

Table 1. The Similarities between the Interactionist Account and the Justification Hypothesis (as published in 2003) on the Evolution of Human Reasoning in 2017/2018.

	Henriques (2003)	Mercier and Sperber (2017/2018)
<b>1. The idea that human reason is shaped by evolution in a socio-linguistic environment involving justification and persuasion.</b>	“Effectively justifying one’s actions almost certainly was a new, difficult, and extremely important problem for our ancestors to be able to solve, precisely the type of adaptive problem that would lead to strong selection pressures and rapid evolutionary change.” (p. 172)	“Reason, we will argue, evolved as a response to problems encountered in the social environment rather than solitary thinking.” (p. 182-183)
<b>2. The idea that there are two domains of reason giving, to self and to others</b>	“The JH suggests that humans have such a strongly developed sense of folk psychology because they are the only species that has had to articulate what they think to others. Likewise, humans are the only animals that have had to evaluate the legitimacy of others’ explanations.” (p. 171)	“Reason has two main functions: that of producing reasons for justifying oneself, and that of producing arguments to convince others.” (p. 8)
<b>3. Framing the problem of reasoning as the difference between the Analytic/Intellectual versus Social/Interactionist Approach</b>	“The ideological goals of the two institutions (i.e., science and law) help illustrate the conceptual distinction [between reasoning analytically and reasoning socially]. Because the law is a good example of a justification system, an analogy comparing the human ego (i.e., the reasoning self-consciousness system) with the role of defense attorney is helpful in clarifying the implications.” (p. 173)	Paraphrasing the overview of the book, offered on the bottom of page 11: The focus of the book is to convince readers that humans reason based on a social interactionist approach rather than primarily attempting to arrive at the accurate answer (what they call the intellectualist approach).
<b>4. Explaining the empirical findings that humans are better at social motivated versus analytic reasoning, and that the reasoning system operates based on short cuts framed by social motives.</b>	“The JH further suggests that the general reasoning capacity in humans emerged out of determining what is and what is not justifiable in the social context. This gives rise to another implication of the JH. If social reasoning gave rise to general reasoning, then humans should be particularly adept at social reasoning, at least in comparison with other forms of general reasoning. This is precisely the case. Cognitive psychologists have long noted that people reason more effectively about what they may, ought, or must not do in a given set of social circumstances than they do when reasoning generally.” (p. 175)	“Psychologists generally recognize that reasoning is biased and lazy...Yet most maintain that the main function of reason is to enhance individual cognition—a task it fails at abysmally. The interactionist perspective, on the other hand, offers for the first time an evolutionary plausible account of the often decried biases and shortcomings of reason.” (p. 10)
<b>5. Explaining fact that reasoning/reason giving is biased toward self interest.</b>	In explaining how the JH accounts for self-serving biases: “Defense attorneys are, by definition, biased in terms of how they explain their client’s behavior, and they work to explain their client’s behavior in a way that affords the most social influence. Thus, according to the JH, people should tend to explain their behavior and the things that happen to them in a manner that affords the most social influence. In an article titled “The Totalitarian Ego,” Greenwald (1980) surveyed the vast social psychological literature on how information about the self is processed. He likened the human ego to a personal historian that is totalitarian and relentless in the manner in which it revises and fabricates history to make the individual seem more important, cognitively consistent, altruistic, and effective than the evidence would warrant. Taylor and her colleagues (Taylor & Brown, 1988, 1994; see also D. L. Krebs & Denton, 1997) concluded that most people (a) view themselves in unrealistically positive terms, (b) believe they have greater control over their environment than is actually the case, and (c) have a more rosy view of their future than the base rate data could justify.” (p. 173)	“The lawyer analogy of reasoning [which had just been covered] brings to mind a context in which persuasion is paramount and the myside bias makes obvious sense: when defending a point of view the myside bias is a good thing. It is a feature, not a bug. This fits with the prediction of the interactionist approach. If the function of reasoning, when it produces reasons, is to justify one’s actions or to convince others, then it should have a myside bias.” (p. 219)