

Conference Announcement

The First International Online Conference of the Journal *Philosophies*: Intelligent Inquiry into Intelligence

Contributing to the 2025 IS4SI Summit

To be held online June 10-14, 2025.

Deadline for Extended Abstracts March 15, 2025

Conference Website: <https://sciforum.net/event/IOCPH2025>

Conference Chairs: Marcin J. Schroeder & Gordana Dodig-Crnkovic

In an era of unprecedented technological advancements in intelligent and cognitive technologies, the concept of intelligence—both human and artificial—stands in the center. **The journal *Philosophies* is proud to announce its upcoming conference, “Intelligent Inquiry into Intelligence.”** This event is designed to transcend the superficial discourse often found in popular media and focus deeply on the essence and implications of intelligence in its multiple contexts transcending the most frequent comparisons of human and technological capacities. Some of these contexts (such as artificial intelligence or advanced alien intelligence) generate popular interest among the general audience, while others are familiar to narrow groups of experts (e.g. intelligence characterizing multiple forms of life starting from a cellular level). The conference has as its main goal to set conceptual and methodological foundations for productive interactions and cooperation between diverse directions of inquiry and to foster a thoughtful and rigorous examination of intelligence, supported by interdisciplinary research and philosophical reflection.

The term "intelligence" has become ubiquitous, often overshadowed by buzzwords and misconceptions. Robert Louis Stevenson wrote in 1881, “Man is a creature who lives not upon bread alone, but principally by catchwords [...]” [1] (41). The same can be said today, possibly with the new expression “buzzwords.”

This conference aims to cut through the confusion and myths that currently surround AI and intelligence in general, promoting informed discussions that can shape future policies, educational frameworks, and societal impacts. By bringing together leading philosophers and researchers from diverse fields, we seek to build a solid foundation for the study of intelligence that moves beyond the hype and toward profound insights, striving to achieve a deeper, more nuanced understanding of intelligence in our rapidly changing world.

Following the mission of the *Philosophies*, the general goal of the conference is to promote interaction and mutual stimulation between philosophical reflection, scientific research, and other forms of intellectual inquiry including diverse forms of expression for philosophical reflection. The intended subject of these diverse inquiries is intelligence, but in the absence of a

commonly accepted definition for this omnipresent but elusive concept, it has to be considered within the context of the abovementioned configuration of themes including information, knowledge, rationality, logic, computation, complexity, creativity, autonomy, agency, life, cognition, and consciousness. Neither of these ideas has achieved the completed status of a clearly, uniformly defined, and well-understood concept that can be used as a stepping stone for the study of the others. Instead, they constitute a family of concepts, that is a mutually interdependent network. Even information that typically is considered more general than all other ideas on the list and therefore seems well fitting the role of a genus for definitions has multiple competing conceptualizations and unsettled attempts to equip it with semantic characteristics.

A secondary but closely related goal supporting the integration of diverse forms of inquiry of intelligence is to prevent confusion created by the diverse contexts of these inquiries. It is a popular but dangerous assumption that in the absence of definitions of concepts that escape rigorous analysis, we can use their common-sense understanding. The danger is in the illusion of commonality. There are empirical studies that show that common sense turns out to be not common (not in the Voltairian sense of its rarity, but as the lack of uniform understanding) [2]. Thus, the claim that common-sense communication secures mutual understanding may be just the old illusion already known to Socrates that the use of the same words does not imply the same meaning. Here comes the role of philosophy which helps in finding if not commonly accepted definitions, then interpretive methods of hermeneutics.

We would like to bring to the attention of all participants of the conference the need for creating a common ground that incorporates together with **intelligence (artificial and natural, including human) the entire network of concepts such as information, knowledge, rationality, logic, computation, complexity, creativity, autonomy, agency, life, cognition, awareness, and consciousness**. This means, that whenever these concepts are employed in the study of intelligence it is necessary to specify their understanding without the assumption that their meaning is self-explanatory. The conference has as its goal bringing together diverse perspectives on intelligence and this means that its relations to other relevant concepts are of special importance. All studies of the configuration of concepts will contribute to this goal.

To facilitate the goal of mutual interactions between different forms of inquiry of intelligence, contributors should avoid the use of specialistic jargon and the works presented at the conference involving mathematical, statistical, or other scientific formalisms should be accompanied by sufficiently extensive explanation and interpretation to be comprehensible to the wider audience. The expectation that such an explanation is possible follows from the famous claim by Richard Feynmann in the context of advanced theoretical physics that if you cannot explain something in a way comprehensible to a freshman student, you most likely do not understand it yourself. [3]

The following outstanding questions of the Intelligent Inquiry into Intelligence are stated here as examples rather than limits of interest for submissions to the conference. The

references are provided **not necessarily as patterns to follow** in submissions, but rather as sources of information about the content of concisely formulated questions.

Questions about:

- **The epistemological status of intelligence** and the systems qualified as intelligent
- **The axiological issues of intelligence** (value in general rather than moral values in particular, emphasizing the plurality and heterogeneity of values) and the systems qualified as intelligent
- **The ontological status of intelligence** and the systems qualified as intelligent
- The related issue of **the status of collective or distributed intelligence** as opposed to the traditional view of intelligence as an exclusive characteristic of singular entities with central architecture [4-6]
- **The role of logic (or possibly alternative logics, rationality) in intelligence.**
- **Non-human natural intelligence** (the wide spectrum of views from the claim cognition = life to the various forms of plant, fungi, and animal cognition, to the denial of non-human natural intelligence or the claim of an essential qualitative difference between human and non-human intelligence) [7, 13]
- **Non-conventional computing** and its role in understanding intelligence and the design of intelligent systems [14-16]
- **The function of non-conventional computing by non-human animals and other life forms** in their existence and its qualification as a form of intelligence. [14-16]
- The meaning of the **separate qualification of natural and artificial intelligence** (including the paradox of natural human intelligence as opposed to artificial intelligence created by humans with their natural status) [16]
- The relationship between **intelligence, agency, and autonomy** (e.g. their mutual roles as necessary conditions for others)
- **Intelligence as normative vs. descriptive attribution** (including the paradox of the contradiction between the attribution of intelligence as a distinctive characteristic of some human individuals and the claim that the main difficulty in the design of authentic artificial intelligent systems is to equip them with common sense) [2,17-19]
- **The capacity of common sense for/in intelligent systems** sought in technological research (a diverse range of concepts from the Aristotelian capacity of humans and animals to coordinate senses, through a variety of expressions in different languages to the philosophical positions on common sense of Wittgenstein and Turing, to the concept of AGI) [2,17-19]
- Involvement of **causality and determinism** in the conceptualization of intelligence (e.g. causality as opposed to interactionism, or need for the transition from Generative to Causal AI). [20]
- The relationship between **intelligence and creativity** (including tests such as the Lovelace test in the context of artificial intelligence) [21-24]

- The relationship between **intelligence and consciousness**
- The related issue of **non-human natural and artificial intelligent systems equipped with consciousness** (including the recently published The New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness) [25]
- Diverse theories and **models of consciousness** (from panpsychism of IIT to more general models of information integration, to alternative approaches) and their relation to intelligence [26-35]
- Diverse understanding of **intelligence in multicultural, cross-cultural, and inter-cultural perspectives** [36-40]
- Learning about understanding non-human intelligence from the diverse cultural understanding of human intelligence. [36-40]
- **Emic and etic methodologies** of the multi-cultural studies of intelligence [36-40]
- **Nature and/or nurture of intelligence** (including the possibility of growing intelligence through learning)
- **The technology of intelligent systems** and its impact on individuals, collectives, society, and humanity (including alternative technological architectures and platforms).
- **Epistemological tools for the study of intelligence** and use of **the technology of intelligent systems as an epistemological tool** for the exploration of reality [41-43]
- The need for **transformation/evolution of human ethics to reflect the role of technology (in particular intelligence-related software and hardware)** in human affairs and its influence on the human condition. [44]
- The relationship between the study of intelligence (natural or artificial) and Contemporary Natural Philosophy. [40, 45-47]

The final, but possibly most important is **the question about possible non-anthropomorphic intelligent systems**. Artificial intelligence and even natural non-human intelligence are usually (almost always) considered from the perspective of human intelligence with its multiple variations derived from human experience, values, and ideas. All searches for extra-terrestrial intelligence failed thus far. Is it possible that the failure is a result of looking for the wrong manifestations of non-human intelligence?

The list of philosophical questions is not exhaustive. Contributions with other philosophical perspectives are welcome, but considering the profile of the journal *Philosophies* sponsoring the conference, it is expected that they all serve the goal of enriching philosophical, intelligent inquiry into intelligence.

References

1. Stevenson, R. L. *Virginibus Puerisque and Other Papers*. Kegan Paul, London, 1881. Retrieved on April 23, 2024 from [Virginibus puerisque, and other papers : Stevenson, Robert Louis, 1850-1894 : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming : Internet Archive](#).
2. Whiting, M. E. and Watts, D. J. A Framework for Quantifying Individual and Collective Common Sense. PNAS, 2024, 121(4), e2309535121, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2309535121>

3. Goodstein, D. L. Richard P. Feynmann, Teacher. *Physics Today*, **1989**, 42(2), 70.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.881195>
4. Levin, M. (2023). Collective Intelligence of Morphogenesis as a Teleonomic Process, eds. Corning, P. A., Kauffman, S. A., Noble, D., Shapiro, J. A., Vane-Wright, R. I., and Pross, A. *Evolution "On Purpose": Teleonomy in Living Systems*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, pp. 175-197.
5. McMillen, P., Levin, M. Collective intelligence: A unifying concept for integrating biology across scales and substrates. *Commun Biol* **2024**, 7, 378. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-024-06037-4>
6. Friston, K. J. Designing Ecosystems of Intelligence From First Principles. *Collective Intelligence* **2024**, 3(1), 1-18.
7. Stewart, J. Cognition = Life: Implications for Higher-Level Cognition. *Behavioural Processes* **1996**, 35, 311-326.
8. Levin, M. Technological Approach to Mind Everywhere (TAME): An Experimentally Grounded Framework for Understanding Diverse Bodies and Minds. [arXiv:2201.10346v1](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.10346v1) [q-bio.TO]
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.10346>
9. Adamatzky, A. Towards fungal computer. *Interface Focus*, **2018**, 8(6), 20180029.
10. Adamatzky, A. Plant leaf computing. *Biosystems*, **2019**, 182, 59-64.
11. Adamatzky, A. Towards fungal computer. *Interface focus*, **2018**, 8(6), 20180029.
12. Vallverdú, J., Castro, O., Mayne, R., Talanov, M., Levin, M., Baluška, F., Gunji, Y-P., Dussutour, A., Zenil, H. & Adamatzky, A. Slime mold: the fundamental mechanisms of biological cognition. *Biosystems* **2018**, 165, 57-70.
13. Vallverdú, J. What if plants compute? Commentary on Sgundo-Ortin and Calvo 'Plant Sentience'. *Animal Sentience* **2023**.471
14. de Silveira, T. B. N. and H. S. Lopes, H. S. (2023). Intelligence across humans and machines: a joint perspective, *Front. Psychol.*, 14: 120761. doi10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1209761.
15. Levin, M. Technological Approach to Mind Everywhere (TAME): An Experimentally Grounded Framework for Understanding Diverse Bodies and Minds. [arXiv:2201.10346v1](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.10346v1) [q-bio.TO]
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.10346>
16. Holm, S. & Powell, R. Organism, machine, artifact: The conceptual and normative challenges of synthetic biology. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* (**2013**),
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsc.2013.05.009>
17. Davis, E. and Marcus, G. Commonsense Reasoning and Commonsense Knowledge in Artificial Intelligence. *Communications of the ACM*, September **2015**, 58(9), 92-103. DOI:10.1145/2701413.
18. Floyd, J. Turing on "Common Sense": Cambridge Resonances. In: Floyd, J., Bokulich, A. (eds) *Philosophical Explorations of the Legacy of Alan Turing*. Boston Studies in the Philosophy and History of Science, vol 324. Springer, Cham. **2017**, pp. 52. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-53280-6_5
19. Harris, R. Integrationism, Language, Mind, and World. *Language Sciences* **2004**, 26, 727-739.
20. Sgaier, S. K., Huang, and Grace, C. The Case of Causal AI. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, **2020**, 18(3), 50-55.
21. Boden, M. A. Creativity and Artificial Intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence* **1998**, 103, 347-356
22. Bringsjord, S., Bello, P., and Ferrucci, D. Creativity, the Turing Test, and the (Better) Lovelace Test. *Mind and Machines* **2001**, 11, 3-27.
23. Zhou, E., and Lee, D. Generative Artificial Intelligence, Human Creativity, and Art. *PNAS Nexus*, **2024**, 3(3), 1-8.
24. Editorial. Collaborative Creativity in AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence* September **2022**, 4, 733.
25. The New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness. [The New York Declaration on Animal Consciousness \(google.com\)](https://www.nyacademy.org/publications/the-new-york-declaration-on-animal-consciousness)
26. Tononi, G. The information integration theory of consciousness, eds. Velmans, M. and Schneider, S. *The Blackwell Companion to Consciousness*, Blackwell, Malden, MA, USA, **2007**, pp. 287-299.
27. Tononi, G., Sporns, O., and Edelman, G. M. A measure for brain complexity: Relating functional segregation and integration in the nervous system. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, **1994**, 91, pp. 5033-5037.
28. Tononi, G. and Edelman, G. M. Consciousness and complexity. *Science*, **1998**, 282, pp. 1846-1851.
29. Reber, A. S. The CBC Theory and Its Entailments. *EMBO reports*, January **2024**, 25, 8-12.

30. Fleming, S. *et al.*, The Integrated Information Theory of Consciousness as Pseudoscience. Preprint at PsyArXiv, **2023**, <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/zsr78>.
31. Lenharo, M. Consciousness theory slammed as pseudoscience - sparking uproar: Researchers publicly call out theory that they say is not well supported by science, but that gets undue attention. *Nature NEWS* 20 September **2023**, available online at [Consciousness theory slammed as 'pseudoscience' — sparking uproar \(nature.com\)](https://www.nature.com/news/consciousness-theory-slammed-as-pseudoscience-sparking-uproar)
32. Cogitate Consortium *et. al.* An adversarial collaboration to critically evaluate theories of consciousness. bioRxiv **2023**.06.23.546249; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.23.546249>
33. Lau, H. (2023). What is a Pseudoscience of Consciousness? Lessons from Recent Adversarial Collaborations. September 17, **2023**. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/28z3y>
34. Lenharo, M. AI Consciousness: Scientists Say We Need Answers - Researchers urge more funding to study the boundary between conscious and unconscious systems. *Nature*, 11 January **2024**, 625, 226.
35. Bayne, T. *et al.* Tests for Consciousness in Humans and Beyond. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **2024**, 2533 (in print)
36. Markus, H.R.; Kitayama, S. Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychol. Rev.* **1991**, 98, 224–253.
37. Frake, C. O. Cultural Ecology and Ethnography. *American Anthropologist*, **1962**, 64, 53-59.
38. Frake, C. O., The Ethnographic Study of Cognitive Systems. In Gladwin, T. & Sturtevant, T. W. C. (Eds.) *Anthropology and Human Behavior*, Anthropological Society of Washington, Washington D.C., **1962**.
39. Goodenough, W. H. Componential analysis and the study of meaning. *Language*, **1956**, 32(1), 195-216.
40. Simeonov, P. L., Gare, A., Matsuno, K. & Igamberdiev, A. U. Editorial. Special issue on Integral Biomathics: The Necessary Conjunction of the Western and Eastern Thought Traditions for Exploring the Nature of Mind and Life. *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology* December **2017**, 131, Focussed Issue):1-11.
41. Hoom, J. F. & Chen, J. J-Y. Epistemic considerations when AI answers questions for us. arXiv:2304.1452v1 [cs.CY] **2023**. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv:2304.1452v1>
42. Wheeler, G. R. & Moniz Pereira, L. Epistemology and artificial intelligence. *Journal of Applied Logic* 2004, 2(4), 489-493.
43. Russo, F., Schliesser, E., & Wagemans, J. Connecting ethics and epistemology of AI. *AI & Soc.* **2023**, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01617-6>
44. Bankins, S. & Formosa, P. The Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence (AI) For Meaningful Work. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2023**, 185, 725-740.
45. Kauffman, S. A. & Roli, A. A Third Transition in Science? **2023** royalsocietypublishing.org/journal/rsfs *Interface Focus* 13: 20220063
46. Kauffman, S. Is There a Fourth Law for Non-Ergodic Systems That Do Work to Construct Their Expanding Phase Space? *Entropy* **2022**, 24, 1383. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e24101383>
47. Simeonov, P. L.. *et al.* Stepping Beyond the Newtonian Paradigm in Biology: Towards an Integrable Model of Life – Accelerating Discovery in the Biological Foundations of Science INBIOSA White Paper. In P. L. Simeonov, L. S. Smith, A. C. Ehresmann (Eds.) *Integral Biomathics: Tracing the Road to Reality*. Springer, Berlin, **2012**, pp. 319-418.