

International Association for Semiotic Studies (IASS-AIS)
International Semiotics Institute (ISI)
Kaunas University of Technology (KTU)

13th World Congress of Semiotics

“Cross-Inter-Multi-Trans”

Kaunas, Lithuania, 26-30 June 2017

ROUNDTABLE PROPOSAL

CYBERSEMIOTICS: Reflections on the transdisciplinary integrating of semiotics, cybernetics and systems

Organizers:

Carlos Vidales. University of Guadalajara (Mexico)

Søren Brier. Copenhagen Business School (Denmark)

One of the most promising aspects of C.S. Peirce's triadic and pragmaticist semiotics is its fruitfulness as a transdisciplinary platform for the sciences and humanities. In the biosemiotic movements a paradigm is developing trying to cope with the living systems in a cognitive and communicative framework encompassing the classical biological disciplines working with mechanical models of living systems as well as the social sciences and humanities working with models of meaning, interpretation and signification. If we look at the discussions in biosemiotic on what it means to be scientific - then we see that a lot of the models developed as early on as Uexküll's functional circle working as a model for perception and his somewhat bio-constructivist Umwelts lehre partly based on a hypothesis of animal qualia - has found it necessary to draw on other transdisciplinary paradigms like cybernetic and systems science by using models of feedback and self-organization into a sort of bio-cybernetician that developed his model into the first foundations for a biosemiotics in that he produced the concept of 'marks' as a sort of signs circulating in a system. This kind of self-organized cybernetic system is what Maturana and Varela call autopoietic. Gregory Bateson's view of information as "a difference that makes a difference" in a cybernetics mind has been important, but especially Maturana and Varela's concept of autopoiesis has been much used in biosemiotic because of its likeliness with the work of Uexküll. The concept is also crucial to Niklas Luhmann's system theory. This integration of systems and semiotics are puzzling since the systems and cybernetics movement never has embraced a phenomenological basis for experiential consciousness or a hermeneutical basis for a theory of dialogical meaning. But Peircean semiotic seems to be broad enough in its conceptual and metaphysical foundation to not only embrace phenomenology and hermeneutics but also systems and cybernetics. Many have worked with parts of this problem, most know is Danesi and Sebeok's book on modelling, Pattee's and Joslyn's work and Brier's Cybersemiotics, where he attempts to integrate Peirce's and Luhmann's transdisciplinary views promoting a self-organizing cybernetics and systems view on Peircean semiotic process philosophy.

We are looking for evaluations on benefits as well as limitation and alternatives on this idea and endeavor.