

Software Agents with Concerns of their Own

Luís Botelho

Luís Nunes

Ricardo Ribeiro

Rui J. Lopes

Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

Author Notes

Luís Botelho, Luís Nunes and Rui J. Lopes, Instituto de Telecomunicações (IT-IUL) and  
Department of Information Science and Technology of Instituto Universitário de Lisboa  
(ISCTE-IUL)

Ricardo Ribeiro, Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores (INESC-ID) and  
Department of Information Science and Technology of Instituto Universitário de Lisboa  
(ISCTE-IUL)

This work was done in the scope of R&D Units 50008 and 50021, partially supported by national  
funds through Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) with references  
UID/EEA/50008/2013 and UID/CEC/50021/2013

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Luís Botelho, of the Department  
of Information Science and Technology of Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL), Av.  
das Forças Armadas 1649-026, Lisboa, Portugal.

Contact: [Luis.Botelho@iscte.pt](mailto:Luis.Botelho@iscte.pt)

### Abstract

We claim that it is possible to have artificial software agents for which their actions and the world they inhabit have *first-person* or intrinsic meanings. The *first-person* or intrinsic meaning of an entity to a system is defined as its relation with the system's goals and capabilities, given the properties of the environment in which it operates. Therefore, for a system to develop *first-person* meanings, it must see itself as a goal-directed actor, facing limitations and opportunities dictated by its own capabilities, and by the properties of the environment.

The first part of the paper discusses this claim in the context of arguments against and proposals addressing the development of computer programs with *first-person* meanings. A set of definitions is also presented, most importantly the concepts of cold and phenomenal *first-person* meanings.

The second part of the paper presents preliminary proposals and achievements, resulting of actual software implementations, within a research approach that aims to develop software agents that intrinsically understand their actions and what happens to them. As a result, an agent with no *a priori* notion of its goals and capabilities, and of the properties of its environment acquires all these notions by observing itself in action. The cold *first-person* meanings of the agent's actions and of what happens to it are defined using these acquired notions.

Although not solving the full problem of *first-person* meanings, the proposed approach and preliminary results allow us some confidence to address the problems yet to be considered, in particular the phenomenal aspect of *first-person* meanings.

Keywords: *First-person* meaning; intrinsic understanding; goals; capabilities; properties of the environment

## Software Agents with Concerns of their Own

**Introduction**

In a debate that came to be better known as the symbol grounding problem (Harnad, 1990), several scientists have expressed their opinions that artificial intelligence would never lead to actual intelligent systems (e.g., Searle, 1980; Penrose, 1989; Ziemke, 1999; and, Froese & Ziemke, 2009). For these authors, artificial systems do not understand what happens to them, the symbols they possess, and what they do. That is, even when an artificial system exhibits a meaningful behavior, that meaningfulness is in the head of the observer; it is not an intrinsic interpretation of the artificial system itself.

We argue that it is possible to develop computer programs for which, objects, events, and situations have intrinsic meanings to the computer program, that is, *first-person* meanings. We use italics because we are applying to machines, an expression explicitly intended for people.

Several of our arguments rely on the view that at least simple non-conscious living beings and artificial systems share the fundamental property of being purely rule-following mechanisms. That is, their behavior in a given state (internal and external) is completely determined by the interaction between the natural or artificial forces applicable to their inner workings and the properties of that state. Relevant forces applicable to artificial systems may include the instructions of a computer program. Relevant forces applicable to living beings include electrical and gravitational forces. From this point of view, at least simple rule-following living beings face the same objections, regarding the possibility of developing *first-person* meanings, as those

presented to artificial intelligence by their critics, especially that the meaningfulness of the behavior of simple organisms is in the head of the observer. And, just as *first-person* meanings have emerged through evolution from non-conscious beings, we believe that they can also develop in artificial systems.

This paper presents our arguments and claims, our proposed research framework, and its preliminary results. It describes a set of conceptually defined, computationally implemented, and demonstrated concepts and mechanisms that support the development of *first-person* meanings, and the enactment of meaningful behavior. The described mechanisms and achieved results are integrated within the context of the presented research framework.

The next section presents some terminology, emphasizes the main contribution of the paper, and discusses the five assumptions of our proposed research framework. That research framework and the defined, implemented, and demonstrated concepts, mechanisms, and results are detailed in section “Research Approach, Proposals, and Achievements”.

### **Research Assumptions: Terminology, Contribution, and Discussion**

This paper discusses several concepts whose definitions are not widely accepted. In some cases, each author uses his/her own definitions. In other cases, not even a definition is presented in the hope that the common sense understanding of the concept is enough for the purpose of the discussion. In the next sub section we explain the sense in which several concepts are used in the paper, and we emphasize the main contribution of the paper. Then, we present a brief example

that illustrates the way we use those concepts. Finally, we present and discuss our research assumptions.

### **Background Concepts and Main Innovative Contribution**

Without any intention of providing a comprehensive view of consciousness, we need to present a few distinctions that will be used to explain other concepts. Consciousness has several manifestations and properties such as the autobiographic sense of the self, awareness, declarative reasoning and language. We will use the term “awareness” and derivatives to refer only to the knowledge or information one has by virtue of being conscious. In the sense that it is used hereunder, awareness is not meant to include for instance declarative reasoning and language. The special kind of awareness referring to the self would be termed self-awareness.

As any other manifestation of consciousness, awareness has a phenomenal component: when we are aware, we have phenomenal experiences, we have sensations with certain qualities, we feel. The phenomenal component of consciousness was termed the hard problem of consciousness by David Chalmers (1995). In the scope of this article, it is helpful to distinguish the information, stripped of any sensations, to which a sentient individual has access when he or she is aware of something. For instance when I am aware of the presence of my children, I experience a sensation (phenomenal) and I know that (I have access to the information that) they are present (cold).

In the remainder of this paper, we will use the expressions *phenomenal awareness* to refer to the sensations one feels because one is aware of something, and *cold awareness* to refer to the

information, stripped of sensations, to which a sentient individual has access because it is aware of something.

Finally, consciousness is also associated with a sense of continuity. When a person experiences and has access to information about the object of consciousness, for instance the image of an apple, the qualities of the experience and the information the person had access to, during the experience, will persistently be associated with the same object of consciousness (and to others, such as the members of the same class). This sense of continuity of consciousness is possibly ensured by autobiographic memory. Damásio (1999) distinguishes core consciousness from extended consciousness. Each time a person encounters an object of which he or she becomes aware, there is a pulse of core consciousness. Each pulse of core consciousness is a short duration event; alone, it does not ensure the sense of continuity. Only extended consciousness, possibly relying on autobiographic or episodic memory, provides that sense of continuity.

*First-person meanings, intrinsic meanings and concerns.* A system has (or develops) *first-person* meanings of things, situations or events if those things, situations or events have (or acquire) meaning for the system itself. This expression is used in contrast with what happens when the meaning is in the mind of the observer (*third-person* meanings), but not in the system itself. In computer science, when a token has (or acquires) meaning, it is (or becomes) a symbol. We can think of the meaning of a symbol as the object, the situation, or the event that it refers to. In this paper, we are interested on a different aspect of meaning, namely the importance of the object, situation or event to the system itself. Thus, in this view, given that the importance of an object for a system reflects the relation of the object with the system's goals (or values, or any other



source of motivation such as the need to survive), it is important to stress that, in the sense that we use the expression in this paper, *first-person* meanings require goals.

Besides, the system must be aware of the importance of the meaningful object, situation or event in face of the system's goals, capabilities, and the properties of the environment, irrespective of whether or not an observer recognizes such importance. Hence, *first-person* meanings also require awareness.

Given the above characterization, the *first-person* meanings of objects, situations or events reflect a value system the agent is aware of. In this sense, when an object, an event, or a situation has *first-person* meanings for an agent, that agent has concerns about that object, event, or situation.

Cold *first-person* meanings, phenomenal *first-person* meanings and consciousness. A system has (or develops) *first-person* meanings of things, situations or events only if the system is aware of the intrinsic importance of those things, situations, and events to itself. If the recognition of such intrinsic importance results from mere cold awareness, we say the agent has cold *first-person* meanings or cold concerns. However, if the recognition of such intrinsic importance is the result of phenomenal awareness, if it is experienced, we say the system has phenomenal *first-person* meanings or phenomenal concerns. It is important to stress that the cold awareness involved in cold *first-person* meanings does not ensure the sense of continuity often associated with consciousness.

We claim that (cold viz. phenomenal) *first-person* meanings of objects, situations or events are a manifestation of (cold viz. phenomenal) consciousness in the sense that we require that the system is aware of the importance of those objects, situations or events to itself. However, we do not equate *first-person* meanings with consciousness because consciousness has other manifestations such as autobiographic sense of the self, declarative reasoning, and language.

Given the distinctions presented so far, we are in the position of describing the main contribution of the paper and also to clearly identify some aspects of the general problem that are not addressed in it. First of all, we restate that this paper is concerned only with one aspect of *first-person* meanings, namely the importance of objects, situations and events to the system. This is a difference regarding other work addressing *first-person* meanings, for example the work by Harnad (1990), Cangelosi, Greco, and Harnad (2002), Vogt (2002), Machado and Botelho (2006), and Steels (2003, 2008), which focuses on the symbol grounding problem, namely the problem of directly or indirectly grounding each symbol of an artificial system on the object, situation or event referred to by the symbol.

We assume that goals, value systems, or other sources of motivation (such as the need to stay alive and the need to preserve our genes) are sources of importance. If an event facilitates or impairs the achievement of someone's goals, then that event is important for that someone. If a situation is unrelated to someone's goals, then the situation is unimportant to that someone. That is, *first-person* meanings or concerns require goals (or other kinds of motives). In this paper, for the sake of simplicity, and because the distinction is not the focus of this research, we often use the term goals to refer to all types of motives.

Possibly the most significant innovative contributions of this paper are (i) recognizing that, for the purpose of developing *first-person* meanings, it is not required that a system really has goals – it is enough that the system sees itself as being goal-directed; and (ii) providing an approach for a program with no explicit notion of goals to discover that it has (or might have) goals and thereafter start interpreting its behavior and what happens to it as if it were goal-directed. To the best of our knowledge, no other work has ever addressed the problem of *first-person* meanings in this way.

We claim the above contribution to be significant given that it represents a way around a plethora of objections about *first-personhood*, living beings, materialism, and computer programs. In fact, it has been argued (e.g., Dreyfus, 1972; and, Thompson and Stapleton, 2009) that only living beings can develop intrinsic meanings because only living beings have intrinsic motives (the need to survive). To those arguments we reply that all that happens with simple organisms as bacteria is acting as determined by the interplay between their state (internal or external) and applicable natural forces – similarly to computer programs, they are just rule following systems. However, this position faces a second sort of objections.

Searle (1980), for example, says that (syntactic) rule-following systems cannot generate meanings (semantics) because semantics cannot arise from syntax. It is maybe this argument that reveals the potential importance of our contribution. The possibility of *first-person* meanings does not elude the rule-following nature of organisms and computer programs because the system does not have to exceed its nature, if it is to develop *first-person* meanings. In our view, it has to interpret itself as being goal-directed. That is, *first-personhood* is within reach of rule-following systems.

Although required, it is not enough for a system to see itself as goal-directed to develop *first-person* meanings. If the system had super powers, it would not be concerned about its goals, because there would not be true obstacles to their achievement. The importance of things, situations, and events is also dependent on the system's capabilities. Additionally, the environment in which the system operates may also represent opportunities or constraints regarding the possibility of the system achieving its goals, given its capabilities. This paper contributes to realize the described relationship and to provide the means for a computer program, originally with no notion of its goals and capabilities, and of the constraints or opportunities created by its environment, to learn them just by observing itself in action.

We claim that the presented contributions address the problem of developing cold *first-person* meanings, in the sense that it enables an agent to start interpreting its behavior and what happens to it as if it were a goal-directed constrained entity. That is, the agent has cold awareness of the relation between objects, situations and events and the possibility of achieving its goals, given its limited capabilities, and the constraints and opportunities created by the environment.

Although recognizing that solving the full problem of *first-person* meanings requires phenomenal awareness, the present paper does not contribute to solve this more difficult problem. This will be an important object of future research.

### **Brief Example**

We briefly present a short imagined example that illustrates our point of view and concepts.

A robot was programmed to weld the external panel of car doors and then to assemble the doors to the car. It has no goals because it is just following the instructions contained in its control program. It also does not have any notions of its capabilities nor of the properties of the environment. Using one of the proposed algorithms, the robot starts seeing itself as if it were motivated to achieve a situation in which it has assembled the doors to the car and has welded the external panels to the doors.

In addition to believing that it has these goals, it also becomes aware of its capabilities, for instance, assembling a door to the car, grabbing the weld torch and using it to weld door panels.

The robot also discovers properties of the environment, such as that it must weld the panel to the door before it can assemble the door to the car because, although having the door panel welded is not a pre-condition to assemble the door, it cannot weld the door panel if the door is already assembled to the car.

In the eyes of the robot, a situation in which it has assembled the doors to the car and has welded the external panels to the doors means that it has fulfilled its goals – it is positively valued by the robot. A situation in which the robot holds the welding torch is also meaningful to the robot, in the *first-person* sense, because it knows the situation contributes to enable it to weld the door panel, which is one of its goals. The situation is positively valued by the robot. The door, the door panel, the car, the welding station are meaningful, positively valued objects for the robot as it knows it uses them to achieve its goals. A situation in which the welding station is broken is also meaningful to the robot because it knows that it will not be capable of achieving its goals. This situation is negatively valued by the robot.

If the robot does not have feelings, in the phenomenal sense, the described meanings (positive and negative) are cold *first-person* meanings – the robot has cold concerns about those meaningful situations and objects.

If the robot phenomenally feels the situation in which the welding station is broken, the situation has phenomenal *first-person* meaning to the robot – the robot has phenomenal concerns about it.

Finally, the car engine, the car paint, the situation in which the engine is not assembled to the car, and the event in which another robot damaged the car engine have no importance to the robot in the light of its learned goals. The robot does not have any concerns about the car engine or the other robots.

Section “Research Approach, Proposals and Achievements” describes the domain-independent definitions and algorithms used by an agent with no prior notion of its goals, its capabilities, and the properties of the domain, to become aware of all this information. After that, the agent is capable of explaining the meaning of events and situations, which, from its own point of view, acquire importance with respect to its goals, its capabilities, and the properties of the domain.

Results are presented for a demonstration scenario.

### **Research Assumptions**

Without a test, it is impossible to rigorously determine if a specific computer program has developed *first-person* meanings. Unfortunately, such a test has not yet been developed. Two major difficulties are hindering its development. The first difficulty arises from our insufficient

understanding of what it means to have *first-person* meanings. Although we have provided requirements for a program to develop *first-person* meanings, we do not make any claim regarding the process used by the program to fulfill those requirements (e.g., individual development / historical evolution / preprogramming).

The second difficulty comes from the fact that, even if it were possible to define a test for *first-person* meanings applicable to animals, it could happen that the same test would not be applicable to computer programs. To see that this may be the case, consider the mirror test for self-awareness (Gallup, 1970). This test was created by psychologist Gordon Gallup Jr. to determine whether a non-human animal possesses the ability of self-recognition, and has been used as a self-awareness test. If an animal, in the presence of a mirror, is capable of adjusting its behavior towards itself (e.g., touching a marked part of its body that becomes visible only in the mirror), then the animal recognizes itself in the mirror, which, for some, is evidence that the animal is self-aware.

If a computer program passes an adapted version of this test, it would not necessarily mean that the program is self-aware because it could have been programmed to exhibit the kind of behavior that would indicate self-awareness if the test had been applied to an animal. Possibly, this test would reveal that a program is self-aware only if we knew the program was defined in a certain way. Gold and Scassellati (2009) developed an unsupervised learning algorithm that enables a robot to reliably distinguish its own moving parts from those of others, just by looking at a mirror. Although the authors explicitly state they do not claim that their robot is conscious, we may be willing to interpret this experiment as revealing self-awareness. However, this would happen only because we know that the robot uses an unsupervised learning algorithm – it was

not explicitly programmed to recognize itself. We still need better tests that do not rely on our knowledge of the way the program is written.

Without a test directed at determining the existence of *first-person* meanings, the discussion about the possibility of having computer programs with *first-person* meanings and the discussion about the way to achieve them cannot be more than just argumentative. We are aware of the arguments used by detractors of artificial intelligence. However, those arguments, as well as ours, may have flaws. Nevertheless, we think that pursuing the research objective of having computer programs with *first-person* meanings, even though it might be unachievable (which we do not believe), will have a beneficial impact on both our understanding of the problem and the possibility to create more effective computer programs capable of facing more complex problems.

We firmly believe that it is possible to have computer programs with *first-person* meanings. Our point of view and the research we have been doing is based on the following research assumptions:

1. It is possible to achieve software agents that develop *first-person* meanings, starting with software systems with no such capabilities, either through historical evolution or through individual development.
2. Individuals may develop *first-person* meanings only if they are aware of those meanings.
3. The agent's goals, the description of the agent's capabilities, and the description of properties of the domain are fundamental concepts on top of which the agent may be capable of developing *first-person* meanings.



4. For the purpose of the present research, it is not important to know if the agent is really guided by goals. It is also not important to understand the evolutionary process by which organisms would have become goal-directed individuals. What is actually important is finding a way an agent starts seeing itself as goal-directed.
5. After the agent acquires the knowledge of its assumed goals, and the description of its capabilities, tasks and environment, it is important for the agent to adopt them, and their relationships, and to shape its future behavior accordingly.

The next sub sections discuss related work, both objections and proposals, regarding the possibility of having computer programs that develop *first-person* meanings in the framework of our research assumptions. We start with a discussion of claims about the theoretical impossibility to create computer programs that develop *first-person* meanings. In particular, we analyze the position that only living beings are capable of developing them. Then, we discuss three groups of proposals regarding this problem. The first group addresses the sub problem of symbol reference. The second group stresses the need of a motivation system. Finally, the third group proposes that instead of building computer programs that develop *first-person* meanings, computer scientists should embrace the problem of building software environments from which the desired programs would emerge.

### **Theoretical impossibility of building computer programs with *first-person* meanings**

For Searle (1980) and also for Penrose (1989), only exact copies of living beings would be capable of *first-person* meanings because consciousness is generated at the physical level of the brain, in the context provided by the body to which it is coupled.

We argue that this does not have to be the case because we can start by creating a functional architecture (see Pylyshyn, 1980) with the same properties of the brain coupled to its body, at the desired level of abstraction. Then, it would be possible to create the processes responsible for *first-person* meanings on top of that functional architecture (but see Block, 1996 for arguments against functionalism).

Penrose puts forth a more difficult argument: since mathematicians can prove propositions that, according to Gödel (1931), cannot be proved by a computer program, there must be processes taking place in the human mind that are not computable. Given that, for Penrose, the only known non-computable physical phenomenon is quantic objective reduction, he hypothesized that consciousness would have a quantic basis. Hameroff and Penrose (1996, 2014) propose a model of consciousness whose physical basis is the quantic objective reduction taking place in the microtubules of the brain cells, which is not computable. Since we require that agents are aware of *first-person* meanings, a manifestation of consciousness, this argument undermines the functionalist approach since it would be impossible to create a computer program capable of exhibiting the desired properties at the quantic level because they were assumed to be non-computable.

LaForte, Hayes, and Ford (1998), and Krajewski (2007) show that Penrose's conclusion that the human mind involves non-computable processes is wrong. LaForte, Hayes, and Ford show that the mathematicians that have proved the sentences that are not provable by an algorithm could only do that because they did not prove the soundness of their proofing procedure, which would be required for a proper proof. According to these authors, this proofing the soundness of the used proof procedure is impossible, even for those mathematicians. Krajewski presents and

proves a general theorem, which shows that every kind of argument similar to that of Penrose must be either circular or lead to an inconsistency.

In addition, we think that, even if some process in the human mind were non-computable (which we do not believe), that process would not have to be the one responsible for awareness.

Ziemke (1999), Froese and Ziemke (2009), and Sharkey and Ziemke (2001) claim that any externally developed mechanisms aimed at creating meanings for a computer program will always produce arbitrary results for the computer program itself exactly because they are externally created.

To overcome this obstacle the computer program would have to create and maintain, from within, its whole network of parts and processes, as it is the case with living beings. This way, the meaning development mechanism of the program, being developed and maintained by the program itself, would produce non arbitrary meanings for the program.

Esteves and Botelho (2007) presented an approach, according to which, the computer program develops and maintains all of its parts and processes from within, starting from an initial pre-programmed zygote. Since this initial zygote is pre-programmed, the approach continues to face objections because the initial zygote of living beings is the result of the co-evolution of the species and its environment; it was not externally created.

We believe that the fact that a living being develops itself and all its parts and processes from within does not constitute an advantage concerning the possibility of having *first-person*

meanings. The requirements for a system to develop *first-person* meanings are (i) being capable of determining the importance of objects, events, and situations in face of their goals, their capabilities, and the characteristics of the domain; and (ii) being aware of that importance. To do this, the system just needs to see itself as if it were a constrained goal-directed entity in relation with its environment, considering that “seeing itself in a certain way” is being aware. Rule-following systems, for instance simple living beings and computer programs with no awareness, do not in fact have goals; they just do what the forces applicable to their inner workings impose them given what happens to them. Therefore, a rule-following system sees itself as goal-directed only if it is capable of rationalizing what it does and what happens to it as if it had goals.

### **Simple organisms and *first-person* meanings**

Thompson and Stapleton (2009), and Froese and Ziemke (2009) claim that the life of even the simplest organism can be described as a sense-making activity. For instance, a specific motile bacterium moves along the gradient of sugar concentration towards its highest value, as a result of its metabolism. Even simple organisms, as the mentioned bacterium, regulate their interactions with the world in such a way that transforms the world into a place of salience, meaning, and value. According to these authors, this shows how the relation of even simple organisms with their environment becomes meaningful as a result of the organisms’ metabolism.

Thompson (2011) and Froese (2015) recognize that this kind of meaning (sense-making) is not to be equated with the *first-person* perspective of conscious beings. However, Froese and Ziemke (2009) believe that it is impossible to have systems with *first-person* meanings that are not rooted on the lower-level sense-making mechanisms resulting of their metabolism.

We argue that the meaningfulness that is created by simple organisms as bacteria, as a result of their metabolism, is in the head of an external observer, exactly in the same way that critics of artificial intelligence have identified in the meaningfulness of the behavior of artificial systems. In fact, the behavior of simple organisms results, in each moment, of the interplay between the natural forces applicable to their inner workings and their state (internal and external), at that moment. In short, simple organisms are just rule-following systems, exactly in the same way as computer programs. None of them has a *first-person* perspective of what they do and of their environment. The requirement for the emergence of a *first-person* perspective in a system is the capability of relating what it does and what happens to it with its assumed goals, its capabilities, and the constraints and opportunities its environment places on the possibility of the system to achieve its goals. However, pure rule-following mechanisms do not have goals. Goals and goal-based explanations are useful abstractions that enable observers to better understand the behavior of complex systems. Goals do not exist for rule-following mechanisms.

How then is a system to develop a *first-person* perspective, if it does not have any goals or other motives? Only systems capable of rationalizing (explaining) their behavior and their environment as if they were constrained goal-directed entities can have a *first-person* perspective.

This is the reason we claim that, regarding the development of *first-person* meanings, it is not important to know whether or not the system actually has goals; what is important is seeing itself as a goal-directed entity.

Given that the sense-making of simple organisms is not an intrinsic property of those organisms but, instead, lies in the mind of the observer, and hence metabolism is not a requisite for *first-person* meanings, we believe that it is possible to individually develop or to historically evolve computer programs with no *first-person* meanings into computer programs with *first-person* meanings. The mentioned development or evolution process must, among other things, provide the resulting computer programs with the capability to see themselves as constrained goal-directed entities, and to become aware of the importance of things, events, and situations relative to the program's goals, capabilities, and to the properties of its environment.

### **The sub problem of symbol reference**

Harnad (1990), Cangelosi, Greco, and Harnad (2002) ground the symbols of their systems on the system's sensors. Mugan and Kuipers (2012) ground the plans of their robots on the motor commands of their actuators.

Vogt (2002), Steels (2003, 2008), and Machado and Botelho (2006) involve their systems in especially designed social interactions through which they develop, from scratch, a shared lexicon of symbols, each of which is connected to the object (and sometimes the category) they represent.

Anderson and Perlis (2005) claim that computational tokens have or acquire representational powers for the computer program if they play consistent behavior guiding roles for the program. In this case, the meaning of each symbol is rooted in its behavior guiding role, that is, in its causal powers. Even though the behavior of the computer program is consistently dependent on

each symbol (due to the assumed consistent behavior guiding powers of the symbol), the program would not be capable of stating the meaning of each of its symbols.

All these approaches address the reference sub-problem of the *first-person* meanings problem.

This article is focused not on the reference sub-problem, but on the importance sub-problem of the *first-person* meanings problem.

For Brooks (1991), symbols and symbolic processing are not required for intelligent behavior therefore its robots avoid the symbol grounding problem. In our point of view, if the robot is to determine the importance of objects, events, and situations, it must see all it does and all that happens to it in the light of its goals. Besides, as Vogt (2002) argues, several high-level mental activities, as language, require symbols (but see Cuffari, di Paolo, and de Jaegher, 2014 for a contrasting opinion).

### **The necessity of a motivation system**

For Dreyfus (1972), systems may develop *first-person* meanings only if they have body with body-related needs, which give rise to motivated behavior. Steels (1996) and Birk (1997) developed robots that successfully learn to stay alive in their environment relying only on mechanisms aimed at preserving internal variables within specified values, which may be seen as a form of motivated behavior. Savage (2003) discusses a set of processes by which complex motivated behavior can be developed in artificial agents, either by gradual improvement through the agent's experience or by historical evolution.

We fully agree that a motivational system is required for *first-person* meanings. However, we argue that, even if the presented systems act as if they knew what is important to them, they do not really have any idea of the importance of objects, events, and situations. To develop *first-person* meanings, they need to be aware of such importance.

### **Emergence of agents with *first-person* meanings**

As already stated before, Froese and Ziemke (2009), among others, contend that it is impossible to build computer programs with *first-person* meanings because the computer program would have to create and maintain itself and the whole network of its parts and processes from within. As a way to circumvent this problem, Froese and Ziemke (2009) present the quite radical idea that instead of trying to build programs with *first-person* meanings, scientists should focus on the definition and creation of environments with such dynamics that enable the emergence of computer programs with *first-person* meanings.

We feel sympathetic towards this idea, which we thoroughly considered adopting and implementing. Although we have not yet excluded this possibility, we have decided to tread a more traditional route for the following reason. Since we know of no literature reporting the emergence, from currently existing environments, of computer programs with *first-person* meanings, we think that currently existing environments will not do. Therefore, we would need to create new and different environments from which the desired computer programs would emerge. However we cannot be sure that a computer program with *first-person* meanings emerging from the new environment would be capable of tackling the problems of currently existing environments. Chances are that the emerging program would contribute to our



understanding of the problem but not to solve the problems of currently existing environments for which we already need better programs. Besides, we feel that the problem of defining environments from which the desired computer programs would emerge is even less understood than the problem of defining the desired programs in the first place.

### **Research Approach, Proposals and Achievements**

Following the research assumptions presented in the previous section, our research agenda consists of investigating the following problems:

1. Mechanisms by which a computer program (*i*) discovers that its behavior is (or might be) goal-directed, (*ii*) discovers the description of its capabilities, and (*iii*) discovers properties of the task it performs and the environment it inhabits;
2. Mechanisms by which a computer program may use its knowledge about (cold awareness of) its goals, its capabilities, and the properties of the task it performs and of the environment it inhabits to create cold *first-person* meanings of objects, events and situations;
3. Mechanisms by which a computer program may use its knowledge about its goals, about its capabilities, and about the properties of the task it performs and of the environment it inhabits to shape its future behavior;
4. Mechanisms by which phenomenal experience may be developed in computer programs. We are interested, in particular, in the phenomenal awareness of the importance of objects, events, and situations in relation to the agent's goals, its capabilities, and the constraints and opportunities presented by the environment, which is the phenomenal component of *first-person* meanings, in the sense we have chosen to address.

5. Everything we do in engineering must be validated therefore all the described problems must be associated with adequate validation procedures. However, designing formal validation procedures for some of our targeted research goals, in particular feelings in the phenomenological sense, will be a major challenge. The design of such validation procedures is another problem of the proposed approach. However, we believe that designing such tests will only be possible after we have gained a deeper understanding of the concepts we are dealing with.

This paper contributes mainly to the two first problems of the presented research agenda. A smaller contribution to the third problem is also presented.

The first subsection of the present section describes the concepts that have been acquired by an initial program with no understanding of what it does and of what happens to it, and the domain independent algorithms that have been used for the acquisition of those concepts.

The second subsection describes a proof of concept scenario and shows that the achieved results encourage furthering our research.

### **Understanding what happens**

The conceptual framework of our work is represented in Fig. 1. The software agent is situated in its environment through its sensors and actuators. In addition to the sensors and actuators, the software agent has three additional components: the executor, the observer, and the adopter.

Fig.1 About Here

**Fig. 1 - Functional conceptual framework**

All of these components share the same sensors and actuators. Besides, the observer component has direct access to the actions executed by the executor component. The executor component is programmed to execute a given task with no sense of goals, with no explicit knowledge describing the agent capabilities (sensors and actuators), and with no explicit representations of the domain. It just senses the environment, through the agent's sensors, decides what to do (this does not have to involve any deliberative process relying on explicit knowledge representations), and acts on it through the agent's actuators. The observer component senses the environment exactly as sensed by the executor component, and also senses the actions being performed by the executor. The observer is responsible for learning the agent's goals, the description of the agent's capabilities, and several properties of the agent domain. The adopter uses the knowledge acquired by the observer to shape the agent future behavior and to produce conscious feelings of what happens, that is, phenomenal *first-person* meanings. This conceptual framework is described at the functional level. That is, the different agent components correspond to agent functions, not necessarily to different structural components.

The main focus of the work reported hereunder is the observer functional component and a small part of the adopter functional component. We have not addressed the generation of conscious feelings, in the phenomenological sense.

In what follows, a behavioral instance is the sequence of actions the agent's executor component performs. A behavioral class is the set of behavioral instances with the same purpose, i.e., the set

of behaviors the agent executes at the service of alternative configurations of the same task the agent's executor was programmed to perform.

In the remainder of the section, a behavioral instance is described as an initial state followed by a sequence of action-state pairs. The state of the last action-state pair of the sequence is called the final state. As the agent's executor executes the actions of a behavioral instance, the agent's observer senses the states and the executed actions.

We have defined a set of concepts to be learned by the agent's observer component as it observes what is being done by the agent's executor component. Some of the defined descriptions are properties of the observed entities of the domain (Table 1, e.g., *Proposition/1*, *Action/1* and *Goal/1*). The other descriptions relate entities of the domain (Table 3 and Table 2, e.g., *Achieved/3*, *Contributed/2*, *MustPrecede/2*, *Effects/1*). Domain entities comprise actions and propositions. A state is a set of positive atomic propositions representing their conjunction. For convenience, states are identified by unique identifiers. We have chosen to use non negative integers to index states. State  $S_0$  of a behavioral instance is its initial state. States are numbered by increasing order of their occurrence.

Descriptions are organized into two other groups according to a different criterion: those that apply only to specific behavioral instances (Table 3, e.g., *Achieved/3* and *Contributed/2*) and those that are independent of specific behavioral instances (Table 2, e.g., *MustPrecede/2* and *Precond/1*).

Finally, some descriptions are represented by functions (e.g., *Effects/1*) whereas others are represented by predicates (e.g., *Achieved/3*, *MustPrecede/2*).

**Table 1 – Learned entity properties**  
Table About Here

**Table 2 – Descriptions that relate entities. Applicable to all behaviors**  
Table About Here

**Table 3 – Descriptions that relate entities. Applicable to specific behaviors**  
Table About Here

Of the mentioned learned concepts, the predicates *Goal* and *Desired* capture the agent's goals; the predicate *Action* and the functions *Precond*, *PosEffects*, *NegEffects*, and *ValidityCondition* describe the agent's capabilities; and the predicates *MustPrecede* and *Mandatory* represent properties of the environment. These last two also capture cold *first-person* or intrinsic meanings of specified properties of the environment to the agent because, if the agent is to fulfill its goals, it knows it must satisfy these two classes of constraints (for all behavioral instances of the same class). All the above concepts represent cold *first-person* meanings or are used to define the predicates *Contributed* and *Achieved*. These latter predicates also represent cold *first-person* meanings of specified properties of the environment observed by the agent and of specific actions performed by the agent in the particular considered behavior.

Some of the presented concepts can be formally defined (e.g., fluent propositions). In such cases, we present the axioms that can be used for their deduction. Some other concepts are not formally defined (e.g., goals). We have defined and implemented totally domain independent algorithms

that were used by the agent's observer component to learn all the described concepts. In the remainder of this section, we present the fundamental ideas behind each of those algorithms.

**Propositions and actions.** Propositions and actions are the output of the agent's sensors. A state is exactly the set of propositions observed by the agent sensors at a given time instant. For convenience, the *State/I* predicate holds state identifiers instead of state propositions. The function *StateProps/I*, applied to a state identifier, returns the set of propositions true in the state identified by the specified state identifier.

The predicate *Proposition/I* is determined through the set union of all states of all behavioral instances of the agent. The predicate *StaticProposition/I* is determined through the set intersection of all states of all behavioral instances of the agent.

Knowing the set of all propositions and the set of all static propositions, it is possible to determine the fluent propositions using the following axiom schema:

$$(\text{Proposition}(P) \wedge \neg \text{StaticProposition}(P)) \Rightarrow \text{FluentProposition}(P)$$

That is, the set of fluent propositions is the difference between the set of all propositions and the set of the static propositions. Although implementation details are not important, all the algorithms have been implemented in the Prolog language. The implementation of all presented deduction axiom schemata is remarkably similar to the actual axioms. This is illustrated by the following example corresponding to the axiom schema just presented.

```
fluent_proposition(P) :- proposition(P), not static_proposition(P).
```

The predicate *Action/I* is computed through the set union of the actions observed in all behavioral instances of the agent.

**Agent goals: Goal/I.** The agent's goals, learned through the observation of its behavior, are represented by the predicate *Goal/I*. *Goal(PropsSet)* means the agent behaves as if its goal were the conjunction of all propositions in the set *PropSet*.

Whether or not the agent really has goals, the purpose of this research is to provide the means for the agent to understand its relation with the environment as if its behavior were guided by goals. We have assumed that, in case of success, the agent behavior ends when the agent's goals are achieved. This assumption is the basis for the proposed goal discovery algorithm. The set of agent's goals is determined through the intersection of the sets of fluent propositions of the final states of all the observed behavioral instances of the same class. We have provided an example of the implementation of an axiom schema (for the deduction of fluent propositions). However, not all algorithms correspond to logical axioms; several are learning algorithms that must process all instances of the same class of behaviors. In general, those learning algorithms implement set operations with the entities of the domain. The following pseudo-code exemplifies that class of algorithms for the case of determining the goals of the agent. This time, we do not provide the Prolog code because procedural Prolog code is not straightforward to understand for non-Prolog programmers.

```

compute_goals(List_of_behaviors) {
  foreach Behavior in List_of_behaviors {
    load_behavior(Behavior)
    FluentProps = last_state_fluent_props()
    update_goals(FluentProps)
  }
}

update_goals(NewGoals) {
  if goals do not exist yet then store goal(NewGoals)
  else {
    remove goal(PreviousGoals)
    UpdatedGoals = setintersection(PreviousGoals, NewGoals)
    store goal(UpdatedGoals)
  }
}

```

Upon completion, the fact `goal(Goals)` will represent the set of the agent's goals.

It is worth noting that the presented pseudo-code does not directly correspond to the actual implementation. The actual program does not implement a separate process for computing goals; it performs several computations at once, for instance the set of observed propositions, the set of observed actions, and the set of goals, among others.

Mainly for convenience, we propose the definition of a desired proposition as a proposition that is one of the agent goals. This definition leads to the following axiom schema.

$$(\text{Goal}(\text{PSet}) \wedge P \in \text{PSet}) \Rightarrow \text{Desired}(P)$$

The algorithm used for determining desired propositions just needs to have access to the set of the agent's goals.



**Mandatory propositions: Mandatory/1.** We say that if a proposition  $P$  must precede another proposition and  $P$  is not one of the agent's goals then  $P$  is mandatory. We believe it would be possible to identify other conditions under which a proposition should be considered mandatory but, for the moment, we will stick to this one.

Knowing that a proposition is mandatory is meaningful to the agent, given that it knows that it will only achieve its goals if its behavior includes a state in which the mandatory proposition holds.

The following axiom schema captures the proposed intuition.

$$(\exists q \text{ MustPrecede}(P, q) \wedge \neg \text{Desired}(P)) \Rightarrow \text{Mandatory}(P)$$

As it will be seen later,  $\text{MustPrecede}(\text{Prop}_1, \text{Prop}_2)$  means that, due to the way the world works, to the task structure, and to the agent goals and capabilities, if propositions  $\text{Prop}_1$  and  $\text{Prop}_2$  occur in a behavioral instance then either they both occur in the initial state or  $\text{Prop}_1$  must occur before  $\text{Prop}_2$ .

The algorithm for computing the predicate *Mandatory/1* restricts the set of all fluent propositions to those that are not desired but must precede another proposition.

**Precedence relations: MustPrecede(Prop<sub>1</sub>, Prop<sub>2</sub>).** As it has been defined, a precedence relation is intrinsically meaningful to the agent because it knows it cannot achieve its goals if it does not satisfy the learned precedence.

We start by the definition of the precedence relation for a single behavioral instance. Then we provide the general definition, valid for all behavioral instances of the same class.

Before the definition, a note about transitivity of the precedence relation, as it is used in our research, is in place. Contrarily to the usual precedence concept, the precedence relation, as we have conceptualized it, is not transitive. It is possible to have  $\text{MustPrecede}(P_1, P_2)$  and  $\text{MustPrecede}(P_2, P_3)$  without  $\text{MustPrecede}(P_1, P_3)$ . Consider the example of the following two behavioral instances,  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ :

Fig.2 About Here

**Fig. 2 - Precedence relation in two examples**

The precedence relation shared by the two behaviors  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  consists only of the pairs  $\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle$  and  $\langle P_2, P_3 \rangle$ , but not by the pair  $\langle P_1, P_3 \rangle$ . If we had defined the precedence relation as being transitive, one of the pairs  $\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle$  or  $\langle P_2, P_3 \rangle$  would have to be excluded. The major problem then would have been to decide which of them to exclude. Instead of finding a criterion to exclude one of these pairs, we decided to define the precedence relation as non-transitive.

Precedence in a singular behavioral instance:  $\text{Precedes}(P_1, P_2)$  holds for a given instance of a behavioral class if the propositions  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are both true in the initial state; or if  $P_1$  occurs before  $P_2$ , and  $P_1$  is not a precondition of one of the actions of the action sequence that leads from the state in which  $P_1$  is true (but not  $P_2$ ) to the state in which  $P_2$  is true.

That is, if  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are not true in the initial state, there must be a sequence of actions, *ActSequence*, such that (i) performing *ActSequence* in the state  $S_1$  leads to the state  $S_2$ ; (ii)  $P_1$  is a member of  $\text{StateProps}(S_1)$ , and  $P_2$  is a member of the difference  $(\text{StateProps}(S_2) - \text{StateProps}(S_1))$ ; and (iii)  $P_1$  is not a member of the set of preconditions of any actions in *ActSequence*.  $\text{StateProps}(S)$  represents the set of propositions of the state identified by  $S$ .

Precedence relation, defined in a class of behaviors:  $\text{MustPrecede}(P_1, P_2)$  holds for a behavioral class, iff, for each instance of that behavioral class,  $b$ , in which both  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  occur,  $P_1$  precedes  $P_2$  in that behavioral instance,  $b$ :  $\text{Precedes}(P_1, P_2)$ . To avoid situations in which the precedence relation is satisfied exclusively by behavioral instances in which  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  occur simultaneously in the initial state, we additionally impose that there must be at least one behavioral instance in which  $P_1$  actually precedes  $P_2$ .

The algorithm that learns the precedence relation by observation closely follows the described definition. First we defined an algorithm that discovers the precedence relation in a single instance of the behavioral class. Then, we defined the algorithm that checks if the precedence relation holds in all behavioral instances and if there is at least one of them in which  $P_1$  actually precedes  $P_2$ . This second component of the algorithm calls the single instance component, discarding those behavioral instances in which  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  do not occur at all.

**Action preconditions: Precond(Act).** *Precond/I* is a function such that  $\text{Precond}(\text{Act})$  represents the set of all preconditions of action *Act*. Action preconditions are propositions that must be true for the action to be executed.

The algorithm to determine the preconditions of an action performs the intersection of the sets of fluent propositions of all states of all behavioral instances in which the action is executed.

Although this idea is correct, the fact that some actions are performed only too few times, even if all instances of the same behavioral class are considered, may lead to sets of preconditions with more propositions than those actually necessary for the action to be executed.

To circumvent this problem, it was necessary to generalize actions instead of considering only the observed instances of the same action. For example, instead of considering every instance of a given action (such as  $\text{Move}(A, P_1, B)$ , moving block  $A$  from position  $P_1$  to the top of block  $B$ ), it is necessary to consider the abstract action ( $\text{Move}(\text{block}, \text{from}, \text{to})$ , in which  $\text{block}$ ,  $\text{from}$  and  $\text{to}$  are variables). Using generalization of the action arguments allowed the algorithm to discover the correct set of action preconditions.

In addition to solving the mentioned problem, caused by action instances that are seldom executed, generalization enables to use the abstract action preconditions for problems that require action instances that were never observed, as it is the case in planning problems. This second reason led us to use generalization also for determining the action effects and the action validity conditions.

**Action effects: PosEffects(Act) and NegEffects(Act).**  $\text{PosEffects}/I$  and  $\text{NegEffects}/I$  are functions that return action effects.  $\text{PosEffects}(\text{Act})$  represents the set of the positive effects of the action  $\text{Act}$ ; and  $\text{NegEffects}(\text{Act})$  represents the set of its negative effects.

The action's positive effects are the propositions that become true immediately after the action is executed. The action's negative effects are those propositions that were true before the action is executed and cease to be true immediately after the action is executed.

The set of positive effects of an instance of an action is determined as the difference between the set of propositions of the state observed immediately after the action instance has been executed and the set of propositions holding in the state in which the action instance was executed.

The set of negative effects of an instance of an action is obtained through the difference between the set of propositions of the state in which the action instance was executed and the set of propositions of the state immediately after the execution.

After determining the effects of all action instances, the algorithm performs generalization on the action arguments, leading to the general expression of the effects of all observed actions.

**Action validity condition:  $\text{ValidityCondition}(\text{Act})$ .** The functional expression  $\text{ValidityCondition}(\text{Act})$  represents the conditions that must be satisfied by variables of the action  $\text{Act}$  that make it a valid action. That is, it specifies the valid instantiations of those variables. For instance, the validity condition of the blocks world action  $\text{Move}(\text{block}, \text{from}, \text{to})$  is that the variable  $\text{block}$  must be a block, the variables  $\text{from}$  and  $\text{to}$  must be places where a block can be placed, and all the variables must have different values:

$$(\text{Block}(\text{block}) \wedge \text{Place}(\text{from}) \wedge \text{Place}(\text{to}) \wedge \text{block} \neq \text{from} \wedge \text{block} \neq \text{to} \wedge \text{from} \neq \text{to})$$

We emphasize that, as it was the case with preconditions and effects, it is necessary, for certain problems such as planning, that the action validity condition is generalized, i.e., it must specify a set of values for the variables that is more general than just the observed instantiations.

The main idea underlying the algorithm used for determining a generalized validity condition of an action consists of finding the static predicates that cover all the observed instances of the same action. First the algorithm tries to apply each one-place predicate to each of the action variables and checks if all observed instances of the action are covered by the tried predicates. Then, the algorithm tries to apply all binary static predicates to all ordered pairs of variables. Then it moves to the ternary predicates, and so on, until all static predicates have been tried.

Each time the algorithm tries to use an N-ary static predicate with all N-ary tuples of variables, it uses first the predicates with a smaller extension as a way of avoiding overgeneralizations, which would have a greater likability of being wrong.

**Description of specific behaviors: *Achieved/3* and *Contributed/3*.** *Achieved/3* and

*Contributed/3* and *Achieved/3* do not reflect general properties of actions or propositions. They reflect the usefulness, the purpose, of specific actions and propositions of specific behaviors.

The relationships  $Achieved(State, Act, PropsSet)$  and  $Contributed(State, Prop, Act)$  represent the cold *first-person* meanings of actions and propositions of specific behaviors to the agent.

$Achieved(State, Act, PropsSet)$  expresses the agent's knowledge of the reasons justifying the execution of a given action in a specific behavior: achieving one of its goals or as a means to

achieve a state in which another action could be and was actually executed. The propositions in the set *PropsSet* constitute the relevant effects of the action *Act*, executed in the state *State* of the specific observed behavior. *Action effect*, in the sense that the action was executed in a state in which no such propositions were true leading to a state in which they all become true. *Relevant* in the sense that each of them is either one of the agent's goals or one of the preconditions of an action that actually used it in a future state of the same behavior.

*Contributed(State, Prop, Act)* expresses the agent's knowledge of the usefulness of a given proposition, true in a specific state of a specific behavior: being the precondition of an action actually executed at that state. Proposition *Prop*, true in state *State* of the specific observed behavior, contributed to the execution of action *Act* in the same state of the same behavior, because it is one of *Act*'s preconditions.

For the formalization of the axiom schema that can be used for the deduction of *Contributed/3* relationships, it is necessary to use the predicate *NextState/3* that has not yet been introduced. *NextState(S<sub>1</sub>, A, S<sub>2</sub>)* relates a state identifier (*S<sub>1</sub>*), the action that is performed in that state (*A*), and the identifier of the new state resulting of the action execution (*S<sub>2</sub>*). *NextState/3*, as well as *State/1* and *StateProps/1*, refers to states, actions and propositions actually observed by the observer component of the agent. For instance,  $\exists t \text{ NextState}(S, A, t)$  means that (i) there is a state in the considered observed behavior, identified by *S*, and that (ii) the action *A* was actually executed in that state, leading to another state whose identification is not specified. These predicates and function do not refer to possibilities; they refer to actually executed behavior.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & ( \text{State}(S) \wedge P \in \text{StateProps}(S) \wedge \text{Action}(A) \wedge \\
 & \exists r \text{NextState}(S, A, r) \wedge P \in \text{Precond}(A) ) \Rightarrow \text{Contributed}(S, P, A)
 \end{aligned}$$

The positive effect  $P$  of action  $A_1$  is relevant if  $P$  is one of the agent goals or if  $P$  is one of the preconditions of a second action  $A_2$  that could be executed after  $A_1$  because that very occurrence of  $P$  was true when  $A_2$  was executed. If  $A_2$  has been executed in a state occurring after the one that ensues immediately after the execution of  $A_1$ ,  $P$  must be true in all states, from  $S$  until the state in which  $A_2$  was executed.

The axiom schemata for the deduction of the relevant effects of an action requires the definition of the relation *PathTrue/3* such that  $\text{PathTrue}(S_i, S_j, P)$  means that  $P$  is true in all states from  $S_i$  to  $S_j$  inclusive.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\text{State}(S) \wedge \text{State}(T) \wedge S \leq T \wedge \neg \exists r (\text{State}(r) \wedge S \leq r \leq T \wedge P \notin \text{StateProps}(r))) \\
 & \Rightarrow \text{PathTrue}(S, T, P)
 \end{aligned}$$

The relation  $\leq$ , between state identifiers, reflects a temporal ordering among states. Being  $S$  and  $T$  two state identifiers,  $S \leq T$  means that the state identified by  $S$  occurred before the state identified by  $T$ , or that they identify the same state.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & ( \text{State}(S) \wedge \text{Action}(A) \wedge \exists r \text{NextState}(S, A, r) \wedge \\
 & \text{Desired}(P) \wedge P \in \text{PosEffects}(A) ) \Rightarrow \text{RelevantEffect}(S, A, P)
 \end{aligned}$$



$$\begin{aligned} & \exists r ( \text{State}(S) \wedge \text{Action}(A) \wedge \text{NextState}(S, A, r) \wedge P \in \text{PosEffects}(A) \wedge \\ & \quad \exists t (\text{State}(t) \wedge S \leq t \wedge \text{PathTrue}(r, t, P) \wedge \exists a \text{Contributed}(t, P, a)) ) \\ & \quad \Rightarrow \text{RelevantEffect}(S, A, P) \end{aligned}$$

*PropsSet*, in the relationship *Achieved*(*S*, *A*, *PropsSet*) represents the set of the relevant effects of the action *A*, executed in the state *S*. The following axiom schema captures the definition:

$$\text{Achieved}(S, A, \{p: \text{RelevantEffect}(S, A, p)\})$$

The algorithms for determining the relations *Contributed/3* and *Achieved/3* apply the axiom schemata presented for their deduction, for which they need the following relations and functions: *State/1*, *Action/1*, *Desired/1*, *StateProps/1*, *NextState/3* and *Precond/1*. Determining *Achieved/3* also requires the relation *Contributed/3* (or else, its definition).

For determining the relation *Contributed/3* the algorithm computes, for all states of the considered behavior, the set of tuples  $\langle S, P, A \rangle$  such that the proposition *P*, true in the state *S*, is one of the preconditions of the action *A*, executed in state *S*.

For determining the relevant effects of an action (i.e., relation *RelevantEffects/3*), the algorithm computes all tuples  $\langle S, A, P \rangle$  such that the action *A*, executed in the state *S*,

- (i) generated at least one of the agent goals (*P*); or

- (ii) generated one of the preconditions  $P$  of another action ( $A'$ ) executed in a future state;  $P$  was true in all states from the one immediately after the execution of  $A$  until the one in which  $A'$  was executed.

These tuples are then used to generate the tuples of *Achieved/3* relation, which include, in their third element, the set of all relevant effects of  $A$ , executed in the state  $S$ .

### **Proof of Concept and Discussion**

The described definitions and algorithms were demonstrated in a simple scenario of the blocks world. Given their independence of the domain, the presented definitions and algorithms could have been demonstrated in other scenarios.

**Blocks world scenario.** In this version of the blocks world, the agent moves blocks around until they are all stacked on top of each other. The place where the blocks will be stacked is irrelevant. There are always three equal blocks – A, B, and C – and four spaces on a table –  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $P_3$ , and  $P_4$ . Each block may be placed on one of the table positions or on top of any other block. The predicate *Place/1* is used to hold the places where blocks may be located. The final stack must contain the block B on top of the block C and the block A on top of the block B.

Fig.3 About Here

**Fig. 3 - Example of a blocks world problem**

Two blocks cannot be placed on the same position therefore a block can only be moved to a place if the place is clear. Predicate *Clear/1* is true for clear places. The agent can only move a block at a time, and only if the block to be moved does not have any other block on top of it. The predicate *On/2* is used to specify the relation between a block and the place in which it is positioned. *On(block, place)* means that the specified block is positioned on the specified place.

The states of the world contain only positive instances of the *Clear/1* and *On/2* predicates, which are accessible to all functional components of the agent through its sensors. The agent's only action schema, *Move(block, from, to)*, moves the specified block, from the specified place (*from*), to the specified place (*to*).

We have made some simplifications in the demonstration to be described. These simplifications will be relaxed in future experiments. First, we assume that the agent's observer component recognizes each time a final states is reached; final states are always successful.

According to the second simplification, each action produces always the same effects.

Conditional and imperfect actions were not considered.

Third, we have also assumed that the agent has perfect access to all relevant aspects of the world.

All initial configurations (e.g., 120) were automatically generated and the agent's executor component had to stack the blocks in each of them, which represents 120 instances of the same class of behavior. The states and the actions of each behavior were recorded on a file. The 120

files were processed by the defined algorithms, which acquired the defined concepts and generated explanations of the agent's behaviors.

**General results.** Our algorithms have correctly discovered all the described concepts. In particular they discovered the sets of domain entities: propositions, fluent propositions (e.g.,  $\text{On}(A, B)$ ,  $\text{Clear}(A)$ ), static propositions (e.g.,  $\text{Block}(A)$ ,  $\text{Place}(P_1)$ ) and actions (e.g.,  $\text{Move}(A, P_1, B)$ ).

The agent's observer functional component also discovered the agent's goals:

$\text{Goal}(\{\text{On}(A, B), \text{On}(B, C), \text{Clear}(A)\})$

One might argue that  $\text{Clear}(A)$  is not a goal; it is a necessity in the sense that it is true in all states of the described world in which the blocks A, B, and C are stacked. Although we have not solved this problem, we have in mind an approach that would generate experiences that would be capable of distinguishing true goals from mere necessities. The experiments would be designed to confirm or disconfirm goals under suspicion. Since the space of all possible experiments would be intractable, the mentioned approach should also provide a way of identifying goals under suspicion. For instance, if a certain proposition is the precondition of any action that achieves one of the agent's goals, maybe that proposition is not a true goal, but a necessity.

Desired propositions are individual agent goals. Accordingly, the agent's observer component correctly identified the following desired propositions:  $\text{Desired}(\text{On}(A, B))$ ,  $\text{Desired}(\text{On}(B, C))$ ,  $\text{Desired}(\text{Clear}(A))$ .

The agent's observer component correctly discovered that  $\text{On}(B, C)$  must be achieved before it can achieve  $\text{On}(A, B)$ :  $\text{MustPrecede}(\text{On}(B, C), \text{On}(A, B))$ .

In fact, the agent would never be capable of achieving its goals if this precedence relation is not observed. Moreover,  $\text{On}(B, C)$  is not a precondition of the actions that achieve  $\text{On}(A, B)$ . The precedence relation arises strictly of the relation between the agent goals and its capabilities.

Given the deduction axiom for the *Mandatory/I* relation, the agent's observer component didn't identify any mandatory proposition because, although  $\text{On}(B, C)$  must precede  $\text{On}(A, B)$ ,  $\text{On}(B, C)$  is also a goal, and goals were not defined as mandatory.

Only to test the deduction axiom and corresponding algorithm, we have artificially added the proposition *GoalPrecedingProp* before the proposition  $\text{On}(A, B)$  is achieved. Since *GoalPrecedingProp* is not a goal, it was identified as a mandatory proposition, which agrees with our preliminary definition:

$\text{Mandatory}(\text{GoalPrecedingProp})$ .

The agent's observer component was also capable of discovering the generalized action descriptions:

$\text{Precond}(\text{Move}(\text{block}, \text{from}, \text{to})) = \{\text{On}(\text{block}, \text{from}), \text{Clear}(\text{block}), \text{Clear}(\text{to})\}$

$\text{PosEffects}(\text{Move}(\text{block}, \text{from}, \text{to})) = \{\text{On}(\text{block}, \text{to}), \text{Clear}(\text{from})\}$

$$\text{NegEffects}(\text{Move}(\text{block}, \text{from}, \text{to})) = \{\text{On}(\text{block}, \text{from}), \text{Clear}(\text{to})\}$$

$$\text{ValidityCondition}(\text{Move}(\text{block}, \text{from}, \text{to})) =$$

$$(\text{Block}(\text{block}) \wedge \text{Place}(\text{from}) \wedge \text{Place}(\text{to}) \wedge \text{block} \neq \text{from} \wedge \text{block} \neq \text{to} \wedge \text{from} \neq \text{to})$$

To learn the inequality relationships ( $\neq$ ) between all pairs of variables, it was necessary to equip the agent with sensors for the equality relation ( $=$ ) and provide it with prior knowledge that, for any two terms,  $(X \neq Y) \equiv \neg(X = Y)$ .

The following equality relationships among blocks and among table spaces were introduced in all states of all agent behaviors:  $A=A$ ,  $B=B$ ,  $C=C$ ,  $P_1=P_1$ ,  $P_2=P_2$ ,  $P_3=P_3$ ,  $P_4=P_4$ . These relationships were correctly learned as static relationships.

The algorithm was then allowed to use all static propositions together with the inequality relation and its definition in terms of the equality relation. This allowed the algorithm to correctly use the inequality relationships among all variables, when determining the action validity condition.

**Explaining specific behaviors.** *Achieved/3* and *Contributed/3* are the relations that provide meaning to specific behaviors. As explained,  $\text{Achieved}(\text{State}, \text{Action}, \text{PropSet})$  and  $\text{Contributed}(\text{State}, \text{Prop}, \text{Action})$  express the importance of specific actions and specific propositions in specific behaviors. Their importance is always explained in direct or indirect relation to the agent goals, hence *Achieved/3* and *Contributed/3*, we argue, represent cold *first-person* meanings. They will become true *first-person* meanings when they are consciously felt by the agent, in the phenomenological sense.

The agent's observer component correctly explained all agent behaviors. However, it is impossible and useless to show the explanations of all actions of all 120 observed behaviors. Instead, we describe an example behavioral instance (Fig. 4) and we illustrate the explanations discovered by the agent's observer component.

Fig.4 About Here

**Fig. 4 - Example of a behavioral instance**

We start with the *Achieved/3* explanations. The agent was capable of describing the relevant effects of all actions, but we provide only two examples of the generated explanations.

Achieved( $S_1$ , Move(A, B,  $P_2$ ), {On(A,  $P_2$ ), Clear(B)})

This means that the action Move(A, B,  $P_2$ ), executed in state  $S_1$ , led to a state ( $S_2$ ) in which block  $A$  is located on place  $P_2$ , On(A,  $P_2$ ), and block  $B$  is clear, Clear(B). These two effects are relevant because the propositions On(A,  $P_2$ ) and Clear(B) were not true in state  $S_1$ , and because Clear(B) is one of the preconditions of the action Move(B,  $P_1$ , C), actually executed in state  $S_2$ , and On(A,  $P_2$ ) is one of the preconditions of action Move(A,  $P_2$ , B), actually executed in state  $S_3$ . Although Move(A,  $P_2$ , B) has not been executed immediately in state  $S_2$ , the proposition On(A,  $P_2$ ) held true in states  $S_2$  and  $S_3$ , which means it was actually used by the action Move(A,  $P_2$ , B).

Achieved( $S_2$ , Move(B,  $P_1$ , C), {On(B, C)})

This means that the action  $\text{Move}(B, P_1, C)$ , executed in state  $S_2$ , led to a state ( $S_3$ ) in which the block  $B$  is placed on top of block  $C$ ,  $\text{On}(B, C)$ . This is relevant because, although  $\text{On}(B, C)$  is not the precondition of any of the actions executed afterwards, it is one of the agent's goals.

The agent's observer component was also capable of finding meaning in the propositions that occur in the states of the agent behavior. Once again, we provide two examples that illustrate the results.

$\text{Contributed}(S_0, \text{Clear}(A), \text{Move}(A, C, B))$

$\text{Clear}(A)$ , true in state  $S_0$ , contributed to the action  $\text{Move}(A, C, B)$ , actually executed in state  $S_0$ , because it is one of its preconditions.

$\text{Contributed}(S_0, \text{Clear}(B), \text{Move}(A, C, B))$

$\text{Clear}(B)$ , true in state  $S_0$ , contributed to the action  $\text{Move}(A, C, B)$ , actually executed in state  $S_0$ , because it is one of its preconditions.

*Achieved/3* and *Contributed/3* relationships can be chained to provide an explanation of the whole behavior.

We have also implemented a small exploratory fraction of the agent's adopter functional component. As can be seen in Fig. 4, the agent we have programmed to perform tasks in the blocks world is not an optimal agent. In fact the first two of its actions, in the depicted behavior,



should have been replaced by  $\text{Move}(A, C, P_2)$  or  $\text{Move}(A, C, P_4)$ . However, if the description of the agent's actions ( $\text{Precond}/I$ ,  $\text{PosEffects}/I$ ,  $\text{NegEffects}/I$  and  $\text{ValidityCondition}/I$ ) and the agent goals are used in a planning algorithm, the agent will exhibit a better behavior. We have actually used a planning algorithm to which we have provided the agent goals and the descriptions of its actions. As expected, the algorithm produced an optimized behavior. This means that an agent can improve its future performance after it understands the goals that move its behavior, the description of its capabilities, and the properties of the environment.

### Conclusions

We have argued that it is possible to have computer programs that develop *first-person* meanings of what they do and of what happens to them. Our belief relies on the following more fundamental one: along the evolution of life, there was a stage in which the most sophisticated living beings, although with brains and nervous systems, did not develop *first-person* meanings. As computer programs, they were pure rule-following systems, in the sense that their behavior was determined by the forces applicable to their inner workings. Yet, in a more recent stage of evolution, those living beings gave rise to other more sophisticated ones, capable of developing *first-person* meanings. That is, a rule-following system with no *first-person* meanings can evolve or develop into a system with *first-person* meanings. We note however that an appropriate test would be a significant advancement.

Damásio (1999) suggests that the concerns of an individual arise only if the individual is consciously aware of what he or she does and of what happens to him or her. While fully adopting this position, we extend it by saying that cold awareness is not enough; it is necessary

to feel, to be phenomenally aware of what one does and of what happens to us. Varela and Depraz (2005), and Colombetti (2014) also recognize the primordial importance of the feeling body to consciousness. *First-person* meanings do not arise of some yet to be understood magic trick of pure rule-following; they are created by our rationalization capabilities and by our phenomenal experience.

From the above argument, we propose that for a program to develop *first-person* meanings, it has first to start seeing itself as a goal-directed entity, so that it can explain what happens in terms of its relationship with its goals. Then it must adopt the goals it learns to have, as well as acquired goal-based explanations. For this adoption process, (i) the program's future behavior must reflect the knowledge the program acquires about itself and about its environment and tasks; and (ii) the program must feel the importance of objects, events, and situations to its goals, its capabilities, and the constraints and opportunities presented by its environment. The research described in this paper contributed to the less demanding problem of the agent becoming aware (in the cold sense) of its goals, its capabilities, its behavior, and everything that surrounds it, and use that awareness to develop cold *first-person* meanings of objects, events, and situations. We have also made a smaller contribution to enable an agent that has acquired the mentioned knowledge of its goals, of its capabilities, and of the properties of the environment to use that knowledge to shape its future behavior.

Although we believe that a program may have *first-person* meanings comparable with ours only when it consciously feels, we are firmly convinced that it is possible to start right now with what could be called cold *first-person* meanings.

We proposed a research framework aimed at the development of agents having *first-person* meanings. The proposed framework was shaped by five research assumptions. Finally, we described the research we have recently done and its results.

The research we have described will be pursued in several ways. First of all, we have to drop some simplifying hypotheses we have used to facilitate this work. The agent's observer component should not know *a priori* when the agent's executor component has reached the final state of its task and if the task was successfully accomplished or if anything failed. The agent world should not be fully accessible to its sensors, and both the agent sensors and actuators should not be perfect. Not everything returned by the agent sensors should always exactly match reality; and not all agent actions should have absolutely predictable effects. All aspects of the reported research may be made more robust. We will also expand our work to tackle persistent goals, such as staying alive.

It will also be important that the agent's observer component monitors the changes in the agent's internal state, in addition to just observing what happens in the external world. This might enable the agent to interpret what it does as a strategy to preserve or to achieve desired properties of its internal state.

All the algorithms used in the research presented in this paper, although totally domain independent, were especially designed for our problems. It might be insightful to approach all the learning problems (those in which the agent's observer component considers all instances of the same behavior) using existing general-purpose learning algorithms and compare the results with those of the special-purpose algorithms we have designed.

The vocabulary we have proposed to represent the agent intrinsic understanding of what it does and what happens to it is still not enough. For instance, the agent does not have yet the vocabulary to express astonishment, and it has little capability to express properties of the environment. We will investigate new concepts, to be learned by the agent, which will empower it with capabilities for a richer understanding of what it does and what happens to it.

Another way this work will be pursued will be by investigating better mechanisms by which our computer programs may use the knowledge they acquire about themselves and the environment they inhabit to better shape their future behavior.

Finally, we will start a research endeavor on what it means for an agent to consciously feel what it does and what surrounds it. A rigorous test must be developed, but its design requires a deeper understanding of what is feeling in the phenomenological sense.

### References

- Anderson, M. L., & Perlis, D. R. (2005). The roots of self-awareness. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 4 (3), 297–333. doi:10.1007/s11097-005-4068-0
- Birk, A. (1997). Robot Learning and Self-Sufficiency: What the energy-level can tell us about a robot's performance. In A. Birk, & J. Demiris (Eds.) *Learning Robots: Proceedings of the Sixth European Workshop on Learning Robots (EWLR-6)*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 1545, (pp. 109-125). London: Springer

- Block, N. (1996). What is functionalism?. Revised version of the entry on functionalism in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy Supplement*. Macmillan (retrieved from <http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/philo/faculty/block/papers/functionality.pdf>)
- Brooks, R.A. (1991). Intelligence without representation. *Artificial Intelligence*, 47(1-3), 139-159
- Cangelosi, A., Greco, A., & Harnad, S. 2002. Symbol Grounding and the Symbolic Theft Hypothesis. In Cangelosi, A. & Parisi, D. (Eds). *Simulating the Evolution of Language*. London: Springer
- Chalmers, D.J. (1992). Subsymbolic computation and the Chinese room. In J. Dinsmore (Ed.) *The Symbolic and Connectionist Paradigms: Closing the Gap*. Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 25-48.
- Chalmers, D.J. 1995. Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200-219.
- Colombetti, G. (2014). *The Feeling Body: Affective Science Meets the Enactive Mind*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press
- Cuffari, E.C., di Paolo, E., & de Jaegher, H. (2014). From participatory sense-making to language: there and back again. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 1-37. DOI 10.1007/s11097-014-9404-9

Damásio, A. (1999). *The feeling of what happens. Body, emotion and making of consciousness.* .

New York: Harcourt Brace, ISBN: 0156010755

Dreyfus, H. (1972). *What Computers Can't Do.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, ISBN

0-06-090613-8

Esteves, A.S., & Botelho, L.B. (2007). The Centrifugal Development of Artificial Agents: a research agenda. In *Proceedings of the workshop on Self-Organized Systems (SOS) of the Summer Computer Simulation Conference (SCSC'07)*

Froese, T. (2015). Beyond neurophenomenology: A review of Colombetti's *The Feeling Body.*

*New Ideas in Psychology* (in press)

Froese, T., & Ziemke, T. (2009). Enactive artificial intelligence: Investigating the systemic organization of life and mind. *Artificial Intelligence*, 173(3-4), 466-500

Gallup, G.G. Jr. (1970). Chimpanzees: Self recognition. *Science*, 167 (3914), 86–87

Gödel, K. (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter

Systeme, I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* 38,173-198. DOI

10.1007/BF01700692. [On formally undecidable propositions of Principia Mathematica and related systems I. In S. Feferman (Ed) (1989) *Kurt Gödel collected works*, Vol. I, 144-195. Oxford University Press]

Gold, K., & Scassellati, B. (2009). Using probabilistic reasoning over time to self-recognize.

*Robotics and Autonomous Systems* 57, 384-392

Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (1996). Orchestrated reduction of quantum coherence in brain

microtubules: A model for consciousness. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*,

40(3-4), 453-480. DOI: 10.1016/0378-4754(96)80476-9

Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe. A review of the 'Orch

OR' theory. *Physics of Life Reviews*, 11(1), 39-78

Harnad, S. (1990). The Symbol Grounding Problem. *Physica D*, 42, 335-346

Krajewski, S. (2007). On Gödel's Theorem and Mechanism: Inconsistency or Unsoundness is

Unavoidable in any Attempt to 'Out-Gödel' the Mechanist. *Fundamenta Informaticae*

81(1-3), 173-181

LaForte, G., Hayes, P.J., & Ford, K.M. 1998. Why Godel's Theorem Cannot Refute

Computationalism. *Artificial Intelligence* 104(1-2), 265-286.

Machado, J., & Botelho, L.M. (2006). Software agents that learn through observation.

In *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and*

*MultiAgent Systems (AAMAS 2006)*

Mugan, J., & Kuipers, B. (2012). Autonomous Learning of High-Level States and Actions in Continuous Environments. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development* 4(1), 70-86. DOI: 10.1109/TAMD.2011.2160943

Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds and the Laws of Physics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, ISBN 0-19-851973-7

Pylyshyn, Z. (1980). Computation and cognition: issues in the foundations of cognitive science. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(1), 111-169

Savage, T. (2003). The grounding of motivation in artificial animals: Indices of motivational behavior. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 4(1), 23-55

Searle, J.R. (1980). Minds, brains and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(3), 417-424

Sharkey, N., & Ziemke, T. (2001). Mechanistic verses phenomenal embodiment: can robot embodiment lead to strong AI? *Cognitive Systems Research*, 2(4), 251 – 262

Steels, L. (1996). Discovering the competitors. *Journal of Adaptive Behavior*, 4(2), 173-199

Steels, L. (2003). Evolving grounded communication for robots. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(7), 308-312



Steels, L. (2008). The Symbol Grounding Problem Has Been Solved. So What's Next? In M. de Vega (Ed.) *Symbols and Embodiment: Debates on Meaning and Cognition*. Oxford University Press

Thompson, E. (2011). Reply to Commentaries. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 18(5-6), 176-223

Thompson, E., & Stapleton, M. (2009). Making Sense of Sense-Making. *Topoi*, 28(1), 23-30. DOI: 10.1007/s11245-008-9043-2

Varela, F. J., & Depraz, N. (2005). At the source of time: Valence and the constitutional dynamics of affect. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 12(8-10), 61-81

Vogt, P. (2002). The physical symbol grounding problem. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 3(3), 429-457

Ziemke, T. (1999). Rethinking Grounding. In A. Riegler, M. Peschl, & A. von Stein (Eds.) *Understanding Representation in the Cognitive Science*. New York: Plenum Press. ISBN: 978-0-306-46286-3