

Aha! The Establishment Clause, Its Interpretation, And The Establishment Of (Secular) Psychiatry As The Dominant Philosophy!

By Kevin A. Sensenig

Draft 1.03

2019 July 24

This is based on and extended from an email I sent today. It is edited from that email.

Subject: Aha! The Establishment Clause, its interpretation, and the Establishment of (secular) Psychiatry As The Dominant Philosophy!

[Recipient],

I did a careful textual study of the US Constitution as part of my nxmvc efforts in 2012-2017, and noted as part of that the Establishment Clause. It's very precisely worded, and is important. "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, nor prohibit the free exercise thereof." No law can be made that establishes religion – not one religion, not religion. No law can be made that denies the people the right to establish religion among themselves (churches, themselves individually, cultural expression, one person, all the people); and the implication is that this must be voluntary. No law can be made that prohibits the free exercise of religion (and this is additionally protective and clear – and the free exercise of religion is again individual, collective, and voluntary). "Congress shall *make no law respecting* the establishment of religion, nor *prohibit* the free exercise thereof." It means what it says, in a really concise statement.

That said: It seems to me now that the way psychiatry has gained such traction as the Dominant Philosophy In Public Discourse (it is the only philosophy discussed in newspapers, especially vis-a-vis the government, or state; except that there is also the philosophy of the political conservative view or the political liberal view) is several-fold: 1) it is medical (at least that is its only recourse and presumed basis) and we as a society hold physicians in high regard; 2) as we have interpreted the Establishment Clause, no religious expression is permitted to be acknowledged by the state, and so the only logic is a secular one – and the secular one can even, in this case, call religious expression 'mental illness!'; 3) we have yielded by illogic and omission – and perhaps more interest in control and presumed authority than in the individual/collective working with truth – and sans the idea 'right' (see Hegel, and also in the Constitution, so there's no excuse) – and we have yielded to scientific materialism taken to an extreme reductionist position.

But psychiatry does not stand up to scrutiny in terms of philosophy (one's philosophy informs one's standpoint, thought, speech, and action – and may be the very basis for it); nor does scientific

Aha! The Establishment Clause, Its Interpretation, And The Establishment Of (Secular) Psychiatry As The Dominant Philosophy!

Page 1 of 2

materialism stand up to scrutiny (consideration of the relational, the nondual, and the perceptual; nor various descriptions like non-discrimination and Absolute Subjectivity).

And it is my understanding that 1) Christianity has significant philosophical expression, if looked for (say St. Augustine or Aquinas, it is my understanding); and 2) Christianity may have important things to say about relationship, and God, and awareness of each other, and awareness of need, or of love and so forth. It is also clear that Zen has significant philosophical expression, although this is very much it seems arising out of a religious experience, or at least a dedicated practice; but so much is expressed in everyday or accessible, secular terms, or philosophy, or philosophical statements, or observations.

So just because someone is a Christian or a Zen Buddhist should not detract from their argument; any religious component can be seen as just that, and there are any number of ways to express things!

But perhaps because we affix things to labels, then reject entire categories based on a label (or one category's connection to one truth-statement or source) regardless of its individual or connected truth-value, we as a society – and perhaps psychiatry and its proponents have taken advantage of this – we yield only to that which excludes all of 'all of the above' – including philosophy and philosophical expression; spirituality and religion and their applied basis; practical and proven psychology; speculation on how we think and why, and act; narrative; open dialogues and the dialogic; mediation; etc. ... even meds in the context of all this, selectively used! ... we admit nothing which can be even tangentially connected to reality!

There is nothing wrong with the secular, and secular expression must be a right, also. But state expression should be subject to scrutiny by the People, religious or secular in thought, so that 'Congress shall make no law *respecting* the establishment of religion...', such religion (and secular) being aware, participant, just, equable, and reasonable – and perhaps individual and collective – dimension rights.

Perhaps a right could be established, for the student in a high school, to hold his or her own views, and to discuss those views, with appeal to 1) statement; 2) evidence; 3) reason; 4) respect. 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion...': thus, the student must retain the right in a public school to work out for himself and herself, and with his or her peers, and with society, questions of philosophy; religion; speculation on how we think and why, and act; narrative; open dialogues and the dialogic; mediation; science; mathematics; the arts; music; gymnastics and sports; etc; and this might open up the source to much of the disorientation and linear programming found in high school!

For instance, with this, the right of the student to ask questions on and seek answers to how we got here; or a description of reality; or the source to and basis of inquiry.

And this idea on right, and the power of the people with philosophy, religion, secular, questions, inquiry, societal connection, etc., are, happily, entirely consistent with Amendments 9 and 10.

Kevin

Aha! The Establishment Clause, Its Interpretation, And The Establishment Of (Secular) Psychiatry As The Dominant Philosophy!

Page 2 of 2