

# Mindreading & Joint Action - Heidelberg

13 MAY 2011 ①

based on Nijmegen 'JA & Knowing Others' Minds'

[Insert ~~after~~ on p3 of Nijmegen notes, right after say that will df ja w/o shared intention:]

Earlier I said that a joint action is an event with two or more agents. (This df is from Kirk Ludwig)

And I gave an example where Nora and Olive each fire a shot, and each of their shots hit Fred. Neither is individually fatal but they are deadly together.

Fred's killing counts as a joint action by ~~any~~ Ludwig's definition just because it is an event with two agents.

~~It doesn't matter that~~

Ludwig's

Now you might object that ~~my~~ definition is much too broad. That's because, on ~~my~~ <sup>Ludwig's</sup> definition, it doesn't matter what Nora and Olive were intending. ~~It doesn't matter~~ Perhaps neither of them intended to kill Fred. The event of their killing Fred would still count as a joint action on my definition.

Or suppose that Olive and Nora did intend to kill Fred, each individually. But also that their actions were entirely uncoordinated and that neither even knew of the other. Still, ~~their~~ Fred's killing would count as a joint action in Ludwig's sense.

This seems wrong. After all, you wouldn't normally think of Reservoir Dogs as ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> illustration of joint action.

Doesn't fit together high enough

New Outline:

- 1) mem talk
- 2) but how do you get from mem to full on?
- 3) JA proposed by Tinsell + NDC
- 4) But this makes no sense on standard views of J.A.
- 5) Alt view of J.A.
- 6) Knowing Others' Minds

Now this seems to show that ~~the~~ Ludwig's definition is much too broad. For ~~it~~ <sup>use</sup> of the cases of ja that are important in development or in philosophy involve ~~a~~ goal-directed joint actions.

That is, they are cases where the event taken as a whole is directed to some goal, and <sup>where</sup> this is not, <sup>or not</sup> just, a matter of each agent's actions being individually directed to that goal.

So, minimally, what we need ~~for~~ to capture the sort of ja that we find in development, is to introduce goal-directedness. ~~And you might reasonably suppose~~ This is exactly why it is tempting to appeal to shared intention.

One of the functions of shared intention is  
→ p3

Can think of mindreading:

intentional relations	e.g. (what s/one is interested in)
...	
prop <sup>n</sup> attitudes	( <sup>eg</sup> what s/one believes)

## FOR INTRO (start x)

Vasu Reddy & Juan-Luis Gomez <sup>have</sup> argued that interactions are essential for the emergence, in development or evolution, of understanding intentional relations between agents and objects — in their view, to be able to think about which objects a third person is interested in, — that ability has its roots in cases where you and another person jointly engage with an object, where, in a sense, you share interest in the object.

We might summarise this view by saying that insights into intentional relations has its roots in social interaction~~s~~.

I don't know whether that is true and, for present purposes I'm not planning to contest or defend their view.

I mention it because it provides a model for what I want to do, ~~there's~~ which concern more sophisticated cases of mindreading — is the emergence of these also fostered by social interaction?   
 NTS / M+Tina ~~say~~ can be taken as indicating that it might be

precisely to link two or more agents' actions,  
considered as a whole, to ~~some~~ a goal

[Insert slide from Leipzig? with the arrow connecting  
action to outcome via shared intention.]

This, then, is the challenge.

I want to characterise ja w/o presupposing  
more than minimal mindreading cognition.

This means, I think, that I cannot appeal to  
shared intention.

So I have to find a way of explaining how  
an event involving two or more agents could  
be related to a goal without appealing to  
anything like shared intention.

To meet the challenge I first want to step back  
and consider ordinary, individual action for a  
moment... [continues as Nijmegen.]