**Quick Review**

- Review: Problems of Other Minds
  - Human and Animal Minds
  - Argument by Analogy (Russell)
  - Inference to Best Explanation (Descartes)
  - Language and Levels
    - Units of meaning and productivity
    - Mechanism, sentence, sapience
- Today: Refining the Theory
  - Consciousness, Intentionality, and Thoughts
  - Explaining other minds?

**Searle’s Mind**

Many species of animals have consciousness, intentionality, and thought processes. By "consciousness" I mean those subjective states of sentience and awareness that we have during our waking life (and at a lower level of intensity in our dreams); by “intentionality” I mean that feature of the mind by which it is directed at or about objects and states of affairs in the world; and by “thought processes” I mean those temporal sequences of intentional states that are systematically related to each other, where the relationship is constrained by some rational principles. Examples of conscious states are such things as feeling a pain or hearing a sound. Examples of intentional states are such things as wanting to eat food or believing that someone is approaching. Examples of thought processes are such things as figuring how to get a banana that is out of reach or monitoring the behavior of prey who is on the move and is trying to escape.” (p. 356)

**Searle’s View**

- Many species of animals have minds: consciousness, intentionality and thought processes.
- Why think that?
  - Just look at how animals behave, especially those that we know so well.
  - Denying these animals have minds is really not possible; that is, there is no genuine possibility of doubt.

**Doubts**

- Descartes’ Dualism
  - Philosophical and religious: Not tenable.
- Other arguments: Humans satisfy a necessary condition for having a mind that animals do not or cannot satisfy.
  - Consciousness
  - Intentionality
  - Thought

**Neuro-biological continuity**

But, any argument against animal minds implies that the difference between human and animal brains is such that the human brain can cause and sustain a mind and animal brains cannot.

- Consciousness?
- Intentionality?
- Thought?
Consciousness?

No one seriously argues that animals don’t or can’t have even the most rudimentary conscious states
- Sentience
- Sapience?

Intentionality?

- Anatomical similarities are too great for any serious doubt that animal minds are intentional; i.e., are “about” something.
  - Basically: representational states or processes
  - Consciousness is representational, and thus intentional.

Thought?

- Importance of Language
  - For consciousness?
  - For intentionality?
  - For thought?

- Human vs. Animal “language”
  - Symbolic complexity
  - Productive complexity

“False belief” criteria

- Davidson: To have the organism should be able to have a concept of a belief, and to have a belief, should be able to distinguish true/false belief. (Metalinguistic semantic predicates.)

- Searle: beliefs are not just linguistic, but embedded in network of perceptions and actions; Perception is a form of believing. (see p 360: Dog and Cats and metaintentional predicates.)

Back to Analogy?

- Searle: the argument by analogy is hopelessly confused because behavior by itself is simply irrelevant. We should look at the causes of the behavior...Behavior is evidence of a cause But, there is no serious epistemological problem because of the neurobiological similarities between humans and animals. (pp. 363-64) We should ignore the problem of other minds; its not a problem.

- What?
  - Don’t we still want to know in what ways animal mind and human minds are similar or different? What behaviors are explained by appealing to conscious, intentional, thoughts? Remember Morgan’s Canon?

Levels Again?

- Morgan's Canon: “In no case may we interpret an action as the outcome of the exercise of a higher psychical faculty, if it can be interpreted as the outcome of the exercise of one which stands lower in the psychological scale.” (1909)

- A principle of parsimony to avoid anthropomorphism
  - For example: Clever Hans Phenomena and Blind-sight
  - Others: false belief tests, mirror tests, etc.

- Suggests “levels” of explanation and thus we are left with another problem of other minds: what is the best explanation, the best theory of other minds? Which behavior is the best evidence? Which mechanism is the best explanation for which behaviors?
Next Time

Thinking Machines?

The problem of another mind?