Review of: "A Unified Psychology as Part of a General Social Science"

Ahmet Hasan Koltuksuz[1]

1 Yasar University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

ABSTRACT

“Through the unique “Algorithmic” reasoning, the author finds out that running of our thinking system leads to consequences like various psychological phenomena, therefore the thinking system and psychological systems can in principle synthesize into a wholeness where, through the same Algorithmic principles, a general social science can be established.”

How do you differentiate the “Thinking System” and “Psychological System”? If you combine these two into one, which means they are two different objects through algorithmic principles, as you claim, what are those algorithmic principles? Moreover, from the computation theory, we know that algorithmic thinking and algorithmic computation are entirely different from that of carbon-based thinking in our brains. As such, the data format, which we think is a protein-based structure, is totally different; hence, it is an altogether different system. Here is a thinking exercise: In which format and where do we keep the data in our brains, if ever being kept there? What is the transfer mechanism so that the data is transferred over neurotransmitters? It seems to be the only “bus” we have discovered.

ALGORITHM FRAMEWORK THEORY

“…that human uses multiple “Instructions”, as the innate universal tools in the brain, to process information to compute or think, serially, dynamically…”

We do not know that! Do you know any molecular pathways for it? It is not like silicon-based computation models like the Turing Machine and John von Neumann’s model. Along with that, unfortunately, we do not know what information is. And since there is no definition for it yet, there is no way to measure it, and we do not have any unit for it either. Also, we do not know how an organic molecule, which is transferred by a neurotransmitter to a neuron, gets processed by a neuron! Therefore, a claim such as yours above, namely a serial, parallel, static, or dynamic computation that is taking place in our brains similar to a computational model that we know of, is a bit early at the moment, I’m afraid.

“The structure of “Instruction + information” as a new dualism represents the interactions between human and the environment. …”

Please see the above paragraph.

DISTORTIVE THINKING

"…the Algorithmic1 knowledge theory: since a computational operation is feeble in information processing, plenty of knowledge stocks need to be prepared in advance, to support current computations. …"

What is algorithmic knowledge theory? Any citation/reference, please? Also, we can't even decide whether the information is algorithmic or not in its nature, let alone the knowledge itself!

We do not process information; we process data, and the result may be defined as information by some scientists, hence the term information processing. However, we are not so sure about that either.

"… "wrapped" like the space and the time described by Einstein. …"

Spacetime is warped by gravitation, not wrapped! Don't you think! :)

THE HARD-SOFTWARE

"… Thus, emotions can be called "hard-software", like the software installed in computers before they leave factory for their users. Though this hard-software can be modified by manufacturers, it cannot by users themselves; therefore, emotions keep constant during one's whole lifetime, and keep alienating the thinking system that evolves quickly, so that sometimes they are deemed "irrational". …"

Again, Although the human endocrine system and its direct output in our brains are marvelous examples of computation, software, and embedded software, unfortunately the current computational systems are far from it. Therefore, any attempt to create a link between the human endocrine system and a computation is futile at best.

Your conclusions and the other sections contain many claims, which are well-thought and nice-sounding altogether; however, I am sorry to say but I was not able to see any concrete scientific proof is presented in your paper to back them up. Looks like, we all have to wait, for the new developments from the fields of molecular biology, neurology, and brain physiology at the moment.

Anyways, many thanks for the nice attempts to combine the psychology and the science of computation together.