# We're Allowed To Do A Switch

By Kevin A. Sensenig
Draft 1.02
2018 January 14, 15

We're allowed to do a switch, in software on a digital computer – but not in our own minds. Not according to or permitted by a psych unit psychiatrist.

Once the act has been ascertained (by remote, limited, "objective" observation) and set in the pejorative, the individual is rendered unable to switch, decide, or explain. And put on meds, determined to be required lifelong, for a case of permanent deficiency.

It may be that the family supports this, the state supports this, and society supports this.

So for all of the use of digital computers in the United States, the simple (or sophisticated) switch is not recognized – much less the modeling aspects to digital computers and intelligently written software.

One should turn to the book "Object Lessons" by Tom Love – and realize: object lessons in terms of 'all of the above' (see my other papers).

Mathematics and physics recognized the value of logic, mathematics, physics, the material – and the switch – in the 1900s, in deriving digital computing. Yet we can't recognize in the case of psych unit psychiatry (ostensibly science and accurate apperception) any of 'all of the above' – not this, and not the insights of the ancients or modern thought (St. Paul or the Buddha, Nagarjuna or Shibayama, Wittgenstein or Aristotle).

The ancients had access to some of the most high-tech technology available: the mind. So do we. We should look to thought both ancient and modern. (This is not neuroscience, this is the mind – and we should look to 'the mind, the mind that is before one'.)

And this mind, in Minsky's view, is 'mind-body-architecture'; and in my view, 'mind-body-architecture-philosophy/spirituality-world, one place'.

We're allowed to do a switch. That is our right. That is the mind, and Truth. We're allowed to work with the mind, and we're allowed to work with Truth.

It is natural to explain, to describe, to be participant, and to work with logic, and to resolve (a social-relational, or a dilemma).

The current situation is untenable.

Endnote: A Switch

A switch in a digital computer is either the transistor (the abstract hardware layer we cannot see) or a (drumroll please) checkbox on a software application form.  That's it!  And that's so much.  And the software developer who is writing code (and the designer) gets to work with if() {} else {} and branch from there.  (Combinations of these yield sophistication.  Object method calls might be invoked.  Functions might be cited.  Both method calls and functions are *functional* – a pesky word that one could contemplate.  So is the switch: it is functional, when it is cited.)  So it becomes dynamic from there.

Endnote: A Difficulty

Things can be either straightforward, explicable, or resolvable – or very difficult.  In the case of any of these, dimension, vocabulary, logic, reason, realism, the participant, and explanation are *required*.

Endnote: Right And Dimension

The individual should have the right to be described in the following dimension way: mental states, intentional states, emotive states, physical states; thought space, energy states, perception, speech and action, patterns of speech and action; joy, centeredness, dilemma, questions, perspectives; significant dilemma, part dilemma, no dilemma, no-dilemma; the situation in its totality; reason, reason 'on the table'; the participant; logic and basis-for, merit; explanation and description; the world-space before one; philosophy, spirituality, psychology; speculation on how we think and why, and act; the relational; resources; artifacts, material, context.

The state should mandate this, that this is the way that psych unit psychiatry is to be practiced, in dialogue and written record – the very framework should be this.

Endnote: Rights And The Digital Computer

Not only in digital computing is switching a right, it is the very nature of the machine, of the software.  So in this way, digital computers have a right that is denied at the psych unit door, and with family, the state, and society – for problems everyday or intense.  Some are in a debate of rights of artificial intelligence; we should also be concerned about our right to explain, describe, switch, be participant, branch, change, or justify – with the psychiatrist and the others, in a psych unit context.

Digital computers retain another right that we don't, in light of psych unit psychiatry: the right to work with virtual reality, and descriptions of reality.  Again, what is needed (and the state should insist on

this) is a framework that is dimension, vocabulary, logic, reason, realism, the participant, and explanation.

Psych unit psychiatry is concerned with gray zones – but makes an absolute, ridiculous, inverted-world pronouncement about them, and contradicts and refutes 'all of the above'. It should treat gray zones as just that, and seek to clarify, mediate, and take just action. It would also be far better able to address profound crisis (suicide attempt, actual threat) in a depth manner; and to factor out dilemma and no-dilemma, again resulting in better treatment, deeper insight, and just outcomes. But the individual's stance in this is again paramount – and 'all of the above' applies.

We should not take the transfer of rights too literally: it might be better to juxtapose this or that, and to come up with illuminating perspectives, as a result.

Epilogue

This is sad-but-true hilarity – that yet again psychiatry would omit and suppress so much, as to omit and suppress the entire world, the world that is before one. In this case, the ability of the mind (and of the digital computer), in this way. So this situation requires realism.