

## Lecture 08: Joint Action

s.butterfill@warwick.ac.uk

## Lecture 08: Joint Action

s.butterfill@warwick.ac.uk

Proposition: Examples and contrast cases are just not enough to ground a theory of joint action.

### 1. Searle vs Bratman on Cooperation

‘One can have a goal in the knowledge that others also have the same goal, and one can have beliefs and even mutual beliefs about the goal that is shared by the members of a group, without there being necessarily any cooperation among the members or any intention to cooperate’ (Searle 1990, p. 95)

Is this a sound objection?:

1. ‘The notion of a we-intention [shared intention] ... implies the notion of cooperation’ (Searle 1990, p. 95)
2. Meeting Bratman’s proposed sufficient conditions for shared intention does not imply that your actions will be cooperative.

Therefore:

3. Bratman’s conditions are not in fact sufficient.

‘This involves a bit of linguistic legislation’ (Bratman 2014, p. 38)

### 2. Problem

If examples and contrast cases are not enough to ground a theory of joint action, what could ground a theory of joint action?

Step 1: identify features ...

- collective goals
- coordination
- cooperation
- contralateral commitments
- experience

Step 2: ... which generate how questions.

### 3. Collective Goals

A *goal* is an outcome to which an action is directed.

An outcome is a *collective goal* of two or more actions involving multiple agents if it is an outcome to which those actions are directed where

this is not, or not only, a matter of each action being directed to the outcome.

Objection: Are there collective goals?

Reply: If there is a single outcome,  $G$ , such that

1. Our actions are coordinated; and
2. coordination of this type would normally increase the probability that  $G$  occurs.

then there is an outcome to which our actions are directed where this is not, or not only, a matter of each action being directed to that outcome, i.e. our actions have a collective goal.

Question for a theory of joint action: In virtue of what could two or more agents’ actions have a collective goal?

### 4. Two Standard Notions of Cooperation

Candidate question for a theory of joint action: What enables humans to cooperate?

a ‘cooperator is someone who pays a cost,  $c$ , for another individual to receive a benefit,  $b$ ’ (Nowak 2006, p. 1560)

‘[b]y cooperation we mean engaging with others in a mutually beneficial activity’ (Bowles & Gintis 2011, p. 2)

‘Cooperation appears in nature in two basic forms’ (Tomasello 2016)

## 5. Philosophers' Notions of Cooperation

Actions are cooperative when appropriately related to a shared intention (and no deception nor coercion) (Bratman 1992, 2014)

'A definition of cooperation ... typically [has this] structure: a set of individual intentions [with] certain origins and ... certain relations, ... is common knowledge' (Paternotte 2014, p. 47) (Paternotte 2014, p. 47)

## 6. Trade-off Cooperation

Demandingness and well-suitedness require trade-offs across multiple actions, not all of which need be yours.

Purposive actions are *trade-off cooperative* to the extent that, for each agent, her performing these actions rather than any other actions depends in part on how good an overall pattern of trade-offs between demandingness and well-suitedness can be achieved for all of the actions.

Question for a theory of joint action: What enables humans to perform actions which are trade-off cooperative?

## References

- Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (2011). *A Cooperative Species: Human Reciprocity and Its Evolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Google-Books-ID: dezaI9XMp0UC.
- Bratman, M. E. (1992). Shared cooperative activity. *The Philosophical Review*, 101(2), 327–341.
- Bratman, M. E. (2014). *Shared Agency: A Planning Theory of Acting Together*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nowak, M. A. (2006). Five Rules for the Evolution of Cooperation. *Science*, 314(5805), 1560–1563.
- Paternotte, C. (2014). Minimal Cooperation. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 44(1), 45–73.
- Searle, J. R. (1990). Collective intentions and actions. In P. Cohen, J. Morgan, & M. Pollack (Eds.), *Intentions in Communication* (pp. 90–105). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Reprinted in Searle, J. R. (2002) *Consciousness and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (pp. 90–105).
- Tomasello, M. (2016). *A Natural History of Human Morality*. Harvard University Press. Google-Books-ID: 0wVuCwAAQBAJ.