

Review of: "The Study of Consciousness Is Mired in Complexities and Difficulties: Can They Be Resolved?"

Fred Travis¹

¹ Maharishi International University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I do not see page numbers, so I have copied the text and then commented on it. My comments are in bold

Q1 Chatbot AI

1. the state or quality of **awareness**, or of being aware of an external object or something within oneself.
2. the ability to experience **thoughts, feelings, and sensations**, and to be **aware** of one's existence and surroundings.
3. the state of being awake and **aware** of one's surroundings, thoughts, and emotions.
4. the **subjective experience** of being aware of oneself and one's environment, including thoughts, sensations, perceptions, and emotions.

I would leave out ChatGPT. AI hallucinates. It is not a reliable reference. If you ask it again, you get a different response.

Adding it here, places it in the same level of authenticity as the other quotes.

Q2 Comment on #3. various types, stages, and levels of 'C': 34 times in 14 reviews

This description has a different character than the others, which you bring out later. The word conscious pertains to active processes involving a subject, object and the process of observation. It is a process. It is how consciousness is expressed in the waking state.

This category, your number three, speaks of Consciousness as existing with different inherent qualities—"stages and levels." It connects well to an experience of Samadhi in the Yoga literature, which you touch on later. Right now, it is hidden in the other 4 categories. I think it needs to be separated out.

Q3. What are we to do with this potpourri of terms – each with its own 'claim of veracity'? How does this exercise of clever wordsmithing bring us any closer to a cogent explanandum that inspires consensus, or does this simply muddy the waters by creating an excess of terminology?

Or see them as descriptions of different "levels or stages" of consciousness. They are not the "same" because they express different dimensions of Consciousness

Q4 According to this approach, 'C' is viewed as a dynamic, multifaceted functional process arising from the material substrate of the nervous system (Delacour 1995, Irwin 2024, Koch 2019, Pepperell 2018, Place 1956, Smit and Hacker 2020), which enables human beings to interact with their internal and external environment.

I think there needs to be a discussion of the explanatory gap. There has been no progress since the 1990s (Chalmers and Koch's bet) in defining the NCC. It may be because the model is wrong. The electrical-chemical activity of a 2-3 lb mass of tissue cannot produce inner subjectivity.

The materialistic model is not sacred. It is a made-up idea. If a model hits a roadblock in explaining observable data (the earth is the center of the universe), then it is appropriate in science to adopt a different model. The materialistic model may need to be turned on its head; that consciousness is primary, and its interactions within itself produce patterns of consciousness that become patterns of matter. You might enjoy Toy Nader's new book *Consciousness is All There Is*.