

**R.Cam** 🦋🐶[@Logo_Daedalus](#)

14h • 5 tweets • 3 min read • Read on X

Subscribe

Bookmark

Save as PDF

You have to define what "thought" is that is somehow "not material" -- we live in an age where computation is a material factor, we have given it measurement. Where are the "computations" governing natural phenomenon occurring?

"Reality is thought" -- where is the thought occurring? The idealist Berkeley said that everything material was a thought of God-- so "material" was "thought" & they were the same thing. So a statement like "reality is thought" is completely meaningless-- whose thought?

Then the latter definition of Materialism-- that "reality is prior to thought & generated by the mechanics of reality" -- completely meaningless nonsense. What is "reality"? What a slippery word you rest all of this upon! "The Mechanics of Reality" -- what if that's the same thing as what you'd define as "thought" -- but then, that simply means, there is an interpenetration of the concepts of "reality" & "thought" -- is "reality" a "thought"? What are these "mechanics of reality" you throw into the sentence here? Are they in the room with us right now?

Your book recommendations are of Science Fiction authors like Daniel Dennett--

"Suppose that there were some neuroscientific apparatus that fits on your head and feeds your visual experience into my brain. With eyes closed I accurately report everything you are looking at, except that I marvel at how the sky is yellow, the grass red, and so forth. Would this not confirm, empirically, that our qualia were different? But suppose the technician then pulls the plug on the connecting cable, inverts it 180 degrees and reinserts it in the socket. Now I report the sky is blue, the grass green, and so forth. Which is the "right" orientation of the plug? Designing and building such a device would require that its "fidelity" be tuned or calibrated by the normalization of the two subjects' reports-

-so we would be right back at our evidential starting point. The moral of this intuition pump is that no intersubjective comparison of qualia is possible, even with perfect technology."

—Daniel Dennet

Literally "what if the blue I see isn't the blue you see" dressed up in Science Fiction garbage. This is your authority on Truth?

Dennett was credited with inspiring false belief tasks used in developmental psychology. He noted that when four-year-olds watch the Punch and Judy puppet show, they laugh because they know that they know more about what's going on than one of the characters does

"Very young children watching a Punch and Judy show squeal in anticipatory delight as Punch prepares to throw the box over the cliff. Why? Because they know Punch thinks Judy is still in the box. They know better; they saw Judy escape while Punch's back was turned. We take the children's excitement as overwhelmingly good evidence that they understand the situation--they understand that Punch is acting on a mistaken belief (although they are not sophisticated enough to put it that way)."

It's like he's discovering the pedagogical purpose of dramatic irony. The dramatic irony of all this "analytic philosophy" reinventing the wheel, but now encumbered by so much science fiction jargon that it becomes self-parodying.

"Words are memes that can be pronounced."

—Daniel C. Dennett

Your Sage.

"Is this Tree of Life a God one could worship? Pray to? Fear? Probably not. But it did make the ivy twine and the sky so blue, so perhaps the song I love tells a truth after all. The Tree of Life is neither perfect nor infinite in space or time, but it is actual, and if it is not Anselm's "Being greater than which nothing can be conceived," it is surely a being that is

greater than anything any of us will ever conceive of in detail worthy of its detail. Is something sacred? Yes, say I with Nietzsche. I could not pray to it, but I can stand in affirmation of its magnificence. This world is sacred.”

—Daniel C. Dennett

He's a Pantheist lol. He worships "the world."