

How long will it take for scientifics (or technologists) *cognitivist thinkers* to "see" that causality "is" not linear, as *folk psychology* induces, but could be understood once formalized, and so spacialized, as quasi-bidimentional, that is ana-logic?! 1/

https://twitter.com/DrTomFroese/status/1714857109291164074

But maybe this is not possible, leading to conceptual "double binds" (Bateson) nor ethically desirable in the actual domain of the problem space. This is why I speak of a TechnoScience², more hermeneutical and phenomenological, driven more toward understanding then explanation.2/

This extension of the rational space, centered on the vital point of scientific activity, the creation of models, could add a necessary breathing space to the dualist and polarized thinking, and free its productive dialectical movement toward general living meaning. 3/

And in that perspective of a virtuous co-determination and hermeneutical circulation between a cognitivist classical science and a scybernethic science², it is clear that the *enactive paradigm* play a vital role of mediator, of Archimedean hinge, to articulate both realms. 4/

It is perfectly understandable, and maybe ethically desirable, that classical science strongly resists this critical meta-transition. What I fear is that the actual disruption of technologies of cognition, scientific excessive competition, the deaf discourse between natural 5/

and human & social sciences, and the general destruction of sense-making make this complex (rational) approach impossible. Only time will tell if this idea is collectively viable and translate a real trend. The only thing I can tell is that at my personal level, it work(ed). Fin.

@threadreaderapp unroll

• • •