

# Basic Notions Of Logic, And The Individual As Participant

By Kevin A. Sensenig  
Draft 1.05  
2019 July 28

“The Logic Book” to the rescue![1]

A psych unit should do this (in bold italics, added by me) – whereas currently this is antithesis to a psych unit. From the exercises to chapter 1, “Basic Notions Of Logic”:

1. Which of the following are true, and which are false? ***Explain*** your answers, ***giving examples*** where appropriate.
  - a. All valid arguments have only true premises.
  - b. A sound argument must be valid.
  - c. An argument with a false conclusion cannot be valid.

...

The ***examples given***, by the individual in a psych unit, can be from the domains of life: the mental, the existential, the social, the societal, the experiential, the physical. They can be logic and standpoint; anecdote and context; perceptions, understanding, and view.

Thus the question would be, in place of the exercises in the textbook above, the following: What are your perceptions, understanding, view, logic, standpoint, anecdote, and context of the domains of life – the mental, the existential, the social, the societal, the experiential, the physical? What are they for the situation? Feel free to explain your answers, giving examples where appropriate.

If there are various parties involved, then they can join the dialogue. It is the various parties mutually co-arising, within a given situation and logic. The various parties includes the individual.

And, in working with the exercises given in the textbook, listed above, ***to explain*** and ***giving examples***, the student is participant, *as the individual (and all of the parties) should be participant in a psych unit.*

(This also points to a strength of Open Dialogues, the approach from Finland.)

But merit and context should apply. ‘All of the above’ should apply.

This would be mvo-p.

## Endnote

Currently this type of thing does not happen at all in a psych unit. A new framework is needed. United States, 2019.

By the way, the principles established in this chapter to the textbook, as reflected in just the 3 questions above, can be used effectively in a psych unit, to probe difficulty, dilemma, or merit, as an inquiry. The psych unit psychiatrist should study this textbook and note, for instance, that the individual may have a strong logic (the argument is valid) but one of the premises is false (yielding a false conclusion) – and this premise may be experiential; or, if it is existential, can be probed; or it might be both mental and experiential, and also reflective of the external world. This might point to the resolution of dilemma, or at least a real-world description of it, and may in addition serve to make the dilemma more tactile.

*Further questions can be asked, and the material worked with.* Or one might find that the argument is both valid and sound (no dilemma, in that way – and this should be looked to! Again, the situation with the individual must be one of *the participant and inquiry.*) – reflecting the strength and merit of the individual.

## Footnotes

1. “The Logic Book” by Merrie Bergman, James Moor, and Jack Nelson. This was a textbook from my symbolic logic course in undergrad.

## Related Papers

“MvO-P”

“All Of The Above”

“Acknowledging A World”

“From Physics: If It’s Objective, Then It’s Participant; And A Subject Is Also Participant, Of-, From-, And To-”

“Psych Unit Psychiatrists: At Present They Are Not This Way At All”