

# Background — Set 1 Papers

by Kevin A. Sensenig  
c 2014-08-19  
m 2014-08-28

## INTRODUCTION

This document provides keys to the background of each of the papers, as might apply to the schiz-like mind, or the “normal” individual, or the individual who is looking for a certain sense of space, or new material to consider (see the Introduction (MVO)); but such distinctions should be put in their right place, in any case.

Each paper that has a background section has here that section, a couple of paragraphs describing why that paper pertains, or in what way I see the material in the paper applying, to say schiz-like mind. Other situations can be typed off of that, if they apply.

Some of these papers will apply to any number of individuals and types of individuals, those that are interested. These background notes can be referenced, but are not the material itself.

Each paper’s title is in bold at the top of the page; the background notes are beneath.

## What Is Before One

### BACKGROUND

Here there is a certain view presented that is again illuminating for both the normal individual and the schiz-like mind. There's a simplicity conveyed that is also realistic in its consideration of the external world.

With a schiz-like mind, the individual can get caught up in "many things at once", and developing worlds that factor in and re-formulate very quickly. The view above simplifies the world to what is before one, one by one, and the other features such as "a very stable existence" — a perspective you have to see to realize its significance. So this cannot be gotten simply by reading; one has to realize it.

Someone suggested that this also might have a calming effect on voices.

It helps, I think, anyone to avoid abstractions that get one into trouble.

# Reason

## BACKGROUND

This is for the schiz-like mind, but even a normal person can reflect on material here, and both can work with it. How do we fold in results of experience that then inform new conclusions — and how are perceptions involved?

In the schiz-like mind, things sometimes unfold in a very quick manner: it starts with the individual and his or her view and standpoint, then to a new perception, then to a new experience, then to a new line of reasoning, then to a new conclusion; and this then informs the new view and standpoint. This whole process can be repeated, unfolding, very quickly, such that in a matter of weeks, one is at a new position in life. Perception is key — how does one validate a new perception, and what is its perspective? Is it “balanced”, or “realistic”?

The risk is that then one takes new action, or interprets what others say and do, in a way that might seem strange, or that is not routine, or is difficult to explain, or have others validate. There is no hard and fast way to establish a rule for describing this: creative thought can take one to new insights, and philosophers disagree about things, too. But is the new position really helpful? This then can lead to questions of values, and questions about the sort of (informal) “philosophical” stance of the individual — and foundational thinking — which itself can be grounding.

This last sentence is something that I think psychiatry could acknowledge and work with much more: how do we “put things together” and what constitutes a valid search? I think there’s much more thought process going on than can be described in simple biological terms, and one can work with the mind itself — views, perceptions, reason, and conclusions.

Characteristics such as disruptive or intrusive behavior, or behavior that entails unrealistic expectations of others, may invalidate the search, or question its nature, in the view of many. Can’t one investigate with routine respectful, realistic behavior? Reminders that this is the line one should look for may help guide the individual, also.

Here there may be a real art to psychiatry and psychology that could be introduced.

Of course, material that has not been resolved before can be a part of the rapid line of reasoning/perception/experience that the individual undertakes.

## Action (Nagarjuna's Theory)

### BACKGROUND

Again, this type of material can apply to normal thinking as well as to navigate through schiz-like mind thinking.

The “normal” person can consider action itself as being one of the fundamental important things we do, and apply a balanced view to it. Likewise for the schiz-like mind. Considering these various factors, outside of action, say in contemplation, can perhaps lead to a renewed sense of the character and value of action, and a new respect for it — this contemplation and a resulting “view” of action then has a calming effect. And when action arises, or does not arise, that very fact becomes more intuitive.

In particular to the schiz-like mind, the individual may find him- or herself in a chain of rapidly unfolding action, which is not well-considered, or understood by others. Thus, to consider action itself in the way here described may lead to additional insight, and a certain giving-space-but-present nature to one's action.

And for the “normal” person, action loops may be present which lead to results that are persistent and have the outcome, “it's always the same [undesired state]”. Thus, reflective consideration of action as a thing to itself may help set new context and awareness.

And psychiatry views in terms of behavior. But how does “to consider action” yield a different angle on this, something more readily considered, or reflected upon?

You may want to view “action” in the context of k lines. Alternatively, you can view action in terms of conscious awareness.

## Setting Context

<no background>

## Introduction To K Lines

### BACKGROUND

This is a more general paper, and I feel with the vocabulary that the idea of k lines offers, one can investigate any number of applications.

## Introduction To Transframes

<no background>

## Regulation Of The Mind And Thought Content

### BACKGROUND

[If one addresses the above to satisfaction, then perhaps it would represent a return to the routine, with resilience, stability, and orientation. One can consider these either on their own or alongside meds, and this can make one's understanding more complete — do you think that's true? Others will be happy with meds alone, without such consideration, and that's fine, too.]



## Addendum 1

<no background>