

**An Overview of my research**

**By**

**Mark Pettinelli**

**Version 1.4**

**Creative Commons Attribution License**

**Mark Rozen Pettinelli**

**2020**



# **An Overview of my research**

## **And biography**

**By Mark Rozen Pettinelli**

**Online handle – xiornik**

**2020**

[xiornik@gmail.com](mailto:xiornik@gmail.com)

<https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=1kiGfJRhyz8CreqJR6lkCSSXhxiKR4-gm>

Ok so I've been doing my own research since I graduated from concord academy in 2003. I was meeting with therapists and got put on a lot of medication, I guess that my research on cognitive psychology mixed with their understanding of people and their emotions as therapists. I tried to make my research practical, finding only the important information and the information that was relevant to myself, like managing my own emotions and thoughts. I don't know what my therapists were thinking about my analysis but they have their own more practical understanding, or an understanding that applies to other people who have different emotions from me. I'm kind of unique but have been meeting with the autism association people for almost 2 years now (in addition to interacting with the staff in my group home and meeting with other therapists).

So what did I learn? I bought a bunch of cognitive psychology books and went through those over the past decade. Now it's the end of 2020 and I wrote my psychology of emotions, feelings and thoughts book at the end of 2006.

So what am I supposed to learn from these books? I already wrote a lot of information about feelings and thoughts in my previous articles. I know the difference between an emotion and a feeling, I wrote about that. Again, a feeling is something you feel, that is why the word 'feel' is used, and emotions are supposed to be strong feelings, like the primary emotions.

I don't know if each person responds to stimuli with a primary emotion first, I would think that the emotions could come in any order.

So any feeling could occur at any time, in any order.

I'm writing this article for my own sake, so i can understand my feelings and thoughts more. And understand how my mind works.

The words 'emotion' and 'feeling' can be used interchangeably, except emotions are supposed to be stronger than feelings. That is why there are only 6 primary emotions of happy, sad, anger, fear, surprise and disgust. Those primary emotions are more powerful or more 'main' than the other feelings humans can experience.

The list of books in this article I think have interesting titles that I could benefit from if the books actually have good information.

What or how do feelings work in the mind? That is the question. Like right now what am I feeling? Those are interesting questions. Do some feelings always come first or do feelings occur in any order?

There are many feelings that people can experience, it's kind of interesting actually. Sometimes feelings are strong, and sometimes they are weak, and sometimes they are mostly unconscious.

I don't really know which feelings I have first or even have period. Maybe I just have a simple mind I guess.

If I have a simple mind, then I should be able to keep track of which feelings I have, when they come and go, if they are unconscious or conscious, and also what my thoughts are.

Thoughts are more intellectual than feelings, and feelings can be physical or emotional, or even intellectual feelings. That is like what I said before, that thought or some feelings can feel or be more intellectual. Some feelings might be stupid also, like some of the stupid physical bodily sensations.

I have about 5 different cognitive psychology textbooks in my room that i've been going through for at least a couple of years now. I also have some other books about psychology and other topics I was interested in, like the topic of emotion and cognition.

I'm going to go through more books that I've just got recently, however I just started going through those books.

These are two of the cognitive psychology books i've been going through:

**Cognitive Psychology: A Student's Handbook 7th Edition**

- by Michael W. Eysenck (Author), Mark T. Keane (Author)

How is it that noticing if something is living that a conceptual thing? Some things like perceptual features, like what it looks like, is clearly perceptual priming. This means that either something is visual or it is conceptual. What is the difference? I mean the mind can think with images that it 'sees' and it can think with concepts that it thinks about. It also has a continuous stream of visual information if their eyes are open anyway. Conceptual information could be just things that a person is thinking about.

**"Judgement involves deciding on the likelihood of various events"**

The statement about judgement is a little bit confusing, how could there be a partial understanding of anything? Judgement means the person uses accuracy to come to a conclusion from a guess or a measured assessment. That's kind of like the scientific method, the person weighs evidence and comes to a conclusion they think is correct. Decision making is also part of that process because they have to decide about how to go about coming to or arriving at the proper conclusion.

The mind isn't that complicated, language is fairly simple, thinking is fairly simple, and so are feelings and emotions. Appraisals of our emotional states can influence the emotions involved, that is also a simple thing to understand. Cognition and emotion are connected that way - humans think about things that influence their emotions and their feelings, in turn, influence what the person is thinking about.

I mean, how complicated can language be? Language is just words that signify something in the mind, and sentences are more complicated than a simple word by itself. A sentence is more complicated than one word. Take the word 'dog', the word dog is a noun that could be the subject of a sentence, so the dog could be doing something - some action that is described with a verb in the sentence, say the sentence 'the dog is running' has one subject, the dog, and one verb 'running'. That is an example of a typical sentence with a subject that is performing an action, the action is the verb in the sentence, and the subject of the sentence is the dog who is doing the action.

Language is simple like that, however only the human species has the ability to use language.

This book helped me realize how simple the mind is. There is consciousness, which consists of humans observing their environment, thinking consciously about their emotions and thoughts, thinking with language and turning sounds into speech in their head (a process called lexicalisation), and just responding to their environment.

How complicated is that? I can keep track of most of what is going on in my head, I have language and speech that I use and words I think to myself to help me keep track of what is going on in my head. I also use speech to communicate with other people, but that is fairly simple, I mean, things like saying 'hello' and 'how are you' are fairly simple to understand.

I might not know how to communicate in other languages other than english (I remember a few basic words in spanish (which i took in high school)) but there are probably equivalent words in other languages for each word or phrase in the english language.

So what else does the mind do that's too complicated? There's a section on emotion and cognition in the book, a section on consciousness, a section on judgement and decision making. All those seem like simple concepts or topics. Even the section on speech and language. Also the chapter on problem solving is fairly simple.

Cognitive psychology is supposed to cover the mind's mental processes and this book discusses all of them, however there aren't that many mental processes that the mind uses or thinks about to itself. That makes the mind a fairly simple organ. I mean, I'm sure the details of neuroscience get pretty complicated, but when you look at the mind from the perspective of cognitive psychology then there is only a few processes going on at any time.

- **The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Psychology (Oxford Library of Psychology)**

By Daniel Reisberg

So i think that means that implicit memory can effect a person because they have memories in their mind but they don't know that those had an impact on them, however they still helped shape the person and therefore have an impact on them.

What does that exactly mean? If there is an input representation, then your mind is going to see the input some way initially, either if this is a visual image or a representation of the visual they see. That makes sense, humans see visuals all the time, and it stays in their memory for a while, and it can be modified so they can remember the visual in their mind by simplifying the visual with a representation of the visual.

“Beliefs are about something”

That makes perfectly good sense, humans can have beliefs, however they are going to be about something and they're going to be formed somehow. How do people form their beliefs? Do they see objects in the real world and then form opinions? Or do they think internally and form beliefs based off of their own analysis?

Here is a list of books I have that I went through:

**Master Your Emotions: A Practical Guide to Overcome Negativity and Better Manage Your Feelings (Mastery Series Book 1)**

by Thibaut Meurisse (Author)

What is 'the ego'? The book says it's your self identity that you've constructed throughout your lifetime, however I would just call that your 'unconscious' self. I mean your own self identity is going to need to have an important place in your mind, so it would be unconscious, and it would need to have power, like the unconscious mind has power. I also said before that most of the mind is conscious, so the ego would also be unconscious.

The book says that the 'ego and awareness cannot coexist' because as your awareness increases, your ego disappears. That's because your ego is your identity, if you are aware of your identity then you don't need an unconscious one. I would say that works for most things, as the unconscious mind becomes conscious, the unconscious aspects begin to disappear because they become conscious instead.

The ego clings to tons of things to make itself stronger like beliefs, attachments and items. So this means that I think the ego is like your unconscious self, constantly working for you only unconsciously instead of deliberate, conscious actions and thoughts.

The ego wants you to strive to be a better person and achieve stuff in life. That makes sense because your ego is like your unconscious mind, and humans are naturally selfish beings.

The book also states that 'emotions come and go'. That is important to understand because you might want to control your emotions, so it might be good to know when they are occurring.

It also states that negative emotions can be useful. I think that I'd rather not have any negative emotions at all, or maybe just an insignificant amount of them if they're needed to contrast strong, happy emotions.

The book says that emotions can be reinforced by your thinking. For instance negative emotions could be thought about and made stronger, or positive emotions could be thought about and reinforced. Feelings and thoughts become emotions when you think about them. An emotion by itself is weak unless you identify with it. I think that's what the book was trying to explain.

That means that your interpretation of your own emotions is important. That makes sense, I mean if you think about it feelings by themselves have to be interpreted by your conscious mind - that gives you some control over your own emotions because you can choose how you respond to or make your own feelings and thoughts.

The book also states that "interpretation, identification and repetition" of emotions will make them stronger. That makes sense, emotions can be changed by your conscious mind. People can repeat emotions, identify with them, or interpret them in a certain way. I mean if you think about it you can have a lot of conscious control over your emotions by either interpreting your emotions differently, or identifying with them differently.

I don't know what exactly to do to change my own emotions, I know that I can think about which emotions I am experiencing and see if I can change my interpretations of those emotions and see if that works.

I mean, how are you supposed to control your own emotions? The book suggests that you can think about your emotions in order to change them through identification, interpretation, and repetition.

It is harder than that though I would think in order to change your emotions. It's important to understand that the conscious mind interprets feelings and thoughts a certain way, and your interpretation can change how you feel, understand, and experience your emotions.

I mean it's like you have a conscious mind and an unconscious mind, and in order to conceptualize or interpret your feelings you have to think and understand.

Otherwise your feelings could just stay unconscious or unfiltered.

## **Master Your Thinking: A Practical Guide to Align Yourself with Reality and Achieve Tangible Results in the Real World (Mastery Series Book 5)**

by Thibaut Meurisse (Author)

This book suggests that our current thinking is inaccurate. People tend to think with biases and make assumptions. If we align ourselves with reality we can control our thinking and be more productive. I don't know how someone is supposed to think more positively if life is hard though. I've resorted to being delusional and that makes me happy. The book suggests we should think realistically but positively. I don't know how to think positively if life is so hard and difficult, I would think the only way out is to be delusional.

Maybe controlling our thoughts could help us think more realistically, but that doesn't change the fact that life is hard and that it's hard to achieve success in life. I mean, if people are biased and make assumptions that's fine, but how are they supposed to be positive in a hard, unrealistic (I mean difficult) world? It's hard to align yourself with reality if reality is hard, the book doesn't really address that.

## **The Contemplative Brain: Meditation, Phenomenology and Self-Discovery from a Neuroanthropological Point of View Paperback – October 10, 2020**

by Charles D Laughlin (Author)

That's kind of interesting, he lists 4 different states of consciousness there, obviously awake and sleeping are two different states of consciousness. Also dizzy or tipsy is a state of consciousness that doesn't have to be made just by drinking alcohol. Someone could get dizzy because they are tired for instance. I don't know all the conditions that could make someone hallucinate.

The main conscious state would just be 'awake' and 'here'. That would mean that the person is conscious and functioning properly. I don't know how someone could go into a dream state without actually falling asleep, however. I would think that different experiences influence our state of consciousness all the time, depending on the experience. Sometimes an experience could make the person dizzy, I suppose. More or less awake could happen often to a person also.

## **The Happiness Trap: How to Stop Struggling and Start Living: A Guide to ACT Paperback – Illustrated, June 3, 2008**

by Russ Harris (Author), Steven C. Hayes PhD (Foreword)

What is the 'observing self'? It's kind of like an inner eye. In the book it says it could be comparable to the sky, and our feelings are the weather and the rain and the wind. The observing self I would say is like an inner eye, it sees and observes what is going on, but does it respond, because it is just like an eye that cannot be touched.

So it could use an acceptance strategy because it just observes, but would be unable to use a control strategy because that would require intervention.

So an acceptance strategy could use the observing self, observing your feelings and thoughts but not intervening.

Here are books that I got after the others and read

## **The Oxford Handbook of the Philosophy of Consciousness**

by Uriah Kriegel (Editor)

This book states that after the philosophy of consciousness finishes explaining consciousness a 'science of consciousness' will take its place. I don't know what that could mean for all of the explaining. What would it take for consciousness to be fully explained? After the speculation is done by the philosophers it would become a sort of 'science of consciousness'.

They need to reframe 'how to explain' to 'what needs explaining'. If you think about it that makes sense, the conscious phenomena, or the observed facts about consciousness, need to be explained somehow, and it needs to be outlined what exactly needs explanation.

Psychology tries to explain behavioral phenomena, and the study or science of consciousness should try to explain consciousness. How are conscious phenomena supposed to be explained?

There's the experience of conscious thought for instance, what is it to think about something? Is that an experience of consciousness?

I talk about important aspects of consciousness in this article, I mention that thoughts and emotions can be either conscious, unconscious, or semi-conscious. Also that you can reinforce unconscious thoughts and emotions by thinking about them or filtering them so they can become more conscious and under your control. That applies to both thoughts and emotions.

Is consciousness just the 'sum total of its psychological functions'? As mentioned in the book, I mean, how does consciousness arise? It would seem that it is just the 'sum total of its psychological functions'. I would say that's a perfectly fine description of how consciousness arises and what it is. I've already pointed out in this article that there are only a few mental processes going on at any moment, like perception, emotion, attention, memory, language, deciding, thinking and reasoning. Those mental processes combined are everything that is going on in the brain, and give rise to consciousness.

I listed those mental processes but I didn't include 'introspection', which could account for internal thinking. Thinking was listed as a mental process, but more can be said about thought other than that the person is thinking. The person could be regulating their emotions, for instance making their emotions stronger or interpreting their unconscious emotions and making them conscious. That function involves the two mental processes of both thinking and emotion.

What else could a person think about through introspection? I mean they do more than regulate their own emotions and thoughts, which is self-regulation and emotion regulation. Self regulation could include regulating their own thoughts, goals, problem solving and planning and is similar to or includes executive functioning. Executive functioning is self regulating your own mind by using your thoughts I would say. While emotion regulation is just regulating your own emotions, both of which could be done through introspective thought.

I mean, what exactly is executive functioning or self-regulation? I would think it is using your own thoughts or power of introspection to monitor your own mind, your own thoughts and your own emotions, while emotion regulation is just handling your emotions.

Also, part of self-regulation is monitoring your own attention (not just your thoughts), which was another mental process that I mentioned. How does controlling your own attention give

rise to consciousness? How conscious the person is relates and is partially determined by their attention and what they are paying attention to, that seems kind of obvious.

The book also states that "conscious states are states we're aware of". That seems rather obvious, considering that the definition of conscious is "aware".

## **The Oxford Handbook of Rationality (Oxford Handbooks)**

by Alfred R. Mele (Editor), Piers Rawling (Editor)

**"Reasoning is a process that can modify intentions and beliefs."**

There's also a difference between "what to believe" and "what to intend to do". People also have "practical reasons to believe something". Does someone allow arbitrary decisions or have wishful thinking? I already pointed out that there is a more type of unconscious type of thinking, that is more arbitrary or without the use of reasoning. Unconscious thought is more illogical and arbitrary and can bypass working memory, while conscious thought is more intentional and uses more reasoning.

There's also a relationship between reasoning and rationality. People have an "account of what it is for beliefs and desires to be justified". "Kant: Rationality as Practical Reason".

Fear is a thought that some anticipated judgement poses a threat. Is there an appropriateness of an emotional response? Emotion is a threat to rationality, however long term they might help the decision of rational options over time. There are factors leading to action, an affective state can modify the person's practical options. I suppose that means that the person needs to take initiative and monitor or figure out their emotional state in order to make practical decisions.

There's also "motivationally biased belief" "Motivationally biased believers test hypotheses and believe on the basis of evidence." But there is still the influence of motivation to be considered.

Also, "what is the relationship between rationality and thought", or the "relationship between rationality and language"?

Rationality applies to "actions, beliefs and desires". Also "rational plans, rational views, rational reactions, and rational emotions". People are practical beings seeking to do things, to satisfy our needs and desires.

What is the role of our belief system? Does it accurately represent the world? What is the relationship between beliefs and knowledge? Maybe people can "achieve a rational belief system".

Are our beliefs justified and reasonable?

Perception requires consciousness. Are objects in perception “ideas” in the mind? Or do they become “ideas” in the mind?

“If you see, hear, touch, taste or smell something then it affects you in some way.”

Memory is also different from perception. With memory you recall something. You can recall a belief for instance. Can memory help justify a belief? That's an interesting question. If it is a source of knowledge then it could be used to justify beliefs.

Consciousness can also be a source of rational belief. Consciousness represents an inner world, There can be objects and representations of them that are ‘in’ the person's consciousness. A person's inner world can contain sensations, thoughts, numbers and concepts.

Reasoning can be reflection, intuition, and understanding in the mind. When we reflect on a concept, or we can form hypothesis to see what an understanding means or is. There are concepts people can understand after reflection. You could use hypothesis to test understandings and concepts. “We can reason from the “premises” and form conclusions.

Knowledge can use “intuition” which would be guesses that are not guided by information, while there can be guesses that are guided by information, and may include using hypothesis and coming to conclusions.

Does inference need memory? I would think that someone could infer something without using very many details from memory, or is that deductive reasoning? Is a source rationally figured out? There can be rational belief without intuition or deductive reasoning. There can be beliefs and knowledge that doesn't depend on other beliefs, memories or other pieces of knowledge.

Does coherence of understanding need justification? I would think for something to make sense all of the facts would need to fit together. There are different sources of knowledge that all need to make sense. There is also the dependence of a fact on someone's belief system.

A belief system could hold many beliefs, does a person need to go through their own belief system to see if they are believing things that are logical, rational and factual?

There is also the sources of the information for the person's beliefs. Are there ordinary justified beliefs? How does this all work? How far do we need to take a belief in order to justify it or understand it?

## **The Oxford Handbook of The History of Analytic Philosophy (Oxford Handbooks) 1st Edition**

by Michael Beaney (Editor)

**Are logical statements dependent on the language that is used? A logical statement could be true if its facts are checked I suppose. Someone could use the scientific method and test hypothesis they form about a fact.**

**Is intentional action backed by logical thought? If something is intentional then it implies that the person thought about it before performing the action. On the other hand, it could be intentional but not well thought out.**

## **The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Mind (Oxford Handbooks) 1st Edition**

**by Brian McLaughlin (Editor), Ansgar Beckermann (Editor), Sven Walter (Editor)**

**“What is the content of a perceptual experience?” It depends what it is like for the subject to experience the perceptual experience I suppose.**

**Also, what is the relationship between thoughts and concepts? Concepts could be fictions, while thoughts are always accurate because it is just a thought. A concept could be inaccurate, illogical or not make sense, while the thought about the concept is more specific.**

## **The Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Phenomenology (Oxford Handbooks in Philosophy) Reprint Edition**

**by Dan Zahavi (Editor)**

**What makes color seen as it is? If you think about color it is a perceptual object. Or some object in a person's environment could be a certain color. That makes perception seem rather simple, that there are just objects in the person's environment that they see that have certain colors. Does that mean that sense experience has 'conceptual' content? It could just be objects that get represented in the mind, it doesn't need to be logical.**

## **The Oxford Handbook of Thinking and Reasoning (Oxford Library of Psychology)**

**By Keith J. Holyoak (Editor) and Robert G. Morrison (Editor)**

**Probabilistic judgement is how people come to conclusions, they weigh certain probabilities and come to a conclusion. People are not computers, however, and their judgements could be biased. I don't know what it would take for someone to always reach logical conclusions.**

**Furthermore, humans understand concepts at the word level and the sentence level. That means each word has a meaning by itself and a more complicated meaning when it is in a sentence.**

"Intuitive judgement" is judgement without using reasoning. So that would be different from judgements that use reasoning. Does that mean that an intuitive judgment is a stupid judgement?

An intuitive judgement could be smart I suppose, if it doesn't require logic to be accurate or intelligent.

Maybe that is like 'deciding from the gut', those types of decisions could be accurate however they don't use logic or reasoning.

People can also use rational judgments to arrive at conclusions. I said that before, it is like they could use something like the scientific method in order to weigh evidence and different options. The scientific method is about weighing evidence and forming and testing theories.

Humans could use a similar way of assessing evidence when judging various options in their decisions or assessments.

It's not like for each conclusion someone comes to the person does some analysis that uses a thorough and rigorous method, like the scientific method.

I mean I don't know what goes on in people's heads each time they go through a process to arrive at a conclusion. I suppose that could be called the decision making process.

Sometimes a person's decision making process could just be intuitive and not use intelligence or a complicated method to reach conclusions, and other times the person might think really hard and use reasoning and logic to figure out a conclusion or solution.

Also there are 2 types of thinking, unconscious thinking and conscious thinking. Unconscious thinking is illogical and can bypass working memory, while conscious thinking is more logical and uses working memory. How can unconscious thought bypass working memory? What are all the differences between unconscious thought and conscious thought? I see how conscious thought uses working memory, and maybe if someone is thinking unconsciously then it doesn't need to consciously use working memory, but it might need to unconsciously use working memory.

What does that mean for how people think, however? Working memory is a conscious process that the person uses to think, it is short term and conscious. When the mind thinks unconsciously it doesn't think about working memory but is still influenced by it because it is the unconscious mind.

So the difference between unconscious thinking and conscious thinking then is the difference between the unconscious mind and the conscious mind. Most of the mind is unconscious because humans aren't really in touch with all of their emotions or unconscious thoughts, that makes most of the mind be unconscious.

So unconscious thought is actually the mind thinking unconsciously.

The unconscious mind doesn't really use working memory because that is a conscious process.

I suppose the unconscious mind could influence what a person is thinking about, and that could influence working memory. So the unconscious mind is therefore connected to the conscious mind.

People also think using categories. How exactly does that work, however? I suppose it means that similar objects or ideas are grouped together in the mind. That isn't really a big deal though. I mean, it's kind of obvious that people would group together similar objects. For instance I grouped together the two different sexes - those are "girls" and those are "boys". But that's part of defining and labeling objects in the mind, in that case, however, they also belong to significant categories.

I suppose that's just how the mind thinks about things, by grouping similar objects and ideas together. It's just association I suppose. For instance when I type on this new computer I'm reminded of all the previous older computers I had over the years. Association and categorization in the mind is a way of learning from similar objects or ideas.

In this book there's a chapter on explanations, which states something like that people constantly search and offer explanations for everything that goes on in their life. I would think that would make people smarter, if they constantly seek to explain and describe what is going on. I don't know everything someone might try to explain, though I would think it could make the person more intelligent and knowledgeable if they have their own inner understanding of the world that they've been trying to explain for years. That's what it's like in my case anyway, I've been offering explanations and analyzing everything for a long time now, it's made me a lot smarter and knowledgeable.

I mean, it's kind of like saying that people have their own internal thinking where they are curious and try to explain the world.

## **The Blackwell Companion to Consciousness 2nd Edition**

by Susan Schneider (Editor), Max Velmans (Editor)

**What is self consciousness? Is it just awareness of the self? Or is it awareness of objects that make the self more conscious? How does someone define what the self is? If consciousness is awareness of our own mental states, then how does that give rise to self-consciousness? I suppose that if a person is aware of their own mental state then they are self-conscious. What could their mental state be in that circumstance? If a human knows if he is conscious and awake then they know if they are conscious.**

**As a kid I didn't understand that I was conscious, I just had simple thoughts. I mean I suppose I knew that I was alive, but I didn't say to myself, "I am conscious, I think about stuff and have thoughts, I am aware of my environment and my own conscious state". I just didn't think about myself that way. Now I can label myself as being conscious and alive, where before as a child I might have just understood that I was alive.**

**Being conscious involves understanding that you are conscious, i have feelings and thoughts all of the time, and as a conscious person understand that those feelings and**

thoughts help make me conscious. When I was a child I would have feelings and thoughts, however I did not reflect upon them or try to control them to a greater extent.

## **Conclusion:**

So I'm trying to figure out if that's all the information I need to know to function in life. In previous books I wrote more about feelings and consciousness, however this is my final book.

I mean, if I can keep track of my feelings and thoughts, and understand the basic mental processes like thought, language, perception, decision making, emotion, attention, and reasoning then I would think I know everything I would need to know.

I can also keep track of my feelings and know the difference between feelings and emotions to help me sort them out. For instance there are only 6 basic emotions that have physiological correlates of facial expressions they are happy, sad, anger, fear, surprise and disgust.

Other feelings that are strong could also be considered to be emotions because one definition of emotion is "any strong feeling" like a strong feeling of love could be considered an emotion but it wouldn't be one of the basic emotions.

Also, in order to keep track of my feelings I need to know that feelings could be the result of the primary emotions, or the conscious experience of the primary emotions.

But there are many feelings that could be independent of the primary emotions I think like hopeless or edgy or self-loving. Those could be experienced any time and be largely independent of the primary emotions, or they could be the conscious experience of feelings of those primary emotions.

That's useful to know if you want to keep track of your feelings, emotions or thoughts.

The information in this book is also useful to know, I talk about and review information about consciousness, judgement and decision making, cognition and emotion, and other topics related to cognition or psychology.

What else would be needed in order to further the research field, like what am I studying here. A cognitive scientist probably knows all of that stuff about the brain and how feelings and thoughts work in the brain, and so would a cognitive psychologist except they might not know how it works in the brain. Also clearly neuroscientists and neurologists know that kind of stuff.

There's also therapists and psychiatrists, i don't know the difference between what all those different professions learn about emotions and feelings. I'm trying to progress the research field here lol.

I've explained my analysis of feelings and emotions and thoughts enough times. Feelings can feel intellectual or that might be when they are more conscious, and there are the primary emotions which are facial expressions. I don't know how much more important the main emotions are from the other feelings someone can experience.

I wrote before that a feeling might not be intense but be clear to you, or it could be clear to you but not intense.

I mean i'm trying to advance the research field here but don't know what all those professions and professionals already know about feelings and thoughts, I'm offering my interpretation and explanation. I mean therapists must have known a lot of stuff about feelings a long time ago.

I've tried to keep my analysis practical and only absorb or figure out the important information I would need for myself. Therapists also must have a practical analysis because they have to help people manage their feelings and thoughts. I've been meeting with therapists and nurses for a long time now.

### **Further Conclusion:**

So what else would need to be explored other than what is in this article? I have another article where I talk about how feelings can feel intellectual or be stupid feelings, like the stupid physical sensations. If a feeling is intellectual does that mean it's more like an emotion or thought? Emotions are deep and powerful, so they could be more like thoughts.

Or is that just describing what feelings feel like? That they could feel different ways, intellectual, stupid, conscious, unconscious, powerful, weak, etc.

What are all the ways I can describe what feelings feel like then? There are the mental processes like perception, attention, emotions, language, and reasoning. Part of the mental process of emotion involves experiencing feelings.

Feelings can feel tons of different ways. There are different mental states and states of consciousness, for instance. If a person is conscious of their mental states they could become more conscious, or more self-conscious.

Furthermore, if people can think about any idea or concept, then there is a lot they can think about. I mean, cognitive science would call that idea in their head an idea that they haven't figured out yet or that is incomplete.

So what kinds of ideas could people be thinking about that they need to think more about? I don't know the answer to that. I feel like I know everything with my knowledge of how the brain works and cognitive science. For instance it is important to know the difference between emotions and feelings so you can keep track of your own feelings and emotions.

Once again, one definition of emotion could be "any strong feeling", also there are only 6 primary emotions of anger, happy, sad, fear, surprise and disgust. Those emotions are more primary than the other emotions someone might be feeling like if love is a strong feeling it could be considered to be an emotion.

It's also important to point out that primary emotions usually come first because they have physiological facial expressions as bodily reactions. Then feelings are felt as the conscious reaction to those primary emotions.

On the other hand, it seems like feelings and emotions could occur in any order. So if I know how to keep track of my emotions and feelings then I am on top of my mental state and know what I am doing. I also could know how conscious I am - for instance I said before that as a kid I just knew I was alive and didn't know how conscious or aware I was. Now I know what my feelings are, what my thoughts are, and mostly what my mental state is. That's all a part of being conscious and aware.

## Enough Information

Well, that seems like it's enough information to know in order to function in life. The information about feelings helps people keep track of their feelings. And the information about consciousness and thoughts helps people keep track of their self-awareness and their thoughts at any moment.

What else would someone need to know? It's important to know that there is unconscious thought and conscious thought. For instance your unconscious ego could be making decisions for you or motivating you in general without you being aware of it. Your ego wants you to be successful, it is an unconscious drive of your own consciousness, or your own self-identity that drives you.

What else is important about unconscious thought? People might be feeling emotions and feelings that they are not aware of, those feelings could be motivating them to act or making them feel different ways that could help them or hurt them, depending on the emotion. If they understand what they are feeling, then perhaps they can filter the emotion or change it to something they want to experience.

I suppose that's all I need to know in order to function in life. I know I have unconscious emotions and unconscious thoughts, that should help me be more conscious and in control of my emotions and thoughts.

I also know about the different things I talked about in this article - such as that thoughts can be unconscious, that there are primary emotions and more minor feelings, that I can be more self-conscious of my mental states or just more conscious in general, that I can use rational or instinctive judgements (a rational judgement is more conscious than an instinctive judgement, which would be more unconscious or automatic).

What else would I need to know, the information in this article seems important, it talks about feelings, thoughts, consciousness, mental states, controlling feelings and thoughts, and visual and perceptual and conceptual information, and judgement and decision making.

### **More on the Emotions and Feelings “hoffman - “feelings list””**

So I've already said that there are 6 main emotions of happy, sad, anger, fear, surprise and disgust. But what makes those emotions the main emotions? They are more powerful so they all have facial expressions I think. They are the emotions people usually feel, while other feelings are just other ways of feeling. There are many feelings that fall under the category of the 'happy' emotion, like amazed, delighted, invigorated, satisfied and thrilled. There are also other emotions that fall under the categories of the other emotions. For instance sad could be anguished, depressed, disappointed, discouraged, heartbroken, lonely, unhappy, etc. There are also feelings that are part of the angry emotion such as aggravated, edgy, furious, hostile, impatient, moody, outraged, and upset. These are some feelings that are part of the emotion 'fear' - afraid, frightened, nervous, panic, scared, terrified and worried. There are also other feelings people can experience such as accepting/open, courageous/powerful, connected/loving, disconnected/numb, embarrassed/shame, guilt, hopeful, powerless, tender, stressed/tense, and unsettled/doubt.

Those are all ways of feeling. I pointed out that there are the 6 primary emotions, and then other ways of feeling things. The question is, what makes the primary emotions more powerful or more 'main' emotions? Is it that they are felt first and have physiological facial expressions? The other feelings are just ways of feeling and are secondary to the primary emotions. For instance loving is second to the emotion of 'happy'. Guilty is secondary to the emotion of 'fear'. There are also the feelings that fall under the same category as the primary emotions, which I already pointed out. There's also the bodily sensations, like achy, cold, full, flowing, empty, sore, or throbbing. Those are more stupid and are just physical sensations, and aren't secondary to the primary emotions like the other mental feelings are.

### **Final Analysis**

**Ok, so i think that's all the information I need to know. The final two sections of this paper I filled out were the two books of rationality and analytic philosophy. Now the question is, what else do I need to know?**

**I've already discussed the basics of rationality, such as that there could be a belief system that needs to be checked. Are all of someone's beliefs rational? How does rationality contribute to consciousness?**

**Its true, most of our conscious mind contains memories, sensations, thoughts, and other mental entities that contribute to our self-consciousness. There's also various different mental states that a person can be in.**

**Thinking about the statement in the book on phenomenology, are perceptions of objects conceptual in the mind? What is the relationship between perception and thought?**

**How does an object become represented in the mind, or what are all the things someone could be thinking about?**

**That goes back to the statement I made before, that consciousness is the sum total of our mental processes. One of our mental processes is vision, we see the objects in our environment and they become concepts or objects in our mind.**

**The other mental processes also become part of our conscious mind, like emotion and attention are two important mental processes. All the different processes of the mind contribute to the person's self-consciousness, including the objects they see in their environment.**