

Photo Credit: Charlotte Bröcker



We and Julio Down by the Pergamon

iMagination: THE FRIENDLY GHOST

A MoMo Presentation

July 4, 2016, Tiyatrom, Alte-Jakobstraße 12, Berlin, 20:00

**Presenters: Pollux and Castor, The Phlakit Brothers
Peter Lupario and Ed Reno**

The Phlakit Brothers wish to express their thanks to Wolfgang Sohst for putting *iMagination: The Friendly Ghost* on the MoMo calendar and to Auris Lipinski of PhenCoCo for having come up with the inspired tagline for thinking as *iMagination caught linguistic™*. Thanks to Charlotte Bröcker, our photographer nonpareil, who risked her professional reputation and Benji Konjhodzic's life to take pictures of us. Finally, thanks to Richard Moore, without whom not. None of these people is responsible for any of The Phlakit Brothers's goofy ideas – or visages.

Méditations Phlakitiennes

Oxbridge and the Art of Misprisioning iMagination

Strawson, P. F., “Imagination and Perception,” in *Experience and Theory*, L. Foster and J. W. Swanson (eds.), Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970, p. 31.

The uses, and applications, of the terms ‘image’, ‘imagine’, ‘imagination’, and so forth make up a very diverse and scattered family. Even this image of a family seems too definite. It would be a matter of more than difficulty to identify and list the family's members, let alone their relations of parenthood and cousinhood.

Gendler, Tamar, "Imagination", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/imagination>

To imagine something is to form a particular sort of mental representation of that thing. Imagining is typically distinguished from mental states such as *perceiving*, *remembering* and *believing* in that imagining *S* does not require (that the subject consider) *S* to be or have been the case, whereas the contrasting states do. It is distinguished from mental states such as *desiring* or *anticipating* in that imagining *S* does not require that the subject wish or expect *S* to be the case, whereas the contrasting states do. It is also sometimes distinguished from mental states such as *conceiving* and *supposing*, on the grounds that imagining *S* requires some sort of quasi-sensory or positive representation of *S*, whereas the contrasting states do not.

Nota Bene!

This slippery slope plunges down to the Humean onedled self and the ultimate perdition of atoms-and-the-void!

Méditations Phlakitiennes

The Charles River and the Art of iMagination in Mufti

James, William, *The Principles of Psychology*, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1893, p. 609.

The relation of experience to time has not been profoundly studied. Its objects are given as being of the present, but the part of time referred to by the datum is a very different thing from the conterminous of the past and future which philosophy denotes by the name Present. The present to which the datum refers is really a part of the past — a recent past — delusively given as being a time that intervenes between the past and the future. Let it be named the specious present, and let the past, that is given as being the past, be known as the obvious past. All the notes of a bar of a song seem to the listener to be contained in the present. All the changes of place of a meteor seem to the beholder to be contained in the present. At the instant of the termination of such series, no part of the time measured by them seems to be a past. **Time, then, considered relatively to human apprehension, consists of four parts, viz., the obvious past, the specious present, the real present, and the future. Omitting the specious present, it consists of three . . . nonentities — the past, which does not exist, the future, which does not exist, and their conterminous, the present; the faculty from which it proceeds lies to us in the fiction of the specious present.**

Nota Bene!

Billy James! Just say the F-word and our philosophical souls will be healed.

Méditations Phlakitiennes

Schwarzwald and the Art of Transcendental Repair

Heidegger, Martin, *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, Fourth Edition Enlarged, trans. by Richard Taft, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990, p. 138.

Kant's laying of the ground for metaphysics leads to the transcendental power of imagination. This is the root of both stems, sensibility and understanding. As such, it makes possible the original unity of ontological synthesis. This root, however, is rooted in original time. The original ground which becomes manifest in the ground-laying is time.

Nota Bene!

Marty to Billie James: "Make that 'faculty' iMagination"

Dedekind Dreaming

As The Phlakit Brothers Will Show

- *Da Capo*: It's *esse*, as *agens*, all the way down ... (Thomas Aquinas, ST I:75:5:ad 3)
- Human Agency Is Expressed Intentionally Through the Modalities of Action and Consciousness
- *Conscientia Est Omnis Divisa in Partes Tres* = Affectivity, Sensibility, iMagination®
- iMagination Pre- and Post-Linguistically Generates Subsumptive Concepts and Propositions as Existential *Tokens* that Function as Open-Textured and Asymptomatic *Types*
- Augustinian First Language, Inner Speech, *Parole*, and *Langue* Are Generated by iMagination All the Way Down (IAWD)
- Thinking = Inner Speech = iMagination *Caught Linguistic*™
- Imagination Is Phenomenologically Accessible, Describable, and Causally Efficacious
- iMagination Is Poised Phenomenologically – and Naturally – Between the Transcendental Neurophysiological Giants and Immaterial Gods
- Unlike Casper, iMagination Is *Not* an Ectoplasmic Ghost – No Pineal Gland Need Apply
- Phenomenologically Heavy and Transcendentally Lite is Rhetorically Best in the Philosophy of Mind
- Hillary Clinton Will Be Elected 45th POTUS – in a Walk

Sellarsian Typology of Philosophical Argumentation

- Ontological
 - Phenomenological: resist the Sirens leading to the Scylla of Legoesque givenness all the way down (AWD)
 - Transcendental: resist the Sirens leading to the Charybdis of AWD reductionism (Democriteanism)
- Methodological
 - Analytical: respect differing internal logics
 - Of differing *paroles*
 - Between *parole* and *langue*: avoid the paralogistic Hydra
 - Dialectical: avoid paralogistic refutational analyticity
- Historical
 - Exegetical: avoid crypto-*ex auctoritate* and hobgoblinish consistency – and Satanic text-mining
 - Dialogical: irenicism *genau*?
 - Aristotelian patricide, Aquinian *pia interpretatio*, and Heideggerian violence are *überlegen*
- All philosophical argumentation grounded in, and articulated by, *iMagination*
- No clear bright lines in practice between the rhetorical types
- Ontologically privilege the phenomenological as far down – and up – as possible
 - “90% of ontology is phenomenological, the other half is transcendental” – Yogi Berra

Anthropological Framework

- Ontologically embodied *agent as existent being* AWD (all the way down) in a space-time bounded, natural world
 - Embodiment anchored phenomenologically
 - Kant's Transcendental Unity of Apperception need not be transcendental: Just look in the mirror Dave and Manny
- Agent *in-Tentionally* inForms AWD
 - *Action/Behavior*
 - *Consciousness*
 - Note: there is a principled debate whether sensibility is intentional
 - Sellars as principal *non*-intentionalist
- Modalities of Consciousness AWD
 - *Sensibility*: intuitive receptivity in relation to the noumenal world
 - *Affectivity*: asymptotically and pragmatically (*a-sympt-ma-tic-ally*) oriented toward (the) good
 - *Cognition = iMagination All the Way Down* (IAWD): asymptotically oriented to (the) true
 - When *caught linguistic*TM = thinking/thought
 - When *caught affective*[®] = the good = what ought to be = normativity
 - When *caught sensible*[©] = *aesthetic*[©]: Up pops the sublimely beautiful vault of the Sistine Chapel
- *iMagination is* Kant's speculated *root* for understanding and sensibility – as *pie interpretatus* by Heidegger!
 - *Kant's* root is Descartes' *pineal gland* in mufti
- AWD means: Practice Safe Anthropology! Don't Fetishize the Modality! – *or the Model* (DFM!)
 - Cf. Whiteheadian (Sohstian?) fallacy of misplaced concreteness

iMagination All the Way Down (IAWD): Basic Structure

- Agentially, hence *naturalistically*, grounded (DFM!)
- Intentionally *conscious*
- Intuitive *and* spontaneous = *intaneous*
- Evident as to its *occurrent* conscious content *and* act(uality) – and phenomenologically so
- *Causally efficacious* – and phenomenologically so
 - Reports of its epiphenomenalistic gelding greatly exaggerated
- *Transcendentally* adverbial as to act-cum-content
 - Which is to say: empirically real and – contra Kant -- transcendentally natural
 - But phenomenalism still *roolz*?
- Psychologically = existentially: functionally *private* AWD – as with sensibility, affectivity, *and* the artist also known as *perception*
 - Ontogenetically – and epigenetically – in a causally and socially shared space and time
 - *All* reporting from iMagination – and sensibility and affectivity – is *self*-reporting
 - *iNtrospection* AWD!
- Dispositionally precipitative – *systemically, but without crowding out ontological occurrency*
 - Not all dispositions are created equal
 - Cf. Aristotelian and Scholastic notion of *habitus*

iMagination All the Way Down (IAWD): Basic Functionality

- Principal modality of agential intentional consciousness which *abstractly* (re-)represents sensibility, affectivity, and iMagination itself
 - Symbol generator than which none greater can be conceived
 - Continuously generates existential *tokens* which function as *open-textured* conceptual/propositional *types*
 - *Subsumptive*: Hierarchical structure is an artifact of dialectically vulnerable transcendental presuppositions, based principally on a paralogistic confusion between *parole* and *langue*
 - One moment's proposition is tomorrow's concept
 - Cf. pro: Heideggerian *zuhanden*
 - Cf. con: Higher Order Awareness; System 1/System 2; Gricean Intentionality; Recursiveness
- Subsumptively operates through *Composing and Dividing*
 - Generates a spectrum of asymptomatic models from the micro to the macro
 - All of which are naturalistically embodied, and are able to causally flow *non-pineally* to arms, hands, fingertips ... legs, feet, and even to the mortal sole
 - Builds and maintains a global asymptomatic self-narrative
 - Cf. Heideggerian "Being-towards-death"

iMagination All the Way Down (IAWD) in Relation to Kantian Forms of Intuition

- iMagination is temporally and spatially conditioned AWD
- Memory = iMagination (re-)representing relative to the *past*
 - Along with Anticipation: grounds the possibility of counterfactual logical space
- Anticipation = iMagination representing relative to the *future*
 - All possibility, down to the remotest regions of modal logic, is a function of IAWD operating in the future – and future perfect – bandwidths of the Kantian forms of intuition
 - Cf. Kantian *mögliche Erfahrung*
- iMagination AWD, together with sensibility, constitutes Kantian *wirkliche Erfahrung* = Sellarsian *perception* – in the (subjective and specious) *present* of embodiment
 - *Rechercher le temps perdu pour faire venir l'avenir et pour faire aussi que son être-au-monde reste au centre de son univers*
 - *Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Zeit bringt die Zukunft hervor und bewirkt zugleich, dass unser In-der-Welt-Sein im Mittelpunkt unseres Universums steht*
 - Cf. William James on the specious present
 - Cf. Husserlian Retention, Protention
- iMagination orchestrates the dance to the music of time

iMagination's Relation to Thinking and Language: Part I

“Augustinian” First Language

- iMagination is phylogenetically, ontogenetically, epigenetically and psychologically *prior* to both inner speech and publicly expressed/shared language = *parole*
- Etiology of language is rooted in iMagination's primordial *interrogation* of Being
 - **What-Is** that?
 - Or as Aquinas says, ST I:84:7:resp: *proprium obiectum est quidditas sive natura in materia corporali existens* [emphasis added]
- Direct interrogation with respect to the demands of affectivity and sensibility
 - And reflexively with respect to iMagination itself
 - Cf. Aristotle's “army in rout”; James's “blooming, buzzing confusion”
- Augustinian “first” language = initial asymptomatic space-time structuring of the bouillabaisse of abstracted sensible, affective, and iMaginative contents of embodied consciousness
- Existential *tokens* in iMagination function as *types* = symbols for the agent organizing its consciousness in each modality – hence consciousness overall
 - *Primordially*: subsumptively generates concepts *and* propositions
 - But ... DFM! DFM! DFM! Don't make the Humpty Dumpty mistake
- Radical “nominalism” prior to inner speech and *parole*
 - First language = iLanguage™: providing the *leitfaden* for the solution to the Problem of Universals
- Query: are there *a priori* “innate structures” unreconstructable by iMagination from the forms of spatial and temporal intuition?
 - Basic logical functions; Plato's *Parmenides*' Being, Same, and Other; Kantian-style categories; Chomskyan unconscious “puppeteers”

iMagination's Relation to Thinking and Language: Part II

Language as Inner Speech (*in foro interno*) and *Parole* (*in foro externo*): Section 1

- Evolutionarily rooted in sound as the most existentially, hence iMaginatively, abstract of sensory modalities
- iMagination married *selectively* to
 - Relative brain complexity
 - Fine-grained laryngeal functions
 - Auditory sensibility
- Generating the *virtuous circle* of language acquisition and developmentally fluent performance
 - Initially as existentially *tokened* but functionally *symbolic* inner speech
 - Causally flowing through *non-pineally* to *parole* – rheostatically
- *Parole* is equivalent, in its indefinite possible instantiations, to Wittgensteinian language games
- **Thinking = Inner Speech**
 - **The hyper-efficient *caught linguistic*TM bandwidth on the spectrum of iMagination**
- Through iMagination's *composing and dividing* activity (predication and reasoning), thinking generates asymptmatically “clear and distinct” conceptual and propositional models
 - Causally and *non-pineally* flowing through to *parole*, even for example to General Relativity!

iMagination's Relation to Thinking and Language: Part II

Language as Inner Speech (*in foro interno*) and *Parole* (*in foro externo*): Section 2

- Conceptual and propositional content is subsumptive
 - Hierarchy is an artifact of the requirement for the spatio-temporal expression of inner speech (in iMagination) and *parole*
- Inner speech, as with all iMagination, is *phenomenologically* accessible in its *occurrence* – on a sliding scale of clarity varying with attention
- Inner speech and *parole* are asymptomatic performances
 - Teleology of inner speech precedes and grounds the descriptive and normative character of *parole*
 - And derivatively of *langue*
- All language performance is spread out in space and time
 - Requiring varying degrees of risk
 - The pre-linguistic baby takes *leaps* of *parole*
 - From the past ... to the possible future ... then back to the specious present
- Augustinian/first, inner speech, and *parole* performances are intertwined with iMagination as also *caught sensible*® and *caught affective*® to one degree or another

iMagination's Relation to Thinking and Language: Part III

Language as *Langue*

- *Langue* results when iMagination abstractly models, i.e., *mentions*, Augustinian first language, inner speech, and/or *parole* for particular purposes: e.g., linguistics, logic, cog-sci, computer science, ... George Carlin's *Seven Dirty Words*
 - Focus is on iMaginatively modelled rule-governed functions and behavior, and away from open textured performance
- Beware ontological fetishization of an iMaginative model of *langue à la*:
 - Logical Atomism: Wittgenstein of the *Tractatus*, Russell (in some of his moods), Carnap, Quine, Sellars, Parmenides!
 - Cog-sci on its way – through the magic wand of “structural isomorphism,” to neural networking, to localization-intoxicated neurophysiology
 - Force-fitting the phenomena onto a *transcendental* Procrustean bed
- Davidson's intellectual *Kehre*
 - Early: “Radical Interpretation” and *theory* of language
 - Late: “A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs” and *passing theory*
 - iMagination in all but name
- Chomsky's *Kehre*
 - From deep vs. surface structures
 - To Minimalist Program (MP), recognizing the “plasticity” of all syntactical structures at their root⁴⁵

And That is Not All Said the Cat in the Hat

- Thinking as inner speech: far from the only bandwidth on the spectrum of iMagination – contra Sellars and many contemporary cog-sci models
- Novelty generating function of iMagination: aggiornomentizes sub-sets of inner speech and *parole* which have been caught *too* tightly linguistic
 - Einstein as Light Beam Rider for General Relativity: iMagination preceded *parole* of tensor calculus
 - Bohr and Heisenberg: Copenhagen Interpretation (CI) of Quantum Mechanics vs. Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen on entanglement
 - Outside the caught linguistic iMagination of General Relativity’s requirement that there be no supra-luminal “speed”
 - Davidson’s *passing theory* of language in “A Nice Derangement of Epitaphs,” as distinguished from his earlier and formalistic Carnapian *theory* of language and Tarskian theory of truth in “Radical Interpretation”
- iMagination stretches the bounds of caught linguistic inner speech and *parole* in literature, the visual arts, music ...
- iMagination as the basis for phenomenologically accessible proprioceptive models for behavior: everyday spatial and temporal navigation, dancing, athleticism ...
 - iMagination is our *kostenlose Handy-App*
 - iMagination even makes the coffee!
- For more on Einstein, and for King Kong ... Sylvester ... Polly ... Dory ... Adam and Eve
 - *Stay awake!*

iMagination as Naturalistic?

What Al, Werner, and Niels Tell Us: iMagination and the *Parole* of Physics

- Einstein Light Beam Rider NYT
 - <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/01/opinion/sunday/the-light-beam-rider.html>
 - Takeaway
 - Einstein *iMaged* General Relativity *before* he had the specific *parole* in which to express it, i.e., tensor calculus
- Quantum Mechanics
 - Validating the Copenhagen Interpretation (CI), Bell's Theorem, and Bell's Inequalities
 - <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/16/opinion/sunday/is-quantum-entanglement-real.html>
 - <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/22/science/quantum-theory-experiment-said-to-prove-spooky-interactions.html>
 - Takeaways
 - The CI of QM *iMaginatively* – in the 1920s and 1930s – broke out of the caught linguistic *parole* of General Relativity, particularly with respect to the *iMaginative* Laplacean construct that there be, at least asymptotically, universal deterministic causality completely pervading the cosmos
 - The *iMaginative experimentum crucis* of Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR, 1935) suggested that it was against the “rules” of *iMaginative* conception that there be the (apparently) supra-luminal phenomenon of *entanglement*. EPR gave life to attempts to mathematically corral QM back into the Einsteinian framework of space-time through *iMaginatively* postulated hidden variables theories – such as were proposed by Bohm and Vigier in the 1950s
 - Bell's Theorem (1964) *iMaginatively* (i.e., mathematically) stymied that attempt, sparking counter attempts to *iMaginatively* construct “real world” experiments that would validate the space-time framework of CI which says: “Yes, Virginia, there can be real interactions – causal connections – in the entanglement situation which appear *spooky* from within caught-General-Relativity-linguistic *parole*”
 - Bottom line: asymptotically refined, *iMaginatively* based, caught-CI-linguistic inner speech and *parole* for QM appear on their way to experimental triumph!

Yes! iMagination is Naturalistic – Part I

Revenge of King Kong, Sylvester, Polly, Dory, and Adam and Eve

iMagination and the *Parole* of Phylogeny

- King Kong has It
 - <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/10/opinion/sunday/what-i-learned-from-tickling-apes.html#permid=18151312>
- Sylvester has It
 - <http://webcenters.netscape.comuserve.com/whatsnew/package.jsp?name=fte/catpersonalitytest/catpersonalitytest>
- Polly has It
 - <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/22/science/parrots-are-a-lot-more-than-pretty-bird.html>
- Dory has It
 - <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/15/opinion/fishes-have-feelings-too.html>

Takeaway

- King Kong, Sylvester, Polly, and Dory aren't going to heaven ... or are they?
- Chomsky thinks that Adam and Eve must have had something akin to It
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WBL1MMSFKKk>
 - And listen carefully when Chomsky talks about the (conscious) introspective middle ground between perception and, in transcendental mode, the unconscious “puppeteering” structures in the brain. Notice that Chomsky – seemingly phenomenologically – identifies thinking as inner speech

Takeaway:

- But how can Dante tell us that Adam and Eve are in heaven? (*Paradiso*, Canto XXVI, 82ff; Canto XXXII, 4ff)
 - It's a *miracle*! (I *Corinthians* 15:51–53)

Yes! iMagination is Naturalistic – Part II

Revenge of King Kong, Sylvester, Polly, Dory, and Adam and Eve

iMagination and the *Parole* of Phylogeny

Takeaways

- If King Kong, Sylvester, Polly, Dory, and Adam and Eve have It, why on earth is there so much resistance in analytically ravished(?) cog-sci to admitting
 - All God’s chillun got it?
 - “Even *Republicans?*”
 - iMagination AWD is naturalistic, phenomenologically accessible, and causally efficacious?
 - And is a methodologically indispensable ingredient in the *scientific parole* of contemporary cognitional theory?

Why Resist the Obvious?

Ectoplasmophobia Casts a Long Shadow – Act 1

Watson, J. B., “Psychology as the Behaviorist Views It,” 1913, as quoted in

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_B._Watson#Behaviorism

Introspection forms no essential part of its [psychology’s] methods, nor is the scientific value of its data dependent upon the readiness with which they lend themselves to interpretation in terms of *consciousness*.

Takeaway

- We don’t need no stinkin’ phenomenological intelligibility to provide a truly “scientific” account of human behavior
- **Screw the appearances!**

Why Resist the Obvious?

Ectoplasmophobia Casts a Long Shadow – Act 2

Skinner, B. F., *About Behaviorism*, 1974, as quoted in https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B._F._Skinner#Behaviorism

The position can be stated as follows: what is felt or introspectively observed is not some nonphysical world of consciousness, mind, or mental life but the observer's own body. This does not mean, as I shall show later, that introspection is a kind of psychological research, nor does it mean (and this is the heart of the argument) that what are felt or introspectively observed are the causes of the behavior. An organism behaves as it does because of its current structure, but **most of this** is out of reach of introspection. At the moment we must content ourselves, as the methodological behaviorist insists, with a person's genetic and environment histories. **What are introspectively observed are certain collateral products of those histories.**

...

In this way [through radical behaviorism] **we repair the major damage wrought by mentalism.** When what a person does [is] attributed to what is going on inside him, investigation is brought to an end. Why explain the explanation? For twenty five hundred years people have been preoccupied with feelings and mental life, but only recently has any interest been shown in **a more precise analysis** of the role of the environment.

Takeaway

- **Real men don't need causally impotent nonphysical mental stuff or events to explain the physical nuts and bolts of behavior, whether of Harvard undergraduates or pigeons – even if supposedly phenomenologically introspectible**

Why Resist the Obvious?

Ectoplasmophobia Casts a Long Shadow – Act 3

Ryle, Gilbert, *The Concept of Mind*, 2009, 60th Anniversary Edition, pp. 245-246, http://s-f-walker.org.uk/pubsebooks/pdfs/Gilbert_Ryle_The_Concept_of_Mind.pdf

We might say that imagining oneself talking or humming is a series of abstentions from producing the noises which would be the due words or notes to produce, if one were talking or humming aloud. That is why such operations are impenetrably secret; not that the words or notes are being produced in a hermetic cell, but that the operations consist of abstentions from producing them. That, too, is why learning to fancy one is talking or humming comes later than learning to talk or hum. *Silent soliloquy is a flow of pregnant non-sayings*. Refraining from saying things, of course, entails knowing both what one would have said and how one would have said it.

Doubtless some people on some occasions of imagining tunes fancy themselves not merely passively hearkening but also actively producing the notes, just as most imagined discourse contains not only imagined hearing but also imagined speaking. *Very likely, too, people who imagine themselves producing noises tend to activate slightly those muscles which they would be activating fully, if they were singing or talking aloud, since complete abstention is harder than partial abstention*. But these are questions of fact with which we are not concerned. Our concern is to find out what it means to say, e.g. that someone ‘hears’ something that he is not hearing.

Takeaway

- Mental events? *What* mental events?
- **Heavens to Murgatroyd! Beethoven’s 9th Symphony was just a series of sub–aural tympanic**
♪good, good, good, good vibrations♪!

Why Resist the Obvious?

Ectoplasmophobia Casts a Long Shadow – Act 4

Sellars, Wilfrid, “Empiricism and the Philosophy of Mind,” §59, in *Science, Perception and Reality* 1963, pp. 188-89

§59. Here, then, is [the denouement](#). I have suggested a number of times that although it would be most misleading to say that concepts pertaining to thinking are theoretical concepts, yet their status might be illuminated by means of the contrast between theoretical and non-theoretical discourse. We are now in a position to see exactly why this is so. For once our fictitious ancestor, Jones, has developed the theory that overt verbal behaviour is the expression of thoughts and taught his compatriots to make use of the theory in interpreting each other’s behaviour, it is but a short step to the use of this language in self-description. Thus, when Tom, watching Dick, has behavioural evidence which warrants the use of the sentence (in the language of the theory) ‘Dick is thinking “p”’ (or ‘Dick is thinking that p’), Dick, using the same behavioural evidence, can say, in the language of the theory, ‘I am thinking “p”’ (or ‘I am thinking that p’). And it now turns out—need it have?—that [Dick can be trained to give reasonably reliable self-descriptions, using the language of the theory, without having to observe his overt behaviour](#). Jones brings this about, roughly, by applauding utterances by Dick of ‘I am thinking that p’ when the behavioural evidence strongly supports the theoretical statement ‘Dick is thinking that p’; and by frowning on utterances of ‘I am thinking that p’, when the evidence does not support this theoretical statement. Our ancestors begin to speak of the privileged access each of us has to his own thoughts. *What began as a language with a purely theoretical use has gained a reporting role.*

Takeaway

- **DICK: Tom, could you please tell me what I’m thinking? Pretty please?**
TOM: Well, watch me, and see if you can figure it out
DICK: You mean iMagine it?
TOM: Don’t be a wise guy, or I’ll report you to Jones

Resistance is Futile!

Embrace the Naturalistic iCasper of iMagination!

Or, as Galen Strawson puts it:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/16/opinion/consciousness-isnt-a-mystery-its-matter.html>

Those who make the Very Large Mistake (of thinking they know enough about the nature of the physical to know that consciousness can't be physical) tend to split into two groups. Members of the first group remain unshaken in their belief that consciousness exists, and conclude that there must be some sort of nonphysical stuff: They tend to become 'dualists.' Members of the second group, passionately committed to the idea that everything is physical, **make the most extraordinary move that has ever been made in the history of human thought. They deny the existence of consciousness: They become "eliminativists."**

Takeaway

- PATRICIA CHURCHLAND: Did Galen just talk dirty to me, Paul?
DANIEL DENNETT: Screw Galen, Pat! If he doesn't know what the iMaginative *stance* is, that's his problem
PAUL CHURCHLAND: Lemme at'im! POW! Right in da kisser!
- **Though the Three-card Monte narrative of Sellars needs to be further engaged**

Factors for Resistance to iMagination

- Groupthink 101
 - AKA lack of iMagination
- *Forgetfulness* in the history of philosophy
- Failure to *iMaginatively* interpret the memos from the primatologists and other ethologists
- Ectoplasmophobia
- Not grokking that it's *iNtrospection All the Way Down*
- How exactly *do* you set up protocols to measure what's going on in Vince Carter's iMagination when he's driving for a slam dunk – with Frédéric Weis in his path?
 - And who on earth would *fund* – or *recommend* funding – that sort of research if the empirical evidence was a couple of YouTube videos?
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XMrPjl-927Q>
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4StvCXBdzcQ>
- Better to stick with flashing “stimuli” in front of €10 /hr undergrads pushing red, green, and blue buttons
 - With fMRIs flowing from their brains
 - While iMaging what they'll be doing with their dates on the weekend

Factors for Resistance to iMagination

- Groupthink 101
 - AKA lack of iMagination
- *Forgetfulness* in the history of philosophy
- Failure to *iMaginatively* interpret the memos from the primatologists and other ethologists
- Ectoplasmophobia
- Not grokking that it's *iNtrospection All the Way Down*
- How exactly *do* you set up protocols to measure what's going on in Vince Carter's iMagination when he's driving for a slam dunk – with Frédéric Weis in his path?
 - And who on earth would *fund* – or *recommend* funding – that sort of research if the empirical evidence was a couple of YouTube videos?
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XMrPjl-927Q>
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4StvCXBdzcQ>
- **Better to stick with flashing “stimuli” in front of €10 /hr undergrads pushing red, green, and blue buttons**
 - **With fMRIs flowing from their brains**
 - **While iMaging what they'll be doing with their dates on the weekend**

So ...

The Phlakit Brothers Say

- Make your *Traubenüsse*[™] iMagination -- All the Way Down!
 - <https://archive.org/details/1955liveCommercialForGrape-nutsCereal>

And, Praise the Lord!