KRISTINA GRAFF: Good morning and welcome to this continuing education workshop online. I will give a couple of minutes for people to enter the ring. I will advise you when you enter the space, to please answer the poll that is on screen. I should say good afternoon or good evening or good afternoon depending on what time it is. We will give people another minutes to come into this space. Meantime, I will share a couple of announcements and then introduce myself and our speaker. Please note that this webinar is being recorded. You can see and hear but you cannot be seen or heard. If you have any questions, please use the Q&A feature to ask them. So when you submit the questions, no one can see them until we publish them with the answers. And finally, the recording will be available on a platform afterwards. With that, I'm going to entreat myself. I am Kristina Graff, the managing director of the foundation, and pleased to moderate this final part, part four, of the education workshop. Dr Shyam Ranganathan is here as well. He will be completing his series on yoga philosophy, yoga in the West and confronting systemic discrimination. It is entitled, yoga and ethical theory. To all attendees, please note we will take your Q&A's at the end and look after the questions and.

DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Thank you Kristina. I'm going to share my screen. This is part four. I am going to do minimal repetition, with respect to what I have covered already. In the previous webinars, I talked about the cultural influence of the West. This tradition that has this model of thought about linguistic meaning, linguistic account of thought. Thought is the meaning of what you say. If you buy that theory, you think that, to understand something is to explain it in terms of what she would say. That model is called interpretation. It is a subjective mode of explanation but it is also an imperial mode of explanation everything has to be explained in terms of what you would say, which means that you are not open to understanding descent or contrary points of view. So what happens then with this tradition, as it grows, because it is committed to understanding everything in terms of what it would say, it's tries to understand what it can, on the basis of its tradition, but then, what can't be reduced to this tradition â€“ literature, going back to the ancient Greeks, gets called religion. That was the punchline of the previous webinar. If you were to take stock of all the things that were called world religions, you would notice that they don't have anything in common with respect to the content because the same position said by a brown person halfway around the world gets called religion, and if it was said by Plato, no one would bat an eyelid. Vice versa, a position that was thought to be pragmatic atheism, or revolutionaries explanation of the universe, when it is said by its South Asians, it becomes Hinduism or Buddhism or something. Religion is the 1.02 which race is the 2.0. In both cases, the European experience is treated as a kind of paradise. Everything is judged against that. Religion racialised is black and brown, in the way that it - - they are marginalised in their bodies. There are two political aspects to the linguistic model of thought. One is communitarian the sum, the idea that the agent is defined by their community. This is an ancient thread of Western philosophy. If you go back to Plato or Socrates, there is no sense that moral obligation connects you to people outside your community. It is all about people in your community. And of course, only humans. Because what it is to understand and to think is to speak language, and that's largely a human phenomena. So you get two enduring political
consequences of the linguistic model of thoughts that focuses on humans, and humans in their own community. What I think is important to note, and I have talked about this in previous webinars, is that there is an alternative method of explanation. Not only does interpretation render the understanding of people you don't include possible, it also violates basic rules of reasoning. I covered this in the first webinar. The reasoning is not what we take to be true, it isn't even what is true, it is about the support that some thoughts provide for other thoughts. So we can understand the support that thoughts provide for other thoughts independent of literature. In fact, you can see a bunch of true things and lock this support. This is a way to manipulate people. You just tell people things that are true, or at least observable from their perspective, and you bunch them together, and if one of those things is scary, you motivate them to be uncritical about the other things. This mode of propaganda depends upon people not appreciating that what is reasonable is linked with Potter Street. Explication is about trying to understand their perspective in terms of the reasons it provides for its conclusions. We understand competing conclusions in terms of their controversy. At no point do you have to use your beliefs as a frame for understanding what other people are saying. This actually goes back to the Yoga Sutra, the distinction between these two methods of explanation are expressed in this way at the start of the Yoga Sutra. Yoga is the control of mental content, so you can provide autonomy. If you fail to do that, you end up being influenced by what you are contemplating. So when we interpret and explain things in terms of what we believe, we are actually being influenced by what we are contemplating because we don't draw any critical distinction between what concert biting ourselves. We treat what we are concentrating as if it defines our outlook, who we are, and we use these foundations for explanation. Yoga is the alternative method of living. It is not about believing everything and acting upon it. It is about drawing this distension between what we can contemplate and actively making a choice. The reason this distinction is important is that it is explaining to us that either we can understand what's contemplating in terms of activity and choice, so we are having experience, we locate some cause of it in terms of what we are doing, or we treated as a fact of the world that we have to accommodate. If we can understand what role we have in generating the experiences we have, we have some foundation for changing our mind. But if we simply treat what we experience in the world as a fact that we have to accommodate, we don't push back against injustice or in health. We treat them all as this kind of basic parameters for our life. When we appreciate that explication is how we should go about understanding the options, we are appreciating that yoga itself is a very basic ethical theory. Not only that, it has been extremely influential in ways that people don't appreciate. What I have on screen here are three Sutra's â€“ 33 to 35 in book 2. Hypothetical arguments must be countered by becoming an opponent who lives according to them and in opposition to the detracting arguments. Hypothetical arguments promoting harm because actions to be done in accordance with euphoria, greed, anger or infatuation, are preceded by mild, moderate and extreme suffering. Without penetrating knowledge, such fruit is endless. Thus, one must become an opponent such influences. So this is interesting. When you meet people who are promoting harmful activity, and they are trying to make the case for it, the insightful analysis is to appreciate that these political projects are actually rooted in past trauma. If you try to engage with people as if they are being reasonable, you are going to miss the origins, the real origins of their programme. It is actually a kind of past trauma. 35, that is based upon non-â€“ harmfulness, and that has the effect of making opponents renounce their hostility. I was looking at this and thinking it sounds a lot like civil disobedience, direct action. The political position of using non-harm as a method of political transformation, where you confront people who are interested in harm with the opposite strategy. Not as a way to leave things the way they are, but to disrupt harmful practices, and the angle is to force your opponent to
renounce their hostility towards you. I was thinking about this and then I contacted a Gandhi scholar. I thought the Yoga Sutra sounded a lot like Gandhi. Gandhi was famous for leading a largely non-violent revolution against British imperialism. He used these tactics of disrupting arm, - - harm and what we have come to know as peaceful process, for political disruption. The Yoga Sutra is from a long time ago. She wrote a book where she talked about how Gandhi quote extensively the Yoga Sutra in his collected works as the source of his political ideas. Why is this interesting and Bolton? You have this chain of influence. The Yoga Sutra influencing Gandhi, and Gandhi forming the basis for information for Martin Luther King and the American Civil Rights Movements, and this turns into the basis and inspiration for contemporary social movements, like direct action everywhere which is an animal rights movement, and Black Lives Matter. All of these movements in a way go back to the Yoga Sutra. It has been remarkably influential. If we pursue this activity, explicating where we think about the reasons a perspective providing for its conclusions, what we will find is ethical and moral debates are disagreements about the right choice or the good outcome. Every ethical theory as a view about the relationship between these two elements. So here is a four part list, a schema of four basic options. Of course there are more complicated and derivative options but these are the four most basic options. When I started my work as a grad student, the common theme is that there was no tradition of moral and political philosophy in South Asia, and one of the things I point out my work is because everyone misinterpreted, South Asians could only ever say something if it sounded familiar to the Western scholar. When we approach things via explication, we see what is going on across cultures is a disagreement about the right or good. So Yoga, while influential in South Asia, is unheard of in East Asia. I shall go to 3 other things, as land last in yoga which is what we are interested in. In order to know what to do, you need to find a good character. In order to know what to do you have to find God. These are an ancient philosophical tradition. Jane also what is it central is (unknown term), an activity that leads us to harm others. -- Jain. Doesn't intrude onto the state of others and we free ourselves. Confucius and (unknown term) are also examples of virtue ethics. You find a bit of consequentialism in Aristotle. I think perhaps the most famous consequentialism ever, certainly in the South Asian and East Asian tradition, the Buddha was concerned with getting rid of suffering. Consequentialist that the right thing to do is justified by some end. I do something to maximise, say happiness or pleasure, or something to minimise, like suffering or pain. You have to know what your ends are and that ends up justifying the means. They set themselves to understand the suffering. A set of practices just fine because they're supposed to minimise suffering. (inaudible) famous in the Western tradition. The last date I have here is important to people to start thinking about. You find consequentialism very influential in the way people think about ethical questions. It is from consequentialism that we get the idea of ethical meat. The idea to even there's some suffering produced in killing NML/, there is a way to do it humanely. -- Killing an animal/. -- An animal for its flesh. Suffering is what really guides your practice. There are lots of problems with consequentialism and yoga, in a way, in the South Asian tradition was developed to address these. The one problem I find disturbing is that all that matters is your experience else suffering, all I need to do is in need this ties you. Nice that to you.

If the threat is credible and you are a consequentialist, it seems like you can guarantee kill two people, otherwise three will be killed. There are a bunch of these problems that arise from consequentialism. One reason these problems are rises because consequentialism is a barely about making the best of the options presented to us. It is not a theory of radically shaking
things up. It encourages us to figure out a way to work without. Then we can to the ontology. Immanuel Kant, very famous in the Western tradition. --DEONTOLOGY. Yogis will be familiar with Karma yoga. That is defended by Krishna as a way to live life practically while minimising problems. The idea there is that there is a GDP to do that is your duty. And your life is lived well if you perfect the practice. -- There is a duty for you to do. It is something that you have reason to do. Your duty is a good thing to do and you have a bunch of reasons to do it, you will avoid problems, et cetera. Now we come to you. I define Yoga as Bakhtin. That is the salvation word for devotion. --Bhakti. People are familiar with theism and a guard from virtue ethics theories. -- Dodd. -- a god. They use these concepts as a method of trying to understand what yoga has to teach as. But yoga is the opposite of ethics. It can't be a version of theism. Virtue ethics says you have to start with a good agent stop what they want is the right thing to do. Yoga flips this and says you have to start with the right. And, as you perfect your devotion to the right, good things start to happen. That is a major accomplishment. But, because the perfection of practice has to be something that happens in the real world, as you perfect your practice, devotion to this ideal of right action, you transform the public world into something that accommodates you, and the states the people to engage in this type of practice. You find this theory defended in the top of the slide. I'll come back to a famous defender of this theory in a bit. This is by Penguin. The basic teachings of yoga as an ethical theory. People are abstractions from their home lives. They are not exactly the same as their mind or body, but we need to call upon ourselves as an abstraction in order to engage in some type of assessment of the quality of our lives and the rightness of our choices. The second one is the main activity. That is the ideal of sovereignty or modelling us. -- Naughtiness. --lordliness. It is defined by two basic traits. Self governing is free to make choices and do as it pleases at the moment. It is a second order abstraction because it teaches us something of what it is to be a person. People thrive when they are free to be I'm conservative and self-governing. That is when people are in a position to be lords or masters of their minds, things go well. When people are not given this freedom, things don't go so well. There is a kind of personal entity on this, but in the way you are people. If this seems difficult to contemplate, consider what is involved in going to your doctor if you are ill. And you're presenting with symptoms, hacking, coughing or something else. She is going to need to form an abstraction, an ideal Asian view, relative to which she will assess your symptoms. -- And idealisation of you. There's no way to determine your illness and your health without it. Your house will be the features of you that are supportive of your sovereignty. The illness will be the features you present with empirically. There is that our inimitable to your sovereignty. But to potentially start to talk about yoga as a practice. -- Book 2. I want to introduce some traditional representations of these ideals from South Asia. One thing I talked about in the last webinar is the problem is that the linguistic model has that creates for understanding of people who do not share our language or culture. It confuses our cultural expression language with the possibility of what we are talking about. If we get rid of the linguistic model of thought, I think we have to accept that ideas can be expressed in all sorts of different ways. You can express them in top paintings, sculptures. Not necessarily with words. What we find here in the three basic practices of yoga listed the start of book 2, are philosophical depiction of three deities that are commonly idealised in South Asia. There is a cosmic serpent. (inaudible). I explain a bit more of this in a second. If you were to look at the history of philosophical theorising of yoga, from the very earliest time there is a connection with this move. - --- Visnu. There is a way to convey how yoga is really about protecting you and things of importance. This goes all the way back through the ancient texts of South Asia. We find that one of the analyst expressions of the four loss of the yoga was a dialogue between God. (inaudible) extended philosophy on the discussion of yoga involves Krishna, who is an incarnation of Visnu, supposedly. If you look at this history of
teachers, there's this interesting connection between kind of philosophical authors who took Visnu. Legend says he organised the community around. He was a spiritual teacher, not a contemporary. (unknown term) found in this small condition. Then, And thousands years. The reason I'm including this is so you can see this insignia. He is widely regarded as father of modern yoga. He was from the south. -- The founder of modern yoga. He had a bunch of famous students. It is no exaggeration to say what most people think of as the world over can be traced to him. This is a picture of Krisnamacharya, who taught all of these people. Lots of influential people were taught by him. He was also a practitioner of yoga. When he was teaching pastoral exercises to students, it was in a larger philosophical context. What has happened over time is that, because we don't have the philosophical context anymore, people think that teaching yoga is about teaching the partial exercises that he taught basically to children. Most of these people were very young when they learnt yoga from Krisnamacharya. He was teaching them a practice that they could start to work on, as they implemented a philosophy of yoga into life. What has happened as this model has been a victim of its own success. Now people treat it as yoga, and they think the philosophy as an afterthought. Whereas, for someone like Krisnamacharya, it would have been the opposite. This is a famous image, I was reading the Yoga Sutra, and I was looking at this image, and it occurred to me that this is a kind of iconographic picture of the Yoga Sutra. The beginning of the Yoga teacher talked about yoga as external influences, the external waves of the ocean. At the beginning of the second book, we have three essential practices. We have devotion, which is the serpent. This depiction, is in a position to influence Vishnu is passive. When you are conservative, you are in a position to support something new. We think of the ideas that Krisnamacharya would have been devoted to thanks to his philosophical practice. This motif would have been central. When he started to teach yoga, it would have been against the backdrop of philosophical ideas, and something embedded in the tradition he comes from. One of the interesting things about this picture, this motif here, is that it reinforces that if you are going to be devoted to Ishra, it is not only about that, you have to break that's devotion down into other components. It is not about sitting at home and praying. And you take on the challenge of supporting these practices in your own life. That's how you implement the practice of yoga as a basic ethical theory. What ties this together is the idea of sovereignty and loneliness. Isvara explains what we have in common. We are all quirky individuals, and we are all quirky individuals because we share a procedural ideal of our own conservatism and self-governance. Even though we are different as individuals, we share this more basic practical ideal on how to live, and so this then provides us away to understand how we can relate to people who are different to us. I think one of the lovely aspects of yoga is that there is no expectation that ethical practices about standardisation and homogenisation, or making everyone examine the same, it is the opposite. We are all different, and what we have in common is interest in our own Isvara, our own sovereignty. We are changing to a philosophy where we are on influenced by the outside. Through not practising yoga, we are a function of our context. And everything around us, we identify with it and use it. When we are practising yoga, the explanation is the opposite. It becomes a devotion to sovereignty that makes us behave the way we do, and the good outcomes to life are a function of this devotion. They allow us to use an analogy. Think about what is involved in learning music, you have to think about the ideal of music. At ideal of music constructs a practice where you are devoted to the ideal of music. At first when you practice, you are not good at it. But as you practice, you develop yourself, and you transform your performance to something that portrays this ideal. It is the same with yoga. As you go on with it, you start to resemble Isvara in your activities. I want to wrap things up soon. A couple of important implications of yoga as an ethical theory, persons come in all forms. The tendency of identifying persons with human
bodies is a function of the West. So I think one of the ways that Western imperialism continues in the construction of yoga is this idea that we don't have to challenge the Western tradition, we just leave that in place and treat yoga as something where the philosophy of yoga is the foundation, it is about the ahimsa. So we have not only humans as people, but access to our nonhuman handle. Yoga practice is about living in a way that facilitates common interest. Ethical choice for the yogi create a world where it is safe to be a person. That's why the first implementation of yoga is about truth and people that we learn from. It is about activities of civil disobedience and processing, they are completely in the practice of yoga, but so is protesting against injustices done to indigenous rights, the rights of trans people. Anyone who does not count - - conform to social expectation. Yoga is about our sovereignty, and the space for us to explore what that means. It provides us a way to understand what we have in common with those that are different to us. Not only animal rights, but the environment, the earth as well, is something we can be interested in. Yoga provides a very expensive way to think about activity. It would be wrong for me to complete the series without bringing attention to the way that yoga is appropriate within the context of Western imperialism. I did mention that there is this can of tendency to treat yoga not as philosophical criticism. This gives rise to fashion wannabe, socialite yoga, where you do yoga in a glamorous context. It is not about glamour. It is about something you are working on. The image kind of distracts but it leads us to believe that yoga is not about confronting the problems in our world, when it is that from the start. Thinking about wonderful context to do yoga, it is almost a distraction. The whole point occupying a space of injustice, that's way begin your practice of yoga, including your own life. If I was to think, somebody had a great question last time, last webinar, I brought up this idea of philosophical appropriation. What is going on in Western imperialism is not cultural appropriation because framing it that way is a western way to frame the model. What is going on in Western imperialism is philosophical appropriation, where the philosophy of non-Western traditions are appropriated and then put forward as a way to further the imperialism of the West. The obvious example is treating Yoga as ahimsa based on devotion to Isvara. Someone asked if Christian yoga would be an example of philosophical appropriation? My answer, I'm not sure. When the practice of self-governance is talked about, Yoga is about owning ideals. As long as you ground your practice in yoga in sovereignty, then choosing Jesus is completely consistent with the practice of yoga. If you think you have to start with Jesus and ignore solvency, that's wrong. Yoga is all about the adoption to ourselves but it is always grounded in a devotion to Isvara or sovereignty. If I was to think about the main no, no, it is the appropriation of other people's bodies to our own ends. This is a basic ethical no no. When reappropriated someone else's body to our ends, we deprive them of an opportunity to impose their sovereignty, and we diminish our insight into what sovereignty is like. Sovereignty is an abstraction about me. When I'm devoted to it, it allows me to transform my life into something sovereign. If I confuse it with my selfish interest, I'm not allowing myself this opportunity to transform. It is from the selfishness that I then treat the body of others as a tool for my own gratification. If I'm going to think critically about sovereignty, it has to be ideal for me. Then I have to appreciate that others have interest in this as well, so why is it wrong to injure others? It is wrong because it is a violation of their sovereignty. As a devotee to sovereignty, I appreciate that's what drives my choices and actions, not my gratification. Yoga is remarkably anticolonial. You would have to treat everybody in the space as something to be respected. I'm done.

KRISTINA GRAFF: We have several questions in the queue, so just wanted to give time for those.

DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Why don't we do that?

KRISTINA GRAFF: Let me pull them up. I'm going to take one here that we received, we have a
number so I will offer this one and then until a few. Specific to 1 of the slides. How would you respond to the suggestion that the milk ocean picture could be perceived as inappropriate and discriminatory?

SPEAKER: He's not interfering with anybody else. The philosophical value of that motif started to grow. You're not interrupting other people's choice in their activity. You're not even interrupting their freedom to contact you, influence you. They're completely passive and non-violent with respect to every entity around you. It depends. I used to have this worried that that was when I was interpreting it! Not looking at the reasons for conclusions within a larger debate. That completely flipped everything.

KRISTINA GRAFF: Great, thank you. I will share a couple more. It was a pair of them to answer. How would you respond to a person who denies the violence of their words and choices by trying to masking with love and appreciation? That is one question. Please speak more about interpretation with regard to literary translation.

DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Interpretation, literally, take says further out into what I've written a lot about. Interpretation is always a problem because it is not about the topic, it is about the methodology. It is confusing what you believe would be a reasonable account. I think that if you value language of the value of expression, interpretation will be how you see the world. I am not surprised literary critics play so much emphasis on this. But you could notice a lot about the politics of the day, and start to appreciate these themes, not by interpreting, but thinking about the background assumptions of structure and literary presentation. It is more about what you believe in the reasons that motivated those kinds of activities. The love light, I know this stuff is maddening. My view is that talk is cheap. People think that saying love is the same as loving. But it is not, right?! If it was, you'd have to do is say something and treat that as if you have done it. Yes, yes, I've done everything you asked me for. Meanwhile I've done nothing. So it is quite possible for people to use words. But I think as we move to practice and devotion of Ishvara as the foundation, the sense of it being like a joke, it becomes obvious that what these people are doing is not yoga. It might make more sense within the context of a virtue ethical picture. Where the right thing to do is what the virtuous agent once. So these people might be depicting themselves as virtuous agent by saying the love and light and all this stuff. But that is not yoga. Maybe on the virtue -- basis of virtue ethics you can justify that. But on the same reason I'm suspicious of it. Because it is about your character, not what you do in how you treat other people. Aristotle was a virtue ethicist and he thought slavery was just perfect and fine. Because the slaves benefited from a relationship with a virtuous master. He was not critical of the political dynamics. He just thought, "As long as I'm good." So I'd be suspicious of virtue ethics for that reason too.

KRISTINA GRAFF: Thank you. I have another one. "It seems to me that most people do not subscribe to just one category of ethics, but might rather mix the categories, creating a complex code of personal ethics. UCD's categories is merely a method of understanding the reason behind certain ethical codes, not necessarily as divine UK city not intertwined within individuals?" -- DC categories as merely a method.

DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: There are two things going on here when you look at what people are doing. You have to wonder about the methodology. Are they simply trying to describe their own judgements. And then, by virtue of describing them, they're helping
themselves to different ideas. If someone is doing that, I don't think they're actually engaging in a private jet of reasoning. They are just interpreting their own psychology. -- Engaging in the project of reasoning. This can mask the underlying problem, which is a failure to be reasonable. The moment you decide that reason is really the most important motivating factor, then you cannot just simply out and pick. You are interested in how bundles of reasons produce conclusions. -- Simply help him pick. So that takes you in a more rigorous direction.

KRISTINA GRAFF: Thank you. I just got a reminder we are at the nine minute mark now. So I will keep moving through. Another question is - how would (unknown term) help the students? Are they similar types?

DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Right. I think thatâ€™ Well, I am a philosophy professor. So I teach whatever is relevant to the topic at hand. I would definitely recommend learning about and understanding the reasons of the arguments for Buddhism. But Buddhism is just a different philosophical theory from yoga. Buddhism is similar to yoga insofar as it has room for meditation. Some of the practices that end up being central to yoga, you find similar practices in Buddhism. But they are different. For instance, mindfulness, being aware of your experiences and not judging. That potentially describes that any on in book 1 is a tool when you're sick. It is not really treat that as a way to deal with practice. When you start to look at the details as to what they recommend and why they recommend them, they are different. The Dalai Lama and the Buddhists would be happy with reasons that are consequentially grounded. So the motivation for their directions would be based on the outcome. And that is not how yoga is configured. I would recommend studying it. But if yoga is your thing, then Buddhism cannot be your thing. If you are Buddhist, vice versa, you cannot really be AOB. But that doesn't mean we cannot talk about these things. -- You cannot really be AOB. a yogi. IDF forces occupying Palestine, how did talk about colonialism and yoga?

DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Great question. These questions were already explored in the (unknown term). Because it was apparent to people taking yoga seriously that if yoga is not about your ends, you could find yourself on the opposite ends of a struggle and still be doing yoga. And you might even be on the wrong side. It is filled with explanations on how people end up on the wrong side, even though in many respects their practitioners of yoga. The answer, I think, is a little complicated. I think one of the things that does come out is that, just because you are doing yoga, it doesn't necessarily mean that your cause is just. It might be because that people end up practising some form of yoga while their larger political project are unjust. And this is an internal problem for those practitioners. They were not actually be able to make sufficient progress because part of their energy will be going to anti-yogic ends. The practice of yoga in this case it's not just by what they do. It makes a problem of it. I think about that with people who do not seem to see the conflict between their anti-Semitism and (inaudible) of animals in practice of yoga. It does not make it OK. I would recommend to these people to keep practising and then use your practice as a way to reflect on other aspects of your life. Christina thank you.

KRISTINA GRAFF: Thank you. We may not get through all our audience questions but will try to get through as many as we can. One question is that Mac suggesting that translating (unknown term) as God or supreme being is a wrong understanding. Never question is should one practice Yammer and jammers to perfection before proceeding with the other limbs?
DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Question. Words are just words. There's no reason to balk at God unless we are smothered with the assumptions. I think that is what happens. People read God and think familiar ideas of God in the Judeo Islamic Christian tradition. I use that word with some trepidation. People will Justin easily misunderstand it. Ishvara is a supreme being, that is OK. They have to understand in what way, it is normatively supreme. Should you perfect those first? If you can't trust that the disposition, they have a (unknown term) path. You are going someplace. Religion is filled with metaphors of getting to a destination. Yoga is all about occupying your space, taking overweight you are and changing the dynamic so you are the explanation, not the environment. Every limb of yoga is an implementation of the practice of yoga. The foundation is Yammer. The next is (unknown term). Any practice in yoga is also a way to practice the earlier limbs. That is why, for instance, you don't appreciate that when you start to do,, you will hurt yourself. You'd think you don't have to worry about e-consent anymore. If he said in (unknown term) are always the foundation, anytime you add a layer, your active rioting and was basic. -- You activating a more basic (unknown term). The order is very important as you add layers. You absolutely have to start with Yammer. If you do not you will create a healthy environment for the practice of yoga. -- And unhealthy environment.

KRISTINA GRAFF: We are in our final two minutes or so one question out there if you are able to answer. I will also say to enter in deeds that you can be followed on Instagram, the information is on our chat.

CRAIG:
People think say love is the same as loving stop". The question is how we facilitate action and authenticity into teaching yoga in its entirety in the Western world? What are your thoughts on avoiding hypocrisy question mark

DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: One thing I say upset people but I think it is true. Western tradition is anti-philosophy. It begins with the murder of Socrates and has a long history of public Eugene -- prosecuting public intellectual. What would we say in a language or community. The emphasis is on community uniformity. The way to really render yoga instruction authentic and anti-Western in that way is to make it part of philosophical exploration. Always reference your instruction of yoga back to a wider commitment to the practice of yoga as a basic ethical theory. The yoga that you then do in class or practice is just a way to further a wider commitment. You can get people to start again about yoga more expensively, then teaching ahimsa can be easier. If not, you just get a western appropriation of yoga.

KRISTINA GRAFF: Thanks so much. For those of you that still have questions, I'm sorry we were not able to get them. But you will have Dr Shyam Ranganathan's information in the chat. Thank you so much for this amazing series, really powerful and powerful and thought-provoking. DR SHYAM RANGANATHAN: Thank you very much. It has been a pleasure. Take care. Bye Bye.