



**Christophe Rigon / Soto** - [@ki\\_cog@mstdn.social](mailto:@ki_cog@mstdn.social) [@ki\\_cog](#)

Mar 21, 2024 · 17 tweets · [ki\\_cog/status/1770719216796086749](https://ki_cog/status/1770719216796086749)

[ “Constraints” --> Relaxations? (this is spring!) ]

I observe a strong reaction, quite understandable, to the technical provocation (Gestell) of "GenAI" in the form of an amplification of the anti-reductionism of the living.  
Stimulus/Response.



This is mainly expressed from the angle of a rediscovery of the organizational functional context in the form of “constraints”. A dynamic version of the old biological structure/function dipole.

It is a holistic functional tendency dialectically opposed to the reductionist tendency. The "context" being in principle infinite, the problem now becomes to define the relevant limit of such a "context", which should give rise to bitter and endless debates.

This approach is consistent with enactive design, except for one detail, and this detail makes all the difference. In an enactive design, that is to say a second-order design, the observer-actor is integrated, implicitly or explicitly, into the modeling:

the interaction of the subject and the object "enact" a world and, in fact, for the subject external reality is expressed in the form of "constraints" (semantic neutrality, structural coupling),

while the meaning is given relative to the perspective of the subject himself (operational closure). Of course, these two notions are dynamic and relative to each other: there is no more absolute meaning than there is absolute knowledge of the world.

Science represents the collective attempt to standardize and universalize this epistemological process. But current Cartesianist and cognitivist science is a science "without scientists", a "pseudo-sacrifice of the self", 3P-Only, the vision from the outside/God-eyes view.

To complicate is not to make more complex. This flight from cognitivism towards a forever unattainable horizon has the merit of injecting a little relativism into this infinite quest, of very religious inspiration if it is really taken for something other than a heuristic:

that of "explanatory" grasping of the world to make it a collective truth "finally revealed".

Do we really think that we are doing justice to the living by implicitly giving it the status of a simple object?! Because this is the weak point of cognitivism: to objectify, to formalize what reveals itself more and more to be deeply in the nature of a process.

However, formalizing a process inevitably means making it lose its dynamic nature, that is to say its deep meaning, if this formalization is more oriented towards externalist operationality than towards individual understanding.

It is also and above all forgetting the transcendental conditions (in the Kantian sense, constituent) of one's own production, thus generating an amnesia contrary to the scientific ethical commitment of a search for truth.

If without doubt this cognitivist conception was adapted to the study of external objects and to making ourselves operational, "as master and possessors of Nature", it is clearly very insufficient on its own to study, as today, subjectivities, ie the living and consciousness.

For Descartes, this operationality was \*heuristic\* ("As"). Did scientists start to \*believe\* in their theories? I'm really afraid of it.

The inertia of scientific mentalities, and the epistemological carelessness that accompanies it (most scientists are not even aware of being cognitivists), is today for me the main cause of our collective inability to (we ) think differently

and transform, by making it more complex (and not by complicating it), our conception of reality to face the changes necessary for our survival.

@threadreaderapp unroll

...