

UNITED WISDOM

Brain and consciousness: what the data show and what they leave open

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W12 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Brain and consciousness: what the data show and what they leave open

Epigraph

> *“There is not just one problem of consciousness.” — David Chalmers, Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness, section 2, 1995.*

What this article is about

Brain research can tell us much about consciousness without answering every question readers connect with that word. Discriminating an image, describing what was seen, and remaining awake involve different tasks. Their relationship to experience matters, but one question cannot quietly replace another. This article distinguishes observed relationships with neural activity, explanations of mechanisms, and philosophical claims about experience’s nature. Selected primary contexts help maintain those boundaries: William James’s historical description of the stream of thought, David Chalmers’s distinction between functions and experience, a 2016 review of neural correlates, and a 2025 comparison of theories. None is presented as a final answer. We ask what grounds each conclusion requires, how reports relate to measurement, and why an open philosophical question does not erase an empirical result. The practical aim is more accurate reading that respects both evidence and what people experience.

I. A relationship and a nature require different answers

Imagine a hypothetical report: when participants say they saw an image, researchers detect particular neural activity. A first question concerns the relationship: which observations are compared, how do they change, and under what conditions? A second concerns explanation: which process connects conditions, activity, discrimination, and response? A third concerns experience’s nature: what does having experience mean, and how does it relate to physical description? All three can matter, but one sentence does not supply three finished answers. If the report answers the first question, preserve that answer at its scale. We need not reject it because it has not also completed a mechanistic explanation or philosophical discussion.

Unnoticed substitution works in both directions. A reader can take a detected relationship as proof that consciousness is wholly identical to a particular signal. Another can decide that an unresolved question about experience makes the measured relationship empty. These conclusions require different additional grounds that the original sentence does not provide.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Return each assertion to its subject: this was observed, this explanation was proposed, and this philosophical position was adopted. Separating them does not prohibit broad theories. It exposes where a theory begins connecting individual findings. Discussion can then address a specific transition instead of merely choosing a favored word with which to describe the brain and the person.

A hypothetical lamp illustrates the structure of these questions, without explaining consciousness. We can establish that pressing a button lights the lamp, investigate the circuit, and discuss what counts as light within different descriptions. These are connected tasks that do not replace each other. The analogy is limited: the lamp is not being assigned experience, and the person is not being reduced to a simple switch. It illustrates different obligations. Observation should specify a relationship; explanation should disclose a process; a broader position should justify further connections. When those obligations remain visible, a short scientific account depends less on the impression created by its headline and more on what its grounds support.

II. Co-occurrence does not yet identify a process’s role

When two events change together, that alone does not tell us one event’s role in the other. Activity may concern presentation, discrimination, remembering, response preparation, or other procedural conditions. This list identifies possible questions rather than supplying an explanation for every signal. We need the comparison and the available alternatives. “Related to consciousness” is broad unless the studied meaning of consciousness is specified. A relationship with a report about an object and a relationship with experiencing that object may need to be distinguished. This distinction does not establish that reports always interfere, or that all activity following presentation must belong to some separate incidental process. It keeps the specific research question open to examination.

Koch, Massimini, Boly, and Tononi’s 2016 review defines neural correlates of consciousness in terms of minimal neural mechanisms jointly sufficient for a particular conscious experience. This technical research aim is stricter than simple graphical coincidence. The selected context distinguishes a general substrate of experience, a substrate for particular content, and background conditions. It is a dated review with its authors’ position, rather than the field’s final unanimous decision. The definition does not guarantee that every detected difference has already met its criterion. Instead, it helps us ask which role the research has established for a process and which role remains a hypothesis. The definition supplies a demanding target, rather than automatic certification of every associated signal.

Readers can preserve the boundary without independently analyzing each neural signal. Begin by recovering the study’s formulation: does it concern experience in general, particular content, the ability to report it, or conditions enabling the procedure? A paper can address

several tasks, but their connections must then be shown. Similar terminology does not show them. If a brief announcement omits these distinctions, leave the question open instead of constructing an unseen mechanism yourself. This is an honest limit on reading rather than a verdict against the work. A specific result can remain useful even when readers do not yet know its complete theoretical role. Recognizing that limit helps separate learning from filling gaps with confident guesses.

III. Enabling experience differs from determining its content

The distinction between general conditions and particular content prevents another shortcut. The 2016 review calls background conditions those enabling consciousness without directly determining an individual experience's content. Read this within the authors' definition rather than as a universal map of the brain. We are not offering a way to determine someone's state from a single outward sign. The narrower issue concerns description: a process can matter to the possibility of experience without explaining why a particular content is experienced in a particular situation. Importance and explanatory sufficiency differ. Consequently, "necessary" cannot be replaced by "fully explanatory" without another argument. The question a process answers determines what its observed importance allows us to conclude.

A hypothetical reading scene illustrates the distinction's structure. Lighting makes an inscription visible but does not itself explain why someone reads this word or assigns it this meaning. Insufficient light may disrupt the task, yet better lighting is not a complete explanation of understanding. This is an everyday analogy, not a consciousness model or an account of a specific neural system. It shows why an enabling condition should be distinguished from the subject of a particular answer. A study can successfully establish one condition's role. Readers should not make it answer for the situation's entire content. Otherwise an important limited result quietly becomes a broad explanation the study never offered or undertook to support.

The reverse inference also needs care. A background condition that does not determine individual content is not thereby insignificant. Readers sometimes hear "background" as secondary and divide processes into real ones and dispensable ones. Roles depend on questions, however. A condition may be central to one question yet insufficient for another. A precise account can say that this supports a possibility while that investigates a content difference. The two statements can agree without competing for a single principal place. This allows a complex system to be discussed through different relationships, rather than turning a limited procedure into a contest among parts that have all been assigned the same task in advance.

IV. Causal explanation needs grounds of its own

Moving from relationship to causal explanation requires more than strengthening a verb. “Occurs together,” “supports,” “causes,” and “is identical to” have different obligations. A causal argument depends on the comparison, the conditions changed, and the alternatives considered. We do not claim that one procedure automatically answers every question about consciousness. A method can clarify a dependence while leaving other relationships unresolved. Find the transition: do the authors report a joint change, or propose a mechanism explaining a sequence? The latter can build on the former, but cannot be completed by retelling it with greater confidence. More definite language is useful only when it reflects more definite grounds for the particular role claimed.

Separate three sentences in a hypothetical discussion. “This measure appeared under these conditions” reports a finding. “We propose that the process works this way” offers an explanation. “Experience’s nature has therefore been completely established” adds a philosophical conclusion. The third does not gain sufficient grounds merely because the first two are substantive. Leaving the third open does not empty the first two either. It preserves their answer’s scale. This is useful when a brain image, a familiar word, and a broad interpretation appear together. The image may heighten an impression of objectivity, but its argumentative role still depends on the procedure, the comparison, and the question the researchers actually addressed.

A causal model should also permit discussion of limits. If the same outcome is always declared confirmation, readers cannot easily identify what was tested. A theory may genuinely allow several outcomes under different conditions, but those conditions should be named. If they appear only after the result, assess that transition separately without presuming dishonesty. The substantive question is whether the model distinguishes possible situations and explains the result in the proposed way. This is not a demand for simplicity at any cost: complex mechanisms can require complex accounts. The modest requirement is a visible connection between data, assumptions, and the causal assertion the reader intends to repeat. Its complexity should remain open to specific assessment.

V. A report belongs to a procedure without exhausting experience

The selected 2016 review points discuss no-report procedures. The authors explain that trials with and without explicit reports, using indirect physiological measures, can help distinguish experience-related processes from attention, memory, or response preparation. This does not mean gaining direct access to another person's experience without assumptions. An indirect measure remains indirect and needs a justified connection to the content being studied. The approach addresses a methodological difficulty; it does not abolish reports in every circumstance. Here we neither reconstruct all experiments underlying the review nor declare one procedure a universal consciousness detector. Its reported purpose should remain distinguishable from stronger claims readers might make on its behalf.

When someone says "I saw a circle," the situation includes experience, discrimination, choice of words, response timing, and the question's conditions. Distinguishing these does not presume unreliability or authorize ignoring the person. It clarifies what data researchers obtain. A response has content, timing, and form. Those properties matter directly to explaining response preparation; investigating experienced content may require accounting for them separately. The same sentence can participate in different questions while remaining a person's testimony. Reading the method helps identify that role instead of automatically choosing total trust or exclusion. We can take a statement seriously while also understanding why an experiment needs to specify exactly how it uses the statement.

Ordinary understanding should respect experience independently of the technical task. People can describe experience even when someone else lacks a complete explanation of its neural mechanism. That absence does not justify declaring the experience invented. Conversely, respecting a report does not validate every explanation of external events attached to it. "It seemed this way to me" and "this happened for precisely this reason" are different assertions. In research reading, these distinctions preserve several kinds of data and questions. They do not authorize determining another person's state from a short account, assigning a diagnosis, or improvising a consciousness test from this article. Its task is careful reading, with its limits visible to the reader.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

VI. Describing a stream of thought has its own subject

In chapter nine of The Principles of Psychology, James considers thought's personal character, change, and felt continuity. This historical context describes experience and its organization rather than a contemporary brain image. It reminds us that an experienced sequence has its own distinctions: connecting a present thought with a preceding one, hearing sound against ongoing experience, and recognizing what occurs as one's own. The selected passages preserve that descriptive subject. Measuring an individual signal at a particular moment does not thereby explain the entire experienced sequence. Describing the sequence does not itself specify the neural mechanism supporting it either. The questions meet while retaining different ways of being justified and different kinds of answer.

Consider a person continuing to listen to a familiar melody. We can discuss an individual note, expectation of the next, recognition of the melody, and an account of what was heard. This example is neither an experiment nor attributed to James as his particular scene. It illustrates why selecting a moment depends on the task. One comparison needs a short interval; another needs relationships between parts. Neither scale is automatically the only real one. Different scales describing different relationships can be connected through justified transitions. An individual measured moment need not be a complete picture of experience; an experienced whole need not exist independently of every measurable condition. The relationship requires examination rather than a premature choice.

Comparing James with later research does not establish that contemporary researchers simply repeated his description in other words. They use different procedures, measures, and theoretical commitments. A similar question about time does not make one theory. Name the connection more precisely: describing felt continuity invites a question about a study's temporal subject, while research invites a question about conditions supporting a sequence. This is an editorial comparison rather than a demonstrated history of influence. It leaves dialogue possible without promising that all concepts have already been reconciled. Respecting a tradition involves preserving the scale of what has been borrowed from it, rather than making its language responsible for a universal answer to later questions.

VII. Explaining function and explaining experience set different demands

In his 1995 paper, Chalmers distinguishes questions about functions, such as discrimination, integration, and reporting, from why performing functions is accompanied by subjective experience. He calls the former “easy” relatively, without claiming empirical work is simple or finished. His argument is a philosophical position about explanatory requirements, rather than a laboratory finding proving a separate substance. Preserve the question distinction. When an explanation shows how reportable information becomes available, readers can acknowledge the success and separately ask about experience. Neither claiming that philosophy has been settled nor claiming that empirical explanation achieved nothing follows automatically. Both moves need grounds beyond the mere presence of an answer to the functional question.

The transition is often hidden in the ordinary word “explained.” What was explained: the ability to respond, a difference between measures, a temporal sequence, or the presence of an experienced quality? Without a specified subject, readers can argue while demanding different things. One evaluates a behavioral model’s accuracy; another wants an account of subjective experience. Repeating the shared word will not resolve the disagreement, but specifying the task can make it substantive. This does not require adopting Chalmers’s complete position. His distinction can be treated as a particular argument, its assumptions assessed, and other explanations sought while retaining an accurate account of what he proposed. Reading an argument does not require turning it into a final verdict.

An open question should not become a finished answer with the opposite content. A selected study’s incomplete explanation of experience does not prove consciousness independent of the brain. Successfully explaining a function does not automatically establish that function and experience are identical. Either move would require another argument connecting the obtained or missing answer with the broader claim. This is a logical boundary for reading, rather than a decision in metaphysics. It allows degrees of progress to be recognized without an artificial ending. An accurate formulation can identify the explanation achieved and separately retain a philosophical question the study did not undertake to resolve. The achieved answer and the remaining question need not compete for legitimacy.

VIII. Comparing theories tests definite predictions

The COGITATE study published in 2025 compares predictions of integrated information theory and global neuronal workspace theory. The primary abstract reports two hundred fifty-six participants and several recording methods. The authors describe support for some predictions and challenges to important tenets of both theories. This is a substantive comparison, but cannot be compressed into a declaration of a final winner or rejection of any brain–consciousness relationship. The primary abstract, selected captions, and consortium task description were actually read here; complete methods and analyses were not independently checked. Our account stays at the level those accessible parts support. It preserves the reported comparison without claiming a complete assessment of its every step.

Specify what is being compared. A theory’s general idea, a particular prediction, its test, and the measured outcome are different subjects. Even a well-organized comparison does not make them identical. A challenged prediction requires identifying the commitments generating it and the conditions of its test. A theory may need substantial revision, but the extent of revision still requires argument. Conversely, one supported prediction does not establish every tenet. Resist a sporting account in which each result must immediately name a winner. The scientific value may lie in more precise distinctions and in identifying relationships a further theory must explain. A comparison can advance inquiry while leaving some questions unsettled, rather than merely postponing a contest’s final score.

Several methods do not constitute several independent final answers about experience’s nature. They can clarify different aspects of a procedure and have different capabilities. The conclusion’s force cannot therefore be judged merely by counting technologies in an announcement. We need their relationships to predictions and their remaining limits. Readers with only the abstract can accurately convey its bounded conclusion while declining to assess the full analysis. That does not take away the study’s value. It protects the boundary between familiarity with a publication and independently checking every step. A broader assessment requires broader actual reading, rather than a more assured voice when repeating a short account. The described scope should match the work that was really done.

IX. A data boundary does not license any preferred conclusion

A limited scientific answer can tempt readers to fill the space with a favored worldview. One declares spiritual independence established; another declares questions about experience unnecessary. The data boundary selects neither position by itself. A further position may have arguments of its own, which should be discussed as arguments. Missing a particular finding is not finding something else. This matters when scientific and spiritual traditions are compared. Different subjects allow conversation, but do not automatically validate one another. An activity measure does not certify a spiritual teaching; a meaningful practice does not certify a brain architecture. Their potential relationship needs to be articulated rather than asserted on the strength of a shared word.

Personal meaning can be preserved without becoming a universal theory. A person may describe experience as important, connect it to life, and seek language for understanding it. That account has a personal subject. Turning it into an assertion about everyone's consciousness creates another obligation of justification. The distinction respects the account by allowing it to retain its own meaning without being forced to explain unknown mechanisms. Similarly, scientific description can clarify conditions without deciding human worth. Recognizing boundaries keeps both conversations available rather than allowing one to absorb the other under the appearance of a final victory. The value of an experience and the grounds of a general theory remain different questions that can both deserve attention.

Notice public formulations that skip these obligations. "We now know who we really are" requires more than a report about an individual measure. "Science will never learn anything about consciousness" also requires more than one procedure's limitation. Both expand the subject into a promise about all possible inquiry and explanation. No such promise is offered here. We consider accessible contexts and transitions between kinds of assertion. A future theory may alter current distinctions, but expecting a future answer is not possessing it. For now, describing obtained knowledge accurately and retaining the possibility of justified correction is more useful. A limited answer can guide the next question without pretending to determine every answer still to come.

X. A precise account preserves progress and remainder

A short conclusion can use two connected sentences. The first identifies the comparison and the limited finding. The second identifies a question the finding leaves unresolved. This does not require listing every imaginable limitation. Select the boundaries whose removal changes meaning. If the paper distinguishes report from content, preserve it. If it tests a theory's specific prediction, do not substitute the whole theory. If it proposes a philosophical argument, do not present it as measurement. Readers can then see progress alongside remainder without turning either into a universal signal of trust or distrust. The structure allows a result to travel with its conditions rather than inherit every meaning of the word consciousness.

The separation helps collective discussion. Ask which sentence each participant supports: a relationship, a mechanism, or experience's nature. People may agree about the measurement while disagreeing about an added explanation. Elsewhere the disagreement concerns the comparison itself. These tasks need different materials. Clarification identifies a next step: reading methods, checking a prediction's wording, considering a philosophical premise, or retaining a personal account at its own scale. It does not promise to eliminate disagreement. Its modest benefit is to make disagreement definite enough that new grounds can affect the discussion, rather than simply occasion another repetition of the same positions. Understanding where disagreement occurs is itself a useful step toward a better question.

Brain data need not settle every consciousness question to matter. A philosophical question need not reject data to remain substantive. An experience description need not become a brain theory to deserve attention. These retain different subjects and requirements. The selected sources show how easily "consciousness" can lose these distinctions and how much work restoring them can require. We do not establish experience's final nature here. We state a condition for accurate reading: each conclusion should retain the question, procedure, and grounds from which it was obtained. The achieved answer then remains visible, and the open question remains open. Neither has to disappear for the other to have a legitimate place in inquiry.

What this means in practice

For a voluntary exercise, choose an accessible consciousness research report on a neutral topic. Write one sentence identifying the authors' question and comparison. If only a headline or abstract is available, mark that reading boundary. Do not use the exercise to determine another person's state or test your own safety.

Separate three assertions: an observed relationship, a proposed explanation, and a claim about experience's nature. A report need not contain all three. Identify a transition you supplied

UNITED WISDOM

yourself and ask what grounds it requires. Note the report's role: what the person said, how it relates to a measure, and which part of the procedure remains unknown to you.

Finish with two sentences: "This work supports this limited conclusion," and "This further question remains unresolved." The exercise serves clear reading. It is not a diagnosis, a test of experience's worth, or an established therapy. You may stop without finishing. The record clarifies your familiarity with the material; it does not replace professional methodological assessment or independent checking of the data. Its usefulness lies in knowing what kind of conclusion you can presently support and which further materials would be needed to support another.

Key quotation

> *"Why should physical processing give rise to a rich inner life at all?" — David Chalmers, Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness, section 2, 1995.*

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Substantive connection and boundary
James IX and Chalmers section 2	Personal experience and questions about experience preserve a subject that cannot silently become a report function. The philosophical positions are not declared identical.
James IX and Koch’s 2016 review	Experienced sequence and neural content require a specified temporal comparison. Historical description does not test contemporary localization.
James IX and COGITATE 2025	Described experiential content and an experimental task can be related while retaining different methods of obtaining data. James’s influence on the project is not established.
Chalmers and the 2016 review	Functional explanation and sufficient neural mechanisms carry different demands. Defining correlates does not settle the philosophical argument.
Chalmers and COGITATE	Testing theoretical predictions does not automatically explain why experience exists. This is an editorial question boundary, not the consortium’s verdict on all metaphysics.
The 2016 review and COGITATE	Neural measures, reports, and theoretical predictions need distinguishing. The later test has its own design; it is neither a repetition of the review nor final acceptance of each of its positions.

Primary sources

1. William James, The Principles of Psychology, chapter IX, 1890, English original, York University electronic transcription edited by Christopher D. Green. Selected personal-thought, continuity/sound-context, and experiential-fringe passages read, printed pages 225–226, 239–241, 258–259. No complete-chapter reading or neural mechanism inferred.

2. David Chalmers, Facing Up to the Problem of Consciousness, Journal of Consciousness Studies 2(3), 200–219, 1995, author’s English text. Section 2 read completely and selected opening of section 3 through the experience-question discussion; quotations from section 2. A philosophical argument, not an empirical proof.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

3. Christof Koch, Marcello Massimini, Melanie Boly, Giulio Tononi, Neural correlates of consciousness: progress and problems, Nature Reviews Neuroscience 17, 307–321, 2016, DOI 10.1038/nrn.2016.22. Primary abstract and selected Key Points read: definition, content/background, no-report procedures, and extension limits. Full review not read; the authors' position retains its date and review status.

4. COGITATE Consortium, Adversarial testing of global neuronal workspace and integrated information theories of consciousness, Nature, 2025, DOI 10.1038/s41586-025-08888-1. Primary PubMed abstract, selected figure captions read. Task documentation appears separately below. Complete methods and all analyses not read; account limited to the reported comparison, without independent data recalculation.

5. COGITATE Consortium, Experiment 1: Objective, official English consortium documentation. Selected Objective and overview headings read; no complete preregistration or raw data. Task context, not an independent replication.

Tags

brain, consciousness, experience, neural correlates, correlation, mechanism, causation, content, background conditions, report, measurement, methods, prediction, theory, metaphysics, philosophy of mind, stream of thought, continuity, James, Chalmers, Koch, COGITATE, global neuronal workspace, integrated information, primary sources, limitations, research reading, uncertainty, respect for experience, explanation

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.