

Theories of Minds¹ and Windmills²

some say that we have these
theories of mind
that what you think you are
is what you think I am
don't put that on me

in parallel we wonder,
“Are we there yet?”
depends on where we are going
in parallel we choose
differently

books of theories:
philosophies,
studies and sciences
saying that we are not, or ought not be
what we thought we were

then dawns the sheer joy
of realizing that differences
are the interesting bits of beings
and having too much commonality
would be unbearably dull

LVP 2011

-
- 1 Maybe having a soul should be an option. I think that could work for everyone except the folks who are busily writing and preaching that there is no such thing, or the folks who insist that we all have them whether we like it or not. I'd choose the option of not having one at all. However, I agree with Owen Flanagan (*The Problem of the Soul*) that there is something called **consciousness** that does exist but that we know little about. I see no reason why I shouldn't call the thing a **mind** or even a **soul** if I want to.
 - 2 “A circle in a spiral, ... a wheel within a wheel...” *The Windmills of Your Mind*, Dusty Springfield. Words—and whatever we have attached to them inside us—are symbols or representations of what we have perceived by receiving, organizing and storing: sensations, sights, sounds, emotions and so on. The contents of our minds stand for something else—something we refer to as the real world out there on the other side of our limited sensory instruments. The contents of my mind are only similar to yours because we use the same words. We are bundles of independently constructed theories about the way things are—wheels within wheels. Please try to curb your need to put your version of reality on me and I will try to reciprocate that respect. This is the kind of dialogue that physicist-philosopher David Bohm (*On Dialogue*) wants us to engage in.