

Contents Volume 9:1 March 1986

Holender, D. Semantic activation without conscious identification in dichotic listening, parafoveal vision, and visual masking: A survey and appraisal		1
Open Peer Commentary		
Balota, D. A. Unconscious semantic processing: The pendulum keeps on swinging	23	
Bisiach, E. Through the looking-glass and what cognitive psychology found there	24	
Bridgeman, B. Theories of visual masking	25	
Carr, T. H. & Dagenbach, D. Now you see it, now you don't: Relations between semantic activation and awareness	26	
Corteen, R. S. Electrodermal responses to words in an irrelevant message: A partial reappraisal	27	
Crowder, R. G. A history of subliminal perception in autobiography	28	
Dixon, N. F. On private events and brain events	29	
Erdelyi, M. H. Experimental indeterminacies in the dissociation paradigm of subliminal perception	30	
Evett, L. J., Humphreys, G. W. & Quinlan, P. T. Identification, masking, and priming: Clarifying the issues	31	
Fischler, I. Knowing and knowing you know: Better methods or better models?	32	
Fowler, C. A. An operational definition of conscious awareness must be responsible to subjective experience	33	
Inhoff, A. W. Attentional orienting precedes conscious identification	35	
Johnston, W. A. Semantic activation, consciousness, and attention	35	
Latto, R. & Campion, J. Approaches to consciousness: Psychophysics or philosophy?	36	
Lupker, S. J. Conscious identification: Where do you draw the line?		37
Macmillan, N. A. The psychophysics of subliminal perception		38
Marcel, A. J. Consciousness and processing: Choosing and testing a null hypothesis		40
McConkie, G. W. Semantic activation and reading		41
Merikle, P. M. & Cheesman, J. Consciousness is a "subjective" state		42
Morton, J. What do you mean by conscious?		43
Näätänen, R. Processing of the unattended message during selective dichotic listening		43
Navon, D. On determining what is unconscious and what is perception		44
Paap, K. R. The pilfering of awareness and guilt by association		45
Rayner, K. Against semantic preprocessing in parafoveal vision		46
Stanovich, K. E. & Purcell, D. G. Priming without awareness: What was all the fuss about?		47
Underwood, G. Facilitation or inhibition from parafoveal words?		48
Wolford, G. A review of the literature with and without awareness		49
Author's Response		
Holender, D. Conceptual, experimental, and theoretical indeterminacies in research on semantic activation without conscious identification		50

Ballard, D. H. Cortical connections and parallel processing: Structure and function		67
Open Peer Commentary		
Andersen, R. A. Value, variable, and coarse coding by posterior parietal neurons	90	
Baird, J. C. Value encoding of patterns and variable encoding of transformations?	91	
Barnden, J. A. Connectionist value units: Some concerns	92	
Churchland, P. M. Phase-space representation and coordinate transformation: A general paradigm for neural computation	93	
Finkel, L. H. & Reeke, G. N. Jr. What's the connection?	94	
Foss, J. Abstract solutions versus neurobiologically plausible problems	95	
Gilbert, C. D. Cortical architectures and value unit encoding	96	
Grossberg, S. Brain metaphors, theories, and facts	97	
Harth, E. Does the brain compute?	98	
Hoffman, W. C. Invariant and programmable neuropsychological systems are fibrations		99
Hopfield, J. J. "Grandmother networks" and computational economy		100
Koch, C. What's in the term <i>connectionist</i> ?		100
Landy, M. S. The gap from sensation to cognition		101
Mumford, D. Two tests for the value unit model: Multicell recordings and pointers		102
Pellionisz, A. J. Old dogmas and new axioms in brain theory		103
Sejnowski, T. J. Computational neuroscience		104
Sur, M. What does the cortex do?		105
Tsotsos, J. K. Connectionist computing and neural machinery: Examining the test of "timing"		106
Author's Response		
Ballard, D. H. Value units make the right connections		107

Sayre, K. M. Intentionality and information processing: An alternative model for cognitive science **121**

Open Peer Commentary

Brown, R., Earle, D. C., & Lea, S. E. G. Not an alternative model for intentionality in vision	138	Leyton, M. The relationship between information theory, statistical mechanics, evolutionary theory and cognitive science	148
Churchland, P. M. Semantic content: In defense of a network approach	139	MacKay, D. M. Intrinsic versus contrived intentionality	149
Daugman, J. G. Communication theory and intentionality	140	Marks, L. E. Cognitive science and the pragmatics of behavior	150
Dennett, D. C. Engineering's baby	141	Morphis, M. A total process approach to perception	150
Dretske, F. I. Stalking intentionality	142	Perlis, D. & Hall, R. Intentionality as internality	151
Ellerman, D. P. Intentionality and information theory	143	Powers, W. T. Intentionality: No mystery	152
Eskew, R. T. Jr. Information is in the eye of the beholder	144	Turvey, M. T. Intentionality: A problem of multiple reference frames, specificational information, and extraordinary boundary conditions on natural law	153
Golden, R. M. On some specific models of intentional behavior	144		
Gordon, I. E. Uncertainty about information	146	Author's Response	
Heil, J. Intentionality and the explanation of behavior	146	Sayre, K. M. Intentionality and communication theory	155
Kelley, D. Information, causality, and intentionality	147		
Lebowitz, M. Semantic information: Inference rules + memory	147		

Vining, D. R., Jr. Social versus reproductive success: The central theoretical problem of human sociobiology **167**

Open Peer Commentary

Bajema, C. J. Passion for sexual pleasure, the measurement of selection, and prospects for eugenics	187	class differences in fitness in modern industrial societies	198
Barkow, J. H. Central problems of sociobiology	188	Kitcher, P. The trouble with human sociobiology is . . .	201
Caton, H. Sound and shoddy sociobiology	188	Kurland, J. A. Proletarian hominids on the rampage	202
Daly, M. & Wilson, M. A theoretical challenge to a caricature of Darwinism	189	Lynn, R. & Hampson, S. Further evidence for secular increases in intelligence in Britain, Japan, and the United States	203
Dawkins, R. Wealth, polygyny, and reproductive success	190	Macphail, E. M. Fertility, intelligence, and socioeconomic status: No cause for surprise or alarm	204
Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. Intelligence and selection	191	Neel, J. V. The "eugenic dilemma" revisited	205
Flynn, J. R. Sociobiology and IQ trends over time	192	Retherford, R. D. Demography and sociobiology	205
Fox, R. Fitness by any other name	192	Silverberg, J. & Gray, J. P. What is sociobiology's central dogma?	206
Gaulin, S. J. C. The use and abuse of sociobiology	193	Sternberg, R. J. What is adaptive?	207
Ghiselin, M. T. & Scudo, F. M. The bioeconomics of phenotypic selection	194	Symons, D. Sociobiology and Darwinism	208
Hartung, J. Proximate mechanisms and distal objectives	196	Van Valen, L. M. & Maiorana, V. C. Surrogate resources, cumulative selection, and fertility	209
Hill, J. Success in a dual evolutionary model	196	Weinrich, J. D. Intelligence, reproductive success, and social status: A complicated relationship	209
Irons, W. Social and reproductive success: Useful data but rethink the theory	197	Weiss, K. M. Avarice aforethought and the fundamental premise of sociobiology	210
Kaplan, H. & Hill, K. Sexual strategies and social-		Williams, B. J. Rejecting sociobiological hypotheses	211



Society for Philosophy and Psychology

Department of Philosophy • University of Minnesota • Minneapolis, MN 55455

President:
Fred Dretske
University of Wisconsin—Madison

President-Elect:
Stevan Harnad
The Behavioral and Brain Sciences

Secretary-Treasurer:
Patricia Kitcher
University of Minnesota

Program Chairman:
Robert Van Gulick
Syracuse University

Executive Committee:
Myles Brand
University of Arizona

William Brewer
University of Illinois—Champaign

Patricia S. Churchland
University of California—San Diego

Daniel Dennett
Tufts University

Jerome A. Feldman
University of Rochester

Janet Fodor
University of Connecticut—Storrs

R.S. Jackendoff
Brandeis University

William Lycan
University of North Carolina

John Macnamara
McGill University

Anne Treisman
University of British Columbia

Scott Weinstein
University of Pennsylvania

Christopher Woods
Yale University

CALL FOR PAPERS 1986 ANNUAL MEETING

The Johns Hopkins University

June 5—8, 1986

The Society for Philosophy and Psychology is calling for papers to be read at its 12th annual meeting, June 5—8, 1986 at The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD.

Contributed papers are refereed and selected on the basis of quality and relevance to both psychologists and philosophers. Psychologists, neuroscientists, linguists, computer scientists and biologists are encouraged to report experimental, theoretical and clinical work that they judge to have philosophical significance.

Contributed papers are for oral presentation and should not exceed a length of 30 minutes (about 12 double-spaced pages). Papers must be accompanied by a camera-ready **300 word abstract**. The deadline for submission is **10 January, 1986**. Send three copies to the Program Chairman:

Professor Robert Van Gulick
Department of Philosophy
Syracuse University
Syracuse, NY 13210

Symposium Proposals should also be sent to the above address as soon as possible

Local Arrangements: Professor Gary Hatfield, Department of Philosophy, The Johns Hopkins University.

.....
Individuals interested in becoming members of the Society should send \$15.00 membership dues (\$5.00 for students) to Professor Patricia Kitcher, Department of Philosophy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Editorial commentaries

It has so far been an implicit *BBS* editorial policy that in the interest of preserving parity among commentaries the editor does not contribute to open peer commentary. For, unlike all other commentators, the editor chooses the referees and commentators, selects (with the help of the referees) and edits the target article and commentaries, has access to what the other commentators have written, and even exerts some influence over the author's response. It is accordingly evident that no commentary by the editor could be on the same footing as the other commentaries. The question remains, however, whether their necessarily privileged status entails that there is no equitable way editorial comments can be openly expressed in a journal of open peer commentary.

Special exceptions have in fact been made in three prior cases: In *BBS* 1(3) 1978 (Puccetti & Dykes: "Sensory Cortex and the Mind/Brain Problem"), I organized and classified recurrent themes among the commentaries and annotated the commentaries and response accordingly. In *BBS* 5(2) 1982, which was on the subject of peer review, I added extensive editorial annotations and an introductory overview. In *BBS* 7(4) 1984, which was devoted to the work of B. F. Skinner, both my co-editor for that special issue (A. C. Catania) and I summarized a series of issues that we felt had not been resolved by the commentaries and responses. The author responded to these editorial comments separately in the same issue. In all three cases, it was the special perspective available to the editor(s) that had motivated appending the editorial contribution.

Across the years it has also become evident that in many cases readers of the varied contributions to each *BBS* Treatment might benefit from an overview to orient them among the issues raised. With this in mind, I have been informally encouraging the writing of independent reviews and overviews of *BBS* Treatments in *BBS*'s Continuing Commentary section as well as in other

journals. I have also occasionally co-circulated certain target articles with a "precommentary" by a representative of either a unifying or an opposing point of view. Commentators comment on both, and both the author and the "precommentator" get to reply to the commentaries (although only the author replies to the "pre-" and "postcommentary"). The growing use of *BBS* reprints for educational purposes has also given rise to a projected offprint series by Cambridge University Press, which will be accompanied by editorial overviews.

No one can be expected to have an altogether objective view of the diversity of contributions to a *BBS* Treatment—not the author, the commentator, the reader, the referee, or the editor. At best, one can aspire to a coherent and informed view. I accordingly propose, on an experimental and occasional basis (because no one can claim sufficient expertise to attempt this in all of the areas covered by *BBS*), to establish and to contribute to a special category of commentary, namely, editorial commentary. This would consist of views and overviews presented explicitly from the vantage point of *BBS*'s editor. This policy is based on the assumption that it would be more in the spirit of open peer commentary to have as much as possible of the editor's unavoidably privileged perspective expressed openly rather than only covertly. It seems inescapable that an editor should have a point of view: this way the readership can have a better idea of what it might be and what influence it may or may not be exerting on other manifestations of editorial policy.

The distinct status of editorial commentaries will be reflected in their appearing separately at the end of the commentary section in the form of an editorial note, to which the author can reply in his response. I strongly encourage the *BBS* associateship, authorship, and readership to let me know their reactions to this provisional policy.