

A Dimensional Biogenetic View. And The Much More.

By Kevin A. Sensenig

Draft 1.17

2020 April 20 – 2020 May 1

Introduction

A dimensional biogenetic view, the body, then the brain, the mind, and their function. And the much more.

Part 1: The Basics, A Dimensional View To Biogenetics

If it is indeed a biogenetic malfunction that occurs, that is the root of the (what would now be realistically described) disorder, then perhaps other biogenetic regions in the brain can be used to correct (suddenly or over time) the malfunction region in the brain.

Another statement: the brain is a multiprocessing, distributed computer. Perhaps even it is the case that each brain cell has or is one or more molecular or quantum-aware computers, and that then in either case, the entire brain can be thought of in computing-functional terms. Of course, the entire brain is cells and molecules – and the relational! DNA is molecules, and molecular computing in its very action (says a book I have, called "Molecular Computing"). According to that book, molecular computers are very energy-efficient compared to our classical computers. And according to computer scientist Alan Kay (inventor, object-oriented programming, Smalltalk, Alto, Xerox PARC, studied biology as an undergrad) even the tiny e-coli bacterium has vast amounts of parallel computing effect. And our cells are much larger, with more parts.

So this should be efficient! And it can intersect what the brain does – the mind! (Minsky writes in his book *The Society Of Mind* that “Minds are what brains do.” So, my thinking goes, if we want to study the brain, and obviously to study what it does, one way to do that is to and one should study the mind!) And – we can represent truth and hold a view, in mind; and we can work with that. We might get stuck, or face dilemma, or explain and discuss merit. We should be able to discuss all of this, think about it, contemplate it, and take action or be still.

This is consistent, then, with 1) adaptability of the brain; 2) the computational view; 3) reflection, principle, and change; and 4) the practical. It also may tap into Buddhist ideas on the mind, the world, reality, dukkha or its resolution, and the mind – and one’s everyday life.

It’s also consistent with vocabulary. And, since thought modifies the brain (insert a new thought into thought space, or see it realized) – or at least thought-perception is obviously always shifting, even with consistent view – even if one gets stuck, one can come up with new Ways To Think (Minsky, *The*

Emotion Machine) or debug the wonderful machines we are (Minsky, *The Society Of Mind, Inventive Minds*).

But there's nothing to say that the functioning regions of the brain can't potentially correct any bug, malfunction, or dilemma – importantly, in conjunction with the world-space.

But the entire brain (and us) is biogenetic-world-space. It is also mind or computing or both. It is the three nen sensation -> perception -> synthesis/reason. We have the six sense grounds: eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, mind. We have reality.

This, obviously, again undercuts the permanent biogenetic malfunction view and theory. It also alters psychiatric and psych unit praxis.

Furthermore, Biogenetics creates this entire human, and interacts with or is the mind – except that there is this thing that the human and mind is in the same space as: the world.

So we can consider, from the first part, that 1) the mind intersects or is represented by the biogenetics; 2) that even if the biogenetics created the mind, we can then work with the mind – on the biology, biological structures, and bio-computing (that is the actual nature of the biogenetic architecture!), in conjunction with unfolding biogenetics; 3) that there is this thing called world, and that this is important; 4) the biogenetics created the neurobio, so we can look to neuroscience, which discusses such things as cognitive maps, social maps, learning, training, decision points, spatial maps, and the temporal-spatial.

Psychiatric theory takes none of this into account, including the mind and world-space; nor any of these points, including the neuroscience implications and vocabulary.

And since we're talking of the mind as being entirely relevant, we can step to Minsky and Buddhism!

Part 2: A Dimensional Biogenetic View, The Body, Then The Brain, The Mind, And Their Function. And The Much More.

If biogenetics produces the brain, it actually produces the entire body and the architecture of the body. Ongoing energy, nutrients, water, motion, and breath continue the ongoing body, with an unfolding architecture. Ongoing thinking, perception, and reasoning occur in the brain-as-mind. Our Ways To Think are embodied in the mind, and in the brain-as-mind. This ongoing, unfolding set of processes is then beyond biogenetics – except how that interacts with these, and supports its natural function. Actually, this is one unfolding architecture-and-processes. If the brain produces the mind, it is actually the case that it is the mind – and by working with the mind, we are working with the brain. We can also see it as the brain-as-mind working with itself.[1] Since we work with and are aware of the mind, we are working with and aware of this brain-as-mind. So if we re-map something in mind, we are re-mapping something in the brain, the brain-as-mind. It is the mind.

If we see the mind as something, and the brain as another, and see that both are mutually conditioning, that they intersect in a nondual way, then we have another view. We can see here that we can work with both the brain and the mind, each in their own way, and at the same time as their mutually-conditioning, intersecting, nondual way.

With the brain-as-mind view, we can see also that the architecture of the body – and of the brain-as-mind – can be scrutinized and ascertained to some degree. One view of this might be computational, and molecular computing might be something that one considers. Another view might be the physical structure to the brain, and how it arranges things. Another might be the mutable, intersecting, interacting, mutually dependent aspects to the body, including the brain-as-mind. Another might be what remains more stable (like bone, changing only in shape and size and strength through growth or in strength via nutrition or electrostatically through exercise/stress/use conditions) and what change more quickly (other organs, in response to the presence of nutrients and water, or in response to natural states, or in response to an outside illness-agent or injury). We can discuss various states of mutability.

And we can note where body responses are in conjunction with what arises in the mind – the mind, the brain-as-mind, or the mind intersecting the brain in a mutually conditioned, nondual way – and in response external conditions (again, through the mind or, in addition, other sense contact).

Minsky proposes what I term combinatorial principle unfolding interconnected relational action-memes in his book *The Society Of Mind*. In his book *The Emotion Machine* he describes things a different way, relying on different terminology (resources and types of interconnected layers, and many Ways To Think, and how we respond to others and work in the world).[2] Both are tremendously instructive, brilliant models of the mind and how we think. We can scrutinize this and reason and introspect about it. Furthermore, Minsky works with the premise that no matter what the exact nature of the physical brain is, or the latest in neuroscience, it's quite clear that we learn and use and change our Ways To Think by – thinking, and being aware, and developing mental strategies – in mind!

When we work with, realize, use, and change our Ways To Think (Minsky's term, *The Emotion Machine*), we're actually this working-with, realizing, using, and changing brain-as-mind itself; or if it's mind intersecting brain in a mutually conditioning, nondual way, then a similar thing is happening, with both mind, brain, and mind-brain, one unfolding no-thing (the world-space is involved, too, again in a nondual way, either in its arising in this or that way, or not-arising, in this or that way – pratityasamutpada (dependent arising)). In other words, we're operating at least with mind, or with brain-as-mind, and if it's brain-as-mind, or if that's part of the picture, then this functional unfolding is itself what is happening. We're actually working with the mind, then, and both the architecture and processes that are set up by the biogenetics, and that they are a part of. We're this very working-with, realizing, using, and changing this, in brain-as-mind or in mind intersecting brain (in the mutually conditioningnondual way). We're being very sophisticated, Minsky would argue, in developing our view of the world and our own thoughts, and how to recognize and navigate it, and in developing and using and refining reasoning and common sense. (See *The Society Of Mind* and *The Emotion Machine* for wonderful diagrams and descriptions of what Minsky proposes as how the mind works, and our various mental strategies.)

This would be mind – brain-as-mind or mind intersecting brain in mutually conditioning, nondual ways. Either way, we work with the mind, in our day to day lives.

A Dimensional Biogenetic View. And The Much More.
Page 3 of 10

Drugs that affect the mind – psychiatric meds, street drugs, and caffeine – each have their own effect; and it appears to be material, physical, matter. But they affect the mind, and we can talk about that. Either brain-as-mind or mind intersecting brain in a non-dual way. In either case, we note that there is the effect of the physical drug – and is the drug mind? Is the drug strictly physical? If it is strictly physical, we can talk about how the physical drug alters the brain-as-mind, and can also talk about the mental aspects retained and different ones now present and points in between. We can note the changes to relationships of things, or what we notice between. We find that to one degree or another or in various ways we can still work with the mind. It is manifest and a fact, a reality. This cannot be overlooked. We can also talk about the computational aspects of the brain-as-mind and the mind. We can talk about how a drug or thinking is that and influences or changes that.

So with or without a drug, the person can work with the mind in this or that way. (The ways available may be altered by the drug. Others may be the same as, and others will be similar to the person's non-drug mind.) We should emphasize this. In both cases, we can consider the architecture of the brain, mutability, various mental states, and various physical states. We can describe them. We can discuss the individual and Nagarjuna's four reliable facts: reason, the external world, the present moment, and reality – this world – seemingly similar to God; and the individual can take this up for himself or herself. We can discuss Nagarjuna's statement that when we see the fusion of the abstract and the concrete, we see the real world. We can discuss the individual, the universal, the family, the state, and society. (See Hegel.) We can discuss understanding, thought, speech, action, livelihood, effort, awareness, concentration. (See the Buddha.) We can discuss how we inherit, work with, and pass on entire cultures. (Minsky.) We can discuss Sekida's observation that the breath and how we inhale and exhale and rely on our tanden is directly connected with our thoughts, speech, and action. We can note St. Paul's suggestion, "And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God." (Romans 12:2.) We might notice that indeed mental processes are different when we take up deep breathing, and concentrate on the thought space (the space between) or release our thoughts – within an awareness space. This is what mindfulness talks about. We should bring these to the table, whether the person is on a drug or clear of any drug.

Furthermore, as indicated there are culture, understanding, view – or, I might dare suggest – ideas. These are held in – mind! And have direct implications for thought, speech, and action, even livelihood, effort, and awareness. And these are mutually interconnected. This is all extraordinarily material to psychiatry, especially psych unit psychiatry, because it does not talk about anything like this. Yet these things that I've mentioned, the everyday, and these things as they intersect the everyday and vice-versa, are us, and we-and-this-very-world. As I indicate, psych unit psychiatry is particularly dismal. All of 'all of the above' is omitted, rejected, and contradicted a-priori, in its theory and praxis. The individual is not participant.

Yet another point: Sometimes we need to explain. Sometimes the individual needs the opportunity to explain. Sometimes we need to discuss dilemma and no dilemma from multiple angles across the domains of life (the mental, the existential, the social, the societal, the experiential, the physical). Sometimes we need to discuss a situation, its context, its meaning, and our personal stories and reasoning. Sometimes we need to discuss merit and demerit. Sometimes we need to let the individual change or switch in his or her own mind or action. We should do so. In particular, psychiatry and

psych unit psychiatry should do so. Psych unit psychiatry does none of this. Instead, it postulates and acts to impose a determination of the individual in terms of only absolute deficiency – omitting ‘all of the above’!

The psychiatric field should be aware of all of this, and should think in these terms. Right now, it talks only of physical mechanisms of a psychiatric drug, and not even the mental space or mental-states aspect to them, much less how they intersect ‘all of the above’, that can be discussed with the individual (particularly the case with a psych unit psychiatrist). It has no idea to introduce ‘all of the above’ to the table, and it preempts in the first place ‘all of the above’. Its vocabulary is lacking because it sees in terms of – its world-view is in terms of – only disorders, the disorders paradigm, and a narrow interpretation of an already limited view, biogenetics. It is a narrow interpretation unless you dimension out biogenetics to the very architecture and function of the body, brain-as-mind, types of things these are (including the relational, constancy-mutability-dynamic-functional, and the computational-aware-perception-reasoning aspects), and body-breath-mind-world-space. Psychiatry needs to step to and appreciate dimensional biogenetics. But even dimensional biogenetics does not include or explain the world-space, nor the ongoing factors listed above, the content and working material. That is, my extension of biogenetics does not explain or include significant aspects of ‘all of the above’. It needs to be updated to my mvo-p concise term. And psychiatry need to step to mvo-p psych, ‘all of the above’, and the much more (a dimensional biogenetics and that which is beyond dimensional biogenetics, and that even dimensional biogenetics only contributes to, in its own way) indicated here – up to the world-space and including the many resources in this very world. This then would include a deeper and dimension approach to science, the art and philosophy and spirituality and religion and psychology and narrative and dialogic and fact of life, and ‘all of the above’.

Footnotes

1. And how does the biogenetics in this at-once-and-unfolding process set up the architecture and processes then interact and support the ongoing architecture and processes? One might ask, with respect to the brain, the brain-as-mind, are new points and structures within the architecture and processes inserted over time? Or some existing ones altered or removed? How does this change or support existing processes? How does this manifest in the computational or neuroscience aspects? And then: how are things that we work with and perceive in mind evidenced? Things like perception, apperception, understanding, thought, reasoning, recognition, perception, orientation within this or that world, part of the world, things constant and things changed or new things introduced. How does it support and change our Ways To Think? And one would ask, are new brain cells introduced, and are existing ones changed, or modified in structure, and regions and types of these? How do these interact? What is embodied in each brain cell, their connections, and their mutual-connected states? From neuroscience, Minsky writes, the brain is extraordinarily complex, with vast amounts of mutually supporting and interacting resources. And this would be brain-as-mind, or mind intersecting brain in a mutually-conditioning, nondual way.
2. I myself bring Zen to Minsky, really enjoy, learn from, and dimension out his theories and ideas (which are already dimension), then make some corrections and insert insight-points. Minsky is a tremendous resource that would be part of mvo-p psych. I recommend his works for the psych professional, along with other material so indicated.

Part 3: Various Ways To See Either The Brain-As-Mind, Or Mind Intersecting And Interacting With The Brain

In brain-as-mind, we see the brain, in its very operational, functional, functioning, as being itself the mind. The mind is just this very brain, operational, functional, functioning; and it is the mind that we perceive, think with, and generate thoughts, speech and action with. We edit the mind – and this very editing is to edit the brain, the brain-as-mind.

This is at least the situation. It may also be possible, as I mention in the above, that it is brain intersecting and interacting with mind, mutually conditioning, in a nondual way. They are in that case things we can talk about, just nondual. (Is the tree mind or not? If it's generated a perception in one's mind, and is at-once, unfolding-present-moment, and representing, projecting, feeling, and noticing: is the tree mind or not – as it is, and as perceived and represented in one's mind? Yet we can speak of the tree, and we can speak of one's mind. They are not one, not two, one space. This, too, is the nondual.)

We can ask, with a domains of life realization or at-ease nature, is this manifest in the brain-as-matter (the biological states) or brain-as-mind or both? We can ask, with a domains of life dilemma or problem, is this manifest in the brain-as-matter (the biological states) or brain-as-mind or both?

Brain-as-mind includes understanding, thoughts, reasoning, and perception. It includes views and standpoints. Can we see this on the brain-as-matter (the biological states) level? Likely not: it would be at least on the relational of the neurons level (the fusion of the abstract and the concrete) or on the 'combinatorial principle unfolding interconnected relational action-memes' level (also the fusion of the abstract and the concrete), perhaps something even deeper, perhaps mind itself.

Dogen says that we have matter, feeling, thinking, enaction, consciousness; and that the immaterial is matter, and matter is the immaterial, and so forth for the others. [1] We should keep all of this in mind, in contemplating psychiatry and the psychiatric theory of biogenetic malfunction, which is an extremely narrow view that excludes all such consideration, thinking, reality, and actuality.

Footnotes

1. See *Maka-Hanna-Haramitsu* in *Shobogenzo* by Dogen translated by Nishijima and Cross.

Part 4: The Psychiatric Model

The psychiatric model, it is my understanding (and I have to verify this) is that there are objective disorders that can be determined by the individual's speech and action, perhaps pointing to thought, according to the DSM (Diagnostic And Statistical Manual Of Mental Disorders). These disorders, as described in the DSM, according to the psychiatric model, are biological in nature, and are passed down genetically (that is, via genetic inheritance).

It does not describe in its theory, evidence in its praxis, nor discuss and work with the individual using or with respect to the key terms and their actuality, from neuroscience, that I cite above: cognitive maps, social maps, physical maps, learning, training, decision points and structures, perception and apperception, spatial maps, and the spatial-temporal. (See the Scientific American article listed below; and see Marvin Minsky's work, which seems to reflect – and take beyond – just this sort of thing.) And, to the best of my understanding, neuroscientist Caroline Leaf has books out about how we think and the attitudes we take can influence our own neuroscience-level functioning and structures. (One should review this for oneself; she also has an approach listed on the Web.)

There is absolutely no account or thought given – it is not part of the theory – as to the body-mind-architecture, much less body-mind-architecture-world-space-and-domains-of-life-nondual or body-mind-architecture-philosophy/spirituality-experiential-nondual. Nor is either brain-as-mind or brain intersecting and interacting with mind, in a mutually conditioning, nondual way, considered. Nor are the mental and physical realms considered, with the individual as participant, or in a dialogic manner. This entire paper is dimension, by comparison; and various features of it, I feel, point to the actual body-breath-brain-mind-architecture-process-world-space-etc. situation, and point to ways to work with an individual's situation, via mvo-p psych.

Part 5: Takuan's Ten Qualities, Inquiry, And A Tangible, Tractable Domain

For instance, Wittgenstein says that logical space is infinite, and you can always insert a point into logical space. He also says that each point in logical space has color. Now, we can derive that one can insert a point into logical space "somewhere out there", or in one's mind, or in one's brain-as-mind, or in one's brain-intersecting-and-interacting-with-mind-in-a-mutually-conditioning-nondual-way. Likewise, we can do this for any statement or in-mind perception that is of reality; as indicated, perhaps with the real and actual in mind – as determined, as noticed, or as an inquiry.

One can likewise introduce thought C to thoughts A and B. (This is the benefit of sunyata (emptiness): impermanence (and things are not fixed, including the state of things are not fixed), and things are without self-existent nature; and there is the relative.) So one looks for a stable situation; and in working from this stable situation, one can more readily see reality. One can see real benefit from this: it is potential and actual.

In addition, one might consult Takuan Soho's Ten Qualities: Form, Nature, Embodiment, Power, Function, Latent Cause, External Cause, Latent Effect, Manifest Effect, and the Total Inseparability of these. One can consider this for the domains of life (the mental, the existential, the social, the societal, the experiential, and the physical), for the various states (mental states, emotive states, intentional states, and physical states), for situations, and even for the brain-as-mind, or brain-intersecting-and-interacting-with-mind-in-a-mutually-conditioning-nondual-way, or body-breath-mind-world-space, or body-mind-architecture-philosophy/spiritual-world-space-experiential. See what you can formulate, and work with to tangible, tactile results in your own mind, world-space, and everyday existence. It is neither being nor non-being; but it is ever-present. And this occurs in the ever-unfolding-present-moment.

This, too, is the sort of thing mvo-p and mvo-p psych points to. Enjoy.

Related Papers

- [Introduction To Mvo-p And My MVO: 2019 Thesis](#)
- [The Concise Term \(Again!\) As One Way To View The Domain \(Mvo-p Psych\)](#)
- [The Universe Is A Catenation, The Digital Computer, The Abstract, The Concrete, And The Fusion Of The Abstract And The Concrete](#)
- [Structural Patterns In DNA Yielding Proto-specialists, And The Mapping Of Ideas](#)
- [DNA \(Or, Genetics\), Proto-Specialists, And An Unfolding World-Space](#)
- [Aha! A Number Of Terms \(Including Proper Neurobiogenetics, And So Much Else That Is Of Dimension\)](#)
- My entire [MVO: 2019 Thesis](#).
- The Mvo-p website: <http://www.mvo-p.com>.

Resources

The Society Of Mind by Marvin Minsky.

The Emotion Machine: Common Sense Thinking, Artificial Intelligence, And The Future Of The Human Mind by Marvin Minsky.

Inventive Minds: Marvin Minsky On Education by Marvin Minsky with contributors.

Fundamental Wisdom Of The Middle Way by Nagarjuna translated by Nishijima.

The Diamond Sutra And The Sutra Of Hui-neng translated by A. F. Price and Wong Mou-lam.

The First Discourse Of The Buddha.

Zen Training: Methods And Philosophy by Katsuki Sekida.

The Unfettered Mind: Writings From A Zen Master To A Master Swordsman by Takuan Soho translated by William Scott Wilson.

Philosophy Of Right by Hegel (Dover Philosophical Classics edition).

Tractatus Logico Philosophicus by Ludwig Wittgenstein.

The Holy Bible (NKJV).

Articles

In Search Of The Brain's Social Roadmaps

By Matthew Schafer and Daniella Schiller

2020 February 1

Scientific American

<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/in-search-of-the-brains-social-road-maps/>

A Dimensional Biogenetic View. And The Much More.

Page 9 of 10

Marvin Minsky Interview And Books

For his idea that it's not body-mind split, but body-mind integrated, and in fact body-mind-architecture, see an interview with Marvin Minsky on YouTube. I don't have its title, but will try to get that, and the link. I do think that the mind is more sophisticated than could fit on an Intel Pentium! And present-moment awareness shows that it's a bit different, in that way. He warns that artificial intelligence may not be so kind to us, as we have not been so kind to the chimpanzee – but says this is not an inevitable state of things. Minsky has some deeply interesting thought and interesting observations, in his books. It's most instructive, with many useful models and reflections. I find that (from a Zen standpoint) he thingifies a bit – yet, he brings a no-thing awareness and fluidity to many topics. Note his (what I call, and extend to) 'combinatorial principle unfolding interconnected relational action-memes'. One could put awareness and common sense in there too. That's from his book *The Society Of Mind* (the agents and agencies and connected triangles diagrams). It's a wonderful way to visualize what occurs – and then I take Zen to his ideas, edit a bit, and viola! – dynamite material! *The Emotion Machine* introduces a slightly different idea and terminology, and uses a different sort of diagram-and-description, again very interesting, and worth attention. There are further interesting ideas and dimension in *Inventive Minds*.