should be seen as an integral part of thinking as a program that explores the intelligibility of its own realization and its ramifications. It is an integral part of a thought that is driven by the autonomy of its ends to explore its possible realizabilities in whatever workable form or material configuration possible. Giving rise to an intelligence that has, at least, the capacities of the present cognitive-practical subject is the demand of a thought that is invested in the intelligibility of its autonomy, and in maintaining and developing it. More emphatically put, for such a thought, the sources of its possibility are necessary but not adequate expressions of its autonomy, since the concrete autonomy of thought is achieved by thought's exploration of its ends or its Concept, its Notion. Accordingly, artificial general intelligence—in the fashion described here—belongs to a thought for which the adequate form of autonomy takes the shape of an all-encompassing striving for the elaboration of its ends and demands.

The real import of the idea of artificial general intelligence can only be properly understood once examined in terms of what it stands for or signifies in terms of the systematic striving of thought for self-determination. As described previously, this striving is encapsulated in the function of philosophy as a program through which thinking begins to determine its own intelligibility by elaborating, in theory and practice, the sources and consequences of its possibility. The organization of thought as a programmatic project starts with the recognition of the possibility of thinking as a building block for the construction or realization of a thought that is possible by virtue of its ends and demands and in spite of material or final causes, how it was originally materialized, and what it is supposedly ordained to be or do.

As a program, thinking is not just a practice but the construction of possible realizabilities of thought, a process that defines the self-determination of thought. Put differently, the self-determination of thinking requires a programmatic approach to the possibility of thinking as such: determining what it means for thinking to be possible and what the consequences of such a possibility are, by examining what thought really is and elaborating its tasks and abilities. Rather than treating the possibility of thinking as something sacrosanct in the name of the given and therefore off-limits to

interrogation and intervention, philosophy instructs thought to systematically act on its possibility as a manipulable datum, as an artefact of an ongoing craft the products of which are not only theoretical and practical intelligibilities concerning what thought is and what it ought to do, but also realizabilities of thought as such. Thought achieves self-determination not by immunizing itself against systematic analysis, but by bringing itself under a thoroughgoing process of desanctification.

Here, the artificial realization of general intelligence represents a necessary step in the process of the theoretical and practical desanctification of thinking, and therefore an essential component in thought's program of self-determination. This is a step at which, in order for thought to adequately expand on its possibility and express the autonomy of its ends, it has to construct artificial realizabilities of itself through the integration of different levels and orders of intelligibility concerning what it is and what it ought to do. But, once again, artificial realizabilities should not be construed as being limited to technological artefacts. In line with the definition of the artificial presented earlier in this chapter and more expansively in the first chapter, the artificial realizabilities of thought potentially include a wide range of functional constructs, including social systems.

To further clarify the role of artificial general intelligence as something integral to the systematic image of thinking as a programmatic project, it would be helpful to define the concept of the program outlined above in relation to what Wilfrid Sellars, in his reading of Plato's idea of the mind as a craftsman, calls a 'recipe'—a complex of intelligibilities (of both theory and practice) and purposive actions that make up the practice of a craft.[329] A recipe is a formula or a set of *what-and-how-tos* consisting of numbers, ratios, and purposive actions for making a possible product from a given collection of ingredients. In a recipe, actions take this general form:

329 See Plato's *Philebus*, *Timaeus*, *Phaedo*, and Book VI of the *Republic*. For Sellars's work on the craft of life as the rational pursuit of the form of the Good, see W. Sellars, 'The Soul as Craftsman: An Interpretation of Plato on the Good', in *Philosophical Perspectives* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1967), 5–22; and 'Reason and the Art of Living in Plato', in *Essays in Philosophy and Its History*, 3–26.

'(If one wants) to make an O, then in C_i one ought to do A_j' (where O stands for a product, C_i the range of given circumstances or conditions in which a given set of actions may or may not be done, and A_j a particular family of action-principles).[330] These action-principles belong to the intelligible order and are objective. As such, the distinction between truth and falsity applies to them. They can be explained and debated, modified, or replaced through rational assessment in the relevant domains of discourse. In a recipe, numbers and ratios are specificities regarding the amount, ordering, and proportion of ingredients as well as the sequence and priority of actions. And finally, the ingredients of the recipe are materials and objects that may be the products of other forms of craft.

In his engagement with Plato, Sellars identifies action-principles and practices of craft as belonging to *phusis* (nature and objective ends), in contrast to *nomos* (law and convention or social norm, as opposed to the rational norm, which belongs to the objective realm). In Plato's account of craftsmanship, purposive actions are neither conventional nor arbitrary: they are rational strivings pertaining to forms as realms of intelligibilities (or what Sellars calls form as 'object-of-striving-ness' or 'to-be-realized-ness'). These actions or strivings belong to the intelligible order and can therefore be appraised. The example given by Sellars to explain the distinction between principle and convention is the process of house building. In building a house, the difference between principle by objective nature and convention by law would be the difference between, on the one hand, actions that ought to be done given a certain range of circumstances and material ingredients necessary to build a house, and, on the other hand, the conventions of a builder's guild, namely, codes and regulations for building a house. The principle takes the form of 'ought to do' whereas the convention takes the imperative form of 'do that!' In the best possible scenario, conventions and laws correspond to rational action-principles and their objective ends, but they can also significantly diverge from them, as in the case of a corrupt guild that might enforce laws demanding the use of materials to which only guild members have access.

330 Sellars, *Essays in Philosophy and Its History*, 9.

This difference between action-principles and action-conventions can be extended to other forms of craft, including the craft of the *polis*. It is precisely the rational nature of action-principles (i.e., the fact that they can be explained and subjected to the procedures of truth and rational assessment) that harbours a subversive potential against sociocultural and political conventions and codified laws.

The art of (philosophical) living, for Plato, is the recipe of a craft of which the soul or geistig mind is at once the material and the craftsman. At the level of ingredients, Sellars suggests, the recipe of such a life includes not only intelligibilities concerning physical materials and corporeal products but also beliefs, desires, thoughts, and mind itself. The numbers (amounts and orderings) and ratios of the recipe are theoretical intelligibilities that pertain both to the ingredients and to the practices and tasks required for the crafting of such a life. And at the level of actions, the recipe involves purposive actions and practical intelligibilities that are not only good instrumentalities (hypothetical practical intelligibilities concerning bringing about a certain outcome in a given circumstance) but also goods-in-themselves (nonhypothetical practical intelligibilities) such as knowledge and understanding, general welfare, justice, and so forth.

It is with reference to this interpretation that 'thinking as a program' can be said to be—at least in regard to the relation between material ingredients and theoretical and practical intelligibilities—a *complex recipe in the making, a recipe for the craft of the life of thought*. It is *complex* insofar as it is composed of other recipes or programs concerning the knowledge of theoretical and practical truths, the craft of different instrumentalities, and the organization or production of the necessary conditions and materials required for the realization of such a life. It is *in the making* since it has to continually update itself at the level of materials and that of theoretical and practical intelligibilities—themselves products of the life of thought. The objective of this recipe is to establish the autonomy of thought's ends by progressively determining how the action-principles, theoretical intelligibilities, instrumentalities, and material ingredients required for the product of this autonomy should be put together.

In this picture, what the idea of artificial general intelligence represents is a culminating state in the programmatic enterprise of thinking—a state where thought as such becomes intelligent with regard to the craft of itself. It uses the intelligibility of its realization as a material ingredient in a recipe for the crafting of a possible realization of itself that has at the very least the theoretical and practical capacities of its current state. Beneath its technological semblance, the idea of artificial general intelligence is an expression of a thought that engages in the crafting of itself by treating its possibility as a raw material or an expressively constructive fundamental universe type—a scaffolding for the labour or exercise (*ascesis*) of investigating (*skepsis*) and working out (elaboration) *what else* can be realized out of this possibility. Such thought places theoretical intelligibilities concerning *what it is* in the service of organizing practices and instrumentalities that involve the crafting of a thought that is possible in spite of how it was originally materialized or constituted.

This is precisely the self-determination of thought in the guise of general intelligence, a form of intelligence for which 'the thinking of its origin' should be placed in the service of 'what thought *can* become or do' by informing itself as to 'what thought *ought* to do'. It is an intelligence for which the intelligibility of things must be subordinated to the organizing intelligibility that is the process of its crafting itself: intelligence.

It is therefore necessary to grasp the concept of artificial general intelligence not merely as a technoscientific idea, but more fundamentally as a concept belonging to a thought or form of intelligence that treats its very possibility as an explicit opportunity to pierce through the horizon of its givenness: it does not matter what it currently is; what matters is what can be done—all relevant things considered—to expand and build on this possibility. This is first and foremost a philosophically programmed thought, in the sense in which philosophy has been defined above. Independently of its actual realization, which is neither inevitable nor impossible, the very idea of artificial general intelligence—of giving rise to something that is at the least endowed with all the cherished abilities of the cognitive-practical subject—is itself the product of a thought that strives to articulate, maintain, and develop the intelligibility of the sources and consequences of

its possibility. The quest for the artificial realization of such a machine is then part of self-consciousness as a task: the quest of thinking to achieve concrete autonomy by overcoming any predetermined meaning or purpose conferred upon it extraneously.

Short of this understanding, advancing the idea of artificial general intelligence amounts to nothing but the well-worn Aristotelian confusion between reasons and causes, as today manifested by a vitalist eschatology with the flavour of technoscience. It leads either to the fetishization of natural intelligence in the guise of self-organizing material processes, or to a teleological faith in the deep time of the technological singularity—an unwarranted projection of the current technological climate into the future through the over-extrapolation of cultural myths surrounding technology or hasty inductions based on actual yet disconnected technological achievements.

To recapitulate, artificial general intelligence is not the champion of technology but a thought that, through a positive disenchantment of itself and its contingent history, has been enabled to explore its possible realizations and realizabilities—whether in a social formation or a multi-agent system of machines—as part of a much broader program of self-artificialization through which thought restructures and repurposes itself as the artefact of its own ends to maintain and expand its intelligibility. Just as the practice of thinking is non-optional for a thought that intends to remain intelligible, the practice of artificialization is not optional; it is mandated by the autonomy of thought's ends and demands.

The vocation of thought is not to abide by and perpetuate its evolutionary heritage but to break away from it. Positing the *essential role* of biology in the contingent evolutionary history of thought as an *essentialist* nature for thought dogmatically limits how we can imagine and bring about the future subjects of thought. But the departure from the evolutionary heritage of thought is not tantamount to a wholesale withdrawal from its natural history. Engaging with this natural history is necessary not only in order to determine the precise role of embodiment and evolutionary constraints in the realization of cognitive and practical abilities, but also in order to adequately think about how a subject whose cognitive-practical abilities

are environmentally situated and which still remains entangled with its terrestrial habitat should methodically act.

Liberating thought from its contingent natural history requires a multi-stage labour to render this history intelligible, to determine its negative and positive constraints so as to intelligently overcome or build on them—'intelligently' insofar as actions should be at all times context-sensitive and resource-aware. On the one hand, actions should be able to properly discriminate circumstances and correctly react to the so-called *fluents* or dynamic properties of the environment. And on the other hand, they should be cognizant of the costs and allocations of intervention in the broadest sense of cognitive, computational, social, and natural costs and resources. For interventions have not only computational costs but also social and natural costs. A paradigm of intervention should be able to analyse the cost of practical interventions from the perspective of different indexes of cost or tractability: computational, natural, social, and even cultural-axiological (cultural values).

However, the demands of context-sensitivity and resource-awareness for action should not be taken as arguments for microlocalist models of restricted action or resignation in the name of low local resources and the high costs of nonlocal actions. Rather than a plea for micro-localism, context-consciousness is the requirement of a strategic and global model of action that incrementally progresses by satisfying contextual and domain-specific exigencies. It allows for action to be updated and to intervene at the level of dynamic properties and complex dependency-relations between local domains that classical models of strategy and global action cannot detect and influence. Similarly, resource-awareness is a requirement for any action that, in addition to being optimal and efficient, aims to avoid starving other activities of resources or impairing the social and environmental structures that play the role of support and enablement for a broad range of other structures and functions.

In its undeniable gravity, the problem of the deterioration of natural ecologies is undoubtedly an argument against bad instrumentalities and those systems within which such instrumentalities are ingrained and propagated. But it is neither an argument against instrumentality (not to

be confused with instrumental reasoning) per se nor an argument against the development of sociotechnical systems that can effectively and intelligently mobilize good instrumentalities that are both resource- and context-conscious. Consequential intervention is impossible without the crafting of better instrumentalities (technical systems), more expansive models for the analysis of costs and resources, and, more significantly, without understanding the formal aspects of practical intervention (whether political or not) in terms of complexity sciences. If the world is complex then how can we possibly act or intervene in it without the science of complexity? Today any intervention that is not informed by complexity sciences is inevitably doomed to fail from the beginning.

A good instrumentality is an instrumentality that at once passes the test of rational-normative assessments (Why or for what reason is it implemented?) and satisfies the aforementioned criteria of intelligent purposive action (How exactly is it executed?). In the latter sense, crafting good instrumentalities is primarily a scientific and engineering program in which purposive action is approached as an interface between the complexity of cognition, the complexity of the sociotechnical system, and the complexity of the world. Such a program involves the development of formal calculi for executing and tracking the course of action in various dynamic domains, and for constructing complex models and descriptive frameworks or ontologies that allow *semantic access* to different layers of information regarding the types, properties, and interrelationships of particular entities involved in the interactions between human agents, the sociotechnical system, and the physical world.[331]

331 One of the main functions of these ontologies (particularly mid-level ontologies as briefly introduced in the second chapter) is to 'specify our conceptual hierarchy in a way that is general enough to describe a complex categorization including physical and social objects, events, roles and organizations' (Porello et al., 'Multiagent Socio-Technical Systems: An Ontological Approach', *Proc. of the 15th Int. Workshop on Coordination, Organisations, Institutions and Norms*, 2013). A sophisticated example of these ontologies is DOLCE (Descriptive Ontology for Linguistic and Cognitive Engineering), a mid-level or descriptive ontology that classifies and integrates information about human agents and social and physical systems according to categories that are

What motivates the development of formal calculi of action is simply the idea that the representation of our reasoning about our actions and their effects in the world should be as factually accurate as possible. Calculi of action are not so much tools for predicting what will arise from an action in the environment, as formal frameworks for studying how an action is performed and tracking its course as it interacts with an environment. Without such a formal representation, our descriptions of what it is that we do when we perform a simple or compound action would be highly inaccurate and distorted. Moreover, it is indispensable to study how the effects of an action unfold in the environment and to be able to reconstruct these actions in formalisms. The term 'formalism' here specifically refers to a formalization of action *in relation to* a world that is not simply a block of wax that can be moulded and imprinted by our actions, but a complex manifold that consists of different domains, has dynamic properties, and resists intervention. In other words, a formalism of action for dynamic complex systems.

The formalization of action is necessary for planning the course of action—for its precise execution, monitoring, adjustment, and implementation. But this formalization must also be able to incorporate a dynamic representation of the world, its domains, and the entities that constitute them. What I have in mind for the scientific study of action execution are various formal languages of action built on logical formalisms such as situation calculus and event calculus, devised for representing and reasoning about dynamic systems.[332] In these frameworks, actions are analysed in terms of the formal syntax of the action sequence and the semantics of situations

'thought of as cognitive artifacts ultimately depending on human perception, cultural imprints and social conventions'. For an introduction to ontologies and DOLCE, see C. Masolo et al., *The WonderWeb Library of Foundational Ontologies—Preliminary Report* (2003), <http://www.loa.istc.cnr.it/old/Papers/WonderWebD17V2.0.pdf>. And for an application of ontologies, particularly DOLCE, to the study and design of multi-agent sociotechnical systems, see Porello et al., 'Multiagent Socio-Technical Systems', 42–62.

332 See for example, R. Reiter, *Knowledge in Action: Logical Foundations for Specifying and Implementing Dynamical Systems* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001).

or events that represent the progression of the dynamic world as the result of the action being performed on its *fluents* or dynamic properties. Even though these formalisms were primarily developed for modelling in robotics and systems engineering, their scope of application goes far beyond these fields. They are as much toolsets for artificial intelligence and robotics as they are indispensable components of a scientific armamentarium required for a political project that aims at the proper and effective execution of intervening actions.

The question of semantic access to different hierarchies of information is the question of understanding the logics of worlds as the primary step for the design and execution of robust and consequential action. But understanding the logics of worlds requires understanding how we say things or think about ourselves and the world using the expressive and conceptual resources of different disciplines and modes of thought. Precisely speaking, understanding the logics of worlds involves working out semantic relations between the different vocabularies or linguistic expressions (theoretical, deontic normative, modal, intentional, empirical, logical, and so forth) that we *use* in order to speak and think about ourselves and the world, just as it involves determining the activities necessary for using those vocabularies so as to count as expressing something with them.[333]

It is by understanding how we can adequately describe and explain ourselves and the world—through the use of different vocabularies and semantic relations between them and their properties—that we can consequentially change the world. Acting in the framework of such a program progressively blurs the boundaries between the cognitive engineering of autonomous agents and the construction of advanced sociotechnical systems, between

333 In *Between Saying and Doing*, Brandom analyses meaning(semantics)-use(pragmatics relations in terms of what one says or asserts when using vocabularies or linguistic expressions, and what one must do in order to use various vocabularies so as to count as saying or thinking various kinds of things. One of the most interesting aspects of Brandom's project is that this way of thinking about semantic complexity and the activities required for generating it presents consequential practical schemas for both the project of artificial general intelligence and an egalitarian pedagogical politics (see chapter 3, 'Artificial Intelligence and Analytic Pragmatism').

how we can adequately come into cognitive contact with the world and the realization of cognition in social collectivities and technological artefacts. As the semantic complexity of cognition is realized in, and reinforced by, the sociotechnical system, the sociotechnical complexity of our world adequately gains traction upon the world and is enriched by it.

DATUM 7. CRAFTING THE ULTIMATE FORM

Just as the inception of philosophy coincides with the speculative futures of general intelligence, so its ultimate task corresponds with the ultimate form of intelligence.

By prompting thought to grapple with itself from below, philosophy drives thought to confront itself from above. It instructs thinking to organize itself as an integrated bundle of action-principles—a program—for the craft of a thought that is the materialization of its ends and demands. In presenting itself as a form of thought that operates and builds on the possibility of thinking, philosophy cues thought to act and elaborate on the intelligibility of its possibility. Thinking becomes a programmatic enterprise that, from one end, deepens the intelligibility of its sources and, from the other, articulates in theory and practice the intelligibility of its consequences. In articulating the intelligibility of its consequences, thought brings about a conception of itself as an intelligence that seeks to liberate itself by unbinding its possible realizabilities. This is the picture of thought as an intelligence that finds its freedom in bringing about and liberating a realization of itself that has as *its starting point* all of its current capacities.

It is in relation to this expansive horizon of thought's unfolding that we can finally answer the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter: What kind of program is philosophy and what does it do? The answer is that, in its perennial form and at its deepest level, philosophy is a program for the crafting of a new species or form of intelligence—a form of intelligence whose minimum condition of realization is a complex and integrated framework of cognitive-practical abilities that could have been materialized by any assemblage of adequate mechanisms and causes, in other words mind or geist as investigated in the previous chapters. But this is only an initial state of its realization. What comes next is an intelligence that formats its

life into an exploration of its possible realizabilities by engaging with the questions of what to think and what to do.

Philosophy is a program for the crafting of precisely this kind of intelligence—an intelligence that organizes itself into a programmatic project in order to give rise to its possible realizabilities in any form or material configuration, even if they might in every respect transcend it. The future of this intelligence will only be radically asymmetrical with its past and present conditions if it embarks on such an enterprise, if it develops a program for bringing about its realizabilities. It can only rise above its initial state (the minimum conditions necessary for the realization of mind or general intelligence) if it begins to act on its possibility as something whose origins and consequences must be rendered intelligible. It can only emancipate itself if it subordinates the theoretical intelligibility of its sources and its history (what it is made of, where it has come from) to that organizing practical intelligibility that is the purposive craft of itself. In this sense, it can be said that the beginning of philosophy is a starting point for the speculative futures of general intelligence.

In whatever form and by whatever mechanisms it is materialized, this form of intelligence can only develop a conception of itself as a self-cultivating project if it engages in something that plays the role of what we call philosophy, not as a discipline but as a program of combined theoretical and practical wisdoms running in the background of all of its activities. An important feature of this hypothetical general intelligence (the geistig) is that it no longer merely acts intelligently, but asks what to think and what to do considering the kind of intelligence it is or takes itself to be. Thus its actions are not merely responses to particular circumstances, or time-specific means for pursuing ends that are exhausted once fulfilled. More predominantly, the purposive actions of this intelligence originate from and are guided by a unified system of ever-present though revisable theoretical and practical truth-candidate statements concerning what it is and what it ought to do, its form and the life that suits it. In other words, its actions, even when they are pure instrumentalities, are manifestations of time-general thoughts about the inexhaustible ends of what counts as a life that suits it.

Let us briefly clarify this point: the form of intelligence that is the craft of philosophy—a thought that takes the possibility of thinking seriously—is not called intelligence because it exhibits those intelligent behaviours that are prevalent in nature. This point has been repeated so often that it should by now be obvious. The actions of this intelligence on which all intelligent behaviours are epistemically modelled are not simply intelligent responses to particular circumstances. The actions of this intelligence arise from what Hegel calls the order of self-consciousness, which is the order of reason. Within this order, even though all actions respond to circumstances and fulfil particular ends, they are nevertheless issued from a species of ends or thoughts that are time-general thoughts of self-consciousness. They are atemporal and atopic, of nowhen and nowhere, and are therefore akin to timeless or eternal ideas. Such actions not only fall under time-general ends or thoughts of self-consciousness (those of a thought recognizing and realizing its possibility), but also exhibit these ends in their very circumstantial particularity. Accordingly, in their variation all actions of this intelligence are identical to the time-general thoughts from which they are issued.

Time-general thoughts are those that are not tied to a specific moment or a particular circumstance—for example, the thought of staying healthy or the thought of being free in contrast to the thought of avoiding rotten food or the thought of social struggle at a particular juncture of history. Inexhaustible ends refer to those ends that are *premises* for actions rather than their conclusions. They differ from ends whose needs go away once they are reached and concluded by a particular action or pursuit (such as healthiness and freedom in the above example).[334]

Take for instance a general end that belongs to the geistig order of self-consciousness or reason, such as being just. Under this inexhaustible time-general end, at one point I choose to assist a friend rather than working on this book. Another time, I choose to prioritize the interests of a group over my ideological convictions so that we can stand against something we all deem to be unjust. While all these circumstantial choices of action

334 For a remarkably painstaking disquisition on time-generality and logical forms of temporal thought, see Rödl, *Categories of the Temporal.*

lead to particular ends which, once reached, are exhausted, they are all issued forth from an inexhaustible end, the idea of justice. But even more radically, these choices are only intelligible to the extent that they both fall under and exhibit time-general inexhaustible ends. Put differently, they are intelligible as choices only insofar as they belong to the objective unity of time-general ends, which itself belongs to the order of reason. These time-general ends or thoughts are the necessary forms for the intelligibility of our choices and purposive actions.

As agents and experiencing subjects, we also have synthetic thoughts. Our intuitions are sensible rather than intellectual, and thus have the quality of temporal successiveness, of taking time and appearing to be in time. This allows us to formulate concrete theoretical and practical thoughts that pertain to particular whens and wheres, contexts and situations. But such temporal theoretical and practical thoughts are held together by and indeed exhibit or instantiate thoughts that are atemporal and atopic in so far as they belong to aspects of the *idea* of what we take ourselves to be and what we ought to do in accordance with that idea qua program, time-generally. In line with the arguments presented in the previous chapters on the view from nowhere and nowhen, then, while as a matter of objective constraints and methodological necessities we are bound to temporal and circumstantial thoughts, we are also *unbound* by atemporal and atopic thoughts.

Time-general thoughts or inexhaustible ends define the practical horizon of this form of intelligence. The thoughts of this intelligence concerning 'what to do and why' are dependent on its time-general thoughts and indeed derive from them. Accordingly, its practical horizon has a unity in the sense that its practical reasons and actions are undergirded and structured by the unity of time-general thoughts and their principles.

Moreover, not only are the strivings of this intelligence not bound to exhaustible ends, or ends which are *explained by* the order of practical reasoning—thoughts of what to do and their corresponding actions—they are also in conformity with its inexhaustible ends, ends which are themselves the *source* and *explanation* of its practical reasons and actions. In other words, this intelligence reasons and acts *from* time-general and inexhaustible

ends, rather than towards them. It is not only that its actions fall under the concepts of such ends, but more importantly that, in determining what to do in a particular situation, its actions manifest the bearing of these ends upon that situation.

But above all, the most defining feature of this intelligence is that its life is not simply an intelligent protraction of its existence, but the crafting of a good or satisfying life. And what is a satisfying life for such a form of intelligence if not a life that is itself the crafting of intelligence as a complex multifaceted program comprising self-knowledge, practical truths, and unified striving?

As a part of the recipe for the crafting of a good life, the self-knowledge of this intelligence is a multistage open-ended reflection on the sources and consequences of its possibility. Its practical truths concern what qualifies as a good life based on a self-knowledge that is not limited to an inquiry into its realized state or what it is now, but also involves the examination of its possible realizabilities. Rather than being grounded on a mere form of dignified opinion or belief about what and how things appear to be, its practical knowledge is based on the *consideration of all relevant things for what they really are* as the conclusive reason for doing something or pursuing one course of action over another.[335] Finally, the striving of this intelligence is a unified collection of different patterns and orders of activities that contribute to the objective realization of the good life in that comprehensive sense of what satisfies it on different levels and brings about its realizabilities.

Satisfying lives and enabling realizabilities are two inseparable expressions of an intelligence whose time-general thoughts concerning *what is good for it* (or self-interest) are only *premises* for the program of crafting a good life. This is a program that is at once an inquiry into the nature of that intelligence (what it is), the examination of what a good life for it consists in (what is good for it), and a unified striving for the objective realization of such a life (how such self-interest can be adequately conceived, and thus

335 For more details on practical reasoning, rational motivation, and knowledge, see W. Sellars, 'On Knowing the Better and Doing the Worse', in *Essays in Philosophy and Its History*, 27–43.

satisfied). It is what Plato considers to be a concrete determination of 'the condition (*hexis*) and disposition (*diathesis*) of soul which can make life happy (*eudaimona*) for all human beings'.[336]

The satisfying life is a combined life of various ingredients, ratios or measures, intelligibilities and concrete practices. It is also a mixed life of pleasure and intelligence. But it is only a mix of both in so far as it is a recipe concocted by intelligence or the general category of mind, thinking, knowledge, and skills. There would be no mixed or multifaceted life if thought were not both the ingredient and the craftsman that integrates pleasure with intelligence. Only a pleasure that is part of the recipe of intelligence can become not only an integral part of intelligence but more like it:

> Still, I will not champion intelligence for the prize against the combined life, but we must decide what to do about the second prize. It may be that each of us will claim his own candidate as responsible for this combined life—I intelligence, you pleasure—so that while neither is the Good, one might claim that one of them is responsible for it. On this point, I should be even readier to contest Philebus. I should hold that in the mixed life, whatever it is that makes the life at once desirable and good, it is intelligence, not pleasure, that is more closely related to it and more nearly resembles it.[337]

For an intelligence whose criterion of self-interest is truly itself—i.e., the autonomy of intelligence concomitant with the knowledge of what it is—the ultimate objective ends are the maintenance and development of that autonomy, and the liberation of intelligence through the exploration of what it means to satisfy the life of thought. The striving of this intelligence for the Good (*agathos*) is neither adequate nor in its true self-interest if it does not culminate in bringing about that which is better than itself. The philosophical test of this hypothetical general intelligence is not an

336 Plato, *Philebus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975), §11d4–6.

337 Ibid., §22d5–5.

imitation game or a scenario of complex problem solving, but the ability to bring about an intelligence that in every respect is better, adequately conceived.

This categorical and ultimate test of general intelligence, what might be called the *agathosic test*, does not ask whether one can solve the frame problem or make a good cup of coffee (something that programmed machines already do better than the *experiencing* subject, a barista with a taste for good coffee), but rather '*Can you make something better than yourself?*' It is not even necessary for it to actually do so; even conceiving the idea of making something better and pursuing it would count as passing the test of general intelligence. What is meant by 'the better' will be elaborated later in this chapter; for now let us keep it to the most minimal criterion, as outlined above: that which has all the theoretical and practical capacities of the cognitive agent, and even more. The claim here is that only an intelligence that has taken its possibility as a premise for the elaboration of the consequences of that very possibility—that is, an intelligence embodying the general function of philosophy—can pass the test of general intelligence.

It is necessary to understand the good life of this intelligence as a life for which the good—both as a concept grasped through an extended critical examination and as the object of a unified rational striving—has both satisfying effects and profoundly transformative ramifications. For the form of intelligence for which philosophy is a program of realization, the crafting of a good life adequately conceived is synonymous with the crafting of intelligence that represents the better. Within the scope of crafting a good life, the relations between the satisfaction of intelligence and the transformation of intelligence, between happiness and rigorous striving, attending to the intelligence already realized and constructing its future realizabilities, the cultivation of the present subject of thought and the development of a cognitive-practical subject that in every aspect might surpass the current one, are neither unilateral nor arbitrary. In fact, these relations exist as necessary connections established by the objective and rational principles of the crafting of a good life between the different mutually reinforcing activities and tasks integral to it. One of the functions

of philosophy is to highlight these objective and logical connections between partially autonomous or even seemingly incompatible tasks and activities that constitute the good life as a complex *unified* striving that has different levels and types of objectives.

Only by working out these connections in reference to the objective ends of the good life and what is necessary for its concrete realization does it become possible to methodologically prioritize different tasks and activities, and to coordinate and subordinate them to one another. And it is precisely a methodological ordering—rather than a prioritization on the basis of a general and vague idea of importance—that is necessary for the unification of different activities and tasks in that striving which is the concrete and objective realization of a good life.

The ultimate form of intelligence is the artificer of a good life—that is to say, a form of intelligence whose ultimate end is the objective realization of a good life through an inquiry into its origins and consequences in order to examine and realize what would count as satisfying for it, all things considered. It is through the crafting of a good life that intelligence can explore and construct its realizabilities by expanding the horizons of what it is and what can qualify as a satisfying life for it. The crafting of a good life is exactly that philosophically conceived program in which theoretical intelligibilities concerning *what is already realized* are subjected to the practical intelligibilities pertaining to its possible realizations. The exploration of the former realm of intelligibilities is translated into an intelligence that explores its realizabilities in any form or configuration possible.

For a form of intelligence that engages in the crafting of a good life, the project is as much about investigating the subject of the good life (what kind of intelligence it really is and what its realizabilities are) as it is about the examination of what a good life for this intelligence consists in and what it would take to objectively realize it. Therefore, for this kind of intelligence, politics or its equivalent must not only supply the necessary conditions, means, and actions for the objective realization of a good life; it must also internalize the aforementioned inquiry into what the subject of a good life—that subject for and on behalf of which politics acts—is. Accordingly, an intelligence that is concerned about its life and its realizabilities must

at all times subject every political project to an altered version of that most vexing question of philosophy: 'Just what exactly is it that you are trying to do and accomplish?'[338] The altered version of this question is: What *sort of a good life* for *what kind of subject* or type of intelligence are you trying to realize, and exactly how?

No matter how committed it is to the present and the future, a political project that cannot coherently answer this question is hardly anything more than a glorified pedlar of mere instrumentalities, or a merchant of promised miracles. The criterion of coherence in the context of this question is threefold: (1) A political project should be able to articulate in theory and practice what the objective realization of a good life requires (theoretical intelligibilities, organized intelligent actions, the necessary conditions—economic, social, technological, and so forth—required for the realization of a good life and how it can provide them). (2) It should be committed to and informed by an inquiry not only into what the subject of this good life is and what type of intelligence it embodies, but also into the possible realizabilities of that form of intelligence or subject of thought. (3) Finally, it should be able to give a reasoned answer as to what qualifies as satisfying for that form of intelligence or subject of thought, all things considered. A political project that fulfils these criteria is a politics that,

338 This question is often attributed to Socrates and his distinctly philosophical attitude. Rather than dismissing or discrediting the activities of his fellow Athenians, by posing this question Socrates attempted to force the interlocutors into making explicit their incoherent or incompatible thoughts and commitments. This is what Brandom calls the 'dark and pregnant' core of expressive rationalism inaugurated by the Socratic method (*Making It Explicit*, 106–7) and what Michel Foucault associates with the attitude of Socrates as a philosophical parrhesiast (truth-teller) rather than a political one. In avoiding a political life, Socrates establishes the critical distance necessary to interrogate and assess political means and ends. He justifies his death in the service not of politics, but rather in the service of a philosophical life that unremittingly interrogates politics. See M. Foucault, *The Courage of the Truth*, tr. G. Burchell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). And for a more elaborate engagement with this Socratic question, see C. P. Ragland and S. Heidt, 'The Act of Philosophizing', in *What Is Philosophy?* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).