**Resumo do artigo de Ingold, T. (2000).**

**“Evolving skills. Alas, poor Darwin: Arguments against evolutionary psychology”**

The author brings up the problematic duality of nature and nurture throughout the example of the human walking skill which can be considered both as an innate ability, by the fact of being naturally equipped, and, at the same time, an acquired technique, unique to each of us in its expression. A common way to reconcile these two views is to consider the human being as an additive assemblage of body, mind and culture. The author names this perspective the complementarity thesis, allying theoretical paradigms from biology, psychology and anthropology, and argues that, although rich and interesting, this view is fundamentally misconceived. In a first instance, the author details and criticizes the three entities of the complementarity thesis. First, the Neo-Darwinian conception of evolutionary biology is described as a genotype-centered perspective, where genes rather than organisms are impacted by evolutive pressures and are a source of variation, independently of environment and development. The author argues that the distinction between genes and environment are a vestige of western philosophy separating matter to substance and is not any more relevant than distinguishing environment to any other interacting element. Second, the cognitive sciences, based on the Neo-Darwinian concept and leading to the field of Evolutionary Psychology, is presented to claim that humans are born with a preformed mental architecture, with innate mechanisms enabling the development of cognitive process, argued by the author to lack theoretical consistency. Third, a view of culture theory considering culture as a practice-independent knowledge transmitted across generations, and offering the basis for a theory of gene-culture coevolution. A counter-synthesis thus suggests to dissolve the division between body, mind and culture. From a developmental perspective, the author advocates for the view of organisms as creative agents both producing and being the product of their own evolution. Furthermore, it is supported, from an ecological psychology’s perspective, the reunion of the body and the mind as a single unit interacting with its environment, as well as the related anthropological perspective where this unit, the organism at whole, perceives, creates meanings and gathers knowledge throughout a practical and repeated interaction with the environment. To conclude, instead of considering a human being made of preformed and innate abilities with an added culture, both environmentally independent, the author calls for a ‘relational thinking’ in order to have an insider view of evolutionary process, considering beings as a part of a continuum of organic life, and organisms as environmental elements growing and developing within a continuous field of relationships.

**Questões sobre o artigo de Barret, L. (2011).**

**“Babies and bodies.”**

What an interesting and pleasant chapter to read.

It first made me wonder if babies had an incentive to learn and that alone could drive the learning process, as if we are born eager to know ? For instance, when the baby has possibly random neural firings making her arm move around, and grasp an object, and move around this object in her field of vision, it is supposed to register a lot of information about the shape, color, texture, size etc… of the object. I wonder if this motivation to extract information and gather knowledge is innate. What if a baby does not care about environmental cues and characteristics? What happens if the environmental information is not registered? Considering a process at work, here the learning motivation, makes me think about the potential process failure. Then, there may be no process, no learning incentive, no particular motivation to enrich our perception and the environmental information would automatically and passively get registered in our body and brains?

It is amazing to think that our cognition and learning process is initiated by random neural firing. To me, it makes a lot of sense and seems so far one of the best suggestions that I have read. I wonder how the random firing evolves and makes a transition towards a less random firing… Why don’t we have random neural firing throughout our whole life? Or do we?

The view on embodied cognition and the affordance of the environment relative to our body shapes and abilities is each time fascinating. This text makes a parallel with the summary article when it suggests that we, humans, may see the world and construct scientific knowledge from a human body and ability perspective and for this reason we may never reach an objective and true representation of the world. The summary article ends up considering that we should understand evolution from within and integrate ourselves as a part of a living continuum from which it appears meaningless to be extracted. The embodied cognition considering that we, humans, all may have a generally similar appreciation of the world because we possess a similar body structure, but that we, humans, also precisely perceive our world in a subjective and unique way because we all differ from each other, is very stimulating. I wonder if we can extend this reasoning to group of humans such as men sharing a different perceptive basis than women, children from adults, black people from white people, homosexual to heterosexual, etc..? Without forgetting that we deal with continuum that makes groups of relative significance.