

Mx-Senxtism

By Kevin A. Sensenig

Draft 1.11

2019 July 17 – 2020 February 22

‘Mx-Senxtism’ is my own term here, used in the following way. It’s independent of other uses of the term *sentism*, which you may find. It’s simply a play on the words **Marx**, **Minsky**, the variable **x** and what it might stand for, **sen[x]tient**, **Shibayama**, **SSNOs** (**sensibility**, **sensing**, **noticing objects** (related to object-oriented programming, and perhaps, Spinoza), and my own last name **Sensenig** – and (importantly) **NeXT**. That’s all.

Mx-Senxtism, as I use it here, is a thought. It takes Marxist critiques seriously. It is not entirely or really Marxist. I see strong critique in TCM of the bourgeois/capitalist system – some compliments of it, and some criticisms – and the bourgeois/capitalist framework and means does lead to dubious results. So the framework should be re-visited. I’ll be developing my own views on this over the next few years. It’ll take study. In the meantime, I do have my paper on what I term the natural form free market gravity well – and this is perhaps a model that could be contemplated. Dunno.

Mx-Senxtism sees strong value in many aspects of (a textual read of) the U.S. Constitution – with the additions, from the start, of 1) all Persons are free Persons; 2) consideration of integration with the American Indian; 3) due process spelled out a bit more, such that each person in a judicial setting gets the opportunity to resources for thorough representation; 4) emphasis that it is up to Congress – as made up of Representatives of the People and Senators of the States (and via the States the people) to have its Powers, which cannot be delegated, except to its own committees or acting councils and so forth; 5) both men and women have the right to vote and to own property and to run a business; 6) responsiveness somehow set forth, to the ecosystem. The Amendments 1-10 are strong, and these demarcations that I list, in various places within the Constitution, would have made it a perfect document, one strongly viable standpoint. There was room to make it completely perfect, given the right impetus; and perhaps we can continue to refine it. Amendment 17 was a mistake. Congress, in the original, was the People and the States (and these entities are again mentioned in Amendment 10, and the rights of the People mentioned in Amendment 9). I feel that the idea ‘right’ hasn’t been studied enough, say from high school on, and it should be. What is their natural or philosophical or religious basis? Etc.

Mx-Senxtism is thought inspired by Zen Buddhism, Marx, Engels, Marvin Minsky, Thomas Paine, a gravity well interpretation of the free market, Wittgenstein, and a textual read of the US Constitution. I am just beginning my studies of Marxism, nascent, and am looking forward to it. You’ll see here some things that represent my own views, that come directly from my own Zen Buddhist practice, and in terms of Buddhism. I’m formulating some rough ideas for all of this, from Zen Buddhist awareness (as far as I’ve taken it), and what I see is that this perspective allows for so much, and for so many standpoints. You’ll see below my introduction to my theme, ‘dialectic with the material’ – what is material to each individual and group. This is also in conjunction with what I call ‘class-type/instance-expression’, where each individual and group has access and right to this – and it actually negates the

class structure that Marx and Engels found so problematic: it is functional, and this is the emphasis, with no person securing an aggregated-only (consistent with the ego-entity idea, then ‘body-property-abode’ (and the Buddha warns in The Lankavatara Sutra against such a philosophy, based on this – see the translation by D. T. Suzuki)) or advantage of accumulation (and this seems to contradict access and right for others), but seeking the function-with, in so many creative ways, with the interconnected delineation of the individual, the universal, the family (and friends and tribe), the state, and society as one way to view things. We already have this in certain segments, and this should be a general societal awareness, training, resource, right, and availability.

I have to look at Marxism-Leninism, at Chinese Marxism, Communist thought, again at Liberation Theology, further at “Philosophy Of Right” by Hegel, and the entirety of “Common Sense” by Thomas Paine, and the entirety again of the book “Six Theories Of Justice: Philosophical And Theological Perspectives On Ethics” by Karen Lebacqz; as well as to further and deepen my own Zen Buddhist perspective, and how it juxtaposes with this or that, and explains or contextualizes.

I also have to spell out my ideas for the basis for certain things in the United States Constitution – real strengths – and post them on nxmvc; and how I would more deeply explain my own textual read of it. Then I have to apply that here (although I do touch on some themes already).

Mx-Senxtism takes seriously the idea of the right to liberty of the individual and group to freely maneuver – in a reasonable way that reinforces this right in others.

Mx-Senxtism does not hold that it is the material world only that matters. I would re-translate this to be ‘a dialectic, of each individual and the collective, with the material, that which they find material’, and to resort primarily to dialogue and debate, and the idea of merit, and expression, on this.

To consider everything in terms of the material or physical (concrete) world leads to distortion. Instead, it is the relational where reality lies.

Nevertheless, when we see the relational, the material or physical world becomes just one more expression of mind. A question: is the relational Mind?

To see things only in terms of the thought, spirit, or the spiritual also leads to distortion. St. James says that faith without works is dead. Nagarjuna says that the abstract cannot exist solely by itself (it always has expression that we can see in the fusion of the abstract and the concrete).

The abstract and the concrete, together, make this real world.

Nagarjuna says that when we see the fusion of the abstract and the concrete we see the real world, before us.

This applies in a real act in the real world, and in physics.

One can see that even the real physics world can be seen as the fusion of the abstract (mathematics-in-function) and the concrete (the physical, material bodies) – that is just the world we see unfolding before us, just set forth in terms of physics. It is the functioning mathematics that relates gravitational

potential (the abstract) to physical masses (the concrete) to describe a planet orbiting a star – just the real world, before us. And the physical world, and this physics world, also is the relational: and it is neither being nor non-being.

As indicated, I look to Marxism for significant critique. However, also significantly, I would not have based it on philosophic materialism (a phrase Lenin uses in one of his letters), and I would have treated religion differently. Nevertheless, Lenin states in that same letter that the final stone to Marxism has not been set. Still, I would start elsewhere, then unfold significant social, religious, philosophic, and economic critique. Thus, my attempt at Mx-Senxtism.

Mx-Senxtism holds that a fundamental matter is the ability, liberty, and resource to: class-type/instance-expression. That is, for each individual and group to retain the right to ability, liberty, and resource to select from or define a class type (pulling from resource economic, philosophic, religious, and spiritual – and from so many domains) (akin to Objective-C or Java, object-oriented programming, resource-aware and functional) and to instance that class, in a reasonable way – subject to debate on merit with society, and in one’s group, within oneself, and in one’s expression. There must clearly then be knowledge, practice, the functional, and financial resources – practical – that enable this right; and this right must be available to everyone, and each individual’s class-type and instance expression must reinforce and be part of a framework that reinforces this for each other, and is functional.

This is distinguished quite markedly from historical classes, that define and constrict, to the advantage (perhaps advantage of knowledge or accumulation) of another.

It is not the same as to establish a self-perceived set-above, fixed, immutable class-type that one buys into or inherits, and uses to subjugate or gain permanent advantage, in social and economic relations (and this might be the complaint of Marx and Engels, in TCM) – which then ties to meaning, and one’s ability to even function freely and at liberty, with the best historical (thought both ancient and modern) available. In fact, it contradicts the historical bourgeois-capitalist subjugation of this meaning and ability. It is to understand, and to work fluidly with, the situation of: truth, mind, reality, nature, and the man-made, and the thought-relational, philosophic-relational, spiritual-relational, perception-relational, social-relational, and nature-relational, in a way that simply functions, and that stands to scrutiny, debate, and dialogue, and that supports the inter-relational and interdependence of us all, while seeing and acknowledging that each individual understands, represents, projects, feels, and notices of- himself or herself; and that this is both the interplay of the subjective and the objective, and seen properly, Absolute Subjectivity.

Each individual in class-type/instance-expression is, as taken from object-oriented programming, part of a system wherein the objects are not defined up front, necessarily inherited from somewhere, but are determined on need and structural requirements and design, in mind, and this is participant, by the individual, within society, the individual retaining right and power to this. There is a ‘no-thing’ basis for this; and each object (individual) is simply part-of, yet retains its own ‘no-thing’ expression. This has to be realized by the individual. (Thus, to say, “You’re business – you didn’t build that. Somebody else made that happen.” is not reflective of reality; a better statement is that “Your business, you built that, along with all the dependencies that go into you, your world, your situation, and the world – and your own effort, or God’s grace.”) See “while seeing that each individual understands, represents,

projects, feels, and notices of- himself or herself; and that this is both the interplay of the subjective and the objective, and, seen properly, Absolute Subjectivity” above.

Mx-Senxtism holds that the State owns all property. And that there is basis for this – both theoretical and practical. More over time.

I may revise this, on property. Qaddafi in the Green Book says that in his view each person or family should own his or her own dwelling, and no more than one: to own to rent is to create dependency and need, and to own more than one needs is to create want elsewhere in society. There might be a natural economy to this. But Qaddafi felt that it was important for true liberation that both material and spiritual need be satisfied, and that self-employment or shares in the product for which one works was the only way to escape the slavery of wage labor; he found fault with both parliamentary systems and one-party systems, and proposed a true democracy system of popular conferences, people’s committees, and general congresses.

I would like to know if say in the year 2000 Libya was truly such a nation. I have to finish the Green Book. Perhaps Qaddafi did not allow enough natural diversity of expression – and I’d like to know the actual type of nation Libya was in 2000. (We never had access to that, via mainstream media, the State Department popular memes, or American heads of state.)

It is not up to one or the other individual to hold or retain or pass along his or her property, especially gotten by means of solely a payment of funds. Such is a distortion, and leads to imbalance and unjust results. The Earth belongs to all. This is related to the establishment of a self-perceived set-above, fixed, immutable class-type that one buys into or inherits, and invests in and accumulates, built-in: Mx-Senxtism contradicts and negates it. It also is related to the creative-destruction of capitalism.

Mx-Senxtism holds the the state is directly a function of and expression of the people. It holds that the various nationalities within the state should be honored and protected.

Mx-Senxtism holds that philosophy and philosophical expression; spirituality and religion and their applied basis; practical and proven psychology; speculation on and expression of how we think, inter-be, and act, and why; narrative and literature and the arts; mathematics and the sciences; open dialogues and the dialogic; the very freedom afforded by speech and language and writing, and its learning, practice, and use; the relational, including thought-relational, philosophic-relational, perception-relational, social-relational, and nature-relational – these are all important.

So are the domains of life: the mental, the existential, the social, the societal, the experiential, and the physical.

Each individual should have the opportunity to work with these, listed above. These then can fuel class-type, and instance-expression.

The state owns the corporation. The people own the state.

The individual works *at* the corporation, *for-with* it, *as* it, in an individual, corporate, workgroup, and societal way. He or she does not work *for-under* the corporation.

Property is owned by the state. The people own the state.

Property is directed by people's committees, who answer to the people and to the state, within the state structure; by corporate boards; and by bureaucrats, who are graduates of the people, and answer to the state. This might be where some of Minsky's ideas in *The Society Of Mind* come into play along with object-oriented analysis, design, and programming – and with reference to thought both ancient and modern. Marxist critique might be useful, as well as corporate and scholastic critique, here in America.

Or, the Qaddafi route. He also suggested that land itself, a sort of permanent thing, should not be owned, but I guess handed down. But one should own or have shares in the means of production, and shares in the product.

Nature is key. The man-made is key. They can be juxtaposed, the relational noticed in profound ways, and a dialogue established between them and among their various expressions.

The indigenous are key.

Both ancient and modern thought are key.

Each individual should have access to these, and to the following relational features: the individual, the universal, the family (and friends, tribe, and group), the state, and society. Each individual should work with these.

Education is key. So is society. So is the individual. Education and society and the individual within the state, the city, the town, the village, the rural, the tribe, the natural.

Each nationality, culture, and tribe is to be respected, and recognized with a dimension framework, and given right to expression.

In capitalism, often those with the means make it their goal to accumulate vast sums, and this gets locked up in layers that do not interact with the rest, and other layers. This is not just the individual, but type; and once one enters this layer, it is only by either sheer loss by speculation or creative destruction that the sums and accumulation are lost. It is not part of a natural, interactive, dynamic, structure-etched-and-fluid system.

Marx says, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." This is a true statement. It is actually how things are done in the equitable, stable, responsible, and inventive corporation, in America, under the free market: per department, workgroup, project, and individual. But this must be the state, also. This should be retained in the company, and made the rule; and it should be available to each individual, in society, to be part of such a framework.

Mx-Senxtism would look to each nation, city, town, village, rural, tribe, philosophy, and religion for insight.

Mx-Senxtism finds significant basis for right and process in the US Constitution, only it would take these, in a deeper, more interconnected, further expressed, and reasoned fundamental way, explicated more clearly than the Framers likely had time or opportunity or agreement for.

The ideas slavery and the threat to the tribes and indigenous are anathema to the ideas in this paper, and the realities, logic, and expression the ideas in this paper point to contradict these. These were serious errors and omissions in the US Constitution. Slavery and the threat to the tribes and indigenous were examples of the “naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation” that the TCM points to, as manifest of the bourgeoisie attitude.

The state would be an expression of the people. It would not be representative, as it now stands in any case, but would be an expression of the people. This would occur by the graduation of each individual in the state, by his or her peers, by debate and dialogue on merit, from local committees or topical workgroups or skilled trades or the state programs. The States would be retained, with governing bodies; and these would be designed in such a way as to reflect the ‘combinatorial unfolding interconnected relational action-memes’ (my term) of Marvin Minsky’s book “The Society Of Mind” – with various attributes like unframes and reformulation. A logic for law, entity, function, and process might be this, and reflect some design patterns of object-oriented programming; and the inner-extensible, dynamic, introspective, delegate-possible traits of Objective-C.

In the current system, in America, an individual runs, based on this or that position in society-writ-large, and may not even be graduated within the party; then, he or she is voted in on popular vote – possibly among several inadequate options. Then the decisions become remote, or set aside entire parts of the demographic, and becomes polarizing and paralyzed, or arbitrary and at-will. It’s a 2-party system, where as soon as one party obtains power, the other party sets out to thwart nearly every angle for the party now in power. It is often divisive and polarizing, it emphasizes the political over the functional, and it usually does not factor in integrated, productive ideas, or the ideas of the derivative and integration. It often also is less than explanatory or well-factored. What is of benefit is that in the Internet age, we have a diverse set of views out there, and this can be taken up on the merit of each view or statement, by whoever wants to take it up and form his or her own view as to that. This is a strong quality of the American body politic. Another benefit of the Internet is that one can on one’s own do significant research – and find charts, graphs, argument, logic, and resource – by searches and references, links and social media.

And one has access to books that one might not have come across, otherwise.

I hope to bring some insights from my natural form free market gravity well idea to the fore; and this should satisfy some as to the type of economics view that could be taken up.

I suspect there is a strong dynamic of small business and some responsive corporate layers in society that are more like this natural form free market – and where accumulation is not the end goal, but the joy of designing, creating, and marketing a product – to see its usefulness or aesthetic in the hands of another – is the idea and intent.

In the Lankavatara Sutra, the Buddha notes that the view ‘body, property, and abode’ is problematic, and is not a view that leads to a nondual, nondiscriminating perception, view, or standpoint. This is

significant. I think what he means is that when our reality becomes body, property, abode – and that's our basis, and particularly our horizon – we make mistakes, and my read is that it becomes problematic, isolated, fixed, exclusionary, perhaps (purposefully or withly or inadvertently) cruel, and indeed may omit opportunity and resource for others. One might reflect on the sutra, and quiet solitude; a Zen Buddhist perhaps will be familiar with this.

In his introduction to Dogen's *Shobogenzo*, Nishijima notes that Marx had the idea that it was matter, and Hegel the idea that it was spirit; and Nishijima says that to Dogen it was neither matter nor spirit. This bears some reflection. I don't think it's scientific materialism, certainly. In spite of this, I think that both Marx and Hegel have some surprising critique. My stance is a bit different, and my own perspective is derived from a Zen Buddhist practice (mostly Rinzai, with some Dogen), and strongly influenced by Marvin Minsky and Edward Tufte.

Senzaki (*Eloquent Silence*, and *Like A Dream, Like A Fantasy*) mentions noumenon, 'a thing of reason'. This is strong. Both the noumenal and the phenomenal should be taken into account. Toward that end, I've found the philosophy-in-action of Nagarjuna in *Fundamental Wisdom Of The Middle Way* translated by Nishijima to be another key influence – and I'm not done with the book.

Dogen has an essay in *Shobogenzo* translated by Nishijima, book 2, called "Zenki": "All Function". It is a surprising essay, and well-stated. I need to review it again.

The functional, action, the fact that in an act consciousness and action are one, the nondual, nondiscriminating mind, the relational – these are all key, as is emptiness (*sunyata*, including impermanence) (that makes things so functional and workable – if one would make it latently or manifestly so).

I have work to do. I need to consider further Marxist writings; to revisit the book *Six Theories Of Justice* in its entirety; to continue to deepen my Zen awareness; to revisit *The Society Of Mind* again; to better understand axiom systems; to revisit the US Constitution and put together a paper on its basis-premises that a direct read reveals, and how I would have explicated my points above; and to further other efforts.

I need to further explain the basis points that I see for 'right' and rights listed and rights and powers retained by the States and the People, in the United States Constitution. These goes far. This should be worked out on a framework level, with original work cited throughout history. I have thus far relied on a textual read to the Constitution and have not consulted say the Federalist Papers. I intend for now to rely on this textual read, and to perhaps rely on *Six Theories Of Justice* and my own Zen for the basis points that one could bring to the table to explain and deepen – and I'll do that in another paper. And, in the case of the slavery that is indicated in the Constitution, correct (and I'm here thinking that the courts and states, over time, in the 1700s and 1800s, could have assigned various rights from the Bill Of Rights to All Persons, such as the right to freedom of speech (the very freedom that we naturally find as expressed in our human-ness) and the right to a free Internet, and then the right to an education and to paid work and to association).

The freedom of speech is just that: a real expressed freedom, and formulative, and essential. It is part of being human. Freedom of speech is to protect liberty and freedom for others, and to express, and is

expressive; and it is subject to scrutiny. This should be borne in mind. The state and the individual have this freedom and liberty – and it is to protect liberty and freedom for others, also.

Liberty is, as stated above, the ability, resource, and awareness to maneuver; it also is the ability, resource, and awareness to class-type/instance-type, in just the dynamic, flexi, structured, interconnected way that it can be. This is dimension, design, and actuality within society, a right and power retained by the individual.

In high school, some geometry should be taught, on an introductory and dimension way; and philosophy should be taught, from Aristotle to the philosophy of religion to mind and truth; and including the domains of life: the mental, the existential, the social, the societal, the experiential, and the physical. Along with a dimension read to study, history, mathematics, science, literature, writing, music, the arts, gym, and the trades. Modern and ancient thought apply. And real applied training and inquiry should occur. Extracurriculars should be maintained.

Religion should be practiced or not by the people. Both religious and secular expression should be protected, by framework and as a right. The state should not mandate either a religious or a secular view; although its own expression would be philosophical or secular, and the view of the state would not be religious, and it would not be permitted to establish religion. Its expression and means would have to be philosophic. In other words, the Establishment Clause could be retained pretty much as is, in spirit, but more deeply expressed and etched. It would continue to be “the free exercise thereof”: of religion, philosophy, and the secular.

In Mx-Senxtism, the courts would continue to play a significant role, especially with respect to right, framework, process, and function. This would be spelled out.

Then, ‘the security of a free state’ can be further understood, within this framework; and the right and power of each responsible citizen to be this – the use of ‘arms’ (in terms of an extension of intent and use), whether assault weapons, handguns, pots and pans, the food that goes in them and on the table, a dwelling, books and libraries, speech, work, music, the arts, literature, mathematics, and science – these are the security of a free state. Each individual has a right to this, in some way, appropriate to role, ability, and need. And we each need pots and pans, food, and a dwelling – and books and society! Those adults who want and who have training, and know what it’s for – the security of a free state, including person – gets access to weapons. Each individual, otherwise, from young to adult, can participate in this in some way. (This reflects some of my basis read to the United States Constitution.)

This paper is meant as a starting point for consideration, thought, and dialogue. It’s not ready for more beyond this. But I hope I’ve conveyed some specifics, and a sense to things. I have to more deeply delineate ideas on how the state would be an expression of the people – neither would be seen as a separable thing or entity, even if I use those terms; and ‘no-thing form of no-form entity-relational-inquiry’, the interconnected, the interdependent, and function would play an important role. With non-discriminating mind, so much becomes at-once-and-unfolding.

And how both the state and foreign policy can both be more deeply responsive, and not at all tyranny – its opposite. For instance, mutual benefit for foreign policy. Again, it is the individual and the collective that has to realize, for itself – it cannot be proscribed, although the people can delineate a

state that does this, at the Constitutional level. One can train, or discipline, or seek to spark awareness; but one cannot proscribe the truth: this is true in philosophy, it is true in religion, it is true in inquiry, it is true in liberty. Discipline, liberty, resource, and awareness can play important roles in this.

One indicator, not final, of how I would have handled the Christian religion differently: in the Bible, bread is mentioned dozens of times. In the parables, the kingdom of heaven is at hand (right there/here now) and is like leaven that a woman adds to her dough to make bread; and the neighbor relents, and gives he who persists bread for his visiting friend. Thus, each should make sure his neighbor has available both spiritual (of various types) and material bread (with organic option); and each should seek to leaven – or illuminate, actually beneficial, not attached to appearances (see The Diamond Sutra) – any situation, understanding, or system. [I have to look again at John Rawls, but this might be consistent with his and others – see *Six Theories Of Justice*.]

More thoughts later. Thanks.

References

The Gateless Barrier: Zen Comments On The Mumonkan by Zenkei Shibayama.
Shobogenzo by Dogen translated by Nishijima.
Fundamental Wisdom Of The Middle Way by Nagarjuna translated by Nishijima.
The Lankavatara Sutra translated by D. T. Suzuki.
The Logic Of Faith: A Buddhist Approach To Finding Certainty Beyond Belief And Doubt by Elizabeth Mattis Namgyel.
The Bible (NKJV).
The American Indian Mind In A Linear World by Daniel Fixico.
Six Theories Of Justice: Philosophical And Theological Perspectives On Ethics by Karen Lebacqz.
The Green Book by Qaddafi.
The Communist Manifesto by Marx and Engels, Penguin Classics Deluxe Edition, Introduction by Marshall Berman.
The United States Constitution by The Framers (and We The People).
The Society Of Mind by Marvin Minsky.
The Emotion Machine by Marvin Minsky.
Inventive Minds: Marvin Minsky On Education by Marvin Minsky.
Foundations Of Geometry And The Non-Euclidean Plane by George E. Martin.
Envisioning Information by Edward Tufte.
Beautiful Evidence by Edward Tufte.
The Visual Display Of Statistical Information by Edward Tufte.

Quotations

From Wikipedia:

“From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs”

"From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" is a slogan popularised by Karl Marx in his 1875 Critique of the Gotha Program.[1] The principle refers to free access to and distribution of goods, capital and services.[2] In the Marxist view, such an arrangement will be made possible by the abundance of goods and services that a developed communist system will be capable to produce; the idea is that, with the full development of socialism and unfettered productive forces, there will be enough to satisfy everyone's needs.

– https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/From_each_according_to_his_ability_to_each_according_to_his_needs, accessed 2019-07-17.

Articles

From PBS:

Now Starring In Children's Cartoons: Authentic Indigenous Characters

– <https://www.npr.org/2019/07/17/740804272/now-starring-in-childrens-cartoons-authentic-indigenous-characters>, accessed 2019-07-17.