Supplementary Notebook (RTEP - Brazilian academic journal, ISSN 2316-1493)

PHILOSOPHY, BRAIN AND THE PICTURE OF THE WORLD

Dmitry Khristoforovich SHISHKOV[1]

[1]*Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Kostroma State Agricultural Academy", village Karavaevo, Kostroma region, Russia. E-mail: schischkov2010@mail.ru.*

Abstract: *The article aims at showing the significance and role of philosophy in the system of private sciences. The argumentation for defining philosophy as a "science of sciences" is presented. Particular attention is paid to the consideration of philosophy as a science from the point of view of functional characteristics and functional asymmetry of the work of the cerebral hemispheres in the process of thinking and cognition of the world by man. The principle is that in the implementation of any mental function, to one degree or another, both hemispheres of the brain are involved. We are talking about the predominance of one or another hemisphere in the process of cognition, analysis and information processing. A brief overview of the current state of brain science is given, concerning the problem under consideration. Methods for studying the functional asymmetry of the cerebral hemispheres, in particular, electrical, chemical and magnetic resonance are specially considered. The characteristics of these methods are given. The functional features of both hemispheres of the brain are analyzed in the process of information processing, in the logic of problem solving, in the perception of written and oral speech, in the perception of pictures and visual images. The role of the right and left hemispheres in private scientific disciplines, in philosophy and art is shown. Particular attention is paid to exactly how a holistic picture of the world is formed and the thesis is substantiated that of all sciences, it is in philosophy that the most effective organization of the work of both hemispheres of the brain is represented.*

Keywords*: philosophy, type of thinking, holistic picture of the world, cerebral hemispheres, functional asymmetry of the brain.*

INTRODUCTION

Anyone who studied at school or any other educational institution, including universities, faced the fact that a teacher of one or another discipline began with the explanation that his science was the most important, most necessary and significant. All other sciences, presumably, were not so important. So, for example, we had one teacher in Chemistry, who at each lesson in various versions explained to us that, no matter what anyone said, chemistry was the main science. Because everything that we eat is chemistry; our home is chemistry; everything we wear – clothes and shoes – also chemistry; we breathe – chemistry; we poison – chemistry. All our emotions, feelings, such as friendship, love, hatred, happiness, unhappiness – all this is also chemistry. And all other sciences have any significance only to the extent that they are related to

chemistry. In a similar way, in about the same spirit, physicists praise their physics, biologists – biology, historians – history, etc. But, perhaps, most of all they rush about their science, as with the "queen of all sciences" – these are mathematicians. Back in school, in every mathematics classroom, various quotes from Gauss, Lobachevsky, Lomonosov and others were posted, such as: "Mathematics is the queen of all sciences", "Mathematics is the gymnastics of the mind", "Mathematics is only to be taught because that she puts the mind in order" and so on. And even in K. Marx, mathematicians found a mention of the fact that "Science only reaches perfection when it manages to use mathematics" (Marx and Engels, 1956).

Since the author is engaged in philosophy and teaches it to students, it is obvious that his direct duty is to prove that philosophy is the most important, the most necessary science, and that it is she who is the "science of sciences". It's like asking if the Pope can declare that there is no God. At the same time, the question of whether the Pope himself believes in God or not is not a matter of principle. However, science differs favorably from church dogmas, from politics, from ideology, from propaganda and advertising, first of all by the fact that simple references to any dogmas and authorities do not work here. Any statement, any hypothesis in science requires serious argumentation and convincing evidence. What evidence can be given in favor of philosophy? There are many arguments, but we will limit ourselves to only four of the most important of them. *Firstly*, it is that philosophy is the foremother of all sciences and all sciences emerged from philosophy. *Secondly,* it is that philosophy seeks to build a holistic picture of the world, which all other sciences do not do. *Thirdly,* the creation of an integral picture of the world is unthinkable without a systematic approach. And, finally, *fourthly*, these are the features of the functioning of the right and left cerebral hemispheres of the brain in the process of human mental and cognitive activity. If the first three of the above arguments are well developed and described in special literature, then the development of the last argument concerning the peculiarities of brain functioning has not been encountered in the literature on philosophy. Research on the functional specialization of the cerebral hemispheres is of an interdisciplinary nature. And the results of these studies are of fundamental importance for many different areas of knowledge – neurophysiology, psychology, pedagogy, linguistics, medicine and philosophy.

MATERIALS AND RESEARCH METHODS

The aim of this work is to show the role of the right and left cerebral hemispheres in the formation of a holistic picture of the world. And this, as we know, is the subject of study of philosophy as a "science of sciences". For a long time, the prevailing opinion in science was that our thought, as well as our thinking, acts as something integral. And since we cannot pull the thought to pieces, then, accordingly, the organ responsible for thinking, our brain, cannot be divided into any separate units or sections. But it turned out that this is not at all the case. The structure and functioning of the brain is indeed a very complex and interesting topic that requires special consideration. In this work, it is advisable to limit ourselves to considering only the differences between the left and right cerebral hemispheres that are directly related to the topic we are considering.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The history of studying the problem of interhemispheric asymmetry is almost a century and a half. It can be divided into three main stages: Stage I – the study of speech

disorders, motor and sensory functions with corresponding unilateral brain lesions; Stage II – the study of neuropsychological characteristics of patients who underwent dissection of the corpus callosum connecting both hemispheres (patients with a split brain); Stage III – the formulation of the main theoretical provisions on the interhemispheric asymmetry of the human brain (Rebrova, Chernysheva, 2004).

By now, the interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain has been well studied. Summarizing the data of the available scientific works on the interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain, it is advisable to first give a brief overview of the current state of science on the issues of interest to us. In all this abundance and variety of scientific works, five main trends can be distinguished.

1) Neurobiological and neurophysiological aspects of interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain are considered in the works of B.F. Sergeeva (1984; 2010a; 2010b; 2010c); N.P. Bekhtereva (2007), M. Gazzaniga (2017), N.P. Rebrova and M.P. Chernysheva (2004), K. Frith (2015), S. Springer and G. Deitch (1983), K. Thomson (2015), S.M. Kosslin and J.W. Miller (2016).

2) Consideration of mainly medical problems of interhemispheric asymmetry is devoted to the works of S. Keane (2015), P. Whybrow (2016), G. Marsh (2016).

3) The analysis of specific differences in the structure and functioning of the brain in men and women are devoted to the works of Joyce Brothers (1993), V.D. Eremeeva and T.P. Khrizman (1998), A. Moir and D. Jessel (1992), Alan Pease and Barbara Pease (2010; 2012a; 2012b; 2014; 2017a; 2017b); V.L. Bianki and I.B. Filippova (1993).

4) The features of individual differences in the brain, as well as consideration of the functional differences between the hemispheric asymmetry of the brain in right-handers and left-handers, are devoted to the works of V. Moskvin and N.V. Moskvina (2011), Khomskaya E.D., Efimova I.V. and others (1997).

5) Some aspects of the interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain from the point of view of psycholinguistics are considered in the works of A.A. Leontiev (2014), D. Slobina and J. Green (2006), T.V. Chernigovskaya (2017).

A review of the above literature leads to the following conclusions. In works devoted to the interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain, the main attention is paid to the psychological, neurophysiological, neurolinguistic, psycholinguistic, medical, social and pedagogical aspects of the problem. These works also present the solution of various practical problems related to such issues as: relationship between men and women and the solution of family problems; memory development; interpersonal communication and negotiation; problems of education and training of children and adolescents; better adaptation in society for left-handers; assistance to young people in choosing a profession, etc. These studies are, of course, very important, both theoretical and practical. However, in all of the above works, the researchers practically do not touch upon the philosophical aspects of the interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain. In this work, the author is most interested in the *philosophical aspects* of the interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain. This concerns, in particular, *how the process of cognition is carried out, and what influence this asymmetry has on the formation of an integral picture of the world in us*.

Based on the stated main goal, in this work we need to limit ourselves to a brief consideration of the following issues: 1) the method of brain research; 2) the logic of thinking and the algorithm for solving problems by the right and left hemispheres; 3) perception of spoken and written speech by the left and right hemispheres; 4) perception of pictures and visual images by the left and right hemispheres of the brain;

and 5) differences in the method of processing and storing information by each of the hemispheres.

Let's start with the fact that according to modern scientific concepts, our brain is *a paired organ*, because it consists of two large hemispheres. The fact that the brain is a paired organ also means that in *the implementation of any mental function, both hemispheres of the brain are involved*. Interhemispheric interactions characterize the integrative features of the brain. Therefore, when it comes to functional asymmetry in the work of the brain, it must be borne in mind that we are talking more about the predominance of one or another hemisphere in each specific process. Of course, the differences between the right and left hemispheres should not be absolutized. Both hemispheres complement each other – like the left and right hand. For example, when we lace up shoelaces or perform any other operation, both hands are involved to some extent.

THE BRAIN AND METHODS OF ITS RESEARCH

As is well known, the brain consists of two *cerebral hemispheres – left and right*. But how are they different? What happens if you inactivate one of the cerebral hemispheres? And how can one of the hemispheres be inactivated? In experiments, two main methods are usually used – *electrical* and *chemical*. The essence of the *electrical* method for examining the brain is that electrodes are applied to the patient's head through which an electric current is passed. Nerve cells exchange information using weak electrical impulses. If weak currents are applied to the brain, then this or that part of the brain is activated in this way. If you supply stronger current with a voltage of up to 100 volts, then it completely disrupts the brain. The parts of the brain that have been exposed to a strong electric current stop functioning for a while. It is possible to position the electrodes on the head in such a way that only one hemisphere, right or left, is turned off (inactivated) (Sergeev, 2010a). In other words, when a weak electrical signal is applied, a command is sent to activate one or another area, and when a strong signal is applied, a "protection" is triggered, as a result of which the system is de-energized and paralyzed for a while; it is inactivated until its normal functioning is restored.

The *chemical* method of research is similar to the electrical one. Various substances are supplied to the brain. Depending on the substance supplied to the brain, its dosage, and in which part of the brain this substance is supplied, it is also possible to achieve their activation or inactivation. Another variation of the same chemical research method is the use of the Wada test. The Wada test is named after the Japanese scientist who developed it. During this test, sodium amytal (a hypnotic from the group of barbiturates) is injected into the right or left carotid artery. The carotid artery supplies blood to only one hemisphere and sodium amytal enters one hemisphere, anesthetizing it. Thus, the work of one of the hemispheres is suppressed (Rebrova, Chernysheva, 2004). Since the beginning of the 90s, the improvement of equipment for brain scanning has led to the fact that it became possible to see changes in the process of brain functioning on a television screen or on a computer monitor using tomography based on positron emission and magnetic resonance (Pease, Pease, 2014). The use of magnetic resonance, by which the electrical activity of the brain is measured, opens up wide prospects for the study of the functioning of the brain, and also makes it possible today to identify and measure the exact location of many specific functions in the brain. With the help of equipment for scanning the brain, it is possible to trace which part of the brain is engaged in solving a particular problem (Pease, Pease, 2014).

Of course, there are specific features of the functioning of the brain in men and women, in right-handers and left-handers, etc. In addition, there are also individual differences in the interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain, which can also be very significant. However, consideration of these features is beyond the scope of this work. You need to understand that any scientific theory presupposes some kind of schematization and a certain simplification, some kind of idealization, which makes it possible to reveal certain aspects more vividly, more clearly. And this is precisely what allows one to abstract from some insignificant details and make generalizations. So, for example, in physics such a concept as "ideal gas" is used, although in nature ideal gas does not exist. Just as in physics the concept of "ideal gas" is considered, in this work we will consider the "ideal brain". We emphasize once again that in any kind of activity, one way or another, both hemispheres of the brain take part. In this sense, concepts such as left-brain or right-brain thinking in their purest form can only be used in relation to the concept of “ideal brain”. So, we briefly reviewed the *methodology* for conducting brain research. Now it is possible to move on from the methodology to the *content* of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Functioning of the cerebral hemispheres and interhemispheric asymmetry of the brain

What we know about the functioning of the cerebral hemispheres:

1) The left hemisphere controls the work of the right half of the body, and the right hemisphere, respectively, controls the left half of the body.

2) Each of the hemispheres has its own separate consciousness and thinks autonomously from each other. That is, the consciousness of each of us is internally “split”. What we realize as consciousness is that one of the hemispheres takes on the role of the main, leading one. But they both work in the interests of a single whole. If, for any reason, coordination in the work of the hemispheres in a person is disturbed, and then both of them become the “main”, then this is already pathology.

3) Our left hemisphere is logic, mathematics, speech center, and accordingly, it is mathematical, logical and verbal-logical thinking. The right hemisphere is all our feelings, emotions, images, associations, intuition, spatial thinking.

What happens if one person inactivates the left cerebral hemisphere, and the right of another? What changes occur in a person with a split brain?

Logic of thinking and algorithms for solving problems by the left and right hemispheres of the brain

The hemispheres solve logic problems in different ways. The left hemisphere solves theoretically solely based on the data contained in the problem itself. It is responsible for the correctness and consistency of mental operations. And the right one solves the problem empirically, correlating the answer with the real state of affairs, with one's own experience. By rejecting false premises, it arrives at the correct answer. This is due to the fact that the right hemisphere compares the information existing in memory with real information, as well as the fact that it is the right hemisphere that forms broad associations based on generalization (Rebrova, Chernysheva, 2004). If one person inactivates the right hemisphere, and the other – the left and a man gives both the same task. For example, ask both of them the same question: “Fishermen are fishing

on the shore. The question is: Is there a fish in the river?" What answer do we get? A person with a working left hemisphere, but with an inactivated right, will say: "Since they are fishing, then there is fish there. Otherwise they wouldn't be standing there". And a man with a working right, but with an inactivated left, will say: "Let's see what they catch." The answer seems to be essentially the same. But *the approach to solving* the problem in both cases is completely different.

Both the left and right hemispheres have their pros and cons. The left hemisphere, solving any problem, solves it sequentially, from beginning to end, performing all intermediate actions, without missing a single link. The main "plus" of the left hemisphere *is accuracy, precision and clarity*. The downside to this is that it is *long* and *cumbersome*. In addition, if the left hemisphere is faced with a lack of input, or if the logical chain breaks somewhere, then it often cannot solve the problem at all. The left hemisphere can be thought of as a kind of computer analog. More precisely, on the contrary, this computer is an analogue of the left hemisphere, albeit imperfect. But, in no case, the computer cannot be an analogue of the right hemisphere, since the right hemisphere has a completely different principle of operation. The left hemisphere works like a computer, which sequentially, according to a given algorithm, solves a particular problem. Both the computer and the left hemisphere follow a certain logical-mathematical model.

The right hemisphere, solving any problem, does not solve it consistently, from beginning to end. And it can immediately give a finished result, relying on *intuition* and *"inner feeling"*, but it cannot guarantee that the chosen option is correct. Here we can rather speak of a probabilistic approach. That is, the right hemisphere gives not exact, but *"indicative"*, *"approximate"* options for solving the problem. This is the downside of speed, performance and relative "independence" from input data. The right hemisphere can see some kind of analogy, similarity, a certain picture or image, which may not have anything to do *with this particular* task. *The nature of the connection here may not be sequential or causal (like in the left hemisphere), but associative, symbolic, or even purely random*. The right hemisphere can see what no logic can achieve, because the solution it gives out does not directly follow from any logical and mathematical models that imply an algorithm for sequentially solving the problem. Its main advantages are *speed* and *performance* in information processing. In addition, since the lack of input data or a break in a logical chain does not matter much for the right hemisphere, it does not "hang out" in such cases as a computer.

It is possible to consider this with a specific example. Everyone must have watched programs like "Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?" You are asked a question, and four possible answers are offered, of which only one is correct. You need to make a choice. Suppose you don't know the correct answer. But intuition or some kind of "inner feeling" tells you which of the options you should choose. And very often it turns out that you made the right choice, although you yourself cannot logically explain why you chose this answer. In life, we most often have to make various decisions in conditions of limited time and lack of input data. What is the use of a perfect correct decision when, for example, a commander during a battle needs to make decisions immediately? Or in a situation where the pilot of an aircraft must make an emergency landing in the event of an engine failure or for some other reason? What is the use of even the best solution to the problem for the pilot after the plane with the pilot crashed? When speed is the decisive factor in making a decision, and it is necessary to act immediately, then very often even an incorrectly made decision can be better than its absence, or a correctly made, but already *belated* decision.

Perception of spoken and written speech by the left and right hemispheres of the brain

A person with a working left, but with an inactivated right hemisphere, is fluent in speech. The voice of such a person with an inactivated right hemisphere is changing. Speech loses its normal *tempo* and *rhythm*. *Stresses* in words are not where they should be. He is not able to distinguish between the meanings of words that differ from each other in the difference in stress. So, for example, in Russian, a different place of stress in the same word can change the meaning of the word: *flour and agony, castle and lock, large and larger*, etc. It is often difficult to immediately understand what such a person wanted to say (Sergeev, 2010b). A person with a working left, but with an inactivated right hemisphere, does not distinguish the *timbre* of his voice. He cannot distinguish a man's voice from a woman's, a child's voice from an adult's, and he cannot even recognize people he knows well by their voices (Sergeev, 2010b). The left hemisphere does not perceive the *tone* of the voice. A person with an inactivated right hemisphere is not able to distinguish the meaning of a phrase said in a different tone. The *intonation* of speech in a person with an inactivated right hemisphere becomes "floating". It is impossible to tell by intonation, he says something or asks a question. He understands speech by ear, but cannot distinguish an interrogative from a declarative sentence. By intonation, he is not able to guess whether they praise him or scold him (Sergeev, 2010a).

If we say a phrase like "How smart you are!" in a different tone, then the meaning of what is said can change from literal understanding, i.e. expressions of admiration, to the exact opposite meaning – sarcasm and ridicule. That is, the left hemisphere does not perceive things such as *admiration, sarcasm, irony, satire, humor*, etc. All of them are deciphered by the right hemisphere. A person with an inactivated right hemisphere understands only the *literal meaning of the text*, that is, as formulated, he understands word for word. He is unable to understand hints, various figurative expressions and idioms. Various literary techniques, such as: figurative expressions, images, metaphors, allegories, euphemisms, hyperbole, etc. – they are all deciphered by the right hemisphere. Thanks to this ability, the right hemisphere is also called creative, artistic. *The right hemisphere has absolutely no grammar. Even with such elementary concepts as singular and plural, past, present and future tense, it does not capture the relationship between a subject and an object* (Sergeev, 2010a).

If write a dictation with people who have one of the hemispheres inactivated: *a house, a table, a chair, a tree, a person*, etc., then the right-hemisphere person will not write, but draw all these objects, and the left-hemisphere person will spell *"house" , "table", "chair"*, etc. or he will draw a regular geometric figure instead: a table – a square, a tree – a rectangle, etc. (Sergeev, 2010b). The left hemisphere is responsible for reading and writing in a person, and when the right one is inactivated, the left one copes with this task. But this is only if we are talking about Europeans and the letter system of writing. If a person is inactivated the left hemisphere, then he will lose the ability to read and write. But for the Chinese, Japanese and others who use hieroglyphic writing, everything will be the opposite. They retain the ability to read and write when the left hemisphere is inactivated, since hieroglyphic writing is perceived by the right hemisphere. A hieroglyph is a schematized drawing, a picture, a separate image. If they turn off their right hemisphere, they lose the ability to recognize hieroglyphs. Thus, *all languages can be divided into two types: right hemisphere – all tonal and all using*

hieroglyphic writing (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Thai, etc.), and left hemisphere – all the rest – non-tonal and using alphabetical writing (European languages and etc.). According to languages, all civilizations can also be conditionally divided into two main types – left-brain and right-brain civilizations.

Perception of pictures and visual images by the left and right hemispheres of the brain

Let us consider the differences in the perception of the same picture by the left and right hemispheres of the brain using two examples. *First example*. If you show them the same picture of a cow, they both know that it is a cow. But if a cow has two heads, two udders, two tails, the head is disproportionate to the body, or the ears are disproportionate to the head, then how will their perception differ? A person with a working right, but with an inactivated left, learns that it is a cow, and will notice all the inaccuracies in the picture. And a person with a working left, but with an inactivated right hemisphere, also learns that it is a cow, but will not notice anything unusual there. And he will not be able to distinguish from the first picture. Why it happens this way is not difficult to understand from the second example. *Second example*. What happens if people with one inactivated hemisphere are shown portraits of the work in the style of Arcimboldo. Giuseppe Arcimboldo (1526 or 1527-1593) – Italian painter and decorator, one of the representatives of Mannerism. In his work, many critics of the 20th century see an anticipation of surrealism. Paintings and portraits of his work are made in the form of an unusual combination of objects, plants and animals. For greater clarity, below we show examples of portraits by Arcimboldo.

Figure 1. Librarian ; **Figure 2.** Autumn

Experiments with portraits of Arcimboldo showed that the left hemisphere can distinguish and see only details, components from different objects, fruits and vegetables, while the right hemisphere sees a “person” (Keane, 2015). In other words, the right hemisphere captures integral images (the right one sees the forest, and the left one sees the trees in this forest) (Rebrova, Chernysheva, 2004). And it is *the right hemisphere that can generalize many features and perceive holistic images* more adequately (Rebrova, Chernysheva, 2004). And there is one more important point

concerning the *processing of information* by the right and left hemispheres. *The left hemisphere is not interested in the entire amount of information, but snatches out of it only what it considers most important*. In this respect, it works like a camera, taking selectively individual pictures. Therefore, it turns out to be a depleted picture, which is very far from reality. The world around us is three-dimensional, and photography gives a plane image (Sergeev, 2010b). *The right hemisphere collects comprehensive information about the world around it, and it uses a holographic method of storing it*. The holographic approach to information processing provides many advantages, one of which is noise immunity. When photographing an object against the sun, for example, we risk exposing the film. With the holographic method, the addition of sunlight is not a hindrance. The wave field contains so much information that no "noise" can completely distort or "drown" it (Sergeev, 2010b).

CONCLUSION

Having considered the main functional differences between the right and left cerebral hemispheres, it is possible to summarize and draw the following conclusions:

1) *All exact sciences – mathematics, physics, chemistry, etc. – they are all based on the predominant work of the left hemisphere*.

2) *All arts are based primarily on work and right brain dominance*.

3) *Only philosophy seeks to fully rely on the work of both hemispheres of the brain at once. This allows philosophy to most effectively use the available opportunities and strengths of both hemispheres. For this reason alone, in the author's opinion, only philosophy can claim the role of "science of sciences".*

4) At the very beginning of this work, the fact that representatives of each science consider their own science to be the main one was reviewed. But then the question arises: can mathematics, for example, be considered the "queen of all sciences" if it is based mainly on the work of only one left hemisphere? The real "science of sciences" should be more perfect, and it cannot be based on the work of only one of the hemispheres. For the same reason, it is impossible to call all types of art perfect, since they, too, are based on the work of only one hemisphere – the right one.

If we approve that philosophy is a science that relies on science – physics, chemistry, biology, that philosophy also relies on scientific methodology, mathematics and logic, then, therefore, it is a purely *left-brain type of thinking*. Unlike all separate, private sciences, such as mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, history, philosophy seeks to create a holistic picture of the world based on the data of these sciences. And when we try to collect data from all sciences into a single, interconnected picture, then all inaccuracies, all disproportions and distortions become noticeable. It's like in the examples which have been given of the perception of an image – a cow or paintings by Giuseppe Arcimboldo. *And only the right hemisphere can create a complete picture for us*. Since it is the right hemisphere of the brain that creates a complete picture of the world, and feelings and emotions are precisely the right hemisphere, it follows from this that any attempt to build a holistic picture of the world is inevitably associated with its sensory and emotional coloring, it is inseparable from *evaluative categories* ethics and aesthetics, such as *good and evil, beautiful and ugly, moral and immoral*, etc. That is, any attempt to create an integral picture of the world is inseparable from our sensory and emotional perception of it. The positivists, led by Auguste Comte, believed that science only states and describes facts, and it answers the question "how", not "why". At the

same time, the positivists defended a fundamental rejection of any evaluative categories as an "unscientific approach".

But the problem lies precisely in the fact that *if only we try to remove from the integral picture of the world our sensory-figurative perception and all evaluative categories, and this is exactly what the adherents of positivism tried to implement, then our holistic, single picture of the world will inevitably collapse. And the construction of a single picture of the world becomes simply impossible*. Therefore, the *worldview* is inseparable from such concepts as *attitude*. That is, the world is like this precisely because I feel it like that. Therefore, philosophy is not only a worldview and attitude, but philosophy is also my *subjective attitude to the world*, and it is also such a way of life. And a person leads just such a *lifestyle* and acts in exactly this way in accordance with his *beliefs*. That is, I lead just such a way of life, and I act in this way, and not otherwise, not only because it is *objectively* the most rational, but also because I perceive the world in this way, I evaluate it this way, I find my *subjective truth*, and this is my attitude to the world.

REFERENCES

1 Bekhtereva, N.P. (2007). The magic of the brain and the labyrinth of life. Moscow: AST; SPb: Sova.
2 Bianki, V.L., Filippova, I.B. (1993). Brain asymmetry and gender. L .: Nauka.
3 Brothers, J. (1993). What every woman should know about men. Moscow: Author.
4 Chernigovskaya, T.V. (2017). Cheshire smile of Schrödinger's cat. Language and Consciousness. Moscow: YASK.
5 Eremeeva, V.D., Khrizman, T.P. (1998). Boys and girls: two different worlds. Moscow: Linka-Press.
6 Frith, Ch. Brain and Soul. (2015). How nervous activity shapes our inner world. Moscow: Astrel, Corpus.
7 Gazzaniga, M. (2017). Who is in charge? Free will from a neuroscience perspective. Moscow: Corpus.
8 Keane, S. (2015). The tale of the dueling neurosurgeons. How the mysteries of the brain were discovered and why the death of one king could turn science around. Moscow: Eksmo.
9 Khomskaya, E.D., Efimova, I.V., Budyka, E.V., Enikolopova, E.V. (1997). Neuropsychology of individual differences. Moscow: Russian pedagogical agency.
10 Kosslyn, S.M., Miller, J.W. (2016). Two players on the same brain field. Moscow: Publishing house "E".
11 Leontiev, A.A. (2014). Language, speech, speech activity. Moscow: Lenand.
12 March, G. (2016). Do No Harm: Stories of Life, Death, and Brain Surgery. Moscow: Eksmo.
13 (1956). Memories of Marx and Engels. Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
14 Moir, A., Jessel, D. (1992). Brain sex: the difference between men and woman. New York: Dell Publishing.
15 Moskvin, V.A., Moskvina, N.V. (2011). Interhemispheric asymmetries and individual differences in a person. Moscow: Smysl.
16 Pease, A, Pease, B. (2012a). Charisma. The art of successful communication. Moscow: Eksmo.
17 Pease, A, Pease, B. (2010). How to make a man listen and a woman to be silent. Why we are so different, but we need each other so much. Moscow: Eksmo-Press.

18 Pease, A, Pease, B. (2017a). Speak exactly ... How to combine the joy of communication and the benefits of persuasion. Moscow: Publishing house "E".
19 Pease, A, Pease, B. (2017b). Why do men lie and women roar? Moscow: Eksmo-Press
20 Pease, A, Pease, B. (2012b). Why do men want sex and women love? Moscow: Eksmo
21 Pease, A, Pease, B. (2014). Language of relationships. Man and woman. Moscow: Eksmo
22 Rebrova, N.P., Chernysheva, M.P. (2004). Functional hemispheric asymmetry of the human brain and mental processes. SPb.: Speech.
23 Sergeev, B.F. (2010a). Brain paradoxes. Ed. 3rd, rev. Moscow: KRASAND.
24 Sergeev, B.F. (1984). Mind is good ... is 2 even better? Moscow: Young Guard.
25 Sergeev, B.F. (2010b). The highest form of organized matter: tales of the brain. Ed. 2nd, rev. Moscow: KRASAND.
26 Sergeev, B.F. (2010c). The phenomenon of functional asymmetry of the brain. Ed. 2nd, rev. Moscow: KomKniga.
27 Slobin, D., Green, J. (2006). Psycholinguistics. Chomsky and Psychology. Ed. 4th rev. Moscow: KomKniga.
28 Springer, S., Deutsch, G. (1983). Left brain, right brain. Moscow: Mir.
29 Thomson, K. (2015). Anatomy of the soul. Surprising connection between neuroscience and spiritual practices. Moscow: Triada.
30 Wybrow, P. (2016). Brain. Fine tuning. Our life from the point of view of neuroscience. Moscow: Alpina publisher.