

Email: More, On Romeo And Juliet

By Kevin A. Sensenig

Draft 1.03

2019 March 28 – 2019 March 29

This is from some emails I sent today and yesterday. It's significantly edited, based on the scenarios, with added comments, and now forms a complete document. The high school student, or someone from the standpoint of philosophy or psychology, might be interested.

<Second Email>

[Recipient],

Below, after the first scenario, I'd written: "So this is sound reasoning, given the standpoint and data." This might be the case. Yet I wonder if appealing to reason, reason itself, and the external world, and the present moment, and reality, might yield a different outcome. (This indicates Nagarjuna's 'four reliable facts'.)

I wonder how this high school student could penetrate this, to find a different way. I'm reminded again of Dogen's "Some go to the river to catch fish, some to catch the Way, some to catch themselves, some to catch catching." An entirely different space.

Kevin

<First Email>

[Recipient],

The inverse logic applies: current psychiatry would consider Romeo and Juliet to be mentally ill, and in need of meds for a lifetime -- not the protagonists in one of culture's great icons' works!

Then, a juxtaposition.

So, I have a scenario (and scenarios are a very strong idea, in my view, and should be utilized in culture more):

High school kid A: "I'm thinking of suicide." "Psychiatry calls me mentally ill." <shrugs, "So what?">

Email: More, On Romeo And Juliet

Page 1 of 3

A: "Romeo and Juliet considered – and did – suicide. Psychiatry would call them mentally ill."
<shrugs, "So what?">

A: "Romeo and Juliet did suicide over unrequited world (family)." <"hmmm... how does that apply?">

A: "I'll commit suicide over unrequited world (the world is meaningless)." <"hmmm... that sounds like a good idea, the best viable option.">

So this is sound reasoning, given the standpoint and data.

As far as it goes.

But it might be that it is a case of a standpoint of not depth enough, and too little data. Or, not enough time, and too few resources – of actual working material. Different material forming various perspectives might lead to a different standpoint – and deeper appreciation for reason, reason itself, and the participant. Many times, I wonder if one can't see that one can oneself contribute 'the material', in various situations, and that this then becomes meaningful, and leads to a throughway into deeper layers of reason and the participant.

I also wonder about whether we don't align data points – points of thought – but fail to penetrate the matter, and that introducing new thoughts and perceptions and interpretations or points of reference might lead to a different place. (See my followup email, above. See also my paper "Points A, B, And C – And Recognizers".) The Lankavatara Sutra also says, "Meaning is reality." I think this strikes home on several levels. It's there: and this is reality, itself (one aspect to it). And to find meaning, is then to genuinely work with it, and to apply perhaps Nagarjuna's four reliable facts, or some other features that one finds. One might introduce logic, and an awareness of the many types of the experiential, then penetrate this logic to actual experience – to realize both possibilities and actualities, and to generate seeds of compassion.

Perhaps student A can find a new standpoint.

Another standpoint and data:

High school student B: "I'm a Buddhist."

B: "It's an unrequited world, but not totally, and maybe meaningful – when I yield to the tree, it gives back."

B: "I'll re-interpret my experiences of the day, week, and years this evening, to see if anything new turns up."

B: "The perception of the mind is very key, and leads to this or that fruitful result."

B: "There's some things to work with! Even the ant without food may find a new spot of nectar at the next turn."

B: "But the mind-body-breath is a standing pillar. And I wonder where perception might lead me next."

This leads to a different place. The student B has an entirely different domain to work with. An individual who worked with Aristotle or Minsky would have another.

Email: More, On Romeo And Juliet

Page 2 of 3

Another standpoint and data:

High school student C: "I'm absorbing Gertrude Stein."

C: "Maybe I can write my own Gertrude Stein, from 'Dr. Faustus Lights The Lights.'"

C: "I'm writing: 'And Hannah Mirabelle said she did say to the serpent how do you do you look fine to me although if I had my way I'd look fine to you. How do you do she said to the snake but was it a snake or a serpent too. She then said how do you do how you are too and you're looking at me with sorrowful eyes as the snake disappears beyond the branch to the tree and Hannah Mirabelle she looks sorrowful too at the snake or was it a serpent too disappears behind the branch in the tree where she was.'"

C: "Hmmm... that's not so bad." <shrugs, turns to the next page to write, or to stare out the window>

So this is a striking, low-key picture, in its own way.

Kevin