DR. CHRISTA KUBERRY: Hello everyone thank you so much for being here for this CE webinar. What you see popped up is a quick poll on the location of where you are joining us today. Just to get an idea our members are, when they are able to join. My name is Doctor Christa Kuberry. I am the Vice President of standards at Yoga Alliance. I am excited to be joined by Doctor Shyam Ranganathan. To really have this conversation from his perspective. He is a Canadian researcher, author, translator, scholar and teacher of philosophy.‘s work spans philosophical traditions and consist and contributions of moral and political philosophy. The philosophy of thought and language, philosophy of religion, the study of East Asian and South Asian philosophy and the global widespread assumptions around what might be called the Western tradition. His work is around Interpublic interdisciplinary work. He is the author of two scholarly books, editor of two volumes, translator of one philosophical text with commentary and offer — author of numerous papers on philosophy. I’m super honored to have you to have this conversation to engage in for all of your joining to know that please share in the conversation. Direct any questions you have in the Q&A and we will definitely be having an interactive conversation at the end of this as well. I turn it over to you. Thank you for being here.

DR. SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Thank you so much, Christa. I’m going to share the PowerPoint that I have set up here.

That is me Shyam Ranganathan. This is the first part and a four part webinar series for the title is yoga philosophy in the West. I want to talk about systemic discrimination, systemic problems and how colonialism, Western colonialism has a lot to do with but also more importantly what yoga can teach us as a response to these systemic problems. This is the abstract. In this webinar we will contrast two basic approaches to understanding. One based on logical inference we can call explication and the other based on what one believes. The other model, the bad model is something we are familiar with. It is called interpretation.

Interpretation historically, interestingly, has a lot to do with the Western tradition. It also generates the -isms that we have to confront. Like racism, sexism, etc. All of this presently is covered in the first four sutures of the yoga sutra. If we want to get back to the basics as practitioners of yoga we can go back to the first four sutras and think about what they have to do just in response to the interpret challenges.

I’m going to start off with something pretty simple. If you are in one of my philosophy courses, undergraduate philosophy courses I would give this. Hopefully it will become apparent as to why this is so important.

There are three forms of logic that are really central to research. One is deduction. The other is induction in the last is abduction. Your inference to the best explanation.

The way you think about these three forms of logic is in terms of their standards. Deduction is assessed by the standard of validity. If the premises are true the conclusion has to be true. That is deduction.

Induction is assessed by the standard of strength. Induction is about coming to generalizations or extrapolations from a data set. So the question of induction is whether the extrapolation is really supported by the data.

And then you have abduction or inference to the best explanation. There you are looking at comparing explanations for some phenomenon in your choosing the best out of the lot.
These are the three basic forms of logic. And so certainly if you were to take a course in logic you would be introduced definitely or certainly the predominant form of logic that you learn is detection. Here are some examples of deduction. Premise one this is a Yoga Alliance webinar. So true. You are viewing a Yoga Alliance webinar, true. Therefore the presenter's name is Shyam Ranganathan. It is true that is my name. However this argument is invalid. Even if it is true this is a Yoga Alliance and you are viewing this.

Simply on the strength of the truth of the premises you do not get the conclusion. The important part of this example is that it shows us that reason and I will reemphasize this later, the reason a truth takes us in different directions when we are considering questions of logic. Is everything OK in the chat.

PATRICIA ANDERSON: Your good. Keep on keeping on.

DR. SHYAM RANGANATHAN: The first example at the top is what is called an invalid argument. Everything is true but the problem is even if the premises drew the conclusion does not follow.

Is an example of a valid argument. Asparagus is a type of cat. Asparagus is type of reptile. I like this example because they help us see other considerations a reason really come apart from truth. There is something that comes from sound arguments which are valid arguments that also contain true premises. Philosophy is a discipline. Discipline requires special training to master. Therefore philosophy requires special training to master. These are both valid at the premises are true the conclusion has to be true and it turns out the premises are true. We call that a sound argument.

Let's think about inductive arguments. Induction is a different kind of reasoning process. It does not operate according to the standards of validity. Which means even a good inductive argument is not the kind of argument where the conclusion is only acceptable if the premise is – or rather it's not the kind of argument where if the premises are true the conclusion has to be true. That is the proper way of saying it.

It is the type of argument with the extrapolation or the conclusion are based on the data set. In induction we talk about weakness and strength. So here is a week induction. Some members of the Yoga Alliance that identify as women are white. There for Yoga Alliance members are white. As an extrapolation, that is not based on the observation that some members of Yoga Alliance that identify as women are white. Because that extrapolation really kind of goes way beyond the observation of the data. That would be what's called a week induction.

Now here is a b induction. Strong induction is not the same as a cogent induction. That is an induction where the extrapolation is not based on the data but the data is credible. This is never the less a b induction I don't know if it's cogent. I've not done the research. We notice it is a b induction because the extrapolation is based on the observation as presented. Members of Yoga Alliance that identify as women are greater than the members of Yoga Alliance that identify as a man. Assuming that is the observation, what kind of extrapolation can we draw from this? Yoga Alliance members are generally self identifying women.

This is not to say that this is true. However, the extrapolation is based on the observation as presented. That is what it would be for it to be b. Here's a cogent conductive argument. Annual temperatures – annual temperature has been rising for some time. The rise coincides with anthropogenic greenhouse gases. The presence of such gases increases temperature therefore, there is global warming.

The reason this is a cogent argument is because the extrapolation is based on the observations and the observations are primarily credible. What happens is when people look at a cogent argument like this they often do not appreciate that the standard is in a way we could then validity. The extrapolation is worth taking seriously not because it has to be true if the premises are true, but rather it generalizes observations that are credible. So each one of these observations are the kinds of observations for which there are further observations of data and support of these observations so then the generalization or any kind of way you can put all of these together will end up being a cogent conductive argument.

Now I want to introduce a contrast between two kinds of understanding. What I have done so far is I have outlined three different forms of reasoning and I have given you examples for inductive and deductive arguments. Inductive
arguments we compare explanations for observations. Those are harder to talk about. You need examples etc. I have not pursued that in any great way. However, in a weird way what I'm doing right now is I'm asking us to consider alternative explanations of what understanding is about. I am suggesting there are two possibilities.

One is you can explain things by way of what you take to be true or you believe or you would say. Or you could engage in an explanation by way of logical validity, the standard of deduction. Or perhaps any other recent approach. What is really important about this distinction is that it splits up the possibilities in terms of the ecological approach and the logical approach. The illogical approach to understanding tries to explain everything by way of what you believe to be true.

We saw and are examples of valid arguments and invalid arguments that you can have arguments for everything you said is true but yet there fails to be a connection between the premise and the conclusion. That is because when we are interested in reasoning we are not interested in primarily what is true. We are interested in the support that the premises or the evidence provides for a conclusion. Thinking reasonably then is very different than thinking in terms of what you think to be true.

For those who know something about the yoga sutra and niyamas you might want to think about how niyamas our list of five values. Before Satvia there is something you have to disrupt harm. When I'm thinking about reasoning I realize I cannot take as truth or what I think is true. Because to do that would be to engage in any kind of harmful psychological practice were not actually being reasonable. Or have to think about how reason supports intrusions -- conclusions independently if they are true. We have these two options I am suggesting but also I am suggesting you want to know where fallacies and reasoning come from, they come from always from interpretation because interpretation is in a way the essence of irrationality. It inverts what really should be a secondary or subsidiary concern namely what you take to be true, believe or say and then makes it a primary concern in your understanding. What are some fallacies. All fallacies, if you were to be very specific there are formal fallacies in a formal fallacy violates rule and if I was to try to understand everything in terms of what I take to be true.

I'm going to go back and I would say this argument is a great argument term this is ideal but allies webinar you are viewing a yoga lens webinar in the presenter's name is Doctor Shyam Ranganathan in this first argument is a great argument and then you would have to say that the second argument is a bad argument, asparagus is a type of Your cats are a kind of reptile. Therefore, asparagus is a kind of reptile. However the inverse is true the one with all the truth claims is a bad argument. At least it is valid. OK. So if we interpret and if we think that what we believe or what we are willing to say or how we see the world really is a primary source of explanation are likely to engage in all sorts of fallacies.

One fallacy is an argument ad hominem or what someone is saying isn't worth considering because of who they are aren't actually paying attention to the argument for the reasons provided, he decided to discount that because of who they are.

The other is to cloak you! If you can show someone is a hypocrite and somehow you have dealt this fatal blow to what they have to say, but is just a way of avoiding the argument, right, and I find this really important. Part of what it is to be a guilty is to be devoted to this kind of practice where you are coming to terms of past errors of something you are no longer willing to constrain yourself and live by, or permitting yourself to overcome those.

It's a very strange criticism of a Yogi to say they aren't perfect and imagine your professor tells you something in the student says he made these mistakes so therefore you aren't worth listening to and it's a bizarre criticism the point of whatever it is someone has to teach you is beside the point of their own past mistakes.

You really need to judge whether what they are saying is worth considering and if all of us are imperfect working on things in a way hypocrisy is going to be par for the course but anyways it is a fallacy because it ignores argument but also focuses heavily on what people think is true about save the people that they are learning from or listening to.

OK. So I got really interested in interpretation because interpretation has stuck aside from the fact it just violates
every basic principle of reasoning, anything you could think of as freezing gets trampled on as you interpret it has implications.

Interpretation is imperialistic because it imposes the exploiters believes on the explained so if you were to provide me reasons for your conclusion and then if I were to interpret it I would then use my view of the world as a filter to understand which you are saying there

So if we were to think about our current loan, especially in North America and the West in terms of Black Lives Matter and Black people, are telling us what life is like to be black and if we were to interpret and if we are black is our view of the world as a filter to understand what they are saying, so it is not something that we don't want to hear what they are saying we would go over it with our view of the world so it would simply continue the very structures of imperialism that these people are trying to inform us about.

It's also colonial because if we interpret the world we treat other people as a prop for our point of view, so they really don't have any independent contribution to make. We treat them as people who are intelligible insofar as they exemplify how we see the world.

So there are two important political consequences of interpretation and what I think is really important to know, and this is something I guess unique or unusual about my work, and I do, I do research in philosophy and also very much influenced and informed by yoga and how I think about philosophical issues that if you really want to understand what the origins of the problems of interpretation are, including political problems, it's a failure of being responsible and reasonable, it's a failure to be responsible for your own mind because when you interpret you don't take responsibility for your own subjectivity term

You treated as though it is a fact that everyone else have to live by so there's a kind of basic ethical failure but also a failure at reasoning for all the reasons I talked about and if you interpret and violate very basic explanations of reasoning.

So it is a political problem, imperialistic but it all comes down a failure of reasoning. OK. So now I want to time which we've been talking about with yoga Sutra and Book 1 2-4 it begins a yoga Sutra by providing us with the choice.

Either we relate to our mind as though it is something that influences us controlled mental influence so that we can be autonomous, abide in our essence as knowers. So this is a very basic choice. Have been influenced or be responsible.

OK. . Here is my translation of the yoga seat repairman these four lines and we delve into the definitive explication of yoga. (Reads) yoga is a control of the character of thought. Otherwise there is identification of the character of the.

Thinking about sutras, sutras are dense text where the authors use complicated words with lots of meeting as a divisive economy like the ancient zip file where you try to cram a lot so if you want to get the most out of the Sutra you have to find a way to accommodate all the meanings.

I was working on my PhD in translating philosophy and chose Yoga Sutra because I had to teach it to a bunch of students in the community and I noticed most all translations cherry pick meanings. They did not try to wrestle with the full range of implications.

Anyways, most all translations are going to reveal to you and really it is about to choice. Either it's about coming to terms with the influence of your mind or simply allowing that influence to take over.

So what I notice and it took me a long time to allow this to come into sharper sleep is a choice we have between interpretation and explication have a choice between trying to understand and how we see the world and what you believe or using logic bring out is for a conclusion is really a contemporary way of retelling the basic choice that potentially is given us the Yoga Sutra so the interpretation, the explanation of what you take to be true, like an independent way of dealing with the world.
It feels like and independently of dealing with the world because when you explain everything in terms of what you believe is your point of view of what you are reliant upon so that's a way for you to assert your independence but when we are explaining things by way of how we see the world it's a perspective that is of constraining us and also how we end up treating other people.

So while we might believe we are free and independent we are explaining everything by weight of our beliefs we are actually being influenced by power and experience is. So when we are interpreting actually aren't practicing yoga so explication is practical when we take responsibility for stealing, controlling and organizing mental content, like into arguments so that activity of arranging thoughts in an argument and taking a step back to assess whether premises supported the conclusion is an example of stilling or controlling your mental content.

So when we do that we are allowing ourselves to not be psychologically influenced by what we contemplate and this is exactly the challenge of life because we are given these experiences and the question is how do you relate to the impairment to be related by people who are influenced by our experiences or by people in charge of organizing and providing some order to our experiences.

The latter is the option of yoga. So I've already said some of this stuff. Its review problem interpretation or that anti-Obama approach life is that it is anti-logical and it pleases to critically accept…and not contingent on choices that we have coverage.

So if I think about the possibilities of explanation in terms of how I see the world I'm completely ignoring all the things you that part of the world. I'm ignoring how my choices structure my perspective. And as noted is imperialistic and imposes on the police of the interpreter and also it converts art naïve point of view to how we understand.

Just going to double check and I don't have too much more to say. So I think perhaps the most damaging aspect of interpretation. In fact I think interpretation is food damaging but gives rise to what I call discriminative marginalization so discriminative marginalization is an exercise interpretation where we form beliefs about paradigm cases and BU sublease about paradigm cases in our explanation of everything, right, so let us say the paradigm case of being human is a white heterosexual male.

If I use beliefs about white heterosexual males despite interpretive explanation and people are going to be discriminated against to the degree that they deviate from this paradigm case, right, so in our contemporary discourse there's a lot of attention paid to the paradigm case is as if the problem is paradigm.

There's nothing wrong with being heterosexual, male or white the problem is…the paradigm case of what it is to be a person and we use those beliefs to interpret the world. What we will do is we create a gradation, a kind of hierarchy of privilege where if you ask people to move away from the paradigm cases they will be in proportion marginalized so if I had a heterosexual white male as my paradigm and heterosexual white female will be quite as paradigm but will be quite as bad, but it's pretty close.

But if I start to move away in any of the acts in terms of sexuality, color etc. and especially if I combined these being Black and gay or Black and trans all of a sudden the amount of marginalization is going to be so much worse. Is also about nonhuman animals. Then as I interpret the world nonhuman animals are going to be in proportion marginalized and regarded as less important and I will see animals that are like humans is more important maybe apes and chimpanzees or maybe dogs because they like us. As raccoons less so and they will get snakes, forget it. The point I want to make is the problem is the kind of explanation we are engaging in. It is not what we are familiar with, is the idea of how we change what we are familiar with into an explanation of everything. That is what an interpretation does. We can get rid of all of these-isms by simply abandoning interpretation. Simply abandoning the idea that we need to explain everything in terms of our beliefs about various things.

OK. What does this have to do with colonialism and imperialism? I'm a bit strange. I have a Masters in South Asian studies were began a lot of my research into yoga and the history of salvation philosophy but I actually wrote my PhD in contemporary Western philosophy and the problem of translation. One weird thing I notice is the predilections of scholars writing on South Asia were directly derivable from common hegemonic assumptions that Western philosophies operate with.
That I started putting – it took a while but the pieces started falling into place. The basic hegemonic assumption of the Western tradition that connects contemporary philosophy and its ancient Greek roots is what we can call the linguistic account of thought. If you buy this account of thought, you think that thought is the same as the meaning of what one says in language, in human language.

If I assume this model of thought that to understand is to understand language than if I'm going to explain what someone else is saying I have to explain in terms of what I would say which is the meaning of the thoughts. The supposedly meaning of the thoughts. But then all of a sudden I'm involved in interpretation. The way thing I noticed with contemporary philosophers all the famous ones recommend that you engage in interpretation is a method of understanding. I was just floored. Not only does this completely violate what we as philosophers teach your students of logic it's irrational. However, I can line up all sorts of very famous philosophers in the Western tradition. The list goes on and on and they would either explicitly endorse interpretation or in so many words indoors it. But they would also all assume the linguistic account of thought. That I started to say well, if we go back to the ancient model we have from the Greeks and we think there is one term logos for thought, language and reason then when we are understanding what someone is thinking we are also understanding it in terms of what one could say. So interpretation ends up being a rather natural outcome of this model of thought. One of the other things I noted is this model of thought is controversial in the East Asian tradition so Confucius endorses it but it's the main point of criticism so in the Chinese or East Asian tradition how this thesis expresses itself is a little complicated. In the South Asian tradition no one endorsed the linguistic account of thought. It ends up being absorbed via cleal is a much later but it's not part of the original tradition.

Now, I think, if you put all of these observations together and they are observations that you come by my research. It is not something you stumble upon one day. There is this enduring model of thought in the Western tradition and we will talk more about this and subsequent webinars but if you assume this model of thought you would end up interpreting.

And then if you do end up interpreting, you will reduce by a discriminative marginalization all these isms were people who do not conform to the paradigm cases are marginalized and then you add to this Eurocentric tradition that produces model of understanding. So your eccentric paradigms are going to be what are used in interpretation as interpretation is basically like how this tradition grows and expands.

When we look at the history of Western imperialism and the kinds of issues we have to contend with today, I'm not surprised. I am not surprised because if you have this history that assumes this model of thought, that leads to interpretation than its paradigm cases are going to be what ends up being used to explain everything. That is the kind of world we live in.

There you have it. I will come back to the history later but I wanted to end this mind -- my talk before we moved to questions on a positive note. What yogis can do to push back against this cultural forest that we are all having to confront or if -- we really have two choices. Actually we confronted and take responsibly for controlling it are we allowed to influence us and then we just uncritically continue on with the Manas.

I think we need to do a couple things. In everyday life you can protect yourself of these tendencies to interpret by engaging in a few tasks. So with respect to any belief you have turn into a conclusion and ask what reasons are there to support this. What premise if true would mean this conclusion has to be true? If there are no good reasons what you have is what yoga calls samskara. A tendency impression. Something that lingers with you. Is an identification a subconscious or psychological identification with the thought or experience.

The other thing you can do is ask if the belief you have is a genuine inductive extrapolation which gives there can and will be exceptions and how good the evidence is for that. If I was to think about a conclusion as an inductive extrapolation, I would then have to be very keenly aware of the fact that an inductive extrapolation tolerates all sorts of exceptions. Let's say if I say that, you know, Canada is inductively, I do an induction of race in Canada and I come to the conclusion that Canada is a predominantly white country. And then I would also have to ask what is the data on which I base this extrapolation because maybe over time that will change. There's a lot of talk in the United States about the demographics in the states is changing. It's becoming an increasingly brown place and so these inductive
extrapolations about race in the US that are probably old-fashioned like this is a white country, etc., are not increasingly not supported by the data. But thinking about these generalizations in terms of them being an inductive extrapolation allows you to then ask the question of how supported these things are by the data, what kind of exceptions there are in notice if you are doing that you are not interpreting. You are already moving away from trying to explain everything in terms of what you believe. I think really the thing that is very helpful is to ask yourself what level of exception is actually consistent with the extrapolation.

Maybe there are good generalizations based on the data but it doesn't mean it does not tolerate all sorts of interesting exceptions. As I get older and I am prescribed medications that do not agree with me, I'm always so frustrated by doctors that say you should take this. But I'm like what is the data for this. You did a study and you found that 40% of the people tolerate this, maybe it doesn't mean that there is no good reason to do things but it also doesn't fall from that that there can be exceptions, important exceptions. Also for accommodation when we think about disability and diversity, maybe there are generalities we can come to with respect to say what it is for people to participate in something but it does not follow from this that there can't be important and interesting exceptions.

That is basically it. I'm going to leave this presentation with Christa, so if anybody wants to take a look at it they can. I did not include references for what I was saying in the present issue but this is a limited bibliography so if you feel like hunting down some of these references you can take a look at these references.

With that, I will say thank you.

DR. CHRISTA KUBERRY: Wonderful. Thank you so much for that overview of a lot of very complicated topics and their relevance to the yoga sutras as well as to the practical application piece of what this means in the conversations we are having today and what that means both from a power perspective structurally but also linguistically. We do have some great questions. First of all, how does the critique of Western society is to interpretive relate to the critique. I heard Western thought is to logo centric.

DR. SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Logo centrism, it depends, that is a famous term from poststructuralist philosophers. So I would suggest we have to view even these philosophers as operating within the Western tradition so they have a way of criticizing it but not disowning or really – because the argument is that there is no alternative but the options we have aren't so great. If you are interested certainly on granmatology is a famous book. It leads us to think about meaning is something that is accessible to us and Deirdre has this big -- he always wants to emphasize how there are other things going on that are beyond our immediate grasp. In a way I think that is salutary to the kinds of considerations that I was bringing up but there is a kind of broader criticism I want to engage in which is even if we think that is true why should we think that should constrain how we think about the possibilities going forward? That is where I depart from philosophers in the Western tradition because often they will stop at these observations and think that constrains how we can think about the possibilities. What I want to say is well, find it is true but that doesn't make it reasonable.

The presentation I just gave shows as to why that is because the truth is really a secondary question. This is where my practice as a yogi really blends in with my research. Thank you.

DR. CHRISTA KUBERRY: Thank you for answering that. Thinking about these things and yet. Thinking about poststructuralism, thinking about others colors. There's the linguistic turn and that some alternate studies group. There are people out there thinking about things in the post if you will. If we look at India's perspective from independence after 1947, and then how structures of colonialism and imperialism in the things that Shyam was talking about still exist and how it is that we can both understand and resist. We can definitely put together a reading list of think about some of these things as well.

The last statement you just made in terms of thinking about reason versus truth makes me think about when you think about the yoga sutras and I know chakra said essentially yes truth is important that we first have to think about is that truth kind. So what are you basing that upon? So I think it's important to think about where the reason comes from, where the subjectivity comes from asking these big questions. So thank you so much for asking that. The next
one is about arguing against interpretation do we not disregard the reality that all human thought is interpretation? Do we not fall into the trap of belief that humans can be completely objective when really there is no purely objective human thoughts?

DR. SHYAM RANGANATHAN: I have a two-part response to this. If the argument is this is just the way things are and that is just pieces of interpretation so my question is why should be! We be constrained by that?

So the criticism isn't a criticism about what is true it is about what is reasonable and this is where yoga really speaks to me because so much of yoga is about feeding us to appreciate how the facts of our life are really structured by the choices we make.

So if we think the truth is really primary were not going to – were not going to look to how we can change things up so maybe there are certain facts about us but it doesn't follow that these are necessary.

The second part of my response is I think that in the Western tradition objectivity is confused. It's confused with truth. So when people talk about humans being not objective or people being not objective their confusing it with truth and I think if objectivity in truth for the same thing and how we see the world a kind of subjective truth would undermine the possibilities of Buzzfeed subjective.

When I think about the South Asian tradition they talked about it or they modeled it is what we can converge on as we disagree, so being objective is really about making room for disagreements. So there are great models for this. What is needed about an asymmetric object and same object, a whole bunch of different experiences.

Then you have the parable about the blind man feeling the elephant. When elephant. Lots of different experiences in these models to see how there is a convergence between subjectivity and the fact of our experience and objectivity. What I think is interesting about yoga or discipline is about helping us draw this distinction so were able to engage in research, come to understand what is objective but what is objective is never going to be how we see the world.

It's always going to be that asymmetry explaining what we see so we can have different experiences of the same thing. So I'm not troubled by – I think objectivity is really consistent with an appreciation for our limitations as subjective beings. And just to follow up to deny it can make us seem as though there's nothing really outside of our perspective which I think is troublesome.

DR. CHRISTA KURBERRY: Have asked the nihilistic view is set if everything is just subjective and that leaves us with very little, however, there is a place between if you will and thinkers like cheesy Smith -- JC has Smith or Peter Berg go will say if everything is subjective as humans are machines in terms of we create structures, understandings of our world and from the other perspective it is called socialize subjectivity and yes, you have subjectivity but you're also socialized in the constructs of where you live whether it's your geography, your class, your race or your place in history if you will so all of these are interpreting or not interpreting the world enemies part of this is understanding how we are these making machines and recognizing these fluctuations of our mind are often driven by our senses and not necessarily by what is behind all these fluctuations.

So all of this work, I think what you are speaking to, is moving away from the interpretive in the sense of the ego subjectivity and that kind of collective whatever it would be that is the path of yoga.

DR. SHYAM RANGANATHAN: for sure. Just one clarification. This version of the chickadee expect objectivity…is that there's a way to be responsible about content where once we are responsible for it acknowledged over subjectivity doesn't experience it simultaneously.

So I've I can grab a conch and not destroy it I can come to a conclusion about the shape of the conch but not necessarily one I will experience simultaneously Jim or for instance is an argument if I understand the premise to the conclusion has to be true that these the possibility that we could all view the truth of the premise different from our perspective so we can disagree but can converge on the objectivity of the reasons supporting the conclusion.

And this is been I think the very liberating aspect of the Western tradition and that objectivity is our friend because it provides us a limit to our subjectivity and it helps us understand exactly what way over subjectivity is limited.
Only receive things for myself perspective at once and yoga as a disciplined movement help us make up for the shortfall by allowing us to see things from different perspectives which is why I think this kind of the perfection and in Book 4 there's the ultimate getting over your selfishness and what is that you say, except you give up on trying to understand everything from the perspective you are in.

So I invite people when thinking about these options that we might have something to learn about objectivity Southeast Asia that goes beyond what people from the Western tradition have to say.

DR. CHRISTA KURBERRY: 's back to the idea of which is. -- It gets back is. There is a two-partner of hard question in part. Many of these ideas seem opinion based in grounded in a realist other than a relativist or contrast of a -- constructivist frame and her comments are the overall idea interpretation is a probable support for me because it's irrelevant whether it is right, and it is how we function and are unable to function in a way even if we listen to perspectives of others still interpret the words because language is imperfect.

Then her other thoughts that she had to deal with was in terms of interpretation as well and subjectivity, so saying we interpret, we don't acknowledge of her own subjectivity. So she wanted to speak to those or you can speak to your thoughts on this.

DR. SHYAM RANGANATHAN: sure. Argument is an explanation in terms of what Gina believes. The point of the consideration I was inviting us to engage in is to ask a methodological question on whether that explanation is a good kind of explanation, so as not to deny what you believe in that it is a deny the psychological explanations and maybe that is just what you function in the way you take.

None of that is disputed it is more methodological and why is it we think this a good explanation or a good way to proceed term I can think of all sorts of analogies. I am teaching you enter logic and rules of inference that are always valid and respond by saying this means nothing to me because I always think and validate in any time I try and understand what you are teaching me…and moreover I think this is the way all are.

So what would be my response to. Is just an empirical observation of the way you operate in the way other people operate but when we think about reason in yoga we are asking how should we operate. This is exactly where the Yoga Sutra begins and says look, we can do the psychology thing or take a normative approach to life and I guess the main response is that the yoga approach doesn't deny the reality of psychology so if I have a psychological propensity to be sexist maybe that is true of me but that octet the way I live.

The question is how do I change my psychology and it's about shifting the way you operate from one of reaction to one of propulsive practice. In the whole strategy is about getting us away from simply thinking that the consequences of our past actions should continue to constrain us so this kind of a methodological interpretation but the question is so what.

So OK, is true as to wait about going about life. Why should you continue that way to mark

DR. CHRISTA KURBERRY: Wonderful and I recognize only have three minutes and lots of wonderful questions so this will be a continued four-part series, these continue to come with your questions and hopes we can address those and I think if we have time just quickly if you want to wrap up last thoughts on this question. Rachel is asking I'm curious about the interpretation of the information you shared with us in many studios moved away from the complete practice of yoga and have adapted in ways.

DR. SHYAM RANGANATHAN: stay tuned. This is one of the things we are unpacking. We are unpacking all sorts of implications that I suggest as we think about these issues we are moving to a core part of local philosophy is yoga Sutra to draw and I think there's going to be where the solutions come from

DR. CHRISTA KURBERRY: 's was said as we think about colonial appropriation at the moment we are in our relationship is yogis, yoga practitioners and yoga teachers to understand and be aware of these conversations existing is speaking to practical applications and idea about what this means in practice as well.
So thank you all for being here today. Looking forward to continuing the conversation and thank you so much to Doctor Shyam Ranganathan here today.