



**Christophe Rigon / Soto<sup>2</sup>** □ - @ki\_cog@mstdn.social @ki\_cog

Jan 29, 2024 · 15 tweets · [ki\\_cog/status/1751911941856280685](https://ki_cog/status/1751911941856280685)

[ Intelligibility & the Formal/Processual Transduction ] 🗑️ □

Expressing oneself and communicating is in itself an act, and it is an act of distinction in the intersubjective cognitive domain which appears to the foreign observer as a differential distinction

in relation to one's own semantic world. Thus what was an act, a *\*process\** (of decentring, of objectification) for one becomes, through explicitation, a *\*formal\** understanding difference for the other.

This illustrates an important point to observe that I have called "form/process transduction": what appears to us explicitly as a static form may originally have an implicit logical coherence, and therefore be intelligible only as a dynamic process.

This is linked to the transition from one 1P-3P phenomenological/cognitive domain to another (the "levels of abstractions" for example).

Conversely, we can only intellectually think of processes as differentiations of coherent forms along a linearized temporal axis (past, present, future). In fact, the Cartesian cut is a psycho-biological technique (disciplinarization of the body by the mind) making it possible

to eliminate the corporeal, emotional analog dimension of natural language to transform it linearly into intellectual "logical reason" making it possible to convey "value of truth" from a cause to an effect, and to guard against relativizing sophisms.

The parallel with the Shannonian *\*tubular\** vision of communication, then suddenly called "information" (process/form transduction) will not escape anyone.

However, there is another, more comprehensive and integrative way of thinking scientifically and rationally about the relationship of process to form: enaction. Despite this, the scientific community and the entire scholarly community, for reasons that I will not comment on here,

continue to persist in favoring a limited way of thinking which can today be extended in its principles, and therefore reinforced.

Now, this initial expressive gesture (like the one I am currently making for you, in the future for me), perceived as a phase-shifting form by the "receiver", also implicitly calling for a *\*felt\** resonance of the gesture, empathetic,

by which we evaluate the expressive gesture of the other (and indirectly their positioning, their situation, their personality, etc.).

And this possibility of fraternal empathy is originally mainly conveyed by the perception of the other's body (attitudes, postures, facial expressions, etc.). This is precisely what is being

taken away from us by the use of communication technologies.

Also, is it not so surprising that the massification of communication technologies, coupled with classic intellectual scientific inquiry, leads us, paradoxically in appearance and in its excess, towards a massive lack of empathy,

that is to say a lack of mutual understanding, therefore a dangerous erosion of the social fabric which can only lead to disasters.

@threadreaderapp unroll

...