



Christophe Rigon / Soto² □ - @ki_cog@mstdn.social @ki_cog

May 4, 2024 · 25 tweets · ki_cog/status/1786686178575396930

[What does "Representation" Mean?] 📚 □

The normative Cartesianist/"Eye of God"/Cognitivist epistemology was build on a *confusion*: blurring the conceptual space between "representing true reality" and "being a representative for others of the social symbolic truth value".

This confusion, induced by the shift from an individual philosophical perspective (Descartes) to a social one was initially virtuous: to institutionalize democratically (the Enlightenment) the scientific endeavor and culture

associated with it's technological mechanic conceptions and productions. And this has been a tremendous civilizational success.

But time has goes on & we have reached nearly a century ago its acme: the conquest of all domains of knowledge, that I called "the saturation of ontological/disciplinary domains". No more domain left that has not been touched, in a way or another, by the scientific rationality.

It was the end of the reign of the abstract mathematical rationalization and the beginning of the ambiguous technical "information society" from Gödel demonstration through Shannon/Weaver, Turing/Church and von Neumann "double cut",

reifying the Cartesianist rational and analytical one but on a technical synthetic axis this time.

Then historically, cybernetic modeling style has also bifurcated between a very well financially founded new "Artificial Intelligence" and the poor parent of "second cybernetic" taking refuge in the field of human and social science and loosing its individual subversive power.

Now we can't no more ignore the cognitive revolutionary power of AI thanks to the "genAI disruption", while second-order cybernetics, the "cybernetic of the cybernetician" is, as all recursive and reflexive movements, repressed, denied and (nearly) forgotten.

But I want to comeback to this ambiguity between a social "symbolic role" and a collective "cognitive role": it is today more and more showing the limits and blind spots of it's hidden initial ruse,

namely the mind-body individual alienation (the famous HPC) and it's object/subject distinction associated social culture.

Many today are tempted to confuse or even ignore in the "natural sciences" this crucial (quasi-bidimensional) socio-historic distinction(s), through the "easy thinking" of technological blurring concepts (like "intelligence" or "information",

which have no rigorous philo-scientific foundations and represent an *unnoticed major cultural and self shift*). For me this is an enormous and non-ethical error.

The reason for this "short circuit" temptation is induced by two different but complementary mechanisms: in one hand by the injunction made by the ultra-liberal capitalist economical and financial world to scientists to be "efficient and productive"

and to align with the positivist commodified/objective society.

And in another hand by the collective traditional/Cartesianist (not Cartesian) normativity of our present mode of rationality: namely "cognitivism".

So, what is the problem? The 1st Person (1P)/3d Person-only (3P-Only) ambiguity of the word "representation". The confusion between a symbolic and social role played "third person only standpoint", and what is its historically, culturally and lived (hidden and denied) foundation:

the first person perspective. Of course I'm not speaking here of any 1P perspective, leading to a dark side of subjectivism (solipsism, extreme relativism and nihilism, etc), but about a *disciplined 1P perspective*.

Let's be clear: socio-historically it couldn't have been otherwise because the real difficulty is the inherent *recursivity/self-refencial dimension* of any objectification act: by defining the world explicitly we are also implicitly defining ourselves.

So we needed collectively, and coherently socially, to go through this nearly two thousand years historical arc to enact this "objective/intersubjective" representation.

We need to realize that this period is over, evidenced by the numerous systemic problems which accumulate and the disjunction/bifurcation between the epistemological know-what and technological know-how.

But technology, with its synthetical efficient but also problematically confusing epistemological dynamic, is not the solution by itself.

So we need to go ahead now in a non-iconoclast way to preserve our precious collective heritage while understanding lucidly the limits and blind spots of the present, toward what I call a comprehensive and encompassing "second-order rationality".

And the rational and scientific roots of this way of conceiving and perceiving the world and ourselves is already here: the enactive paradigm of sciences AND technologies of cognition, if well understood.

I know its epistemic AND technical integrative power because I have experienced it, at my personal level, but armed with my scientific rationality and very patiently.

Second-order thinking and experiencing is an open and progressive road, relating effectively and productively the analytical with the synthetical without dissolving the alternatives. Difficult but necessary, before barbarism enter the City.

@threadreaderapp unroll

