

Some Core Psychiatric Tenets; Its Philosophy And Praxis; What Are We As Human

By Kevin A. Sensenig

Draft 1.08

2019 December 17 – 2019 March 2

I've just this afternoon hit upon some core psychiatric tenets. This is perfect, and it's descriptive, and it opens up the domain to discussion of psychiatric philosophy – and it then can be discussed by philosophers, the religious, psychologists, the citizen, politicians, from many views. Striking. More later.

Then, it cuts even deeper. This domain, and psychiatric core tenets, are both also an expression of modern society (but of course there are many expressions and standpoints within modern society).

I have the theory perfectly. It is a core tenet of psychiatry. See if this is valid:

If the individual is 1) a threat; 2) unpredictable; 3) inexplicable; 4) deterministically so, as a physical machine, with no further insight or recognition possible (this is programmed, by the hardware, and is evident via a permanent neurobiogenetic malfunction), then one would want to avoid the individual at all costs, and subdue with whatever means necessary.

Psychiatry says these are the case, in at least those many types of psych unit instances it encounters. It may form the basis for its message in society, for many perceived ills or dilemma.

In the context of society the result is: Stigma. In the context of psychiatry the result is: its theory and praxis.

This is what psychiatry presents, it is inevitable.

The disorders paradigm fits this perfectly: if an individual has a set of symptoms, a combination of symptoms, or a group of symptoms, then that individual is diagnosed with absolute deficiency, and either 1) required or coerced restraint and confinement or 2) required or coerced meds or both are necessary.

It is also a conclusion of psychiatry's: The machine (the individual) is incapable of learning, of transformation, of explanation, of acquiring and setting forth a new idea, of a new type of action.

There is also a philosophical manifestation: the individual is given no new idea, no new perception, no new potential, no new mode of body-breath-mind-world-space, no new philosophical, spiritual or religious, psychological, or narrative information, that that individual

might put into action, or develop inquiry with – to put into action or find new paths, or use to step to a new experiential. Is such deemed as dangerous to its own theory/praxis, psychiatry's very existence? Is it really that they've somehow omitted by accident what I term 'all of the above'? It might be that psychiatry has a historical idea that to share such information is to again propagate delusion: as it would see (in its view) has been done over the millenia, in this or that culture. That is, psychiatry and its philosophic cohorts have determined their answer to the question of our existence, and all other such inquiry is a-priori, per individual, negated, prevented, and refuted.

I just hit upon this above (then extended it). It also integrates with other ideas I have. Of course, in a realistic scenario, some is left to the individual, and some to treatment, merit, or explanation (and this is what I would do, it would be set in a different context than psychiatry's, with mvo-p); but the above is what psychiatry has set forth.

Not all psychiatrists practice this way, but many do. And it is the tenets of the psychiatric theory and praxis. The psych unit is like this.

I had to reflect, the very title to the novel "A Clockwork Orange" by Anthony Burgess suggests the question at the basis of the philosophical/theoretical premise and operational methods that are psychiatry's. I'd have to consult the novel again, but there is one language item I'd recall: "in/out" – horrorshow, or computer i/o – can AI be cruel, or learn? (The novel was written before AI became popular form. Marvin Minsky's books may have something to say – the tenor of his take on AI and the mind is fairly positive – it's *functional*.) Can a new program on a computer, or a new feature in an existing one, result in different functionality, on a computer? Perhaps the Mandalorian's distrust of droids goes along with (see the recent Disney Plus show). But one can also consult thought both ancient and modern. "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you..." – St. Paul ("Romans"). "The realization of impermanence involves the unity of spatiality and temporality." – Masao Abe ("A Study Of Dogen").

Would an AI bot study and cite Aristotle, Dogen, Minsky, Masao Abe, Spinoza, Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Hegel, the Gospels, or the Koran? Would it study American Indian ideas or the indigenous? Should or would a human?

Recall that psychiatry is a 250 year old theory and praxis. It may have antecedents.

The Buddha said in the Lankavatara Sutra, "I am of neither a creator, time, nor atoms." My ears perked up on that one, as I'm neither an evolutionist (in its current form; it does not explain the expression and unity of functionality in form, and it's matter-only, one-sided (although this might be correctable), and it's not intelligence built-in, or mind – and it might be proto-forms, in the universe, that work with the concrete matter) nor a Creationist (there can be no strictly separable), and I think on considering matter one might want to look at different things, also (including the relational, fields, and mathematical-verb – and it itself is a virtual space – and Nagarjuna is correct: "When we see the fusion of the abstract and the concrete, we see the real world, before us."; and, I may be impermanence, and impermanence-and-form, or the immaterial-and-matter, and there may be prototype forms in the universe, even implied in the mathematics and its action.). And as far as time, there is no external reified linear arrow of time (and see Nagarjuna), although time can be useful (in physics and the everyday; but careful how you

think about it, use it, or reify it – it ultimately goes to that which is presenting; and there are the three times the past the present and the future, and the actual present moment). And so forth. This is very much developing! So I could refine or edit my views.

Others will have their own views.

But this psychiatry stuff is striking.

I myself point to mvo-p and ‘all of the above’, that the field must admit and talk in such terms as mvo-p and ‘all of the above’ – pointing to this very world and world-space.

Then, what makes the machine ‘the psychiatrist’ certain that it has the correct view? And that this view can’t be discussed?

There are further practical questions: what is it to insist on authority, a particular authority, as a given, and to use its derivative as a given? What is it to say that someone deserves it? These are social and societal questions. This is on top of the fundamental question of: what are we as human, and what is this very world?

This all is not to say there are not problems. Life can be difficult. Life can be ease. Life can be explicable, or not. There are, in addition, social and societal rules to navigate. I describe things in mvo-p in terms of what I call the domains of life: the mental, the existential, the social, the societal, the experiential, and the physical. Spirituality, religion, and philosophy (and maybe psychology) will touch on each of these. May each individual penetrate the matter, and live a life of satisfactory depth, insight, salvation, and/or discipline.

Resources

I have relied on these, as resource, thought, discipline, and practice, to one extent or another:

The Society Of Mind by Marvin Minsky.

The Emotion Machine by Marvin Minsky.

A Study Of Dogen by Masao Abe.

Shobogenzo by Dogen translated by Nishijima. (Included in that is “Zenki” and “Uji”.)

The Gateless Barrier by Zenkei Shibayama.

Zen Training by Katsuki Sekida.

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

The Lankavatara Sutra translated by D. T. Suzuki.

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

Zazen.

The everyday.

Some Core Psychiatric Tenets; Its Philosophy And Praxis; What Are We As Human

Page 3 of 5

Then, also, I relied a little, some, or significantly on:

The Basic Works Of Aristotle edited by McKeon.

Envisioning Information by Edward Tufte.

The Visual Display Of Statistical Information by Edward Tufte.

Beautiful Evidence by Edward Tufte.

The Bible say the NKJV or NASB versions.

Tao Te Ching by Lao-Tzu translated by Ursula K. Le Guin.

Tractatus Logico Philosophicus by Ludwig Wittgenstein.

Foundations Of Geometry And The Non-Euclidean Plane by George E. Martin.

The following might be interesting:

Ethics by Spinoza.

Heidegger.

Philosophy Of Right by Hegel.

The following might be key:

The American Indian Mind In A Linear World by Donald Fixico.

How We Became Human by Joy Harjo.

Secrets From The Center Of The World by Joy Harjo and Stephen Strom.

Traditions I haven't mentioned but that are significant:

Each of the religions, spirituality, and philosophy will have their significant works, like...

The Koran.

The Upanishad.

The indigenous likely have something to say. I think this is significant, along with the village.

Mathematics.

Science.

Endnote

Feynman: "Nature isn't classical, dammit, and if you want to make a simulation of nature, you'd better make it quantum mechanical, and by golly, it's a wonderful problem, because it doesn't look so easy." – Physicist Richard P. Feynman, as presented on [Quantum computing explained with a deck of cards | Dario Gil, IBM Research](#)

Maybe we are AI. Maybe we are quantum. Maybe we are paintings on a wall. Maybe we have insight, and maybe our very being (in neither being nor non-being) is then time; maybe we are the present moment, but time is also the three times the past the present the future.

Some Core Psychiatric Tenets; Its Philosophy And Praxis; What Are We As Human

Page 4 of 5

Maybe it's God, or a Creator. Or maybe the material. Or maybe the world is Mind-only, and it's seen in terms of neither being nor non-being. Maybe it's "When we see the fusion of the abstract and the concrete, we see the real world, before us." (Nagarjuna).

Maybe we are these or of these, and highly dynamic, all-function.

Maybe we are body, mind, will, emotions, soul, spirit.

Maybe it's the nondual.

Related Papers

Mvo-p – Psych Context

'All Of The Above'

The Mvo Framework, In This Way (The External World And Relevant Mental Events)

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

Psych Unit Psychiatrists And Idea And Praxis (And 'All Of The Above')

Psych Unit Psychiatry Contradicts And Refutes 'All Of The Above'

Things Psych Unit Psychiatry Omits; And Other Paths So Indicated

Another Way To State A Point, Vis-A-Vis Minsky (Solving Hard Problems)

My entire MVO: 2019 Thesis.