



Christophe Rigon / Soto² □ - @ki\_cog@mstdn.social @ki\_cog

Feb 4, 2024 · 28 tweets · [ki\\_cog/status/1754110021003104657](https://ki_cog/status/1754110021003104657)

[ A “New” Mission for Science & Philosophy: Generative Enaction ] 🧵 □ 🖋️

For me, the top priority mission of philo-science ars now is not so much to produce at new expense a new (processual) "worldview" of the cosmos, top-down and representationalist,



but more subtly to offer society \*tools of think\*, that is also \*tools to feel biocognitively\*, so that each citizen can enact their philo-scientific, rational and \*extra-ordinary\* conception of the world.

What is needed is to renew our sacred alliance (Bateson) with the world, and it is fundamentally an aesthetic and hermeneutical (r)evolution, both an individual & collective responsibility and endeavor.

It is not so much the representation as \*the method\* (1P <--> 3P) that must be shared and disseminated. This is what I try to do through my expression of cybernetics, my experiential “portable philo-science” in touch with sciences and technologies of cognition.

We are entering a new regime of our Western rationality which must be more complete and all-encompassing: we will fail if we do not understand this and if we cling excessively

to our effective but limited traditional "3P-Only"/instrumental reason/techno-industrialization modes of operation. In my opinion, we are at a historic tipping point.

And it is in no way a question of denying them: on the contrary, it is a question of extending them and revealing their tacit/implicit values: understanding the limits and blindspots is the sine qua none condition of our individual and collective emancipation.

To be free is to know one's chain. For me knowing is the road of emancipation, toward meaningful actions.

Of course then the subject of “common social representation” arises in its ambiguous cognitive-representational/political senses. I am deeply convinced that what produces the cohesion of the social fabric is not so much the common representation that we have of the world,

nor our technologies, as our \*empathetic\* (not to be confused with imitation or identification), and doing-together capacities.

Ana-logic is both a synchronic and diachronic feeling leading to language as a coordination of/for action, because languaging (Maturana) is our native \*technic\*.

It is useful to remind us that all the biological science shows us to what extent we have in common and how we tend to focus on very small distinctions. We are not only social beings but also primarily biological beings of flesh, \*representatives of nature\*

who share with their congeners (99+%) and other living beings (> 50%) the majority of our genetic patrimony. This may seem naive and utopian, but if we look more closely, it is terribly pragmatic: we are nothing without others. We are a bio-socio lifeform.

Moreover, whatever the collective scientific representation, which undeniably draws its rational value & collective intelligence from its coupling with an experimental-experiential empirical dimension,

it will inevitably be instru-mentalized by the hyper-industrial technological culture (don't be fooled: digital is above all a \*material\* infrastructure) which is today trying, like other technical dimensions (AI and finance for example)

to become totally autonomous by tearing themselves away (Heidegger, Marcuse) from their bio-socio-cultural roots, it is up to say human origins. The trans-humanist mentality that accompanies it is symbolically emblematic in this regard.

And it is also the risk of a philosophy of process (Whitehead or Simondon for example) poorly understood and imported into the collective culture as it is in a normative way, missing the form/process transduction implied by the 1P-3P to 3P-Only analogical importation:

of formally reifying the phenomenological dynamics of the process, as have already been pragmatically for almost a century the "information sciences and technologies" ("information" = form), which, I have explained many times,

come from a (mathematical) abstraction of communication, that is to say an interactive \*process\*.

This is why enaction (Varela & al.), enactive thinking, is for me a very valuable solution: because it is based on a style of thinking which does not essentials, contrary to our common non-reflexive representational mode, the processes

but on the contrary allows us to understand them and to feel them, thus connecting them to our fundamental cognitive act: the gesture, that is to say to our own bodily and historical sensorimotor coordination.

Connecting patterns to enact useful 1P/3P meanings, but ana-logical patterns can't be expressed in a normative and dualist propositional logic of distinction, that is of exclusion toward action, nor purely abstracted in a computational/calculus quantitative way.

Thinking that quantity in its extreme will lead to quality is nonsensical. Suspension of judgement is also and mainly needed to access to this wiser dimension.

For more than thirty years, like an increasing number of others, I have cultivated this dual approach, putting into hermeneutic circulation the point of view "from the outside" (3P in con-sciousness), with that "from the inside " (disciplined 1P), and I attest experientially

to its virtues, both in daily life (unconscious mixed of the dipole subject/object), and in my learning trajectory (subject/object distinction awareness). Everyone is free to experience it: don't ideologize, just try.

It is this "groundless ground", patterned network conception, this "in-between" navigation between self, others and world, sometimes techno-mediated, which allowed me to enact what I called, to respect the cybernetic historical tradition, "scybernetics":

a second-order (idiosyncratic) 1P/3P rationality (rationality<sup>2</sup>).

So if you accept it, good luck for this next mission. This message, I hope, will not self-destruct in thirty seconds...

@threadreaderapp unroll

...