- @RichardDawkins Mr Dennett is right, but forget the obvious: there is no other road pragmatically. This is more complex. Classical/Cartesianist science is just a disciplined "3P-Only" perspective based on a "pseudo-sacrifice of the self", a (serious) professional role-playing game. 1/6
- @RichardDawkins While "professional philosophers" tend to confuse this analytical distinction between 1P and 3P-only. Both are constrained by the fact that one need to make a distinction in the intersubjective linguistic space, which is the necessary critical space, 2/6
- @RichardDawkins leading to dualist collective thinking ("cognitivism" in the epistemology of cognitive sciences) intensified by it's coupling with dualist analytic propositional logic to "explain objectively/scientifically" the empirical facts. 3/6
- @RichardDawkins So I propose to extend our current rationality toward an enactive (Varela and al.) 1P <--> 3P hermeneutic circulation and co-determination so that we don't throw the historical Cartesian baby with the bath water. 4/6
- @RichardDawkins A "Science of consciousness" is not possible for me, because self-referenciality, only "Science with Con-Science" is possible: a second-order techno-philoscience more epistemologically aware (of itself), extending our current western rationality. 5/6
- @RichardDawkins This should lead, recusively and so iteratively and patiently, to a collective rationality², may be less normative and empirically polarized (like today) but also more comprehensive and integrative. 6/6
- @RichardDawkins @threadreaderapp unroll

• • •