I still take your point about "pragmatic or interest-relative".

Dear

What a great answer you provide, especially with the quite clear and interesting example! There is one thing I need to clarify:

When I write/speak of 'conditions-of' my concept is basically "condition-of/for" what is then seen in direct observations (<-- the best and ultimate grounding of everything).

I fully agree with you when you say "I see no way, as long as the only "model" or "method" is natural language, kind of philosophical belief "system" (grossly misusing the word system)." I try to say essentially that very same thing. BUT: Psychology is replete with belief systems, resulting in poorly-arrived-at "assumptions" (actually pseudo-assumptions, presumptions, or just plain run-of-the-mill beliefs, nearly of the status of superstitions). I have taken on a number of such "systems" in my essays (writings), all available here on RG. I have proposed a

solution (a general solution) by offering a paradigm (I would say "new paradigm", but Psychology, as my friend Orlando has indicated, is pre-paradigmatic (or in a non-scientific stage)).

Dear

I agree with my friend, Orlando M Lourenço , that Psychology is pre-paradigmatic (or in a non-scientific stage) . What is contrasted is simple, limited, unjustified crude belief sets (based on pseudo-assumptions and presumptions that are much more comparable to superstitions, than to good, REAL assumptions). It is these which are in some conflict (ALL DAMNED BORING). So, it is NOT "many incompatible paradigms" involved.

My Main Project offers (really for the first time in history) a paradigm FOR PSYCHOLOGY [(which totally, thoroughly, relies on a better and strict empiricism ALWAYS (for each and every concept or construct) -- and which would finally give Psychology a science.)]

I read and reviewed Davood Gozli's Experimental Psychology and Human Agency, (2019). See <https://dgozli.com/> and October 2019

You say "... to start a new discussion here on RG focussed on installing a (new) paradigm in psychology... ". I HAVE BEEN DISCUSSING NOTHING BUT THAT FOR *** FOUR YEARS ** (nobody listens/reads well or they are too lazy to look into it; they appear content with their already "complex" theories (actually the "theories" are confused and confusing because they are nearly baseless)). If you can read 1000 pages of my essays, all HERE on RG, YOU can find out.

Dear

Part of the reason I push my system hard is that "it works" in many senses, one BIG one being that it allows for actual direct observational grounding FOR ALL CONCEPTS, ETC. __AND__ it allows a fit with a definition of SCIENCE-IN-GENERAL. NO other existing system works in these ways.

Part of my motivation starting in 1985 was to not only find a way to merge theories, but with the greatest empirical concerns INCLUDING YIELDING TESTABLE HYPOTHESES.. I accomplish BOTH these goals : it (a system like mine) is what IS REQUIRED to accomplish these goals. Of course, these features are indicative of a good, real science.

P.S. It was Orlando M Lourenço who first stated what I stated about preparadigmatic . I readily agreed and adopted this view; HE was the first to bring up this term.

(Paul: Seems like you are looking for a way to stay with the status quo, which from my perspective is insane -- like so many other psychologists OVER several YEARS : psychologists are babies, matching their field which is in its infancy even after 130 years (I have an essay on this "infancy" outlook, explaining it, just as I reinterpret or

explain so many things (a big one being: abstraction (abstract thought)).)

Dear

I greatly liked your post and, I think, I could agree with your positions. Yet (as you also indicate) Psychology is a special case. I have argued it not only is, but will remain so when Psychology is a science. This is because inter-related PROCESSES (behavior patterns and patterns of patterns) are involved. Biological things like that are rarely fully defined and the inter-relationships (between behavior patterns) would show up more-and-more, as a matter of course. No absolute cause to pinpoint.

Thank you again for your marvelous, insightful reply.

Dear

You say : " I am not interested in any particular sort of purely experimental or empirical psychology ". I cannot agree with the "empirical" part; ALL must be strictly empirically grounded/founded (e.g. at its inception) for an endeavor to be considered a science at all. You are basically saying: I do not care if Psychology is a science.** I just think you have not been able to see it that way (but let me not "trouble you" about this -- I have seen such a response many times). Let me add:

THERE ARE NO SHORTCOMINGS IF YOU DO THINGS CORRECTLY (e.g. define NOTHING yourself, but let the Subject define all -- a good outlook in a biological field).

P.S. Re: "Methodological behaviorist": The philosophy instructor I paid to help me edit "A Human Ethogram ..." back in 1984 or so, described my work that way and I liked it, so I used it.

** FOOTNOTE: You are, thusly, just as I characterized you.

Dear

One problem people have is they claim (basically) that philosophers have thought things out for them. REALLY ! Someday, we will realize (and be able to "peg" as fact) they all have biases that seriously taint their views OR they have an "ax/axe to grind". AND: This comes with just "believing them"; it is self-limiting, yet you may not know how (likely even more self-limiting than for any particular philosopher him/herself): that is because you think you can read something you totally agree with it and then use it for many or all purposes <-- such unwarranted generalization is a VERY common trait of those philosophers themselves. Such philosophy is no good. You will notice I NEVER cite any philosopher, showing myself as too learned to do so. I NEVER SAY :

"According to so-and-so". And, thus I may more freely have my OWN thoughts and do better (and more real) analyses.

What you say about sciences other than Psychology is kind of interesting.

Dear

Some things about "cause 'A'" : "A" could also be a cause of other things; other things could cause "A"; "A" could be a cause, as you say, but other things might (in reality) be involved and be important. Have I missed anything? ** As some or all of these may be true, it might be better to talk about "conditions-for/of". Also: It might be OK to say that "A" is A cause, as we understand it, but not good to say: THE cause. Thus, as you say, "... the notion of causality does not make much, if any, sense in the psychological domain".

Orlando, Thanks for not indicating over-certainty. That was helpful.

** FOOTNOTE: I did try to cover before, after, in-between and "other" (and these possibly at the same time as "A" and/or "B", as well as whenever else). Ask: are there clear distinct cases of "other"? (examples (just examples) here might be: "modulators", depressors (inhibitors), and augment -ers -- and these could be before, after, or in-between (between "A" and "B") (and these would be dependent on how well-defined and/OR fixed "B" is and similarly for "A" -- let's concentrate on well-defined (see my writings for how to arrive at good definitions)).)

Also, as interest-relative , I can also see room for the type of cause .Karl Pfeifer described

Dear

A truly clear (becoming more and more clear by itself (in a sense), by design) is exactly what I provide.

You ask: " I guess you want to be such a paradigm changer, don't you? ". Actually more than THAT (beyond what Kuhn described). My system too much replaces how Psychologists look at and approach things in research , so much so it would be a revolution -- something Psychology may well not be able to cope with; thus, I may have to be more of a replacer rather than any simpler kind of win-them-over-er (I may end up wanting to defeat them rather than enlist them). I have tried several types of incentives to move them and my writings provide clear counters to several of the poor conceptualizations and more, yet the poor conceptualizations are the centerpiece of some branches or variations of the field : it is who they ARE.

About " psychology without a clear theoretical framework " -- yes all of Psychology is exactly such. AND: Psychology is not a science because everything is not clearly and agreeably (reliably/validly) based and founded/grounded/or stemming from DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR [PATTERNS] <-- I can do just that and leave out NO BEHAVIOR [PATTERNS] regardless or whether the behavior [patterns] are overt or

become covert and then are covert (ANY AND ALL OF THEM, I PROMISE).

P.S. Yes, Biology and Ethology are sciences (unfortunately, Psychology never understood or appreciated the latter and abandoned it; they also very rarely nowadays consider ontogeny). No wonder psychology people of the status quo cannot "find time" to read me -- it's not just that; they are lazy unreasonably self-satisfied bone-heads (shunned by real science people at science conventions because of their gross inadequacies).

Dear

You say " To say that A is a cause of B does not entail A is the cause of B, although we may call it that if it is a salient cause of interest in a pragmatic context ". I KNOW that and THAT is exactly (in part) what I said. BUT I gave a much more detailed and full description of causalities in my last response to Orlando M Lourenço (a much clearer and fuller answer). For example, you say " When we speak more broadly of the causes (plural) of B, we presumably speak of a number of things each of which is a cause " . I describe various types of CASES of that.

Philosophy is such a disease, and in my writings I illustrate how and why. You always try to over-generalize the inadequate. In some regards you and your philosophy "stuff" remind me of Psychology OR rather I should say it the other way around: Psychology reminds me of your philosophies.

Dear

I stand on the shoulders of Darwin, the classical ethologists, and Piaget (AND with consideration of all major so-called personality theories, including Freud) AND I DO SO TRULY, PERSONALLY, AND THOROUGHLY.

What if I asked you : what greater thought-system you incorporate the views of your philosophers into ? (no answer here indicates no personal and true understanding).

Dear

If I was insulting you (if that is what it was, I'd call it rather: righteous frustration, with a touch of anger) it was for a VERY GOOD REASON. You have apparently no knowledge and/or appreciation for the ways of classical ethology. You make assertions which basically imply the ONE MUST adhere to your sort of model and associated understanding conjured by people. (I hate models.) I have indicated that THAT does not "mesh" at all with my outlook. To say a bit more about NOT defining (seemingly so very hard for Western man who likes to conjure intuitively, in his head -- which will NEVER TURN OUT TO WORK WELL) MEANS:

An ethologist ** looks for types of things and eventually for very specific types of things; if he finds THE actual behavior patterns, if they match his expectations, then they EXIST (only then) and in a weak sense IT (whatever pattern IT is) is defined; BUT rarely are things so-defined without refinement or elaborations necessary, PROVIDED BY THE ORGANISM; when THOSE/THAT are found, this contextualization is part of the "definition" (in quotes because, again, most Western people cannot understand this; certain Biologists can understand this ***). This turns out to be a damned good definition for proceeding with observational studies and from that ALL sorts of studies).

I am sorry and I am sorry I do not delete most of my Answers in response to your posts; I worked too hard on them and believe they are generally informative.

** FOOTNOTE: Two classical ethologists were, in 1973, given the Nobel Prize for their behavioral science work; this is the ONLY Nobel Prize ever given to behavioral scientists, or (at least) the only one given in the last 50+ years. The Prize was in "Physiology and Medicine" BECAUSE that is the closet category for behavior science.

*** FOOTNOTE: Heck, Psychologists do not even know OR ACT LIKE, or even congruently, with the FACT that behavior patterns (including ALL significant behavior, i.e. clear and necessary patterns (aka species-typical or species-specific)) ARE AN ASPECT OF BIOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING. Today, psychology is a game played by cult members.

Dear

Conditions may be just conditions; BUT they are not necessarily probabilistic (at least in a given circumstance OR (sometimes) type of circumstance) and some of the most important ones, like the capacity-conditions of the Memories are not in certain situations: think of the limits of the Memories in a certain high-demand situation; the LIMITS are not just probabilistic, given a certain tested and established status at a point in ontogeny . That you can hold only so much in mind and of certain types of things is a very important and necessary condition for learning, but obviously not a direct "cause". Perhaps more clearly: A similar case can be made at least for types (real solid concrete types) of environment aspects making for a condition for clear, distinct types of behavior pattern response (think of someone hitting your toes with a hammer); the same response can be to other things. Maybe anger responses can be a clearer example here. (It has been argued that all the emotions (universal emotional responses) are to some clearly definable type or types of situations -- still they are quite clear and these types of situations can be concretely defined __OR__ there is good reason to believe they can be. Here we have conditions reliably leading other conditions and these perhaps (but not just probabilistic) leading to a variety of possible responses, and being necessary conditions for some type(s) of response, perhaps more primitive responses.)

P.S. Dear

Sorry for 2 hr. of editing my last response to you, but with such kinds of situations where all the data (needed observations) are NOT in, it is hard trying to make the point clearly.

Dear Orlando,

This is another way of making my point , specifically, about your assertion that conditions are probabilistic. I could try to say that that is not the case for some [CONDITIONS]; but, I will say that both you and I may seem to be right. How could that be? Well, as I can appeal to you as a stage theorist and invoke the saying of Einstein that "God doesn't play dice", here is my formulation: It is based on the idea that qualitative changes must have some precision OR "things" would run amuck. So, how does it work? Well, as you know, I see stage changes AT THEIR INCEPTION involving truly basic perceptual shifts. AT THESE INCEPTIONS, these "shifts" must be of some reliable nature. But, to be of a realistic reliable (and even species-specific) nature, THESE (the "shifts") might well span (and, in later stages, DO span) across times and spaces.

How? This is the capability and capacity of contextualization BROUGHT FORWARD "out of" long-term memory and being the context in which such perceptual shifts occur. It is a capacity and capability of long-term memory. That said, we much realize the non-specificity of specifics. Sounds crazy BUT : The application of the perceptual shifts to settings/situations/circumstances may involve what seem to be different actualities, but, I argue, these still conform (at the beginning) to a TYPE of concrete environmental aspects and the TYPE is strictly and concretely definable. These are, at key points in ontogeny, of a of a concrete nature, and at the inception of a shift, are seen in strictly type-able: CONCRETE, DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS. Again, this may only be seen AT KEY POINTS and across and between situations/circumstances (AS IS POSSIBLE, and seems so, IF ONE HAS SUFFICIENT IMAGINATION FOR IMAGINATION). (Things can be of a definable concrete type without all the environmental aspects being a certain way.) At some less refined level (and the way we most often really think), the "type of circumstances" may vary and be, IN A SENSE and to a degree, probabilistic. BUT, at the core, no. AND, thus, what probabilities there are will be constrained probabilities and will (if important) NEVER BE RANDOM IN THE SENSE OF A RANDOM DISTRIBUTION (so NOT really just probabilistic).

With Climate Change and all, I will tell you what I think the minimum needed for survival is

With Climate Change and all, I will tell you what I think is a minimum needed for survival and that is: literally a completely, fully, entirely new outlook on life AND that being FOR EVERY HUMAN BEING and involving all our work-a-day pursuits -- a wholly new way of life (and "full-blown" way of action/work) and a source of wholesomeness and great actions and GOOD:

Every hour/day/week/month/year, etc. you wake up mindful, informed (and get more informed as ever needed to proceed ASAP), dedicated, and completely persistent and consistent in acting for the earth-life-

dignity of your CAUSES and related CAUSES. Serious life as pursued will be nothing but your involvement and active-dedication to CAUSES (maintaining rational, workable consistencies, and AS MUCH IN ACTION as possible, to actually achieve or actualize the causes). Satisfaction will have nothing to do with "being easy-going" NOR with typical or traditional ideas (notions) of happiness, nor with any [supposedly] other way of (or toward, or for) "satisfaction" -- "rewards" of life many of you, much of the time, thought likely would come with "freedom" and "general happiness" (as historically thought about) but such will be clearly seen as blatant, flagrant, and shameful irresponsibility of old ways considered not worth even thinking about FOR ANY GOOD PURPOSE or any goal in the world (you will have plenty else to think about and with integrity and dignity AND FOR DIGNITY AND INTEGRITY)(plus, there is inherent irrationality in the old views: one way or others of expecting -- and basically even counting on -- MAGIC). BUT, now, all the old happiness/play/satisfaction/fun in-and-with any other "things" or activities will naturally and rationally and personally come to be seen as that which eliminates true dignity and integrity and any worthwhile (or even real) satisfactions -- now with you having the dignity and integrity of work on AND for your CAUSES. With this new way (for all we see for ourselves and for any decent folk we will associate with), SOON nothing else will will "do"; we will have a new way to real dignity, better understandings, and some true, real, good lasting, progressive satisfaction, and with greater loving kindness and equanimity (as we accept we do what we do and others do as their own best in the same vein). As indicated, the way is to operate (LIVE) IS ONLY in terms of CAUSES and inter-related or necessarily simultaneous or successive CAUSES. Developing and accomplishing (in action as much as possible and necessary) will be ALL for the CAUSES which will be your life -- the "all" of your life that matters or has any implications for yourself or others. And, this is also at least as all other decent human beings doing all major things of working life will know you, and that is how you will know them. This is all simply a commitment to understandings, and engaging in wholesome pursuits (which, AGAIN, will be in terms of CAUSES). The causes will be shared only as well, rationally, and wholesomely pursued through group action BUT may well be otherwise that which is done alone (individually), if that is how things are going to get done.

This is the formula for self-breeding of the species and for any real decency and for the survival of the species itself. I cannot imagine how anything else will be sufficiently adaptive; in fact, anything else breeds ignorance, confusion, chaos and irresponsibility (an easy logical and sound argument to make). (I want to live, I want humans who follow me to live; DO YOU?)

Here, on New Year's Eve, I have decided to use my imagination and state HOW MUCH of that disciplined approach (described in the Discussion question beginning this thread) is needed. For dealing (actually dealing) with climate change, my intuition tells me that at least one local leader (say, within blocks of where you live and known to you) needs to be fully (always), striving diligently -- working on one or more clear parts of these problems, as would be necessary each and every day (i.e. truly diligently striving each and every day, all day). (People "throw around" the word 'community', BUT I am NOT doing that here.)

When it comes to the biggest single factor which IS THE HUGE PROBLEM, we are talking about POPULATION. I see solving this real and unavoidable problem as literally involving EVERYONE in such discipline (as described above), every day.

What it comes down to is that Psychology needs its executive functioning & meta abilities (homunculi) BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO BELIEVE IN STAGES

What it comes down to is that Psychology needs its executive functioning and meta abilities (homunculi) REALLY JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT ALLOWED TO BELIEVE IN STAGES (with/during ontogeny, child development). Psychologists, quite separate from validly typing phenomenology, "DEFINE" things. (If you "define" things, you must find the exact sets of phenomenology such "defined" things refer to -- which is beyond very, very unlikely.) [By the way, the only reasonable perspective on sets of behaviors the organism displays IS IN TERMS OF behavior PATTERNS (and the patterning of such patterns, ETC.). Anything else is NOT biological; good reasoning demands the biological characteristic OF patterns; I do not think you want to deny that BEHAVIOR PER SE is an aspect of biological functioning.]

Going with Stages and the nature of the Memories during ontogeny really explains ALL parsimoniously ____ AND ____ in ways that can be empirically tested (as I have clearly outlined in my writings). (Of course, there is also the simply and basic associative types of learning involved in development.) [NO one has defeated the point of view I have presented in over 4 years.]

[(You can see my writings for the nature of the Stages of cognitive development -- completing the main parts of Piagetian theories that need completing.)]

Why does modern Psychology offer so little that is useful to Artificial Intelligence and General (real) Artificial Intelligence (AGI)?

Why does modern Psychology offer so little that is useful to Artificial Intelligence and General (real) Artificial Intelligence (AGI)?

I surely think I know. It is because many of Psychology's constructs (e.g. the "meta"s and the "executive functioning") are _made-UP constructs_ -- they have no distinct concrete or material grounding (NO clear foundation(s))(thus there is no way for them to be "mechanized"). These constructs are then clearly empirically

(and altogether) UNJUSTIFIED (and distract from any and all good science). Those constructs are PSEUDO-ABSTRACT because anyone with any sense would realize that for a developing biological entity THERE MUST BE TRUE IN-THE WORLD, CONCRETE (specific) groundings (as foundations) for everything, INCLUDING ANY ABSTRACT CONCEPTS HUMANS DEVELOP. (And, what I just said about abstract concepts: This includes abstract concepts conjured-up and used by Psychology theorists and researchers !!!)

That's why my AI Project provides THE ONLY USABLE FRAMEWORK IN PSYCHOLOGY for AI/AGI.

Plus, my perspective and approach to Psychology is not limited, but can (I firmly believe) account for all human phenomenology (that is, ALL BEHAVIOR *** __ PATTERNS __ ***) ***. The lackings of and in Psychology have not been well-addressed -- even over decades (and there is NO GOOD excuse for this). If I am the only one addressing this, then I win ! IN any case, there is NO GOOD REASON for anyone to accept modern Psychology for science or for most any useful understanding (again, as I said before, Psychology presently has a status like actuarial "science" , that used to determine risk and proper coverage and 'benefits' from insurance).

Psychology people SHOULD be asking why AGI has not used many of the constructs FOR DECADES (this, itself, adds weight to the view that many Psychology constructs are NOT GROUNDED (well-founded)). Psychology's denial of reality is apparent and is embarrassing -- that is the only reasonable explanation for its great non-use in AI or AGI (since DECADES have passed).

*** FOOTNOTE: Read :

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

following that Discussion Question for elaborations/clarifications. AND: READ:

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

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK) and <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory> (see the Project Log of this Project to see many important Updates.) ALSO, not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking). And, similarly, see the other 2 addenda .

You might also look at my Project that is expressly AGI (if you are in the field of AGI).

P.S. The key to success for founding psychology _is such as I have provided with progressively increasing details in my writings (over the last 4 years): THAT which are the concrete, observable, new aspects of behavior patterns that ARE BOTTOM-UP AND TOP-DOWN at THE SAME TIME. NOT an oxymoron, but the KEY to real progress.

AND, my perceptual shifts are thus verifiable/falsifiable.

(You will find all this in my writings, as I detail the perceptual shifts during ontogeny; but, you must read much of my writing to "see" this.)

What will determine what major, main, central theory will win for Psychology?

What major, main, central theory will be best for Psychology, catapulting Psychology to a science (like ALL the "natural sciences") ?

I submit it is a theory that appreciates not only the reliability of the CONCRETE (though also that which is across situations (spaces) and across times), but also that sees the parsimony of that Concrete -- an unbeatable combination (and SO likely true). AND, such a theory will be Biology, that is: the Biology of behavior PATTERNS per se (i.e. a biology of "just 'behavior' ", all clearly grounded and clearly founded in DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS); all this is as a good theory for Psychology would have to be.

My nominee is likely clear, if you know me.

If we cannot come to actually see ourselves as a species among other similarly biological-behavioral species, can we really accomplish anything?

If we cannot come to actually see ourselves as a species among other similarly biological-behavioral species, can we really accomplish anything? I say NO -- not anything significant involving ourselves AS A TOPIC OR AGENT. And, I am talking about seeing our OVERT behavior patterns and overt observable foundational behavior PATTERNS, as BIOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING -- this is to say: behavior PATTERNS , [that is " 'just' behaviors" (in common parlance)] , AS biological patterning ITSELF PER SE. Though already many realize this must be true, with behavior having to be a true aspect of biological/organismic functioning even onto itself, YET BECAUSE we DO NOT KNOW HOW TO SEE THIS, we are "sunk". Only recently have I come to realize how important my guide to Psychological (behavioral) science is.

If we cannot reach this better point (indicated), we will not see anything involving our responsibilities in any complete or sustained way AS IT REALLY IS: Needless questions and needless superstitions will necessarily and

irreparably confuse us. AND: We may not know this because, very largely unbeknownst to us, Psychology as a science has not yet started -- though in ways this is easy to see if you look for any true and meaningful talk of strict empirically-established behavior PATTERNS (actual discovered-through-key-observations-REAL, actual OVERT PATTERNS (and patterning of patterns, etc)). AGAIN, only recently have I come to realize how important my guide to Psychological (behavioral) science is; I used to say "let's worry about climate change foremost", but now I realize that US thinking about most anything very important well (or behaving in any significant continuously disciplined manner) IS VERY, VERY LIKELY CONTINGENT ON US BEING ABLE TO PUT OURSELVES IN PROPER PERSPECTIVE AND CONTEXT; without true knowledge of true foundations we are terribly weak-of-mind (the nature of the problems here just indicated).

[In line with the views above, I have sought to UN-FOLLOW many poor and useless Questions -- ones that, nonetheless, go on and on (even for years). I do not wish to in any way encourage these.]

In regard to climate change, I have described the big (great) nature of changes in our behavior [patterns] which must be made. It seems clear that only some profound understanding will motivate such committed, active, and sustained behavioral change (otherwise, at least, such behavioral change will be VERY hard; PLUS, we -- all of us --- must for the most part have this significant behavioral change): see:

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

Dear

If you read more of my writings, you will see that I completely agree with some of the major points you make. You write (quoting you): "I am inclined to agree with Uttal (2003) who referred to such findings as "The new phrenology." In his more recent book, Uttal (2012) made an even stronger case [:] Any definition of such tag-along concepts (see list above) is inherently incomplete. Because such concepts have no specific physicochemical substrates, they are fictitious; that is, they are not materially real; and that is where muddling arises. ..." [<-- I have, myself, made that very point, but certainly do not believe things should be or CAN BE based in "physicochemical substrates", as you say. ALSO NOTE: Things in brackets ([]) are needed insertions (for editing) OR a comment inserted by me.)] (now, continuing:) "... Many 'cognitive' concepts are reified by their users; they are often misused as representing, for example, causes or effects." (END QUOTE) In at least some essential ways I very much agree with that last statement of yours I quoted.

BUT NOW: LET'S GET SPECIFIC about some MAJOR concepts and constructs: I have identified all the "meta" this-es and "meta" that-s AS FICTIONS, like you describe. Ditto for "executive function" or "executive functioning". AND, for most uses of the words " 'social' learning" (sometimes going so far as "cultural learning"). My system (theory and approach) make it clear ALL these poor (pseudo) 'concepts' are NOT NEEDED AT ALL; they, in fact (as yours you indicate), are MISLEADING, DISTRACTIONS (from the real and realities), AND for-sure STIFLE good behavioral science.

But, one thing: IF a behavior PATTERN is found among behavior patterns already truly and rightly discovered (e.g not produced by psychologists) AND CLEARLY BASED (or at least at their KEY inception) ON directly observable overt patterns and if the pattern occurs only in important (or KEY triggering) circumstances, THAT IS MOST CERTAINLY NOT FICTITIOUS ; IN FACT, THAT IS most EMPIRICAL -- as empirical as it gets in behavioral science (at least if behavioral science is seen as a science of observable overt behaviors (AND those clear and recognized agreed-upon PATTERNS that clearly follow them)) (now, understand, I am talking about a science "just" of behavior patterns [(over Psychology's history and now 'they' try to call them [simply] 'behaviors')] PER SE and that's it. "Just 'behaviors' ". So, you see, I am in no way interdisciplinary (and consider that itself a "muddling").

Disparate "pieces" will not come together into their real natural wholes, unless there is some understanding of the over-arching cognitive facts and principles from ontogeny are DISCOVERED, as above, AND DISCOVERIES PROCEED AS I INDICATE; the disparate "pieces" I refer to can be the studies from the UNclearly-related schools or subfields OR they can be disparate from being interdisciplinary.

Dear

I have yet to read all your new longer paper. I should say, right off "the top", though, that I DEFINE NOTHING. As in the well-established sciences, the Subject (literally (and not the subject matter or oneself or one's thinking)) defines ALL. Behavior PATTERNS actually seen in directly observable overt behavior (you can give that a name based on context, contingency, or other associated patterns) , BUT ONLY THAT. Then, just that which clearly follows (or, rather, become admixed and within) a given behavior pattern IN CLEAR or necessary ways: Then such can named. I, with my mind, do not divide up the world in advance (in any sense) unless necessarily or mistakenly.

Dear

I may have referred to "my mind", but in no non-necessary or important sense did I use that term when referring to agency (or any 'thing'). Western "man's" views as well as his thought and curiosity is corrupted by about everything (or anything) said about the mind. Rest assured, I refer to my mind only indirectly (in the context of some much more real, important, and significant involved situations/circumstances). I think about my mind (and really NOT) only for reflexive reflection of THAT which it was used on and about how it got stuff in there and stuff that is reliable and valid with the strictest empiricism -- such fills it all. And, even then, ideally, when using the mind as just indicated, one is STILL within a most-relevant real (concrete) context (and thus has the correct supports for non-bias). Needless to say I NEVER say anything about "the mind", clearly an overly-general subject, in addition to all the other problems discussing such

Why can't philosophers & thinkers on Psychology realize that IT is insufficiently (not strictly) empirically grounded as ANY science would HAVE to be?

Why can't philosophers & other thinkers on Psychology simply realize that Psychology is insufficiently (very much not strictly) empirically grounded as would, of necessity, need to be the case for any science (or even its beginnings)?

'BEHAVIOR', behavior PATTERNS, themselves, PER SE (including ALL the significant species-typical and species-specific behavior patterns) are as they, of course, must be: AN ASPECT OF BIOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING. Knowing that and just looking at the "terrain" of Psychology and its rough, supposedly 'specific' topics (for their work: for theory and for areas of study), you see: the LACK of a clear concrete grounding -- grounding foundations in/ with KEY directly observable overt phenomenon -- of most of (in effect, nearly all) its concepts or constructs; THAT is easily APPARENT.

A solution must be found. I found one; if you can find no other decent or good solution, you must go with mine. My perspective and approach is clear in every aspect (or as clear as it could be without some basic observational work -- which is very doable) and it is clear like that in every sense; and it is potentially (in some REAL sense) fully explanatory, while being parsimonious. It is also explicit in all principles and assumptions. It is potentially everything for the true "container", the ACTUAL over-arching nature of the phenomenon in the field.

In contrast to what should have been done and should be being done, it appears psychology people have been hiding from me (and, very arguably, from realities) -- for 2 of the last 4 years I have been here.

THEY HAVE HAD NO REASONABLE RESPONSE (including in those 1st 2 years) and offer no reasonable alternatives or solutions. BUT NOTE: Hiding can work if others are complicit or people simply really don't care. Then, they simply keep their "jobs" -- whatever they are.

Dear

For me nothing in or about "quantum" anything (even its rightful use in Physics) means anything to me and I will never see any connection to Psychology (nor should anyone). I see such as badly-motivated fairy tales. With the tiny bit I have seen this elaborated, it is not Psychology and is of no value (even as any kind of metaphor, analogy, or simile) to Psychology.

Ethological/developmental/biological, all "just-behavior"-based view of the unfolding of cognitive capacities that must not (for science) be neglected

Message to behavioral science / philosophy of science "think tanks":

I am referring to a (the) strict empirical view and approach to behavior [patterns] ; it is well-founded, well-ground, explicit, and ALL concepts have a notable CLEAR CONCRETE relationship to DIRECTLY OBSERVABLE KEY OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS (at least at the INCEPTION of all major new ways of thinking (each qualitatively different, but hierarchical)) This is a BIOLOGY OF BEHAVIOR per se (of "just behavior"). It gives a wholly biological view and perspective on what is (what MUST BE) an aspect of biological functioning: behavior patterns. THIS IS THE ONLY THEORY AND APPROACH THAT DOES THIS; and, in the end, by the time you get to and read the addenda, the view provides a clear a set of testable (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses -- as much as is possible, without further discoveries (LIKELY DISCOVERIES).

Here is the main guidance you need: READ:

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

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK) and <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory> (see the Project Log of this Project to see many important Updates.) ALSO, not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking). And, similarly, see the other 2 appenda .

Ignoring this view (A NEEDED AND UNIQUE VIEW and OF empiricism and of science) would be science negligence -- something you do not want to be a part of. AT THE SAME TIME, it is as much philosophy (of science, psychology) AS ANYTHING (so, thus, if philosophy is your interest my work should [still] be a major interest of yours).

I await a good analytic philosopher to show this (the way I describe things -- in all my completely related RG-available writings) is the ONLY WAY IT COULD BE (or there can be NO behavioral SCIENCE -- I have pretty much come to this realization). There is a great opportunity here for psychologists and analytic philosophers -- or try to prove me wrong (which, correspondingly, I consider impossible). [Look hard; you may be just 900 pages away from a career (and not just a job in a "slot"). It could be that the field of Psychology, etc. is too "established" (in a wrongful way) to accept a meaningful critique (or, equivalently, no one "has time").]

P.S.s:

Reading ahead, reading https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (the first addendum), will give you an idea where all my thoughts end up (I did NOT put forth everything at the beginning, because I had not known or decided on everything). Yet, all the writings (all 900 pages) are important aspects of the view and approaches and certainly needed for a good understanding. ALL is necessary for contrast with modern systems of understanding and needed for the explication of the new view, with its better assumptions.

The idea and phrase of "lack of imagination for imagination" actually occurs in those words only in the last (with "absolutely last" in its name) addendum. Yet this carries much meaning about cross-situation/cross-circumstance perception/attention, etc. (It is too bad one cannot think of all at once.)

FOR THOSE WHO MIGHT LIKE TO JOIN ME IN MY WORK:

<https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory-A-Full-Fledged-Paradigm-for-PSYCHOLOGY/update/5efb5d0bc89e7a0001d2b01e>

Even if you "don't believe" in stuff like mine, my work should be a tremendous example of what complete strict empirical grounding would be like. Also, you can see a view with complete internal consistency. Plus, you will never see more parsimony -- yet it ALL could be as I say. If necessary, you can get the good out of the writing even if you have to read it as science fiction (my writings would be a good exercise for any and all in Psychology).

Don't colleges need a basic course or two on the hallmarks of DRIVEL and identifying it?

Don't colleges need a basic course or two on the hallmarks of DRIVEL and identifying it?

I say YES, YES, YES BECAUSE so many professors PRODUCE GREAT EXEMPLARS OF DRIVEL.

(1) Here are some ways of spotting Drivel: when in an essay or writing the writer (basically "out of the blue") asks the reader ad hoc to "imagine 2 travelers from 2 different countries ..." IN A WAY not clearly related to anything earlier in the paper NOR clearly (really) integral to what they are discussing. This is basically a very crude on-the-spot analogy OF EXTREMELY QUESTIONABLE VALUE. This same form of "elucidation" comes up often, similarly, when the reader is asked to imagine/think-of/think-about something ("out of the blue") like: "let's say one child has experience with bananas and is imagining/thinking about a banana, while another child has had experience with apples and ..." AGAIN:

Without clear connection to clear earlier parts of the paper OR clearly INTEGRAL to a worthwhile topic, THIS IS DRIVEL.

AND: ALSO:

(2) Ultimately (at some point eventually) it is a problem when a writer cannot explain where-from-hence phenomena discussed CAME (AND/ OR AT LEAST have what's discussed connected to agreed-upon IMPORTANT actually-EMPIRICAL data, THAT IS: FOUNDED IN DIRECT (beyond express/explicit) [actual] OBSERVATION OF OVERT INSTANCES OF phenomena -- THOSE which are CLEARLY CONNECTED AND IMPORTANT phenomenon to the issue(s) at hand. Lacking such connections, often then (at best), the "discussion" will "dead end" (has no future ... does NOT OR will not provide for obvious, needed progress).

Neither of these lackings is empiricism at all and thus is NOT science (it does not reach an acceptable standard of presentation (writing/speaking, etc.) in or for a science).

I READ SO MUCH OF THIS DAMNED "stuff" of this nature (either deficient for the reason in paragraph (1) and/or for the reason in paragraph (2)), and it is so elementary NOT TO DO LIKE THAT, BUT YET PROFESSORS (whose "material" I am guided to read) DO IT. ALL THIS drivelt must be "stomped out" early and, because it is so elementary (and easy to see and find,) TEACH COLLEGE FRESHMEN how to identify SUCH and thus learn to NOT DO IT.

You will find NO instances of SUCH drivelt in my writings anywhere; it is completely intolerable. DRIVEL is negligence, ignorance, bias, pre-conclusion or something likewise or similarly unseemly (e.g. that which is philosophical) which is the where-from-hence of the DRIVEL.

There is NO 'proximate' without absolute discovery

There is NO 'proximate' without absolute discovery.

Not a question for me (I've answered it with full, real, strict empiricism -- observational "anchors" ALWAYS, clear and INVOLVED -- for/in EVERY CONCEPT, ETC.). It is also not a discussion for me but, rather, for literally/practically EVERYONE ELSE (see previous sentence). You may well be only 900 pages away from knowing the what and the how. (At the same time, I will show you the best (and most real) PARSIMONY; it may be VERY hard for you -- it is hard to "escape" and grow up.)

Identifying a pattern simply and clearly DOES NOT GIVE SOMETHING CAUSAL STATUS (e.g. simple learning patterns -- yeh, they are THERE but in any specific important circumstance/situation do not DESCRIBE the real GROUND of WHAT IS (AND HAS) GONE ON -- they are simply NOT the full crux of anything (not the only thing

involved in any crucial juncture); <-- Not, IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, ANY THING LIKE A PROXIMATE CAUSE.
hopeless, hopeless, hopeless If the simple "learning" explanations had been good, they would have "stuck" 40 years ago (e.g. with Charles Brainerd)) .

Over-generalization because of academia's permanent inability to connect with Reality (at any crucial point, WHICH WILL BE THROUGH DIRECT OBSERVATIONS). "It" maybe "is and ever shall be", but it is just crap (thinking doing too much of "the job" in some sick, but real, sense). [P.S. I, too, see learning (NOT one type of thing) as always involved.]

Here is the main guidance you need to start (the OTHER guidance noted is also necessary for specifics, for specific testable (verifiable/falsifiable) HYPOTHESES): READ:

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

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK) and <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory> (see the Project Log of this Project to see many important Updates.) ALSO, not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 page BOOK: these are addenda: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking). And, similarly, see the other 2 addenda .

For some idea how to get towards/to some major 'PROXIMATES" see the bottom 2/3rd of https://www.researchgate.net/post/Ethological_developmental_biological_all_just-behavior-based_view_of_the_unfolding_of_cognitive_capacities_that_must_not_for_science_be_neglected

Dear

You ask "... isn't the whole purpose of proximate to get close? ...". Yes, but it is the right kind of close (not necessarily just in one (or more) particular given controlled environments you choose and, often, not understandable by any given set of now-present circumstances). It is not always possible to get close in a single time and space; for example, to get as close as possible to what is fundamentally going on : more than one related setting/situation/circumstance MAY WELL BE INVOLVED. [Each setting/circumstance, though, will have, each-itself, concrete directly observable overt and important key phenomenon (at least at the inception of any major shift , e.g. those which are the cruxes in cognitive levels/stages advancements); the empiricism for ALL

should be and must be complete.] My view/perspective/approach/theory will get you as close possible to the distinct observable beginnings -- to a real first cause(s) (or, rather, "internal" and external conditions FOR the beginning -- yet, these typically being short-lasting and specific where they are (AND observable) and quick, i.e. real CLOSE; you do not get real OR close enough otherwise). If this view does not seem parsimonious, portions that seem not parsimonious are not viewed correctly; many needless concepts and constructs in today's Psychology are both unnecessary and wrongful and basically need to be thrown out -- that may help you see the parsimony.

Your phrase "One can argue over synthesis" is objectionable BECAUSE WE/YOU/ME, as scientists/empiricists should DEFINE NOTHING; to do so is to use hypothetico-deductive thinking before it is needed and, thus, improperly -- that forecloses true discoveries. Like anything else: some notable, clear, important aspects of "synthesis" should be discovered directly, before we do any thinking that, in effect, is conjuring. WE OURSELVES DO NOT DO THE SYNTHESIS FOR THE SUBJECT, and especially at any key beginnings, THAT involved (at least key, important parts) IS SHOWN BY THE ORGANISM: clearly indicated in DIRECT OBSERVATIONS OF OVERT BEHAVIOR PATTERNS; and, knowledge of the PAST experiences of the organism (as observed)(given the Memories) will often be necessary to literally look to SEE what is going ON at any later time. (Knowledge of similar behavior patterns will also be seen in other TRULY similar times and places -- so that, too, will be helpful, not to mention definitive.)

My system directs you on how to find the most direct (and truly and ultimately "close", and likely quick) extremely relevant, see-able phenomenon. AND this is all similar to other real sciences and necessary for Psychology to be a science.

[Keep in mind that in most cases, to say the least : NOTHING in any given highly controlled laboratory environments will be IT -- except those I lead you to FIND, and then it will be SOME circumstances (settings/environments, often plural) , as indicated by the Subject (organism) itself and not by us.]

Here is the main guidance you need TO START : 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 THEN

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK) and <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory> (see the Project Log of this Project to see many important Updates.) ALSO, not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages:

Data paradigmShiftFinal.pdf

; you CAN find this pdf through this last link (it may take a little careful looking down the page for the real link). And, similarly, see the other 2 addenda (also important) (I.E. see ALL "LINKS" ("Lined Data") associated with the main Article ("Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory ...") -- there is a tab for that "Linked Data"-- and then follow the looking procedure indicated necessary for the first addendum) . *** OR ***:

Also, now:

The three addenda to " Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory" are now easily found and available, for viewing WITHOUT download, if you wish: http://mynichecomp.com/key_content/paradigmShiftFinal.pdf
http://mynichecomp.com/key_content/finalfinal3-converted.pdf
http://mynichecomp.com/key_content/Absol_the_last_addendum_TO_BOOK.pdf

Episodic Memory and Experimental Psychology

Though this Discussion may not make sense to some, I have shared the following view with some professional behavioral scientist (psychology) friends and feel it may be helpful to get this view (or sub-view) a little more exposure.:

It is becoming obvious that Episodic Memory is a major crux of things (e.g. for much of the content and structure of the episodic buffer -- the last "thing"/step before any working memory action (i.e. reinforcing or new processing of new or old)).

I have very recently made many downloads (most in the last few days) of articles on Episodic Memory. This is a major faculty and a major crux of things going into the episodic buffer -- and may account for much of whatever organization is there. To see what Publications/Articles I am reading, to get an idea of how BIG this topic is: You can check my "Following" link on my Profile page to find the list of what I selected. (Please do take a look: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Brad_Jesness2/interest .)

Took me a while to realize that this is an especially good area to read in AND STUDY. I believe this subject matter (and it is a true subject matter) is researchable in many ways, likely including in several realistic ways in the lab of experimental psychologists (even with the time/space constraints). This may be a " go 'ticket' " to realism and productivity for Experimental Psychology (as well as for other studies better spanning times and places). After one realizes a human, even largely unbeknownst to him/her self keeps track of partly related "things" (features and actions) across times and spaces (the very basis of abstract abilities), one also gets a perspective on the great and significant perspectives (templates) provided in/"for" reality by Episodic Memory.

The growing number of articles show this is very much an up and coming research area -- fits with my theory (Ethogram Theory), but provides other, more study opportunities. You MOST PROBABLY find it beneficial to read all 900 pages of writing on the theory (the clear basis for a true empirical science of Psychology) FIRST.

If one appreciates the likely great sophistication of Episodic Memory, THEN there is NO NEED for any artificial setup in an Experimental Psychology Lab looking into that. Here's why: You can have typical (though important), ecologically-sound, real set-ups that will literally naturally elicit adaptive response(s) (including centrally: episodic recall); you just need to invent how to measure such recalls -- BUT, you are (or would be) measuring real (non-set-up, non-artificial responses !)) Such adaptive responses have species-typical or species specific aspects. (I do not see measuring the episodic recalls would be hard; just see the relevant research.)

Day-to-day important situations and settings are all the "stimuli" (situation/circumstances) are the 'set-up'.

Another way of saying most of this is to realize that in any important set of circumstances (INCLUDING REALISTIC ONES IN THE LAB) the Subject comes with much to bring to bear and does bring it to bear (AND this, too, is real as real can be).

I should make it clear that this point of view, above, is totally consistent and congruent with the Ethogram Theory I put forth (a true, thorough shift using only behavior patterns and strict empiricism -- it is a true paradigm shift for Psychology (actually, it offer Psychology its first paradigm)). I basically consider the above sub-view to be part of Ethogram Theory.

Even if behavior was "embodied", wouldn't the brain notice?

Even if behavior was "embodied", wouldn't the brain notice? YES, of course: then the BRAIN would become the better "vehicle" for remembering, thinking, and "time travel" (i.e. prospective memory) -- possible (and possibly trivial) sensori-motor components notwithstanding. [I am really quite tired of the "embodied" conceptualizations (which have yet to be shown as non-fictions *). See my writings. No one has argued against the views/approaches (content) in these writings NOR accepted/liked/or adopted them (now 1+ years (or 5+ years, depending how you look at it) and counting).]

* Footnote: All this nonsense is ALL because NO PSYCHOLOGY OUTLOOK (other than my own) "believes in" anything psychological, innately guided, and emerging with ontogeny (which is not tenable). (The idea that learning is literally nearly always "the same" (outside of clearly always being associative in nature) is preposterous (think of a two -year-old and an adolescent -- and imagine any systematic and universal instruction you credibly might posit). P.S. Relatedly : "Culture" does NOT directly impinge on the individual -- the actual Subject and ultimate, but absolutely necessary, unit of analysis &/or explanation (for Biology or for Science). All executive or "meta" processes can NOT be properly shown to be anything but homunculi.)

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

Dear

Perception is an important part (aspect) of behavior. When this is "adjusted" with experience, before or after [further] experience, or during (with) ontogeny seem to be the interesting questions. BASIC perception very likely shifts with ontogeny and this is NOT reasonably addressed at all by mainstream Psychology (anywhere) (this is why we have "lost Piaget"). (What distinctions are found during observations* OF the organism -- that is, THOSE that are defined BY the Subject/organism ITSELF -- THIS is what matters; what distinctions we make as humans barely matter -- BUT premature hypothetico-deductive theorizing or "models" are antithetical to science.) Behavior per se IS Biology. Psychology has abandoned its own field and has abandoned an extremely major aspect of Biology (again, behavior, and most crucially: OBSERVABLE BEHAVIOR PER SE to properly explain ALL) and thus is NON-Science. That the pieces will NEVER incrementally come together, properly and validly, when one is looking in the "wrong direction(s)", this is surely something yet to be realized. (Neurological (brain) response indicators will not (in fact, can not) rectify this situation.)

* Footnote: We have also basically forgotten classical ethology, yet the ONLY time (at least in the last 70 years), behavioral science earned a Nobel Prize (and, it was specifically in "Physiology and Medicine", the closet category): THIS WAS FOR WORK of/in classically ethology and essentially all (some say completely all (I do)), based observations. Look up Tinbergen and Lorenz, 1973.

P.S. Ethology The Biology of Behavior (also a title of a great 1975 book (by I. Eibl-Eibesfeldt; first in English in 1975)) is to be seen (literally) in behavior PATTERNS and the patterning of patterns. Not speaking in terms of behavior PATTERNS, that itself, alone, shows Psychology is "off the track" and this is certain (although, I know, nothing is "supposed to be" certain).

Article Ethology: The Biology of Behavior

(see my Comment)

Dear

NONE of what you say is contrary to what I say. I don't, for my most reasonable position, have to believe there are no connections in/to the greater body, JUST THAT THEY ARE LIKELY TRIVIAL AND NOT ALONE (there are plenty of reasons to believe there are the most significant representations in the brain). Neuroscience as a big help to psychology is unlikely (brain patterns are more sophisticated than we can make sense of -- they are LIKELY as sophisticated AS THE NUANCES OF BEHAVIOR PATTERNS THEMSELVES; and, to wit, I have written essays on this and have most-reasonably argued that you must know the BEHAVIOR __PATTERNS__ very well to know what the more obscure brain indicators may refer to -- and DO THIS for the most part, NOT the other way around.)

Sadly all these BIG BELIEFS in/of embodying "representation" in sensori-motor ways is just because you do not have a belief/presumption/assumption structure to believe what is VERY likely, biologically: THAT THERE ARE SUBTLE, BUT IMPORTANT BIOLOGICAL BEHAVIOR SHIFTS WITH ONTOGENY -- these likely BASIC perceptual shifts, in a significant sense originating FROM THE ORGANISM ITSELF in appropriate environments. You are not true hierarchical stage theorists, which essentially means you cannot see actual behavior __PATTERNS__ (patterns being a term rarely used in Psychology, and when used : not correctly) OR SEE anything else of the TRUE BIOLOGICAL NATURE not only of BEHAVIOR __PATTERNS__ but also the PATTERNINGS OF patterns. And, as such, you are separated from the biology of BEHAVIOR ("just behavior", BEHAVIOR PER SE); separated from Biology, you are separated (needlessly) from strict empiricism and the SCIENCE itself.

Help on Approaching Death

There does not seem to be much help, but what there is is here:

The Buddha clearly and repeatedly seems to refer to one's purpose fulfilled (OR achieving major goals) as: "life has been lived, what had to be done has been done". Here are typical contexts:

"Through dispassion [his mind] is liberated. When it is liberated there comes the knowledge: 'It's liberated.' He understands: 'Destroying birth, the holy life has been lived, what had to be done has been done, there is no more for this state of being.'"

"... Considering your own good, bhikkhus [(monks)], it is enough to strive for the goal with diligence; considering the good of others, it is enough to strive for the goal with diligence; considering the good of both, it is enough to strive for the goal with diligence."

P.S. To the Discussion issue (post) that began this thread: The Buddha very frequently said the nature of the "diligence" involved is STRIVING (specifically, "striving with diligence")(very frequently, but obviously not always).

[I believe this addition (and the qualification) are congruent with, and affirmative, with respect to Karl Pfeifer's point-of view.]

Also pertinent : The Buddha said: Do not think about past, future, or present existence. To be fortunate upon death: You have, in life, through intentional actions earned merit (& generated & changed/created kamma). And, thus to be so fortunate, in life: you have engaged in what you have to do & gotten it DONE (even if it may not be finished). ...

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

Also, there is my favorite quote of the Buddha, given when he was "put on the spot" (e.g. as walking down the street and asked 3 times, even if by a stranger) : "When in the seen will only be the seen, in the heard only what is heard, in the sensed only what is sensed, in the known only what is known, [then] you will not be by that; when you are not by that, you will not be therein; when you are not therein, you will be neither here, nor there, nor in between. This is the end of dukkha (suffering)."

For completeness, and for necessary understandings, the good Buddhist must view WORDS (language) just as tools (as the Buddha did) and often not meaning anything conventional when viewed with a different mind-set -- yet very useful when seen another way. About "suffering" (dukkha, a broad understanding of suffering), let me cite what seems like a self-contradictory statement , yet very meaningful when understood in a different "light" : To paraphrase the Buddha, broadly concerning suffering, he said: THAT WHICH IS THE NATURE OF ITS ARISING IS THE NATURE OF ITS CESSATION.

Perhaps a clearer example from Zen Buddhism:

"When all the world sees beauty as beauty, that in itself is ugliness."

Together my posts here could possibly be a good, yet brief/ briefest, introduction to Buddhism. For more, see my relevant Project (one is amongst the 5)

Dear

Having read and comprehensively summarized all the words of the historical Buddha (the Pali canon)(<https://mynichecomp.com>), I can say : (1) the Buddha was as socially responsible to community as one could be, and his words reflect and advocate that; every person must morally be in/for the good of the Community (and that is good for ALL, including oneself). SEE: <https://mynichecomp.com/answer.php?id=42&subject=12&topicid=13>

(2) The Buddha was married: BUT: One night (quite long after being married), he left the palace seeking self realization [(actually: JUST realization)]. Yasodhara, the wife of Siddhartha [(the Buddha)] was not at all shocked. She had prepared herself for this eventuality. She never regretted her husband seeking enlightenment. She had been wedded to ... the Shakya prince Siddhartha, in his 16th year when she was also 16 years of age. At the age of 29, she gave birth to their only child, a boy named Rāhula. Rāhula (Pāli and Sanskrit) was the only son of Siddhārtha Gautama (again, commonly known as the Buddha). The mother brought Rahula to see his father and Rahula became one of the strong followers of his father.

It is in the Cullavagga **, the stories explaining each rule in the monastic code, that we first hear that Rahula was ordained as a child, and that his mother had sent him off to join the Buddha with the poignant words “go get your inheritance”

Buddha called on Ven. Sāriputta to ordain Rāhula, who was only seven years old. Despite his young age, Rāhula, being cultured, obedient, and well-disciplined, was eager to accept instructions from his elders . Rhaula is one the the major persons the Buddha dialogs with (in the essays that are the historical words of the Buddha); Rahula is also one of the major people who memorized and passed on (OVER CENTURIES from memory) the words of the historical Buddha. [(The Buddha's words were written down between 500 and 1000 years after his death (he was born 563 BCE or 480 BCE and he spent 45 years of his life teaching); before the words were written down there were many of his the most avid followers who MEMORIZED the exact words of many, many suttas (essays/teachings) each. (I have the impression that each had memorized an amount that we would call a book.) In any case. the resulting "books" ARE ALL REMARKABLY CONSISTENT WITH ONE ANOTHER.)]

The Buddha had many loved ones and made a point of being at the beside of several when they were dying (i.e. when he could be). He most assuredly did not fear death (my previous posts, above, describe death as a welcome final end after living A good life). The is no evidence of the Buddha being a coward in any way.

Herb, perhaps you should ask yourself how it is helpful to have poor knowledge and poor regard for the Buddha (???). Perhaps you would like to explore AND/OR EXPLAIN (to us) the motivation (for motivation is mainly all it is)

** FOOTNOTE: The Cullavagga includes an elaboration of the bhikkhus' (monks) etiquette and duties, as well as the rules and procedures for addressing offenses that may be committed within the Sangha (a close group of associates following the Buddha's teachings). Also included is the story of the establishment of the bhikkhuni Sangha (the first monk group).

Dear

A final most-relevant tidbit : YOU say, " I trust in my own personal experience ". THAT IS EXACTLY ALL THE

BUDDHA THOUGHT (and taught) ANYONE SHOULD TRUST; he said (many, many, many times) one should believe NOTHING (and no one) whatsoever or whosoever UNLESS THEY (each person by, and for, him/herself) VERIFY THINGS FOR THEMSELVES (and all of Western and modern society most tremendously FAIL AT THIS; clearly the Buddha did better).

For the sake of thoroughness, let me point out 3 or 4 other aspects of the Buddhist Life: (1) You should not personalize things (always seeing things you were involved with as "mine" -- in fact, for at least the most part, you should NOT do this at all). (2) Relatedly: Have no firm attachments (irrationally "holding" things as your own). And (3) realize the actual impermanence of things. And, overcome or face all this with equanimity (and with a calm and clear and free mind).

To have an idea of what striving diligently would look like for serious matters, see:

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

For climate: many, many of our leaders will need to be like this thoroughly and completely in their way of life.

FOR THE MAJOR PROBLEM OF POPULATION: Just having many leaders will not be sufficient, rather what is needed w/r to this issue IS: essentially all of us (as individuals) would have to have everyday abiding discipline as described on that web page (

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

Dear

It is very difficult to soundly argue and state (or believe or conclude) that the Buddha lacked "mutual love" or lacked such love "enhanced by sex". It is easier to indicate the opposite (and believe that) : The Buddha was married when he was 16 years old; he did not go on his special mission (involving leaving home) to become more knowledgeable until he was 29 years old -- it was at that point he left his wife (i.e. after 13 years of marriage). The married couple had a son (which would have involved some sex). The son was born late in their marriage (this can be inferred from the fact that his son first saw his father (the Buddha) when he was seven years old). ALSO: Rāhula, his son, [it is said] was born on same day Prince Siddhārtha Gautama renounced the throne by leaving the palace (his home).

What is this good marriage/good sex contrast you try to show between yourself and the Buddha? It seems you

push these aspects of life as the certain most vital things in life AND you especially want to contrast yourself (having THAT good life) with the Buddha's life, who supposedly (related to your poorly established beliefs) did NOT have those things you had for THE good life. Contrasting yourself with the Buddha does NOT MAKE YOUR POINT; an opposite interpretation of the Buddha's life (opposite yours) seems more likely (read above paragraph); PLUS what the Buddha discovered AFTER leaving his home is said to have brought him great and truer or truest happiness AND that also for OTHERS as well -- the liberation of the mind to come to "see things as they are?" (or to get much closer to that point where it counts most [in life]).

Herb, if you are going to keep on this way, asserting your good life, you better at least pick someone else to contrast yourself with. You are making no points with your oft-repeated baseless assertions about the Buddha. AND: This is not even addressing the lack of merits of your claims about mutual love, sex and marriage making for THE "good life" (THE good life, it can certainly be argued, should include greater and truer happiness associated WITH important GOOD KNOWLEDGE (with this, a truer happiness than you have or can clearly argue for)).

It seem appropriately that you should learn a LOT of what Buddhism is before bringing the Buddha up again. Read a good comprehensive summary of all the words spoken by the historical Buddha (<https://mynichecomp.com> -- only 100 page) before you say more. You should thusly at least learn enough not to make the extreme baseless assertion: (quoting you) "... so he spoke superficially ".

You seem now to be defiling this Discussion question and the thread with baseless assertions -- never helpful anywhere on RG.

Dear

It seems to be pointless to just again say what I said and say it again and again, in response to your rote repetitions WITH your total lack of exposition and lack of any cogent argument (or even description(s) and/or justification(s)) -- you provide nothing which could guide the minds of others anywhere at all. Just stop (do you need so much help (here, from others) in/for loving YOURSELF?).

Be sure to read my last Answer too, because you composed a response after only reading part of it (I was only 2/3rd done with that Answer before your last "retort".)

With the Proven Irrationality and Stupidity of which humans now prove themselves capable, the status quo

wins

With the Proven Irrationality and Stupidity of which humans now prove themselves capable, the status quo wins. It is understandable security. And, with the spiraling to extinction (also), there is a wonder anyone in any field can fight for any significant change. In fact, I understand how, in the here and now, persons would just give up. These people have my understanding. To describe things metaphorically : I (myself, personally) was born and raised and educated in "heaven" and can now barely see anything but "hell". Yet, I pity not the people, but have my major feelings and concerns for the other sentient beings on this planet. I hope people do consider this worthy of discussion (and, perhaps, mercifully, can refute this view). [It is fortunate that I largely see myself finished/done.]

[P.S. Face the MOST major single (real) issue: population -- now rarely a matter of discussion, in direct opposition to the dying hopes of Jacques-Yves Cousteau, who KNEW THE OCEANS (and saw what already had been done -- 23 yr ago). It is with recognition such as this we (the people) can occasionally "get a clue" .]

Can you see that just with the ill-defined concepts of "learning", Psychology is not a Science?

Can you see that just with the ill-defined concepts of "learning", Psychology is not a Science? This could be in "sound logic 101".

Since "learning" is such a ubiquitous 'term', it is obviously ill-defined. That suffices for my present argument . Easy; done. [Clarification: I am referring to the use of the word "learning" basically by itself : that is: basically alone, with no modifiers, no sufficient contextualization, and no typology; I DO believe -- as much or more than others -- that virtually all noteworthy behavior PATTERN change involves basic sorts of simple associative learning, but surely, most often, more needs to be "said" somehow to be clear or meaningful (or empirical or scientific). I think you do likely know what I am talking about.]

Unfortunately, as I have many times said, Psychology is a GAME (and not a clear one). Everything is easier/clearer if you take responsibility for your thought.

Those with baseless AND untestable "theories" in Psychology continue

Those with baseless AND untestable "theories" in Psychology continue: in particular and for examples: embodied cognition AND "meta" ("meta" everything, incl. "executive processing")

Inexcusable and this is true (that is: they continue) because of implicit (professor-taught) desperation to maintain FALSE VIEWS ABOUT HUMANS (thanks, philosophy, and their goons). (BUT, I am still here:

Article Is psychology not a good science, and if not, how might it become one?

Feel ok, now?; I don't. (Sickening ; perhaps, thankfully, I may soon be deceased.))

In recent articles (chapters) I have read, the use of the notion of "metamemory" obviously dead ends explanation. They are left more or less satisfied with that "explanation" and only think of THAT poorly founded (and actually unresearchable) concept as what then (or next) to look for [in a trumped up way] in future research going in that direction. (For an example, see the chapter "Implicit memory in childhood ..." in the rich edited work (a book) entitled "The Development of Memory in Infancy and Childhood" 2nd edition.)

See the problem, my friends?

I have offered a cure. You can verify all this yourselves, but with much help from reading my writings, to get an idea of a clear alternative to the "metas" (and to "executive processing")

It seems a major sort of addition needs to be made to cognitive-developmental ontogeny theory (Ethogram Theory)

Re: It seems a major sort of addition needs to be made to cognitive-developmental ontogeny theory (Ethogram Theory)

I have been out just to describe the developing very early processing and all the later hierarchical developments and processing, yielding the development and the progressing of the [grand/always-important] "outer container" (cognition). These are the levels of/stages of cognitive abilities being most of, and what's central to, guiding behavior: cognition, representation, abstract concepts and thinking, and actions. I NOW do believe something more is involved than I have yet ever indicated (something I avoided). For years and for decades:

I almost perhaps incredulously spoke nothing of emotions. Now I do; BUT, reservedly: I want to "add-in" and speak of just basic, early-on emotions that may be central to ALL cognitive development, per se: in particular it is those that are likely necessary to transfer a level of representation and thinking abilities from one domain (once established in an early domain) to another domain (this is sometimes known as transfer, sometimes as generalization -- neither which captures all that goes on with true hierarchical development with ontogeny).

I have long sought to make emotions (relatively simple response PATTERNS) something that can simply be added-in ("tacked on"), AFTER cognitive ontogenies are under way (which seemed esp. good for AI / AGI). But, the problem of humans (as well for AI / AGI) going from using a level of skills somewhere at first and THEN going from one domain to other domains for a new same sort of transformation THERE, i.e. to a essentially new similar level/stage of which he/she is capable THERE, has remained unclear. This matter is now, in much of mainstream psychology, explained hypothetically (or supposedly) based on obvious/common-sense contingencies of guidance (from others and language) _OR_ as using analogies or metaphor to find the similar structures (alignments) in the new domain. This does not often seem plausible and is not sufficient for the broad and quite precise applications for a new level of thinking. (It is too crude and contains irrelevancies.)

FINALLY NOW, I thought of my likely neglect in not providing sufficient impetus or motivation OR direction (or "self"-reward) for ontological shifts (at inception: BASIC perceptual shifts), then changes. Early on, and then later, given the representational context of past key developments:

Maybe SOME key emotions help direct the organism to take a closer look at things, actions, and events and with the simple general sorts of motivations GIVEN BY SOME truly basic emotions; if there is more "dwell time" and the organism will take a closer look, THEN he/she will find more, and develop a similar system of structure and understanding THERE (as well as in contexts where such a system was applied earlier).

For, after all, a number of notable emotions have been with us sentient beings since mammals and birds (evolutionarily speaking). Not using any, even for the development of the grand "outer" container no longer seems possible. They (some emotions) are there, and, if they give direction and impetus, why wouldn't they be used in cognitive stages key unfoldings (and making them more precise and reliable). These few particularly important emotions are THERE basically from birth. For me, now, NOT making use of a small set of basic emotions aiding cognitive development does not seem adaptationally likely OR even plausible (from the point of view of logic and soundness, as well as evolutionarily). The set of such basic emotions for cognition and cognitive ontogeny (throughout), i.e. for all major cognitive developments, can be likely understood as interest-excitement-anticipation and surprise and joy. (The combination, in the first 'hyphenated term' are in part(s) present in all modern theories of the basic emotions, while the last two are IN ALL such systems of understanding.) In short such emotions ARE THERE to provide major motivations to dwell on aspects of things, circumstances, and situations -- even situations, in later ontogeny, very much spanning instances (situations/circumstances) across times and space -- AND also facilitating the basic associative learnings -- so things "carry on".

Some present proposals which put forth that for "generalization" or "transfer" metaphors and/or analogies doing the bridging just do not work for me. This brings in irrelevant distraction elements and does not give you the needed precision or focus on new things or things seen-anew. Analogies and metaphors WITHIN a single stage may be helpful to the degree workable and appropriate in more minor learning regards.

For descriptive details of the Theory (Ethogram Theory) itself see:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Isn't_it_obvious_that_Cognitive_Science_in_Psychology_refers_to_structures_not_understood , in particular, the Answers .

Why an ethological-developmental theory of cognitive processes and of cognition?

Why an ethological-developmental theory of cognitive processes and of cognition? Here's my shortest answer:

(1) The Memories ARE Phenomenology : all of the most notable things we think and do are PROMINENTLY with the Memories . BUT, it is more than that: If you just put together the definitions of all the various Memories (long term: episodic, declarative, procedural; working memory; visual-spatial memory; the episodic buffer; articulatory loop(s) etc.) it becomes obvious that "memory" (the Memories) are not just the very basis of our experience, but, in all the most important ways ARE EXPERIENCE (first-person phenomenology) ITSELF.

(2) The ethological cognitive-development theory is well-arguable and more justified (and worthwhile) than any other perspective/approach:

It is based on real things: aspects of the Memories ("memory") -- the clearest concepts and evidence in all of Psychology and, NOW, some emotions (also well-established), are also in the theory (see latest Update to the Project)

(3) If what I have just outlined could be enough to suffice for explanations of cognition, cognitive processes and cognitive development, AND everything else is ill-defined , perhaps you can see how the assertions of this theory are justified AND, thus, it is possible that THIS outline for/of cognitive development suffices. If all this is true, then, why not "go for it". (see (5))

(4) For science, understanding and to abolish trumped up hypotheticals (esp. the homunculi of all the "meta" and "executive processes" -- needed ONLY if you begin with a perspective based on false presumptions (I KNOW I do not need them); these concepts are clearly and literally concepts-of-convenience : not well-founded NOR researchable WITHOUT CLEAR PRESUMPTIONS. "Ditto" (the same argument) against "embodied cognition" and "enhancement" theories.)

(5) Parsimony is the ultimate "null hypothesis" (act. hypotheses (plural), and ones this theorist would not like to see defeated __ AND YET __ the now near-clear hypotheses ARE testable, as is required for science). Like null hypotheses, you want to try to defeat them, BUT, in a case like this, one would be glad to see them essentially NOT defeated.

(6) For Experimental Psychologists: This outlook allows experimental psychologists to better hypothesize and

understand what the Subject BRINGS TO the lab -- and may make more naturalistic tasks, then valid as "stimuli". AND: The view/approach (at least eventually) allows experimental psychologists to better hypothesize BASIC processes ("perceptual shifts") and even look for them and find them in the lab setting (THAT time/space).

(7) See (and this is vital):

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314402953_Is_psychology_not_a_good_science_and_if_not_how_might_it_become_one

[Please also read the latest Update to the Ethogram Theory Project. OR see:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/It_seems_a_major_sort_of_addition_needs_to_be_made_to_cognitive-developmental_ontogeny_theory_Ethogram_Theory]

For further claims/justification see:

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

One might ask: "Does this theoretical and research perspective provide any important new credible hypotheses?" Yes, it does: A major "internal" sub-theory explains the nature of abstract concepts (how their bases will be found distinct and how they come to be) (true abstract conceptual processing and not shallow, untrue "look-alikes", e.g. earlier child "mimicry"). This possible knowledge and understanding comes with reading all the writings all the way through and then also the addenda (look for the phrase "lacking imagination for imagination"). AND:

Beside the fact that it is a strictly most-empirical approach, as empirical as any science, it respects necessary truths : most importantly, seeing behavior PER SE ("just behavior", actually, behavior PATTERNINGS) as organismic / biological (and there is the "structure", most vaguely alluded to in much research on cognition). And, the theory completes Piaget (his theory), with associated near-clear, near-specific hypotheses on how to detect (in direct observation of overt phenomenon (behavior PATTERNS, specifically BASIC perceptual shifts)) stage advancements. (Admittedly, for complete clear hypotheses, some discovery must be done.)

Also it redirects Western-oriented thinkers on how to DEFINE NOTHING (oneself, as a researcher), but seeing and realizing that the Subject (the organism) DEFINES ALL -- ALL: all concepts, in a most Subject-centered as well as truly empirical way as can be (all founded in (or its inception in) direct observations of overt behavior PATTERNS) -- as is the case in all legitimate science.

Finally, I do not know anything wrong with the perspective: it can incorporate any good findings (and would often improve perspective, e.g. again, wherever you see vague references in research on cognition to [clearly unknown] "structures").

I have offered as much as I can for the defeat of the view AND for one who accepts it, understands it and likes it, and then who edits the writings, and wants to be (with that) a co-author, ALL THAT. The good news is: no defeat in 6 years; the bad news ...

Also see:

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

I do challenge others to succinctly outline the main theory THEY use. Try 7 points and one brief paper (or anything else you can keep in mind and YET that is, IN THE MAIN, what you actually use AND it is/seems totally founded in reality -- AND, ultimately in OBSERVABLE replicable reality and with some likely validity). This is (or would be) a damned good exercise -- look how long it took me to do it.

ALSO : "Does this theoretical and research perspective provide any important new credible hypotheses?" If so, specify.

By the way, in many years the BEST IN THE FIELD (e.g. of Experimental Psychology, e.g. Davood Gozli) could not dispute my perspective and approach, but could only (literally) say "I disagree".

For descriptive details of the Theory (Ethogram Theory) itself see:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Isn't_it_obvious_that_Cognitive_Science_in_Psychology_refers_to_structure_not_understood , in particular, the Answers .

TO ADD: first, a sort of PARTIAL abstract on the Question beginning this thread and, particularly on my writings, in general (<-- about the relevance of all THAT). And, then after that, a listing of main "entry points" to my writings:

I have a cogent and extremely helpful theory, where I outline and indicate the nature of and the way to the discovery of the "maturation" involved in (or that IS) Equilibration Type 2 (that is the equilibration (homeostatic balance) between the stages (and thus putting the organism in the position to move on the the

higher hierarchical stage)) . This is the type of equilibration which, even to the end, Piaget could only say was "due to maturation". I believe I have found the way to discover the main inception or beginnings and proximate causes of these key parts of cognitive stage shifts. I complete this important part of Piaget's theory with strict empiricism: All concepts, constructs, models, etc. are clearly grounded/founded/ or begin with concrete observables -- the evidence is directly observable OVERT behavior patterns/patterning (and, of course, the relevant aspects of situations or circumstances). BY the end of my 900 pages of my writings, and taking my perspective and approach, one can hypothesize THE proximate causes of stage shifts , the basic innately guided PERCEPTUAL SHIFTS which essentially are the beginning of shifts to more abstract conceptualization and abstract thinking -- and key to all else major in cognition which relates to this . I posit, but then outline STRICTLY EMPIRICALLY how to discover these basic "perceptual shifts" which are "allowed-for" by long-term memory abilities spanning times and spanning spaces MUCH MORE than has heretofore been imagined (in a real and significant sense: we now lack imagination FOR/OF imagination); and, it is just these that are the inceptions or beginnings of abstract thought.

This perspective and what my approach also yields is THE END OF ALL MAJOR NATURE/NURTURE CONFLICTS (as it has been hoped for for many decades). AND: It shows when/how "top-down" and "bottom-up" ARE THE SAME THINGS at important junctures.

Since essentially all my writings are needed to comprehend my testable (verifiable/falsifiable) hypotheses in-contexts and, for this, one must really read all my articles, essays, and books -- ALL AVAILABLE THROUGH RESEARCHGATE (researchgate.com)

For more detail, : READ:

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

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK) and <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory> (see the Project Log of this Project to see many important Updates.) ALSO, not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking). And, similarly, see the other 2 addenda

ALSO, SEE THE RECENT RG POSTS:

<https://www.researchgate.net/post/>

[Isn't it obvious that Cognitive Science in Psychology refers to structure not understood](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Isn't_it_obvious_that_Cognitive_Science_in_Psychology_refers_to_structure_not_understood) AND

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/It seems a major sort of addition needs to be made to cognitive-developmental ontogeny theory Ethogram Theory](https://www.researchgate.net/post/It_seems_a_major_sort_of_addition_needs_to_be_made_to_cognitive-developmental_ontogeny_theory_Ethogram_Theory) and

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/Can you realize top-down and bottom-up ARE THE SAME THINGS at important junctures IN ONTOGENY child development](https://www.researchgate.net/post/Can_you_realize_top-down_and_bottom-up_ARE_THE_SAME_THINGS_at_important_junctures_IN_ONTOGENY_child_development)

If the limits of Memory are presumed to be those limits shown with the limitations of the lab, do you see the problem?

If the limits of Memory are presumed to be those [limits] shown with the limitations of the lab (time/space), do you see the problem? What about long-term memory bridging times and individual circumstances/settings ? [(and providing some such great context to the Episodic Buffer and (in important part) for working memory)]<-- AND THAT is highly likely explanatory for the abilities to have abstract concepts and do abstract processing. I believe I can "rest my case".

[One can base a lot on the great research on the Memories which is done (and I do), BUT NOT EVERYTHING : not all the bases of all Memory phenomenology can be seen PER SE as-founded OR found with findings THERE, with the current perspectives/view and now-used methods; BUT, worry not: I also provide an Answer here, to this sub-problem: not so much indirect evidence as the nature of the behavior patterns (BASIC perceptual shifts, likely present at/during each of the foundations -- inceptions in each new relevant situation -- of such a greater perspective that the the organism is developing), hypothesized to be DETECTABLE with eye tracking ** -- you're maybe only 900-pages away for understanding what I mean.]

** FOOTNOTE: not so far-fetched if you look at behavior PATTERNS per se ("just behavior") as biological onto itself (specifically: the patternings and patternings of patternings), which IT MUST BE.

For Basic Science: What Psychology needs is "multi-dimensional" studies (many TYPES) and NOT multi-disciplinary

The Multi-disciplinary approach gets various disparate findings put together by intuition (almost never good) (this criticism most certainly INCLUDING neuroscience findings). Multi-dimensional studies would involve MANY TYPES of studies, including several OUTSIDE THE LAB _and_ including better (and more varied) use of eye tracking (Psychology's microscope)

There may be much more to the latter (multi-dimensional studies). Feel free to add to this Discussion, adding perspectives and approaches.

Isn't it obvious that Cognitive Science (in Psychology) refers to 'structure' not understood?

Isn't it obvious that Cognitive Science (in Psychology) refers to 'structure' not understood (and often admittedly not understood)?

I see it over and over again, and in nearly all Cognitive Science work, as some answer much needed but never addressed. I address 'structure.'

Dear ____ You say, "at the level of both society and the Psyche - this is no more than a metaphor". In a way I can see this, because biological things do not have structures in any rigid sense (nor are there "mechanisms"). BUT: "Structure" has to do with set relations [(at points of key times)] _OR_ relatively constant relations between "things" -- "things" 'being whatever is addressed. This need not be static and the relations can have to do with principles (or laws) and, in THAT way, need not be set (same-specific at all); it could be the relations between what are called, or regularly referred to, as "dynamic processes" (which is the way I see the matter). (Plus, this interpretation is a matter of both norms and often [also] fact (fact, at least in cases of well-defined relations that have reliable, observable foundations or inceptions and with some sort of external validity -- making them predictive). This has with little to do with philosophy -- esp. since it seems nothing per se has to do with philosophy.)

On the matter of "nonidentity of the subjective and the objective worlds": this assured seems NOT to be the case IN THE CASE of classical ethology (which most everyone has basically forgotten because of their rigid deterministic (forceful and autocratic) professors -- see

Preprint Where is the Trouble in Pseudo-empirical Research?

for an example of THE HUGE RESULT). If you want to see real fallacy,, see ontology, as "opposed" to ontogeny -- check me out on that Question (with my Answer).

Dear ____ I am as humanly far from the rigid sort you want to talk about as can be. I am a pure, well-founded, real empiricist (and no one has, or can, show otherwise -- just look into it). I am NOT a reductionist in any real sense of that word. I only assert that ultimately all concepts have to be "reduced" to what you see/sense (and this is only rationality and empiricism -- that really cannot be assailed). (Any serious science person goes well beyond the minimum standards of Popper -- and Kuhn for that matter.) P.S. I have nearly no use at all for neuroscience. (I must ask, dear Frederik, if your motivation is to negate or neutralize anything important that might be said -- so, in my view, this is the "wonderment" of much academia and (especially) philosophy.)

[Please note I often I add to Answers (like my Answer above) for even up to an hour, so please re-read them. Thanks.] P.S. to all: my opponents are often those just restating what they "learned" in school, from professors who [indeed just] "profess"; ditto for Recommendations given to my opponents by others. You will find I quote (or mention) NO ONE, because I (as much as possible) evaluate ALL for myself -- and, it most certainly is not

because I am not well-read. (With me, all philosophers are "barking up the wrong tree" (as the metaphor goes). Most modern philosophers claim to BE analytic philosophers, yet no one knows what "analytic philosophy" means -- and very few nowadays try to really (that is, in real contexts) do it.)

Dear :

You say " It's not possible to be an empiricist - in the ordinary sense - and not be a 'reductionist', in the sense of a confounding a truth claim with a description of a state of affairs. " <- So, the philosopher, who addresses nothing, says. I respond: Read my writings and see no such confounding: Let me try to describe the nature of what is presented in those writings: I say there will be truths OF SOME CLEAR BEHAVIORAL PATTERNS in (or with respect to) a definable state of the organism's (the Subject's) affairs (often too crudely put as: aspects of "the environment"). Early in life, in the application of behavior patterns, and in all cases: both the circumstances and behavior patterns themselves are clearly and highly inter-related and really and truly defined (for us) by by the organism -- AND the behavior pattern responses ("responses" implying "environmental aspects" responded to) are eventually the basis, NOT of ideas/concepts conjured by the researcher, but of the real clear overt [further] PATTERNED responding (behavior PATTERNS) at early clear key times in behavioral ontogeny. These are truths of THESE behavior patterns (RESPONSES), at key times in their "environments", AND/BUT THEN (later) becoming, in a similar but "NEW" _present_ setting/situation/circumstance, a big part of the that present's natural contexts. I.E., these relevant earlier behavior PATTERNS, at any given later point in ontogeny are still in existence, also providing some of the major contextualization, with aspects you have already seen BEFORE, NOW perceptually related and/or conceptually related -- and NOW in the new "present", as represented (see below). SO: Presently we have the results of old established behavior PATTERNS with OTHER behavior PATTERNS emerging, so you have the new and the old, each and all, in response to key environmental/situational/circumstantial aspects.

Reiterating, adding more description: So, at key points, with this situation, now some key relevant elements of the sets of behavioral patterns that are older (and in some ways more easily dispatched with) set up the emergence of newer "higher" (more inclusive) hierarchical response patterns (using the older response patterns, BUT ALWAYS (if there are significant developments (ontogeny)), adding some key PATTERNING (and there being, then, some patternings of patterning) for us moving forward with changes in these later much-related settings. (As you can imagine, in such situations, earlier behavior response patterns apply to these settings by way of very often being represented (representation as images; both rather formal AND informal concepts; and recalled episodes (each and all as properly inferred from their earlier related settings and the way they WERE, AS existing similarly now, and them still being much the way they were when overt)). So, now, in this present, (the present, we are now discussing), they are not so much overt, but now a matter of memory that sets up a key new response pattern and patterning (new behavioral pattern aspects, being in some clear way more fully in response to the situation/circumstance) BY virtue of THE OLD patterns providing some major contextualization. It is THEN also we have, at key points, the NEW emergent patterns/patterning responding, to new or additional specific elements of the setting/environment/circumstances. (NOTE: There is NO true hierarchical developments without something new or significantly seen-anew.) With this later, key, PRESENT, the meaning of the present-setting/aspects-of-the-"environment" ARE SEEN with/by (in good part) and from THE CONTEXT KNOWN OF THE OTHER OLDER PATTERNS. Both these old behavior patterns AND their relevant aspects of the environment are all part of the behavioral phenomenology now (at this later present), BUT this

to be defined further in a way by essentially new environmental aspects, which are, in part and in some form, the old ones, and those also of the old behavior patterns now (with these patterned portions in less overt form) BUT with some addition(s) which shift behavior patterns and patterning overall . AGAIN: The old ones were at some time clearly overt. But, now, it is more: the truth (as much as there is "truth" at all) EXPANDS with a set of old relevant sets of response patterns, to environment aspects, sub-serving a new emerging behavior PATTERN when development goes beyond them, [having] the old PATTERNS special "in the story" by setting the context within which the new behavior patterns emerge (much of the contextualization from the old, from the Memories)], shifting the old with the emerging of the new patterns.

In short the DESCRIPTION OF SUCH A STATE OF AFFAIRS UNDERSTANDS PROPERLY THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE OLDER PATTERNS OF RESPONSES AND their ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS -- that being NOW part of the current environmental aspects. This sort of study is obviously cumulative, but this approach is also self-correcting (NO POSSIBLE CONFOUNDS WILL REMAIN UNCORRECTED).

Directly above, I have roughly described just ONE CYCLE of FIVE that occur during human ontogeny (human child cognitive development (0-18+ years old)). All 5 "cycles" (each being a notable level/stage) are similar, though It is commonly said they differ qualitatively. This is basically a neo-Piagetian theory translated (as it must be) to be ethology -- and, making use of the most-excellent research results on the Memories (with a bit of innate emotional "auto"-incentive thrown in). This theory, though, is MOST strictly empirical and includes the way to FIND (discover) an explanation for the inception of these stage shifts. These stage changes (changes at the beginning of each stage) are first seen beginning in subtle ways: BASIC perceptual shifts (with eye tracking very likely needed to detect the shifts at key times and in key circumstances (<- note the plural)). Each stage shows itself in each kind-of-similar important domain and, with the theory and approach, this is described much more clearly and all is founded 100% empirically -- all theory concepts are clearly grounded [ultimately, but clearly and truly,] in directly observable overt behavior PATTERNS. The stages are the bases for abstraction and abstract thinking.

Have you read ME?

Also see:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/It_seems_a_major_sort_of_addition_needs_to_be_made_to_cognitive-developmental_ontogeny_theory_Ethogram_Theory for a statement recognizing a likely emotional component

.

Can you realize "top-down" and "bottom-up" ARE THE SAME THINGS at important junctures IN ONTOGENY (child development)?

Can you realize "top-down" and "bottom-up" ARE [or certainly can, if not MUST, be] THE SAME THINGS at important junctures IN ONTOGENY (child development)?

This Question is NOT addressing YOU (the "self"), your social relations and activities, NOR your language. This question is about the biological processes SHOWN IN BEHAVIOR PATTERNS _PER_ _SE_ of the organism (aka "just 'behavior' "), DURING ONTOGENY, and beginning in overt and observable ways. As words are tools, to express certain things, sometimes (and even and especially at some critical times) the words used will seem contradictory or an oxymoron ,(e.g. it is hard to truly well-imagine a case of perception beginning thought). This cannot be viewed as a real problem. SO: at important key 'shift' points in development, what we CONCEPTUALIZE as "top-down", may have their actual key inception in what, in the highly [overt] behavior-related processes, may fundamentally have to be seen as "BOTTOM-UP". Major (if not THE major) shifts in behavior PATTERNS during cognitive development (of emerging seemingly qualitatively different stages/levels) may certainly have their inceptions in BASIC perceptual shifts (actually seeing new things or some things in a significantly new framing perspective AS new (or, in other words, the latter: "as seen anew")). [(THIS is seen as possible, if not necessary, if only by the reasoning processes of EXCLUSION -- if you are an empiricist/scientist.)]

With this perspective: the UN-defined bases of cognitive stages (equilibrium type 2, the balance between the stages and the point allowing for the stage shifts) is both more simple AND more researchable (with eye tracking) than anything conceived in academia heretofore. In short, this perspective is much more strictly empirical AND TESTABLE. [Piaget clearly, yet ultimately, ONLY ever said one thing about such stage shifts: that they were "due to maturation" -- Piaget realized this was the most serious deficiency in his theory to the end of his days (explaining why his LAST BOOK was on Equilibration). Piaget was big on "formal logic", which inherently, as applied, results in embracing limited content -- for THAT (as applied) is OF our normative conceptual system, not of independent, actual real biological systems).]

To get more perspective of my view and approach, _start_ at:

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Why_an_ethological-developmental_theory_of_cognitive_processes_and_of_cognition and READ all the Answers (follow-ups) and "go from there".

Now, well-argued, that much/most of Psychology is literally ridiculous (citation within)

It is now, well-argued, that much/most of Psychology is literally ridiculous, see : Where is the Trouble in Pseudo-empirical Research? Those involved should surely respond appropriately and fully determine how (/why) that is. Certainly, most all would tell me "it is not worth it, stop" (perhaps, particularly not "worth it" on Researchgate (and, often, so it seems)). I most assured would like to stop and WILL when I am finished [(apparently)] -- it's like a curse. PLUS, I have been told many times to give short Answers, but OFTEN that is

only possible when we tell each other what we ALREADY "KNOW" which, in most cases, or certainly too often, is NOT WHAT WE HAVE EVALUATED FOR OURSELVES, BUT we have ESSENTIALLY __MEMORIZED__ ("learned") from Professors. (And, we like to be told and to repeat what we already "know".) The game (quite literally a game -- or at least that is an extremely apt metaphor) may soon be over. Persons in Psychology may actually be better off if they "listen" to me or find [(not pretend to find)] another way. Please, IN ANY CASE, read the excellent Article, cited (I see that as unassailable with any sound logic -- EXCEPT: "we have to do it that way", and, to assert that superficially aping what could be the science of Psychology is "enough [somehow sufficient]" ("it will come together") and/or it is "all we can do" -- WHAT?, ARE YOU TRAPPED IN THE "LAB"?)). Behavior PER SE ("just behavior") is biological and PATTERNED and, if you cannot find PATTERNS and use that word, you are most assuredly "off track" -- truly defying what MUST be TRUE. Stop denying biology and science itself. (Logic or even what very much seems to be soundness, is NOT ENOUGH -- LOOK to/for foundations.) (If I ever need to provide an excuse for why I don't have a doctorate : it is because it was demanded that, with my topic, I follow suit with SELF-EFFICACY THEORY. (Again, see the Article -- it's bunk).)

Why People "in psychology" support "Embodied" and "Enhancement" "theories": THEY SIMPLY CANNOT BELIEVE [in] ANYTHING EXCEPT "LEARNING"

Truly preposterous (in fact, Trumpian): Why People "in psychology" support "Embodied" and "Enhancement" "theories": THEY SIMPLY CANNOT BELIEVE OTHERWISE _and_ often largely FORBID __believing__ ANYTHING EXCEPT ** "LEARNING" ** as the major "explanation" for much of everything. ("Learning", here, being basically an often ubiquitous, OFTEN ill-defined "concept" -- a "get out of jail free" type of thing) (such, as such, is not only seen as "OK" but a required BELIEF -- and, so often, JUST a belief (<- and no more to the foundation; under-specified and unresearchable (untestable) -- as embodied and enhancement "theories" themselves have been shown to be).)

Unfortunately, the only "jail" they are getting out of is : reasonable (and real) SCIENCE (yes, the problem is, indeed, of a Trumpian nature; and it often is raw ultra-simple vague believing (aka "just believing")). Truth is: Behavior must be, and is, IN PATTERNS. Correspondingly, behavior per se ("just behavior") _itself_ IS BIOLOGICAL (and that ITSELF is the full field of study) -- and psychologist are not even THERE yet (pause and think about THAT). (Also ask: How often, if ever, do I see the word "PATTERNS"?)

To slightly elaborate, on what all THAT (described above) truly is: Today's psychology "theories", identified above, are simply an extrapolation of Piaget's sensori-motor Period (0-2 y.o) to EVERYTHING cognitive (and, because of this this, they need not "believe" in stages/levels at all -- and, that is why THAT so very rarely comes up ("ditto" for any explanations for 'structure' to/"in" responding)). It is NOT because development (ontogeny) is a "separate" sub-"discipline", as they might try to claim; in fact, in a sense, with the unit of analysis being the individual human, there are no directly relevant separate disciplines or even sub-disciplines. And, so ill-grounded and ill-founded: psychologists get away with: if you CONJURE UP a pseudo-pattern (or, often, it is

"identified" and referred to simply as "a behavior") and THEY name it, [because of Western philosophy], then it is happily assumed to be a THING (unto itself) (i.e. existing in reality) SEE:

Preprint Where is the Trouble in Pseudo-empirical Research?

for some congruent material. (Words are NOT things.)

The 110+ year-old situation is disgraceful, and NOTHING they are doing will fix it or ever fix it. (Things will NOT just "come together" -- it is largely total stagnation (and, as Meehl said, just with changing FADS).)

In perhaps a more unclear way, a similar argument can be made against all the "hypothesized", but not clearly defined (by the Subject) -- so not testable -- "meta-cognitive [NOT] 'things' ", AND all the uselessly called [and simply supposed] "things" "termed" "executive processes". At best they are bad description. Maybe a better (or easier or more direct) perspective is: THEY ARE HOMUNCULI (disallowed in science) (arguments in favor of these basically mythical "things" are in essence: "because I said so" -- and "go" from there (they are OF J. H. Flavell)).

But even the argument in the Discussion Question, above, I would guess is applicable.

It is not hard to be with a mind-of-science if you have that.

Answers to OTHERS' Questions:

What the meaning of psychology ?

Dear

You say: " The psychology is a science deal with behavioral ". In reality, it can be very well argued that Psychology is [presently] NOT a science. Psychology aspires to be a science, but until they accept how direct observation of overt behavior CAN be found AS the clear basis for all important species-typical or species-specific behavior PATTERNS: no progress towards a real science can be made

A real problem for Psychology: It pretends to be a science, just by taking certain forms (essentially aping an observation-based science (aka REAL science)) . Relatedly, their hypothetico-deductive systems are "top down" (conjured too much in the mind with no good real empirical grounding) and thus the **premises for hypotheses** (not being "bottom up") are not established . (It is logic without soundness.) AND, a greater problem is that Psychologists believe their own false self-assertions [of being scientists] and believe AND present themselves AS actual scientists (thinking they are doing things in as "good" a way as possible -- VERY unimaginative and short-sighted). And, all this when about every concept "developed" since the 1970s is conjured up and NOT sufficiently empirically established -- to say the least (this includes all the meta and "executive" stuff, all embodiment stuff AND EVEN " 'social' learning" -- unestablished in the unit of analysis, the individual human). There are clearly homunculi involved (things seen as person(s)-within-the-person)).

As long as Psychology remains this way, it will NEVER be good science; **IN FACT, as it is going, IT will NEVER BE ANY SORT SCIENCE.** (Psychology, NOW, has the actual status of actuarial studies for insurance companies; it is that sort of "science".)

What are current and the most controversial problem in biology?

Dear

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

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

How much we never fully or clearly processed these achievements of these ethologists correctly (and then

went on from "there") is not explicable in any legitimate way. ALSO, with that: "forgetting" about Piaget's stages of cognitive development. These both are the grievous symptoms of a fallen and sick and artificial "science" (fallen away FROM a science of behavior patterns PER SE). These symptoms ARE OF A SICK false "SCIENCE", A SICK PROCESS, that has left the greatest likelihoods for ontogeny of behaviors (and child development) "behind". WE MUST ALSO ASK: how the heck has this happened?, i.e. what is the **systemic problem of Psychology in the colleges and universities** for what I can only see as this OUTRAGE? And the "replacement" over the last 2-3 DECADES has been a basically **false and pretend "science" well-shown to be UNPROVABLE (untestable) and merely speculative**, that is known as "EMBODIED" cognition "theories" (AKA enhancement "theories") -- well-shown in peer reviews as untestable assertions and completely scientifically UNACCEPTABLE. Ironically, it is clear these bastard "theories" are clearly based by-analogy on Piaget's first stage of cognitive development (where all is clearly overt in ways "scientific" psychology can see), known as the Sensori-motor Period . See: web page, link.springer.com/article/10.3758/s13423-015-0860-1 , for the thorough and scathing peer review of such newer "theories". Such theories are NOT THE BEST WE CAN DO, because **we can SEE IN MORE (and real) WAYS**, beyond the necessary "lab" situations and settings these defective, phony "scientists" can "see". [And, not only are these "scientists" NEEDLESSLY constrained in their observations, but findings of great and important patternings of behaviors through more thorough, inclusive (broader) observations (and, yes, some "in the field") and thereby findings of more and more significant real, overt patterns **may well also have overt signs clearly detectable IN THE "LAB" ****. It is so damned ironic.]

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

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

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

•

Dear

I would say that the the most controversial problem in biology is how to see all behavior as BEHAVIOR PATTERNS __AND__ see that the patterning PER SE (i.e. "just 'behavior') is in-line with other biological functioning

-

Is rationality normative? Can rationality be naturalized? Is rationality depended on normative conditions, or is it independent of normativity?

The questions, as presented, as problem(s) are see-able "that way" (wrongly, falsely) because persons with such questions (that way) are running around "in a box" with myths in their head. Really, this is how I am ABLE to see it; I have no such problems. This is UN-guided (misguided) philosophy -- something that should have been recognized for what it is, and in many cases, for a long time; such is the philosophy that has hindered behavioral science for centuries. But the very poor "science" history of Psychology let's it go on. That is all.

Dear

OK. Then identify the "box" you are in. What is the clear empirical context(s) for the questions? Nothing makes any true/real sense without that. If you can't identify that/those [(and it best be "that")] you are in, then you are in trouble conceptually; we (all of us always) are always in some "box"; if you can't clearly identify it, your thinking, like all thinking under those circumstances, will be "off track" (in a very strong and certain sense).

I may be a "science warrior", but I am a successful one. See my writings. I have properly replaced decades of Psychology with the empirical perspective and approach needed and the clear, proper, necessary and sufficient parsimonious view; ask AI and AGI persons, and they essentially MUST agree (see their work and compare it to Psychology constructs; NOTE the Psychology constructs that are not or never (I've only seen NEVER) used); I have the only workable Psychology system: my system is the only one with concrete foundations enough to be mechanized. This may be more than the typical stilted "science warrior" you have encountered has done. (I've seen them too.)

I cannot say more about the topic here (fortunately, I am relatively "ignorant" of that -- I didn't major in "spinning my wheels"), but I can comment on sort of the WAY people are here and the way such individuals will likely operate, to no avail.

Dear

You may have to tell me (OR show me why); otherwise see my last Answer for why (otherwise): I cannot help such thinking. In a way I did tell you why; it is thinking without any mooring ("adrift at sea"). I can't see what you are talking about, so it is unclear to me (as it would be or is to many others). Such questions and surrounding thought are loosely flouting words about (based, at best, on partial meaning and out of a useful context(s); that's all I can see

Dear

I see most philosophy as the mistaken/misidentified "box". This is why I denied being a philosopher for many years; and I only accept that title with reservations AND because I am that good. P.S. Your latest answer, again, is more than unclear.

Dear

" towards the subject by which you are able to produce such work in the first place. " is UN-interpretable. I see it as an ultimately vague THUS false assertion, AND with no evidence, direct or indirect. NO ONE I've seen, except perhaps me, has been able to produce ANY instance of an acceptable argument like that HERE on RG (and if RG is where you are, that is where your explanations are/or aren't). Otherwise:

NO one here on RG has been able to produce any convincing (or cogent) argument for what you now argue.

See my 3+ years of the damning outlook I provided on philosophy in the following thread:

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

Perhaps I shall regret the relatively little reason I did finally provide, when I admitted I can be seen as a good analytic philosopher.

How and why does the Questioner (and likely or perhaps others) seek to provide understanding " like laws of physics ". If philosophy provided SO MUCH, why would 'it' then seek THIS?

Dear

The " overzealous enthusiasm for logical positivism and logical atomism " seems to be opposed to a complete lack of strict grounding empiricism (see the terrible concepts of the "'meta" this and that' AND "executive functioning"). Requiring such empirical grounding (as I indicate) with each major step in one's conceptualization is merely an absolute requirement OF ANYTHING WHICH IS (or proclaims to be) A SCIENCE. THAT last statement is NOT disprovable.

You are basically just name-calling and casting aspersions (and this about REQUIRED ASPECTS OF SCIENCE ITSELF).

And, you say, " ... if phenomenology were to take the place of positivism, and positivism would then be the philosophy so harshly criticized, it would be no more desirable of a situation to the current one." Really?? One and/or the other comprises EVERYTHING. Are you so encouraging pure "arm-chairing" -- the blight of philosophy on behavioral science for centuries?

All my theory is clearly based in key phenomenology (specifically, directly observable overt phenomenon (in

behavior science: in directly observable overt BEHAVIOR PATTERNS)). IN CONTRAST: Philosophers mainly just "stir things up" to make major questions seem unanswerable. I've seen that AND I KNOW IT.

NO one supplies more "support to phenomenological research" than I do.

Let me do you a favor and give you a question related to Psychology worth working on (AS I HAVE ALREADY): What IS it that is both bottom-up and top-down at the same time? (And, this would also end any nature/nurture conceptual conflicts TOO.) Find that in my writings and "try that on"; or, also work on such a question (which is NOT an oxymoron).

Dear

I DO find that many of the terms and labels used by philosophers rarely come up (at least in that form (as topics per se)) in/for Psychology. I have gone 40+ years without talking to any significant extent about "rationality" or "normative conditions" -- and I am no doubt better for it. It is not that the terms you trumpet are not discuss-able; it is they are rarely worth discussing PER SE (and other supposedly indirect discussions of them, too, are not of any clear value). Otherwise, how did I miss having these discussions clearly imposed upon me (to establish some sort of decent perspective)? As R.W. Emerson said: "Away profane philosopher ! seekest thou in nature the cause ? ... thou must feel it and love it, one must behold it in a spirit as grand as that by which it exists, ere thou can't know the law." It goes on "known it will not be but glad loved and enjoyed" (which is fine). It is better to talk in terms of adaptedness than "pull out" and try to have the perspective of a god. (I doubt we can have pure or, often, even clear rationality -- and about as much worthwhile talking about as "pure reason".) The approach (as in science) for ME is to not to define (or accept any definitions) of anything; RATHER, the Subject defines all (<-- small and large: the behavior patterns, the patterning and patterns of patterns, ETC.)(And, my position makes sense, unless the Psychology theorist or researcher is trapped in a "lab" -- a condition which is not necessary with modern tools, e.g. eye tracking.)

Are ethology and comparative psychology still healthy?

Dear

It is not others (other than E.O. Wilson) that are ad hoc -- AT LEAST WHEN COMPARED TO THE GREAT AD HOC-ness OF HE HIMSELF. Examples: " Integrative neurophysiology:" and some imaginative role of Endocrinology .

This man is making such statements ON THE BASES OF WHO KNOWS WHAT (but: NOT on the basis of real concrete behavior PATTERNS). I have always greatly disliked E.O Wilson (for 4 decades)(as long as I have been an ethologist). Wilson is no kind of ethologist and is rather much, much more like an armchair philosopher. We don't need such "great thought", BUT, RATHER we need GREAT DISCOVERIES (and that will be plenty AND THE RIGHT STUFF, to think about).

Now, about ethology in general over the last 3+ decades; it has become greatly diminished by the PURE MYTH that it explains more in innate terms (and, presumably/persumptively explains less in terms of learning) and no one likes that (in short, the myth is believed by those with a shallow education in behavioral science).

[(In fact, the more classical ethology one does (finding more and more behavior patterns and THEIR patterning, etc.), ONE CAN BETTER SEE DIFFERENT TYPES OF LEARNING -- instead of the ubiquitous myth that there are basically a few simple sorts (and, ironically, SOME OF THOSE sorts of 'learning' ARE IN A VERY REAL SENSE MADE UP! : Example: "social learning", which loses track of the unit of analysis: the individual human; they may not know this because the thinking of these psychologists is so crude).)]

Even a person as great as Frans de Waal has replaced "ethology" using the "term" ecology INSTEAD (and NOT using the term, ethology). In one of his latest books he explicitly SAID (wrote) saying just THIS is what he is doing. And, you can find the clear switch of "ethology" TO "ecology" MANY PLACES (pure substitutions). (Two other examples are: Ethology and Sociobiology became Evolution and Human Behavior in 1997 ; the Journal of Social and Biological Structures was renamed Journal of Social and Evolutionary Structures, the latter renaming, I believe, occurred even before the name shift of that first journal.)

AND:

NOT BY COINCIDENCE: Since the 70s and 80s, stage theories of child development are eschewed, eschewed by the prevalent, foolish, modern psychology theorists and researchers. These "folks", again (AND THIS IS THE LINKAGE), want to believe that there is NO innately-related behavior patterns emerging after infancy or babyhood (BUT this is just a PRESUMPTION, and less justified than the OPPOSITE, from the perspective of Biology and as seen in phenomena exhibited by other complex organisms). Hey, also note: Behavior Patterns (and their patterning, etc.) are themselves BIOLOGY: I.E. 'behaviors' PER SE (" just ' behaviors' ") must show the characteristics of Biology (e.g. homeostasis) JUST LIKE ANY ORGAN, being biological (organismic) as it functions and adapts.

So in summary, what has been lost: the ability to discover and think in terms of behavior PATTERNS (with ethology and with me, these patterns always clearly founded or grounded, at least in their inception, ON directly observable OVERT 'behavior' (actually: BEHAVIOR __ PATTERNS__ (<- - this latter full term must be regularly used; using that wording is WAY BEYOND being a GOOD SIGN)).

SO: Given the last couple paragraphs, above: We largely lost the great stage theories of Piaget and neo-Piagetians . (Note: I am familiar with some current neo-Piagetians, and know that ALL of this is not lost; but, it is ALL SEGMENTED OFF AND VERY LARGELY NOT USED.)

I would submit that ANY respectable behavioral scientist, IF they go back and thoroughly study the work of the classical ethologists (like Tinbergen and Lorenz, who were awarded THE NOBEL PRIZE in 1973) __AND__ also go and thoroughly study the great foundational (or at least good-beginning) ideas of Piaget, etc., they would want to thoroughly "bring back" Ethology and Piaget (though adding in ME).

Another basic problem is that psychology theorists and researchers cannot get out of "the lab" or the other contrived situation. THIS even though we have new tools to help us monitor behavior PATTERNS better (e.g. eye tracking).

In a key way I have completed a major part of Piaget's theory. Piaget, himself, said what was left to be found,

detailed, and articulated were the ACTUAL shifts with Equilibration TYPE 2 (initiating each new cognitive stage emerging) ; and I provide the "mechanisms" for Equilibration 2 Shifts and they are much more clear than what Piaget had to explain only by saying "with maturation" -- and my proposals for the key discoveries are most-strictly and truly empirical. And , despite my criticisms of the "lab" setting, etc., not only do what I describe occur with those major PATTERNS shifts which ARE the emergence of the Equilibration 2 Stage Shifts (completely PIVOTAL BASES OF COGNITIVE STAGES), __YET ALSO__ because ALL has to be worked through working memory (basically : short term memory) THEN these key phenomenon MUST SHOW MANIFESTATIONS THAT COULD BE SEEN (ACTUALLY OBSERVED) (at least with eye tracking) IN THE SPACE/TIME CONFINES such as that OF THE LAB !!! The best of everything AND: finally a PARADIGM FOR PSYCHOLOGY (up to now non-paradigmatic); Psychology, would become strictly empirical (as I indicated, above) and be AS MUCH A SCIENCE AS ANY SCIENCE (i.e. a natural science).

To get back to having sense, and for science and real progress YOU MUST discover/rediscover the great foundations; you may start "getting back" by reading my writings, all here on RG (researchgate). Though the essays, etc. number 900 pages, this is a good start to the thoroughness required to "get back".

Dear

I basically forgot E.O. Wilson's work with ants; that undoubtedly was good and important (so, I know "where you are coming from"). Unfortunately, very soon after that ant work he moved on to books, writing of Sociobiology -- an area I see as always without sufficient grounding and thus highly speculative (AND at least in certain regards "just speculation" may well not be all there is to do; there is most certainly better grounding for behavior patterns). The way an ethologist looks at things, behavior patterns so greatly provide the context for other behavior patterns (or, in some certain cases, emerging behavior patterns) that behavior patterns are greatly and for the most part, and in effect, defined by surrounding behavior patterns at the point(s) of proximate causation.

What criteria do you have in mind while characterizing a scientific theory?

I have relatively recently tried to provide a general (overall: for all sciences) definition of science:

The definition of science :

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 a 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 times, present) variables that are overt and directly observable.]

ALL THAT is the minimal empiricism for science (and of science) and, I believe, PROVIDES A DEFINITION FOR SCIENCE -- and THEORY (with testable hypotheses) has THAT as its foundation.

Piaget's theory has some major aspects that are not sufficiently grounded in overt observables -- IN PARTICULAR, as he himself knew: the basis for the "balance" between stages and what "sparks" going from one to the next. Here is an outline of some specifics:

I have a cogent and extremely helpful theory, where I outline and indicate the nature of and the way to the discovery of the "maturation" involved in (or that IS) Equilibration Type 2 (that is the equilibration (homeostatic balance) between the stages (and thus putting the organism in the position to move on to the higher hierarchical stage)) . This is the type of equilibration which, even to the end, Piaget could only say was "due to maturation". I believe I have found the way to discover the main inception or beginnings and proximate causes of these key parts of cognitive stage shifts. I complete this important part of Piaget's theory with strict empiricism: All concepts, constructs, models, etc. are clearly grounded/founded/ or begin with concrete observables -- the evidence is directly observable OVERT behavior patterns/patterning (and, of course, the relevant aspects of situations or circumstances).

BY the end of reading my 900 pages of my writings HERE on RG, and taking my perspective and approach, one can hypothesize THE proximate causes of stage shifts , the basic innately guided PERCEPTUAL SHIFTS which essentially are the beginning of shifts to more abstract conceptualization and abstract thinking -- and key to all else major in cognition which relates to this. I posit, but then outline STRICTLY EMPIRICALLY how to discover these BASIC "perceptual shifts" which are "allowed-for" by long-term memory abilities spanning times and spanning spaces MUCH MORE than has heretofore been imagined (in a real and significant sense: we now lack imagination FOR/OF imagination); and, it is just these that are the inceptions or beginnings of abstract thought.

This perspective and my approach also yields is THE END OF A MAJOR NATURE/NURTURE CONFLICTS (as it has been said it must be for many decades). AND: It shows when/how "top-down" and "bottom-up" ARE THE SAME THINGS at important junctures.

How to characterize a dynamic model ?

Dear

One flippant answer would be: by most extraordinary and more-than-highly-unlikely luck.

But, let me "get real": Your question is the quandary we get in when we try to verify our own notions and constructions, NOT built "piece by piece" as the Subject itself does and would SHOW US [(and, if it's an organism we are talking about: how it would clearly be doing so adaptively, for adaptive purposes)] -- in any case, with the correct modest and continuing perspective: that way SHOW [us]. So it's NOT with that "dynamic" way (with a 'model' first) that we would come to see 'things' as clearly observable patterned phenomena and as the well-observed and well-followed phenomena patterns would show going forward (and as the the Subject itself -- organism or any system -- well-observed would reveal). We cannot simply imagine ALL THAT, or even any basic core of ALL THAT (or any key major guiding 'thing' for ALL THAT). Thus I see the hypothetico-deductive/fictional constructs of "dynamic models" as contaminated (and biased) overall perspectives of those who did not do sufficient work (to say the least) with the Subject to get any real definition of an overall or over-arching or "containing" perspective. AGAIN, it is the "cart before the horse" situation we get when we poorly use imagination (i.e. use bad thinking) to generate a hypothetico-deductive system that is not YET warranted from inductive work (<-- the primary data: observations of the development of behavior PATTERNS (or in 'natural sciences': patterns of phenomena)), ALWAYS with "anchors" (at least at key inceptions) IN directly observable overt phenomenon (in Psychology, the phenomena is BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, but AGAIN I would like to keep my statement general so it is a major part of any definition of ANY science itself). [Psychology, too, could be a 'natural science'.]

What is the difference between a full set of memories and our "self"?

The Memories are phenomenology ITSELF (by the very definitions given of the various, distinct, separate types of Memories) : thus, there is no difference between "the self" and a big portion of long-term memory.

This certainly does not mean the Memories are just the self OR that you remain conscious of procedural long-term Memory involved in "the self". Often little of the Self is helpful in adaptation and problem-solving and it is there best to be/have essentially no-self.

How many learning theories do you use in your work?

Dear

The reason I stick just with the main associative learnings (classical and operant) and the other simple forms of learning (e.g. habituation, sensitization) is because that is all that is needed in my most-strict (actual) empirical perspective and approach for Developmental Psychology and for General Psychology (for Psychology, generally). As with all real empiricism, with an approach knowledgeable of previous OVERT developments of phenomenology/ontogeny, there come to be NEW "things" to see, or (equivalently) new ways of seeing : THUS observing adapting behavior PATTERNS, as they are essential to the new learnings of distinct qualitatively new kinds of things (or equivalently: seeing old "things" in very different new ways). NOTE: STILL (and always) -- all occurring in directly observable overt behavior Patterns -- at least in their KEY and essentially important inceptions. (More on this, below.)

About your adoptive learning (as you describe), this seems like what they call observational learning: PROBLEM HERE IS: because the true unit of analysis in Psychology is the individual human, such observational learning must be found composed of just processes of the individual OTHERWISE there is a break with strict, real empiricism (briefly described above).

About " adaptive learning where we apply the higher-order thinking skills " : These are the types of things AGAIN VERY ROUGHLY (too roughly) CONCEPTUALIZED in terms of "executive processes" and the "meta" processes . I see all this as bad 'science' (pseudo-science) because what is clearly involved is the-man-within-the-man (the homunculus) -- long considered bad in science. My outlook and approaches need neither of these, for we abstractly view ourselves just as we come to view other things abstractly , with clear changes in child development -- i.e. just as we come to abstract concepts and thinking with regard to (and about) other things ("in the world"), so too with ourselves. Again: Somethings more primary must be behind this "adaptive learning"(and more than the simple learnings are resulting in new ways: if behavior PATTERNS much shifts qualitatively with ontogeny (and they do -- otherwise the basic simple, clear types of learning ARE ALL THAT IS NEEDED). (Again, your view of "adaptive learning": without any real sense of what "leads it off" WITH the individual seems to make your concept here NOT basic or in ANY sense of strict empiricism -- which is absolutely necessary and ALWAYS necessary FOR any science (no exceptions).)

I have a perspective and approach and a basic "containing and container" theory for all that you described BUT I indicate all of it comes from more basic (again strict empirical direct overt phenomenon (behavior PATTERNS) -- BUT with a big "CATCH" being that each important, qualitative change may well only be directly observable with clear observable PATTERNS only at the inception of the new pattern (basically because of the Memories and that brought forward for more basic conceptualization for contextualization; AND, especially in later ontogeny, the shift in behavior PATTERNS may be very subtle and require the new eye tracking technology to literally SEE them (and that, perhaps, with computer assisted analysis, too).

I recommend, you try:

Try a strict empiricism, making Psychology a natural (and real) science like those already so-recognized (I show that such is more-than believably possible). If you read my whole perspective and approach and understand it as a real "container" (about 900 pages of writings, all here on RG) and if you can come to DIRECTLY OBSERVE any of the subtle, qualitative perceptual shifts** stemming from CLEAR testable (verifiable falsifiable) HYPOTHESES about directly observable overt behavior PATTERNS (the necessary observations likely requiring eye tracking), you'll have it "made". SEEING the "perceptual shifts" intimately involved, actually, being themselves the foundation of each new developmental stage (some say: level), THEN YOU, my friend, will have

the only Nobel Prize in behavioral science in about 50 years (the last one in 1973 for true classical ethology work involving "JUST behavior" PATTERNS and patternings of those patterns, etc.; the Prize was under Physiology and Medicine, because that is the most-apt category Nobel has for such).

** FOOTNOTE: These are basic shifts in basic perception (NOT in any way merely the product of learning; and they are NOT "top-down" UNLESS you can come to see they are "button-up" and top-down AT THE VERY SAME TIME (also, then, ANY nature/nurture dichotomies become nonexistent -- something known as necessary for 40+ years).

I do not think learning in-and-of-itself is an area for much theory. I recognize ONLY the simple forms of associative learning and other simple forms of learning, like habituation and sensitization . There are a number of good papers out describing how such simple forms of learning are sufficient for LEARNING. For some of these good write-ups, just look for such in my reading list:

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Brad_Jesness2/interest

My apology for repeating basically much the same answer I gave Nov. 2018 (above)

Why do researchers accept hypotheses as facts?

Dear

I certainly agree with your first statement. But, I believe that to attribute the lacking of a proper perspective to a need for special skills is missing the real basic and true point. THAT (such skills) is not really what is required and necessary; the situation is much more basic and simple: It is really quite simple : You really just need to examine the common basically skewed understanding of deductive reasoning vs the common "definition" of inductive reasoning: the former is touted as using factual premises and arriving at certain conclusions; in contrast, it is indicated that inductive reasoning never gives certainty. BOTH views are just plain wrong. With inductive reasoning it is possible to come to findings that are as reliable and valid AS ANY; and, using deductive reasoning almost never involves certain premises (but rather really just hypotheses). BUT: Since hypotheses are part of a hypothetico-deductive thought system, they are assumed more certain (than any mere observations) because they HAVE THE PLACE ("slot") in that form of reasoning AS: PREMISES [(now, as proposed above, just go and look at the extremely common skewed "definition" of deductive reasoning, alluded to above; BINGO !!]

We humans are rarely complex but when confused -- which we often (and often naturally) ARE (ignorance is typically what is there before knowledge). Anyone can arrive at a good-enough perspective here (on these forms of reasoning), if we just connect with a sampling of realities/related phenomenology and forget about "our" (or THE) "definitions". That we come up short in these regards (understanding the actual usages of the 2 forms of reasoning) is simply part of the plague of WESTERN history and philosophy with which we are

burdened; shed that and things may well be seen better. [(Let me say it: Yes, I submit that Western thinking is ACTIVELY STUPID and, as such, may be worse than ignorance. Take the tacit (implicit) requirements of bad philosophy away and you open yourself up to see and/or use resources. Too bad universities are so full of touting the greatness of A certain perspective or a TYPE of perspective (basically wrongfully over-defining in advance; this makes the academics loose much of any possible "edge" they may have by being in those nice buildings).)]

A P.S. for ____ : a hypothesis itself is never (in any real sense) PROVEN; it is a hypothesis-IN-CONTEXT (for example: a hypotheses in a BIOLOGICAL system, like a system of behavior PATTERNS, I outline) that can be shown true or at least be true in the sense of being useful for further understanding

What is Science?

Dear

In my writings I have defined good, necessary, strict empiricism THAT IS science. SEE, in particular, the first addendum to "Essentially, all Recent Essays on Ethogram Theory" (called paradigmShiftFinal.pdf) through the following page (scroll down a little -- about half a page -- to see it ; you may start on page 16, if you wish, to save time; OR you may start on page 51, if you really lack time):

Data paradigmShiftFinal.pdf

(unfortunately, HERE you have to Download it to read it).

*** OR *** , RATHER,

a copy is NOW available for VIEWING WITHOUT DOWNLOAD (if you wish) at:

http://mynichecomp.com/key_content/paradigmShiftFinal.pdf

How important for each scientist is basic knowlegde about philosophy of science? What is your opinion?

Dear

Though you have been nice and even complimentary, I will address your statement : "... your working definition of "decent thinking" is so much different (in language or concepts) from those authors' approach or paradigm, that mutual understanding is virtual impossible" (end quote) Truth is that my perspective is MORE UNDERSTANDABLE due to the requirement of grounding/founding/"starts" in directly observable overt

phenomenon (in psychology: behavior PATTERNS) FOR ALL (each and every) concept; THAT, present and traditional views and approaches LACK. It is the status quo nonsense that is not clearly understandable; AND, people do not even think they 'understand' until they "join one club or another" (which they do most often under some sophist professor's thumb AND they skip key necessary independent validation, themselves, of the field (e.g. see "embodiment" or "enhancement" 'theories') -- which would reveal to any thinking person what I said above and say below is the case). The result: Psychology as a whole is fundamentally facile (unstable and changing almost as with a whim), though one "club" or another may be most popular for a while (again, see those ridiculous and untestable "theories" I just mentioned -- going for 25 yr+ now). It is really just ridiculous when one realizes the necessary strict empiricism provably necessary for communication (AND FOR SCIENCE, which in good part simply involves good communication) -- and which you will find in every progressing/real science.

Dear

Thank you for elaborating your position, though parts of it try to affirm some philosophy claims that I believe are just not true (Philosophy makes claims of worth it cannot actually show and cannot substantiate (except mine, of course)). <-- One of the truest definitions of a philosopher (as I have found them) is : "my system of ideas/thoughts is better than yours [and ALL others]". By this definition, I DEFINITELY AM A PHILOSOPHER [(but please do not use that "P" word to refer to me -- too much terribly bad "baggage")].

But, as a philosopher among philosophers, I encourage you to fully read the better empirical (science) philosophy and science of Psychology Philosophy of Brad Jesness . You seem to be a philosopher, Paul, and you should relish reading my 1000 pages of "philosophy" writing (all the writings related) (right here on RG).

By the way, that sequence of books I have used recently to refresh on philosophy, ESPECIALLY as related to Psychology, seems quite sensible and prudent. I did find a fourth book on philosophy in general which I read, but will not provide the title etc., just for you to make fun of it. (Oh, hell, it's: The Philosophy Book: Big Ideas Simply Explained (2017) read to just get a broad (though superficial) view of the entire field.) You making fun of my books has no impact on me. AND, my initial Answer to this thread is a fine Answer, since you could apply your negative critique to ANYONE that does not seem to agree with you -- as a philosopher would. As one philosopher to another: "Greetings and farewell [(but I am likely better than you)]".

I should note, since it is pertinent, that I have recently read a critical review (a book) on Experimental Psychology

Book Experimental Psychology and Human Agency

AND reviewed it: see: <https://dgozli.com/brad-jesness-review/> (Please see all follow-up responses to the first review post which are basically my addenda.) P.S. You can find that whole Davood Gozli book on-line (and legally) for free -- that's where I got it. [BookAuthority, which claims to be the world's leading site for nonfiction book recommendations lists Gozli's book as #18 among the best 49 experimental psychology books (this is: among the best "of all time").]

Is every activity of living systems a consequence of receiving and processing information from their environment?

Dear _____ Let me talk of Psychology:

Only things like clocks have mechanisms; living things have processes and behavior PATTERNS and PATTERNING (patterning of patterns). Behavior [PATTERNS] are an aspect of biology, like the functionings of your liver. Real behavior patterns are involved in all and "cover" all (all real definitions come from what is seen in/with the Subject). Any views that do not clearly display such a view (with real discovery of PATTERNS -- beginning overt and directly observable -- as all their bases for all their concepts ... models) are essentially medieval; you must see a clear and meaning discovery of PATTERNS or the rest is largely not science (and often junk). This is a "hard pill" Psychology must "swallow" OR "choke on it".

What are the differences between mechanisms and processes of developmental change?

I doubt one can necessarily make any qualitative distinction between "mechanisms" and "processes" of developmental change IF one knows and requires that ALL of each must be grounded/founded/have-their-inception-in directly observable overt phenomena (the phenomena in psychology: behavior patterns and further patterning).

There may be a connotation difference with the "mechanisms" being a starting-off of what THEN (after) develops (and what there is) through simple associative learning and experience -- through the [other] "processes" -- STEMMING FROM THOSE VERY MECHANISMS; the "mechanisms" can also rightly be called "processes". Taking this connotation difference you have: the consistent (specie-specific or species-typical) basics from which all of a given qualitative way of conceptualizing and thinking begins with; and, then there are other more individual variants in what is so-conceptualized and so-thought-about as/after the processes unfold and are elaborated.

As "processes" may also be seen to include the start-off mechanisms, thus, in effect "processes" is just a term with a larger scope by connotation (a more general term) (and that is fine, good, and well); but there will be seen to be a difference in consistency of well-defined "mechanisms", where that is not found in later "processing" (with individualization).

By the way "requires that ALL of each must be grounded/founded/have-their-inception-in directly observable

overt phenomena" has to be true of any concept or conceptualization FOR AN ENDEAVOR TO BE A SCIENCE, like all other good progressing and rather well-understood science. HOW THIS IS ACTUALLY POSSIBLE is detailed in my writings, all here on ResearchGate; in my writings you will also find the elimination of any question of nature and nurture being separate. Sound good? Take a look.

Thanks, I would like to add that the mechanisms ** and the other processes WILL be the beginning of distinct qualitatively-different ways of conceptualizing and thinking -- I am a neo-Piagetian, after all (seeing 5 level/stages of thinking emerging during childhood ontogeny (0-18+y.o.)(I break the Pre-Operational into 2 levels/stages, as some others do)). It is still an open question at what point in such a portion of ontogeny that the qualitative differences in thought (different from earlier thought and what comes later) will actually be effective and thus clearly meaningfully existent; this point may well differ domain-to-domain to some notable extents and from individual-to-individual to some notable extents.

[I do believe a lot of the trouble Psychology has had has to do with having to declare "stages or not" before finding any of the key contexts where such would (or could well) emerge (my writings offer strict-empirical proposals here). We simply are impatient label-ers and want to label and want to use our apparently "god-like" powers of intuition (like Descartes) to do so. That is a bad, confusing and un-resolvable way to start; PLUS, this way, things STAY UN-RESOLVABLE.]

** Footnote I am still rather-much with the guy that sees NO mechanisms, except in things like clocks. THAT is my basic position. [The truth lies in the very largely unexplored "mire".]

Dear

I do believe that a LOT of behavior (esp. cognitive behavior like imaginings and thought) goes "underground" . This is of course thanks to the marvelous set of the Memories we have (the Memories is a central area of research and will likely just become more so). Still, for science and for any progressing-with-clarity, we MUST have directly observable overt referents or what are clear "anchors" for any significant behavior patterns that DO become un-observable (and also, UNAssessable, without careful systematic observation OF behavior patterns, WHICH MAY WELL BE ABLE TO PROVE THEMSELVES). (What is an important basic is seeing the term "behavior PATTERNS" as the true units of observation -- and that would obviously also be the way things are looked at and described in scientific Psychology Articles; consistent use of the term "behavior patterns" would signal the start of a tractable science -- actually, in my view: the beginning of scientific Psychology itself, the first 110 years notwithstanding.)

Can we mathematically model consciousness?

Dear

I do not have a fragmented view of consciousness; consciousness is in many ways, but I in no way indicated they were not related (and DO NOT BELIEVE THEY ARE UNRELATED). Still, I do see different sorts of "consciousness" in different circumstances. BUT, you do see how you simply "read in" the "unrelated" interpretation, don't you?

You got your retribution; fine, I don't mind; unfortunately (for you) the bad things you say about me are not true (go through up to 1000 Q and A's to see if you can find any good evidence for the characterization of me); I might be the most disciplined and serious person here on RG (and I've been that way for years).

What do physics people have to do with Psychology? Answer me that. Psychology is in such an infantile state, it wouldn't be hard to learn Psychology (at least as most do). If Physics does not satisfy you, switch your area of study to Psychology. (Otherwise, keep your "quantum"s to yourself.)

Dear

You are mistaken. There is/was nothing "spiritual" OR "meta-" about my Answer. To be honest, I cannot understand how you could see it that way. Perhaps it is just "minds adrift" with "no mooring" (and no actual way to correctly bridge across perspectives), ONCE AGAIN. If so, that is not graduate level thought related to a well-guided discipline. (Physicists, especially, seem to have trouble staying in their field(s). "Quantum", my ***) We should all know that most mere reasoning-by-analogy is not good (important facets or processes often are not mirrored in the analogy).

I do think discouraging Answers like mine is just (in effect) a way to say: "I like RG crappy". And, obviously many (if not most) DO (but I thought that was what twitter was for).

You could 'define' "consciousness" in a 'researcher'-defined way so, in a restricted set of 'researcher'-defined circumstances, it can sometimes almost show mathematical patterns __BUT__, always involving changing, inexplicable constants or normalizations . So, that is done wrong, and basically, very close to NO GOOD (close to not even useful). YET: This is the "state of the art", mathematically, for Psychology (do you think YOU are better at Psychology??; if not, what the heck are all of you talking about??). Let me provide an example that very much seems to be related, AND has the fatal problems indicated:

Article Inhibited Elements Model — Implementation of an associative ...

I suggest you come to know and realize this "state of the art" and then realize how silly the Question is -- as well as for other clear major reasons I have outlined over the years, all true : One thing I've rightly said before is: "consciousness" can, in no useful way, be defined as one thing (there is no useful general definition, but NOR NEED THAT BE THE CASE); it CAN be usefully defined in/for sorts of circumstances -- these being numerous, but many nonetheless important.

I do think that supposedly learned people could get a valid perspective (if only on their particular ignorance) and thus to CEASE WITH THESE SILLY QUESTIONS. It is often very hard to believe that people here have advanced degrees.

MISSED Questions of mine:

Why does modern Psychology offer so little that is useful to Artificial Intelligence and General (real) Artificial Intelligence (AGI)?

Why does modern Psychology offer so little that is useful to Artificial Intelligence and General (real) Artificial Intelligence (AGI)?

I surely think I know. It is because many of Psychology's constructs (e.g. the "meta"s and the "executive functioning") are _made-UP constructs_ -- they have no distinct concrete or material grounding (NO clear foundation(s))(thus there is no way for them to be "mechanized"). These constructs are then clearly empirically

(and altogether) UNJUSTIFIED (and distract from any and all good science). Those constructs are PSEUDO-ABSTRACT because anyone with any sense would realize that for a developing biological entity THERE MUST BE TRUE IN-THE WORLD, CONCRETE (specific) groundings (as foundations) for everything, INCLUDING ANY ABSTRACT CONCEPTS HUMANS DEVELOP. (And, what I just said about abstract concepts: This includes abstract concepts conjured-up and used by Psychology theorists and researchers !!!)

That's why my AI Project provides THE ONLY USABLE FRAMEWORK IN PSYCHOLOGY for AI/AGI.

Plus, my perspective and approach to Psychology is not limited, but can (I firmly believe) account for all human phenomenology (that is, ALL BEHAVIOR *** __ PATTERNS __ ***) ***. The lackings of and in Psychology have not been well-addressed -- even over decades (and there is NO GOOD excuse for this). If I am the only one addressing this, then I win ! IN any case, there is NO GOOD REASON for anyone to accept modern Psychology for science or for most any useful understanding (again, as I said before, Psychology presently has a status like actuarial "science" , that used to determine risk and proper coverage and 'benefits' from insurance).

Psychology people SHOULD be asking why AGI has not used many of the constructs FOR DECADES (this, itself, adds weight to the view that many Psychology constructs are NOT GROUNDED (well-founded)). Psychology's denial of reality is apparent and is embarrassing -- that is the only reasonable explanation for its great non-use in AI or AGI (since DECADES have passed).

*** FOOTNOTE: Read :

https://www.researchgate.net/post/Not_Psychology_for_Psychology_but_open_tough_thorough_true_fully_p_henomenologically-based_real_empiricism_for_all_explanations_and_understandings and the Answers following that Discussion Question for elaborations/clarifications. AND: READ:

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

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/329428629_Essentially_all_Recent_Essays_on_Ethogram_Theory (basically a BOOK) and <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Human-Ethology-and-Development-Ethogram-Theory> (see the Project Log of this Project to see many important Updates.) ALSO, not among the 200 pages of major papers and 512 pages of essays in my "BOOK", above (which you already have been directed to), the following link gets you to 100 more pages of worthwhile essays composed after the 512 pages:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331907621_paradigmShiftFinalpdf (you CAN find the pdf at this last link, though it may take a little careful looking). And, similarly, see the other 2 addenda .

You might also look at my Project that is expressly AGI (if you are in the field of AGI).

P.S. The key to success for founding psychology _is such as I have provided with progressively increasing details in my writings (over the last 4 years): THAT which are the concrete, observable, new aspects of behavior patterns that ARE BOTTOM-UP AND TOP-DOWN at THE SAME TIME. NOT an oxymoron, but the KEY to real progress.

AND, my perceptual shifts are thus verifiable/falsifiable.

(You will find all this in my writings, as I detail the perceptual shifts during ontogeny; but, you must read much of my writing to "see" this.)

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

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" (2015-2019)

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)

Dear

I do believe we must have a clear standard. There must be a dividing line between science and not-science. Here is what I have argued for as a SCIENCE standard, and here in particular for psychology: we want Psychology as 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) .

At least the preparadigmatic way Psychology is, IT IS NOT A SCIENCE -- by this necessary standard (above). All is NOT okay. We certainly cannot wait things out in a terrible case such as Psychology -- bad, in general (largely; in most areas), over its entire history. NO reason to believe anything essential will change without providing a paradigm.

Dear

One must discover strict empirical bases OF the foundations (the inceptions) of major behavior patterns during ontogeny (and affecting a being through its lifetime). It is not just "this or that" and both are always ok! Qualitatively, that is what you are saying.

I go beyond Popper because I know an area where they are trying (albeit poorly) to make a science; I am not just a philosopher, so I can do better. I believe I know more (and have shown more) of a paradigm shift than Kuhn ever knew or described.

It seems to me that many try to "smooth things over", so there is no change/no progress. Just "jobs", just "slots", just unclear "boxes" (confusion).

In short, I do not see your point as a point. If I have a dogma, it is a strict real-science standard of empiricism, esp. to discover foundations. THAT is my only "dogma" -- and it shall remain. One must truly "anchor" realities (phenomenology seen). My position is to "define" NOTHING; the Subject DEFINES ALL (behavior patterns and their patterning and further patterning of patterns). That is true empiricism in all sciences (just substitute the word "phenomena" for "behavior patterns", for the other sciences).

