

[ The Limits of First-Order Technoscientific Thinking ]

hasa llabiasticall paints of sign and bissa

A good summary of the current debates. But for me these "objective" points of view are biased by 1. the lack of explanation from the observer-actor point of view of these same perspectives (where are we talking about?)

https://twitter.com/ineshipolito/status/1805106323702628371

and 2. by a misunderstanding of the psychoactive nature of these technologies: functionalism is an opportunistic technological thinking which has yet to clarified ethically the epistemological role of modeling in the attribution of properties to objects.

It does not seem to me at all "reasonable" to claim to "explain" linguistically consciousness "from the outside" even though we use this same consciousness, with linguistic constraints, but implicitly and tacitly to think it. There is a recursive paradox here to be elucidated.

Moreover, 1P-3P Rationality being paralyzed by this paradox, it is also opening wide the door to all operational instrumentalizations and therefore to the practical outcome of the debates being finally decided by... finance and industrial applications!

This is the consequence of a bounded normative rationality excessively reduced to reason, incapable of thinking itself in a critical 3P-Only collective regime: a procedural technoscience drift which is becoming more technological than really rational and scientific.

@threadreaderapp unroll

• • •