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 Uexkull'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 transdisicplinary 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 at theory of dialogical meaning. But Peircean semiotic seems to be broad enough in it 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.

Literature

Brier, S. and Joslyn, C. (2013a). "What Does It Take to Produce Interpretation? Informational, Peircean, and Code-Semiotic Views on Biosemiotics". *Biosemiotics*, Vol. 6, Nr. 1, 04.2013, s. 143-159.

Brier, Søren (2013b). Cybersemiotics: a new foundation for transdisciplinary theory of consciousness, cognition, meaning and communication, in Liz Swan (Ed.)(2012): *Origins of Mind, Springer book series in Biosemiotics*, Berlin, New York: Springer: Pp. 97-126

Brier, Søren (2013c): Cybersemiotics: A New Foundation for Transdisciplinary Theory of Information, Cognition, Meaningful Communication and the Interaction Between Nature and Culture, *Integral Review: A transdisciplinary and transcultural journal* Volume 9, No. 2, 220- http://integral-review.org/documents/Brier,%20Cybersemiotics,%20Vol.%209,%20No.%202.pdf

Brier, S. (2013d). Cybersemiotics: Suggestion for a Transdisciplinary Framework Encompassing Natural, Life, and Social Sciences as Well as Phenomenology and Humanities. I: *International Journal of Body, Mind and Culture: Cross-Cultural, Interdisciplinary Health Studies*, Vol. 1, Nr. 1, 2014, s. 3-53. http://ijbmc.org/index.php/ijbmc/article/view/6

Brier, S. (2015) Can Cybersemiotics Solve the Paradox of Transdisciplinary Knowing? *Semiotics No. 2014: The Semiotics of Paradox*. red. / Jamin Pelkey; Stéphanie Walsh Matthews; Leonard G. Sbrocchi. Toronto : Legas, 2015. s. 611.

Cariani, P. (2011).The Semiotics of Cybernetic Percept-Action Systems, *International Journal of Signs and Semiotic Systems* (IJSSS) 1(1)

François, C. (2004). *International Encyclopedia of Systems and Cybernetics,* Munich: K.G. Saur.

Joslyn, C. (2001).The semiotics of control and modeling relations in complex systems, *Biosystems*, Volume 60, Issues 1–3, May 2001, Pages 131–148.

Joslyn, C. (2000).Levels of Control and Closure in Complex Semiotic Systems, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences,* Volume 901,Pages 67–74.

Pattee, H. H. and Rączaszek-Leonard, J. (2012). *Laws, Language and Life: Howard Pattee's classic papers on the physics of symbols with contemporary commentaries,* Berlin, New York. Springer (Biosemiotics 7)

Rocha, Luis M. [1998]."Selected Self-Organization and the Semiotics of Evolutionary Systems". In: *Evolutionary Systems: The Biological and Epistemological Perspectives on Selection and Self-Organization*. Salthe, S. G. Van de Vijver, and M. Delpos (eds.). Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 341-358. http://www.informatics.indiana.edu/rocha/publications/ises.html

Sebeok, T. A., Danesi, M. (2000). *The forms of meaning: Modeling systems theory and semiotic Analysis,* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Von Uexküll, J. (1982). The Theory of Meaning, *Semiotica, Journal of the International Association for Semiotic Studies / Revue de l'Association Internationale de Sémiotique,* Volume 42, Issue 1 (Jan 1982).