

Review of: "Social context of the brain and law: Is consciousness social?"

Sergii Shevtsov¹

¹ Odessa National I.I. Mechnikov University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I find the article interesting and ready to agree with its main thesis. Unfortunately, this means little, since in the form in which the author presents it, this thesis seems to be something obvious. In my opinion, the material is presented unsuccessfully, below I will try to explain why.

I'll start with some formal aspects. The author has put more material into the article than its volume suggests. In addition to the problem of consciousness and the brain, he considers neuroscience, language, truth, lies, memory, colonization, law, sense of agency and a number of other issues. None of them can be revealed to the extent that is needed for the main problem. It seems to me that the author of the paper is narrating by association, so he is forced to go one way or the other all the time. This makes it very difficult to develop the main idea. Although I am familiar with at least half of the papers cited by the author, his references are often devoid of substantiation, and I had to stop each time and try to understand what exactly the author was talking about in each of the references. Some of them seem arbitrary to me. In any case, their interpretation remains unexplained. In addition, I am not sure that the scope of the concept of "consciousness", for example, in Franz Brentano and Ludwig Wittgenstein is the same. It is difficult to get rid of the impression that the author has arbitrarily selected the works of other researchers that confirm his view (as it seems to him) and ignored the difficulties with which they are sometimes associated.

Now regarding the content or main idea of the author. The author's thesis that "the understanding of consciousness... requires one's critical understanding of social context and group processes" is essentially devoid of argumentation. The emphasis is on refuting the view that consciousness is reduced to the activity of the brain. But even here it cannot be said that the author has succeeded in refuting such an approach to the problem of consciousness. In any case, it is difficult to consider this as a novelty. The author's understanding of consciousness is not clarified. For example, does he, following Brentano and Husserl, consider intentionality as the main characteristic of consciousness, or just one of its features, or even something accidental? When the author acknowledges the importance of neuroscience research, does it shed any light on intentionality?

Finally, it remains unclear to me what the author means by "social" or "social environment". Does it include only people or the whole external world (gods, animals, rivers, images of gods, things, institutions, etc.)?

In general, the article is more reminiscent of the selected passages from the draft, which were given a certain problematic focus. I did not find in the article some of the theses that are present in the abstract. The conclusion clarifies little and

could just as well serve as an introduction. In my opinion, the article should be divided into several theses and dedicated to each of a separate article with a consistent argumentation of each of them.