Christophe Rigon / Soto² ☐ - Scybernethician @ki_cog

Oct 25, 2024 • 10 tweets • ki_cog/status/1849650766836912136

[Politics of Modeling: Why I don't like PP-FEP] 🧵

As an enactive thinker (more than "enactivist"), my problem with PP-FEP is political: the politics of modeling / style of thinking in science of cognition.

Christophe Rigon / Soto² 🪸 - Scybernethician
@ki_cog · Follow   X

[Norms (constraint functions) / Improvisation]

A fascinating free-style discussion between @ThouArtThat and @TNWJackson about the role of the imaginary/imaginal (I'm discovering Henry Corbin) vs PP-FEP, including a 101 in musicology. It sparkles! 🫧

Imaginal Cognition Musical Improvisation

youtube.com
Imaginal Cognition, Musical Improvisation, and Predi...
You can find links to the articles we are discussing in this brief reflection I wrote about them: ...

8:40 AM · Oct 24, 2024   ⓘ

♥ 7   💬 Reply   🔗 Copy link

Read 1 reply

For me it is too much on the empirical side, a pure product of the actual dominant utilitarianist scientific trend. It's probabilist foundation ("Bayesian inference"), and locally global conception, while "efficient",

tend to mask thereby it's underlying emergence of coherence from (biological) micro-processes and put a screen on their intelligibility by reducing them to statistical dynamics.

Parallel and distributed processing (so called "connectionist" / ANN) dynamic modeling is for me more pertinent and adequate, not in their "associative" polarity usage, as usually understood, but on their "pattern-detector" one.

That is not on their associationist polarity but on their biocognitive simulation one ("spontaneous generalization" generic property simulating abstraction and categorical classification).

These models are more productive and scientifically heuristic. Moreover, an isomorphic relation can be drawn between the two formalisms (that's why ANN models are often explained, by the "theorists", in statistical terms).

For me PP-FEP modeling, while socially and rhetorically effective to "convince"/sell (reason) and abusively rationalize, are, and because of this power, misleading and poorly ethical/rational.

But to understand this nuance, one need to have a "deep" *practice* and understanding of these PDP models: speaking from outside about their perceived usages and dangers is not enough (blind spot of technique)

, one need to intimately know them (phil. techno-phenomenology), as models of *phenomenological* micro-processes (cf. the work of Petitmengin and Depraz about "microphenomenology").

Ex: microphenomenology.com/home

or

(more specialized "jargon")
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/352065035_Depraz_Husserlian_phenomenology_in_the_light_of_microphenomenology

@threadreaderapp unroll

• • •