Perspective Studies, Day 14

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 14 July 2014. Watch on YouTube

---

I made this transcript by machine from the recording and corrected it against the recording's description and my own records. I have not checked the words by ear. I checked a sample of the speaker names by ear, and corrected those I heard differently. [?] marks a word still in doubt and [unclear] a passage that could not be made out. A speaker is named only where the broadcast's screen or the recording's own words say who is speaking. Fillers such as "uh" and "um" are left out. Times are from the start of the recording.

A name followed by (?) was read from the screen at a moment when it changed from one speaker to the next, so the turn may belong partly or wholly to the speaker before or after.

Prayas Abhinav · prayasabhinav.net/videos

00:01 PRAYAS Hi Uttam, are you here?

00:04 UTTAM Yeah, I'm here, I'm here.

00:06 PRAYAS Okay. So you know, yesterday we ended with lots of
00:15 With lots of folks [?] of ideas, lots of tan tangents actually in our hands.
00:20 Mm-
00:20 And today and then we kind of decided to just give it time and let it develop across the next flowing in with today's topic which is you know the other.
00:36 Mm-
00:36 So how do we know the other? is knowing the other as the negative space of ourselves is that a
00:48 Is that an idea that works or are there is there not just in relation to ourselves and is something by itself too?

01:01 UTTAM Space you mean like self and others are mutually exclusive? Is that what you mean?

01:07 PRAYAS Right. So in the sense if you think o think about who am I, then you are who you are not, right?

01:19 UTTAM Right.

01:20 PRAYAS I mean I mean
01:23 Yeah. I mean you are the negative space of who you are not, right?

01:31 UTTAM (?) Right.
01:36 So
01:40 I mean I don't know if it aligns with the negative space idea, but I think like the self I mean others can be a reflection of yourself. Like nothing.

01:56 PRAYAS A r not a not an inverted reflection you're saying.

02:01 UTTAM Yeah.

02:04 DHRUV Hello?

02:06 PRAYAS Hi Dhruv. y can you hear us?

02:10 DHRUV (?) Yeah.

02:11 PRAYAS Yeah. So but why do you need to retain the idea, hold on to the idea that the other might not be an inverted reflection. So in the sense that it could be all kinds of fle reflections. It could be n minus one or n minus hundred or n minus million, whatever, right? It could be any co any configuration.

02:38 UTTAM Right.
02:43 Or rather I think it's
02:47 Others can be
02:55 PRAYAS A reflection.
02:58 What were you saying with it?
03:05 UTTAM Like that?
03:06 PRAYAS No, I couldn't hear you your voice was breaking.
03:10 UTTAM Oh I'm sorry, so I was just telling. others can be seen as superimposition of all the reflections that they have interacted with in the past.
03:23 PRAYAS Right. But don't you think the other is anything on its own?
03:31 Is it just in relation to the point of reflection, that is, ourselves, or
03:39 UTTAM Right. I mean the thing is if
03:45 For me, others is a very abstract concept because for me, you can be or people can be others, but for you, I will be others, right? So it's a very subjective point of view and you can't define others objectively or if it stands on its own.
04:10 PRAYAS No, but if you take any body in the universe, if the body is looking at everything else, that's the other, right?
04:20 UTTAM (?) Right, okay.
04:22 PRAYAS So there is always the self and the other.
04:26 UTTAM Okay, yeah, I understand, okay.
04:32 PRAYAS But I mean I'm wondering if the other is just refined in relationship to ourselves or is it something on its own?
04:48 UTTAM Again, I think it's definitely got to do with whatever the cliched example of four blind people trying to identify an elephant, right? So
05:00 PRAYAS (?) No but why would you say that in the sense you are a person you are a person your sense of the other it's the same as my sense of the other.
05:10 UTTAM No, it need not be. That's what I was saying. I think it's more of the I think the person who's seeing has got a lot to do with how other is perceived as. You know, like the lens or the perspective.
05:25 So you don't really know what the other person is
05:29 PRAYAS No, not the other person. The other the re
05:33 UTTAM (?) I'm sorry, the other yeah. Yeah.
05:36 PRAYAS Abstract other.
05:37 UTTAM Yeah, the abstract other. so you don't really know what the abstract other is. It totally depends on the way you look at it. That's my point of view.
05:51 PRAYAS What do you think JK?
05:55 KRISHNAMURT I came into the conversation a little late. Can you give me some context?
06:00 PRAYAS Yeah, so you know, yesterday we had this thought in our hands, how can we be ourselves?
06:07 UTTAM (?) Okay.
06:09 PRAYAS Right, and then the topic for today
06:18 Hello?
06:25 Hello?
06:27 UTTAM I think Prayas is having some issues with the
06:31 KRISHNAMURT His connection is it? Okay.
06:37 UTTAM Yeah, so y you were asking what was today's topic or you want like the recap of what we have done till now as well?

06:45 KRISHNAMURT Yeah, I just wanted to recap.

06:47 UTTAM We were trying to yesterday we were trying to define what self is.

06:53 KRISHNAMURT Yeah.

06:54 UTTAM And
06:58 To perceive others as well.

07:01 KRISHNAMURT Thank you

07:01 UTTAM You know, is others like the negative space of oneself or what I how do we define others as?

07:10 KRISHNAMURT Okay.

07:10 UTTAM So that's what we're trying to answer right now.

07:17 KRISHNAMURT Is Prayas back?

07:19 UTTAM (?) No I don't think he is back. But Satya?

07:25 SATYA Yes, hi.

07:27 UTTAM Hi. So I was just trying to tell JK like what we've done yesterday and what today's topic is. Would you like to add something? I was just telling how we try to define self.
07:40 How do you define others and stuff?

07:43 SATYA Okay I'm gonna attempt I think we talked about the self being a congregation of various selves of various waves that come together as an envelope which has holes in it. we also had talked about how the whole how the self could be perceived as a donut. and we were trying to put together these two concepts and after that we came to discussing about how does the s self realize itself or how is the self viewed? Where can the self be itself? and what is the space for it to be itself or something like that?

08:30 PRAYAS (?) Right. So I mean we had that thought and then we had we have today's topic that is the other. So is the other a negative space of ourselves? So you know we have these two things, right?
08:49 And we were talking about we were figuring if the other is the same for all of us or it's defined always in relation to
09:02 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, how the self observes it.

09:07 KRISHNAMURT Okay.
09:11 So when b when you say other you're talking about a you're talking about an extra abstract contact concept here, right? So the other for let's say for an example, the other for India as a nation would be all other all other nations. The other for me as an individual could be all other individuals. The other for let's say one body part of mine could be the other po body parts which constitute me. But consciousness at all those levels will determine what the other is, right?

09:45 PRAYAS Right. I mean it's just the whole minus yourself, right?

09:51 KRISHNAMURT Correct. Okay.

09:56 SATYA So the negative space is the whole.

10:00 PRAYAS Right, and looking at it that way, does it make it same for all of us or does it make it dependent on power dynamics again?

10:11 KRISHNAMURT Can I can I make one comment? Maybe as you're talking about this, it just occurred to me that we're talking about this negative space being everything other than the self, right? And this is at all levels of consciousness, right?

10:22 PRAYAS Right.

10:23 KRISHNAMURT So I'm just making a statement out here that maybe the people that actually think about this and become realized souls, so to speak, are people that get rid of that negative space completely. So if you can keep moving out of reference frames, let's say I'm a I'm a human being, an individual right now, if I start looking at the whole animal kingdom as myself,

for example, then that lessens the negative space if there is an absolute boundary, right? And as I keep moving those reference frames, I become more and more realized, and therefore that negative space goes away. So I am I mean in sorry to close [?] a cliche here, but then as you keep doing that, you become one with everything and there is no negative space at the end.

11:09 SATYA So what this process is precluded on the condition of wanting to realize oneself. So the compulsion is realization.

11:18 KRISHNAMURT Mm, correct.

11:22 PRAYAS But JK would the does the negative space go away or do we just bec become tolerant to it?

11:33 KRISHNAMURT My guess is that if you're looking at I mean the general philosophy is that it's infinite but it all looks the same, right? So wha at one level of at one level of abstraction it's f it's futile to do this because as you keep moving away from your reference frames, you'll find that there is still infinity out there. So there will always be a negative space, it will manifest itself in different ways, what I'm guessing.

12:05 PRAYAS Yeah, because I mean w one of the things that we kind of

12:14 Accepted as a kind of rule of this conversation in the in the earlier in the first few days was that you know we if you can talk about things in a way that we can talk about them, right? In a way so, you know, self realization and infinity and you know these things are at one level

12:35 You know, beyond the scope of conversation, in the sense they are almost mythical entities.

12:41 KRISHNAMURT (?) Okay.

12:43 PRAYAS Right, so but what can we verify from personal experience and th by doing that further the conversation that we are we are in and

12:59 So how would you how would you break it down? So if you break down the self realization process or s or f you know, other parts of what you described, how would you break it down?

13:15 KRISHNAMURT (?) Let's I'm can I continue?

13:19 PRAYAS Yeah, please.

13:20 KRISHNAMURT (?) Okay, so I get what you're saying about being able to wrap your hands around this problem and okay, so let's talk about it from a purely individualistic point of view, saying, Okay, as a human being, what is the negative space, right?

13:36 PRAYAS Right.

13:37 KRISHNAMURT So one thought that occurred to me was if I'm if I'm looking at it from a very non philosophical space, I would say that the negative space is one way of looking at negative space is the is the beliefs that you've left behind as you have matured or evolved. So that could be one way of looking at the negative space. Instead of looking at it as everything outside yourself, you could actually internalize this whole thing and say, as I have evolved over the last whatever years, I have left behind X, Y, and Z beliefs. And that is the negative space.

14:17 PRAYAS So that is the negative space of yourself.

14:21 KRISHNAMURT Correct.

14:21 PRAYAS Would that make the space be the other?

14:26 KRISHNAMURT I think it you can extend the definition into that because if you have left behind some beliefs, right, and you're holding on to some other beliefs now, if the sum total of this is the is the whole superset, then it's equivalent to what ev everyone else is holding on to. I mean, I'm not sure if I'm clear on what I'm saying.

14:53 PRAYAS (?) What do you what would you say?

14:55 SATYA Became part of the other.

14:59 KRISHNAMURT (?) Yeah, I guess I'm w I'm trying to say that the beliefs that you have left behind as you have evolved today might be held by other people.

15:09 SATYA (?) Right.

15:11 KRISHNAMURT Right. So the fact that you left those behind makes it your negative space.

15:17 PRAYAS You know, but there are things held there are beliefs held by other people that you also never had, right?

15:24 KRISHNAMURT (?) That's also true, correct?

15:26 KRISHNAMURT (?) So but it's not

15:27 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

15:30 Yeah, it'll intersect, but it won't be as a set, it won't contain

15:36 Entirely the

15:38 PRAYAS (?) I'm sorry, I said it's a super set, so

15:40 PRAYAS (?) A superset, right.

15:42 KRISHNAMURT What's it clear? [?]

15:43 PRAYAS (?) Oh, I h I heard intersect.

15:45 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, and then I started thinking about intersection.

15:50 Dhruv what would you add to this?

15:55 DHRUV Okay, so as JK looked at the negative space as something as like set of beliefs, those I left behind as I grew up. I was looking at negative space as something as in totally physical connotations like the space, a three D space minus me. For example consider a chessboard as the universe and I am a piece on a chessboard occupying one cell out of sixty four. So in that sense the remaining sixty three cells would be the negative space of mine.

16:43 And hence the pieces those occupy those rest of the cells would be others for me. And what I would like to add here is my position or my cell in that universe would definitely determine my take on the others as in how close others are to me.

17:15 Or how far away they are from me.

17:20 That would definitely make an impact.

17:24 Oh

17:27 What others are to me. As in that context I'll say that others is not something totally objective. It also depends on how I perceive them.

17:47 PRAYAS No, how does it depend on does how does it also depend on how you perceive them? Like you described this chessboard and you described all the other cells except your the cell in which you are positioned. And I understood that.

18:06 But how does that I mean it depends on the position, sure.

18:13 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

18:16 You're saying that what you can see depends on where you are.

18:20 DHRUV Yeah. Precisely. As I'm

18:24 UTTAM Sorry, Dhruv may I add one point?

18:26 DHRUV Yeah, sure.

18:28 UTTAM I think Dhruv is trying to tell that how the threat to a piece depends on where it is. Like if it is like in the weak spot like where a horse can attack the whatever pawn or your piece. So it actually depends on where exactly in like spatially it is located. So that makes you look at things differently. I think Dhruv is coming from that point of view.

18:56 UTTAM (?) Yeah, so

18:58 KRISHNAMURT Can extend the chessboard analogy.

19:02 UTTAM Great.

19:03 KRISHNAMURT I mean I'm I'm glad that Dhruv brought it up because it just occurred to me that if you define the negative space as the rest of the sixty-four sixty-three spaces, then there is also this additional thing of the more you travel in those sixty-three spaces, the more you re-alise what the negative spaces are. Because you might be in one cell at a given moment. Right? Right. But if you look at life experience as moving through that chessboard and taking those

risks of being attacked by someone else, etc., it's when you it's when you encounter those risks that you actually realize what the real negative space around you is.

19:46 UTTAM (?) Right.

19:48 SATYA I wanna add to that saying that Dhruv had talked about perception and if I were one of those chess pieces, I would not even have thought about perceiving the others or where I am in that chessboard to have a strategic importance. What I'm trying to say is how I perceive myself on the chessboard also has a meaning. also adds to how I construct how the chessboard is. Do you see what I'm saying? Like for some it might appear like the other is a strategy to go through. For me, it didn't even occur to me that there is a strategy to this chessboard.

20:29 So there's a difference in perception of the other of the other.

20:34 KRISHNAMURT Correct. I think this is this is analogous to what I call whose Petri dish are you in. Right. Right. So this is I mean the equivalent here is whose chessboard are you in and who are the people in your chessboard. So the i this is like a plus infinity to minus infinity kind of thing there. Where you control some things and you think you're the god of that chessboard, but then there's a chessboard above you and so on and so forth.

21:02 SATYA (?) Right.

21:05 And actually maybe there are no I'm sorry. there are no there are no chessboards really. I mean they are chessboards but what we think is a strategy or what we think o is risk or what we think our power is on that square or depending on the location may actually mean nothing.

21:27 SATYA (?) Mm- right.

21:28 PRAYAS But you know, irrespective of which grid we are a part of, right? So which power nexus we are you know just ploy [?] in.

21:43 As far as the self and other question is concerned even if you are one chessboard above me in that sense whatever is not you is the other, right? So that doesn't change. Even if so, I don't know if there is a power dynamics in the perception of the other in the sense that is there a hierarchy of powers the lower powered pawns on the chessboard under a particular chessboard, would it would it be less a past part of the other, or is it flat?

22:29 SATYA So it's like the other is a monolith.

22:35 PRAYAS Right. I mean that's what that's what I would think

22:41 And not so much of a of a surface with many holes like the envelope of the surface, right? So

22:53 SATYA I mean maybe you identify with some others though. I mean if you if you have some identification of the self in some other, even if you were to try to break down the other. I guess when we talk about chessboard it's like breaking down the other.

23:11 PRAYAS Right, because of the because of the battle, because of the conflict.

23:15 SATYA Struggles, yeah, whatever, power. But as a whole, yeah, I mean ev anything that's not me is the negative space. I mean we can choose to not explore the negative space in any terms and just accept that it's a negative space.

23:32 Or we can

23:34 PRAYAS Without defecating [?], without creating levels.

23:38 SATYA Yeah, that's one way.

23:40 UTTAM (?) Do you think others can be a part of the holes that we described yesterday? Like

23:47 SATYA Yeah, I would if we in my opinion, if we are going in that direction, if we are trying to break down the other, then there will be some links between the self and the other through these holes.

24:02 Or through some other new holes or some other new thing.

24:12 PRAYAS But how does that help us in a way respond to where we were yesterday and which was you know how can we be ourselves? So does what helps us? Does specifying the other help us or does it help us to just consider it flat, like one entity?

24:39 Right.

24:42 I think

24:43 PRAYAS (?) Specifying heads. [?]

24:46 KRISHNAMURT (?) No from what you said, you referred to a hierarchical structure and power and all that stuff, right?

24:53 PRAYAS Right.

24:54 KRISHNAMURT (?) So it is it is under the influence of power structures that we are not able to be ourselves in my opinion. Right? But if you look at if you look at the negative space and you come to the conclusion that the negative space is filled up filled with entities that are just as important as you, not less or more. That's what makes it a flat structure, right? If that is the case then you c you have more of a chance to be yourself.

25:22 KRISHNAMURT (?) Right.

25:23 Than otherwise.

25:26 SATYA But if you perceive that there are all these others, you could be inhibited.

25:31 SATYA (?) But

25:33 KRISHNAMURT (?) Yeah, what I'm saying is that the inhibition that you just spoke of Satya the inhibition comes from these power structures and these power hierarchies. If whatever meditation we do, and I'm using meditation in a very cognitive kind of sense

25:49 SATYA Make observations or

25:51 KRISHNAMURT Yeah, whatever observation we do, if it comes out with the result that there are other entities out there who are just as important as you or just as influential as you, or just as vulnerable as you, then you will be much more comfortable being yourself, is my submission.

26:08 SATYA But that might actually put me off because I might have a sense of self where I you know I don't want other people to be as important as me, right?

26:20 So it might actually put me off to think like that.

26:24 UTTAM Why do you say that?

26:26 PRAYAS Right. No, but that's that takes us in a very tac that takes us to a space which again we were

26:35 We were in the last few days, but we never mapped it. So, you know, the effect of noise in the environment. So one was the you know clamming up, so inhibition, one was anger, so you want to dominate it by making more noise. But so you are saying that at this point, if I want to dominate, and domination generally necessarily has a hierarchy. So if you want to dominate and

27:12 I'm saying that

27:15 Oh you know, we are the same, then it won't work.

27:32 SATYA So I guess what I was trying to say was if there is I depend who realizes, who wants to express the self

27:43 I'm sorry, Obtuse, are you am I interrupting Obtuse? I don't know.

27:51 PRAYAS There's n noise, yeah.

27:58 Yeah, please continue.

28:00 SATYA Okay, when do we when are we ourselves was the question. When can we be ourselves? And the point one thing but that we're talking about right now is everyone else is equal to me, that's when I can be myself.

28:15 SATYA (?) Great.

28:15 SATYA (?) But

28:17 PRAYAS It doesn't work.

28:18 SATYA Mm it may not. I'm not saying that it doesn't. I'm saying it may not because if everybody is the same, what's the distinction between me and the others? So where does the self even come then?

28:32 PRAYAS So how do I differentiate?

28:36 SATYA Yeah. The question is do I want to differentiate and if I do, how do I?

28:45 PRAYAS Right. I mean because the in a very organic way the self the individuation process, you know, the formation of the self process happens through differentiation at first, right? So we can't totally give up on differentiation because

29:07 'Cause when we do that then the self won't even form.

29:12 SATYA Right.

29:16 UTTAM (?) I think

29:20 Like others can be same as the self, but their perspectives can be different. That's when I can be myself, when I hear different perspectives or encounter different point of view.

29:34 PRAYAS Perspectives of

29:38 UTTAM Perspectives of others again, like for them I think there is some common intersection space on how you how like for the other as you said like for two people, right? or two selves, the other what both of them can talk about have some common intersection point. And when I know about their perspective about that intersection point, that's when I can be myself.

30:15 Did I make sense? I don't think so.

30:18 DHRUV To me, yes. as in I this is how I perceived what you said.

30:26 DHRUV (?) Mm-

30:27 Like we talked about how it is completely

30:38 Completely natural to have this differentiation in the first place to for the formation of self.

30:46 Right.

30:47 And my way of building this formation or my way of

30:55 Clearing or defining this differentiation to me, how I am different from others.

31:04 UTTAM (?) Right.

31:06 DHRUV Each something that essentially makes me different from others, as in others or let's say just a quick question by others, do we mean people or is it limited to just living entities or

31:26 It can be any pixel in the negative space.

31:32 Possible.

31:33 SATYA (?) The third one, any pixel.

31:36 UTTAM (?) Any pixel, yeah.

31:38 DHRUV So what I'm saying is that pixel let's assume that's rational entity whatever that pixel is, that pixel would also have a way of differentiating itself from its own negative space.

31:56 DHRUV (?) Right.

31:57 DHRUV (?) And that way would might be different than how I look at myself.

32:07 And those two different ways would make this structure essentially rough, as in not something that's flat.

32:19 PRAYAS So everyone won't be equal essentially. So you are saying that this the contrast will naturally emerge, so differentiation will happen and the self will be formed. So right. So JK what do you how do you respond to that? The that the idea of you know everyone being the same somehow seems difficult to model.

32:53 KRISHNAMURT So hi here's what I'd like to add, yes, it is important for us to differentiate ourselves to be individuals, but I have a feeling that this should come full circle where you f you differentiate yourself to figure out who you are and then as you evolve you rea you start realising that while everything may not be the same, everything is of equal importance. And then you go back to being a part of the larger entity. Maybe that is what the cycle of life is about.

33:23 SATYA Yeah, I mean again I'd agree with that. That i keep thinking of Siddhartha's life.

33:30 SATYA (?) Mm-

33:31 PRAYAS Great.

33:34 And you're very clearly using the words of equal importance and not same, right? So it's not a question of equality like democracy falsely promises, you know, it's more an idea of equal importance.

33:51 KRISHNAMURT Yeah, equally important. it is our power structures that give different things different degrees of importance. Right? Now I'll take an example, this can be extended to most things. The work that a potter does and the work that a banker does are different, very clearly different, but in a society that didn't have hierarchy, they would be just as important.

34:17 PRAYAS But in an economic system right an economic system necessarily requires to accept and accept and make peace with the idea of hierarchy.

34:32 SATYA Yeah, for flow to happen there has to be ups and downs.

34:38 PRAYAS So how would you reconcile your the model that you are proposing with the idea with economics? I mean with the

34:50 With exchange.

34:54 KRISHNAMURT (?) Yeah, so there's two kinds of exchange, right? There is barter like it used to be in the old days.

35:02 KRISHNAMURT (?) Right.

35:03 And there is this current economic regime that we live in, which basically that I mean the regime that we live in today is honestly in my opinion an artificial regime where a few people have appropriated all the wealth and they're just doling it out in small installments to every one of us.

35:26 PRAYAS But do you do you find natural systems other than human, like the animal kingdom so to say, do you find that their economic systems are absent from their society if they have a social system?

35:43 KRISHNAMURT I don't know enough about that to comment. But w I will comment based on something that I've seen let's say the native Indians in the US, for example.

35:56 Their societies didn't have these level of structures, right?

36:01 PRAYAS Right.

36:04 DHRUV Sorry what are you referring to?

36:07 KRISHNAMURT I was referring to the native Indians in the in what is today called the United States of America. They seem to have lived in a

36:17 Yeah.

36:17 In a reasonably peaceful equation with not just their surroundings but the others around them. There was enough respect given to everyone's profession, everyone's importance and things like that.

36:31 SATYA Something that is of value, right? That gets traded? Or do you think that trade doesn't happen? I mean, currency can be different.

36:39 DHRUV Mm, but there's always some attribution of value to some tangible entity. As in today it's the currency or the

36:52 DHRUV (?) Coins.

36:56 Or Indian rupees or whatever it is.

36:59 DHRUV (?) Right, value is always there.

37:01 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

37:02 SATYA So there's economics in some way or the other.

37:06 DHRUV Yeah, what I think what JK is saying is attribution of value to something quantifiable is what is playing the game. As in if you look at the barter system where I want to exchange my commodity X with

37:27 Y being in position of someone else, and X is with me. So there's no standard quantifiable rule.

37:39 Between X and Y unless and until we two meet and talk about it. Whereas today if I want to have X or Y I know what the MRP is.

37:56 Is that what you're saying, JK?

37:59 KRISHNAMURT Yeah no, I want to add one more thing here. Saying yes the economic value is important, but if you go back to a time where we weren't living in this hyper marketing kind of a world, there was a method of realizing the true value of a certain object or a certain service. What's happened today is that a few people, because of the power hierarchy, have appropriate all appropriated all the wealth and they are now determining what has value and what doesn't have value. Earlier I think there was a system where society as a whole determined what was valuable and what was not, or what the what the gradation of value was.

38:42 SATYA But ultimately there is value, right? There is value and there is high and low values. How it is determined still doesn't matter.

38:52 KRISHNAMURT Yeah, there has to be there has to be that differentiation in value for transaction to take place.

38:59 KRISHNAMURT (?) Right.

39:01 UTTAM Could someone just quickly tell me this economic perspective on how we define others or is it just a lens that we are talking about?

39:11 PRAYAS No so I understand this economic perspective in the sense that looking at the other as a flat space with everyone being of equal importance is what you know as JK you know suggested this model as different from an other which is which is basically one entity or the other in which there are levels of you know of power dynamics and hierarchy, whatever.

39:48 PRAYAS (?) Right.

39:50 But you know but I would say is that no matter which time we look at look at, there was always a hunger for growth. Right? There was always a hunger for progress. And that is the reason why from then we have reached now. So and that hunger for growth, progress, whatever has been

40:17 At the cost of creating even synthetic or whatever, some power dynamic, some hierarchy, right? So

40:27 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

40:29 SATYA (?) And it's become cancerous now.

40:31 PRAYAS Right. I mean that's the only way we know of growing. So an economic an economic viewpoint of the Native American lifestyle would be that you know we that you know the Europeans came and they had more money and more progress and they outpitted them and conquered the land. So I mean capitalism has this inherent rationalization, which is survival of the fittest, which is a very brute kind of logic, right? So it's brute in the sense that it accepts that what we want is growth. And if growth has to happen, then this is the cost we have to pay.

41:23 SATYA Right, versus if I if you think of life if its goal is to survive, it's not talking about growth, it is just talking about sustenance. Sustenance versus growth. So health versus stability kind of thing.

41:40 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean there is very there's almost a rare prevalence of obesity and outside humans. In the sense, you know, you find a it's rare to find animals hoarding food that they don't immediately need or something like that.

42:04 SATYA (?) Right.

42:06 PRAYAS So what you're saying health, you know, once that state is achieved then maybe there is a nullification of all further desire.

42:14 PRAYAS (?) Right. There's a flattening.

42:17 KRISHNAMURT I wanna make actually I'm gonna play a devil's advocate here. This is not what I believe in, but I'll say it in I'll say it regardless. imagine that this conversation that we are having now was happening in let's say five hundred years ago in what we now call and there was this system where people cared about sorry, didn't care about GDP growth and things like that. Would we still have had a problem defining the self and others in that situation? that's part

one. Part two is we are having this conversation now and saying that the way we are living now is cancerous. But could some future look back on today and look at it as the ideal society?

43:13 SATYA I think future looking back, yes, certainly. I mean i it's all perspectives, right? Like it depends on what the what the goal is, what people what is the prevalent cultural, social, whatever goals, right? So yeah, absolutely. This could be utopia for somebody. And like what we are looking back on, same thing. We don't like you say, I mean the de the conversation on self and other may have been different in the past, yeah. Because it's the structures. And it depends on what value is given to what.

43:49 You know, we are saying now that we have a few people hoarding all the wealth on top of you know, the wealth is in the hands of few people. It used to be like that in the past too. It's like almost we have gone back to that state. You know, the kings had the control.

44:07 DHRUV Right. I would I would like to throw light on this from a different standpoint sort of. as in I would like to say that the world the regime that I'm living in right now, I would prefer that over the earlier Native American sort of thing. in the sense that even then as Satya is saying power structure was there and attribution of value was instead of GDP and economic growth, it was given to different tangible entities like human blood bird feathers in Native American culture. So there used to be human sacrifices and things like that where kings or the rulers were

45:06 Analogous to the people in today's context who have appropriated all the wealth and who are playing around with the world, so to say. So to

45:20 Look at it from a neutral standpoint, I would say that today I am valued or I am judged by the others based on what skills I possess or

45:34 What?

45:36 Value I might add to the system as opposed to the earlier times when people might have judged me based on what totem or tribe do I come from and

45:53 PRAYAS You are saying that we live in meritoc you know we live in a meritocracy, right? Like we our merit decides our value. You are saying that.

46:03 DHRUV As opposed to the earlier times. as in what I'm saying is power structure essentially has to be there, be it any point of time in the history of civilizations. as long as there is a group of people harvesting the land and or even claiming the land and living there instead of being nomads and like differentiating themselves from wild animals, there has to be a pro power structure.

46:37 PRAYAS So even in the Matrix even in our projections of the future, the Matrix are we have power dynamics and we have a very clear line of control. And even in the machines we design which needn't actually have no inherent need to mirror the power systems, power structures we live in, also m also mirror those back. But

47:04 So in would you would you then say that the view of the other as into as parts of equal importance, would you say that then that is utopian?

47:20 DHRUV Mm of equal importance

47:25 UTTAM To the present? Is it what you're saying to us?

47:28 PRAYAS No to the self, right? So in the sense that when you feel that everyone else has equal importance in the system, which is right do you think basically that's not possible?

47:48 SATYA It could be seen as utopian in one way, but in another way if you look at it as the universe being indifferent, then actually it just is. Everything is equally important, everything is equally not important.

48:03 PRAYAS So it ma the scale matters. At a large enough scale, things lose

48:08 SATYA Mm. Not even that. It's more like which perspective are you taking? If you're taking the perspective of social and cultural definitions of what utopia is, then it might look idealistic

48:21 Right.

48:22 PRAYAS So if you if you look if you take away the personal context and colour and flavour, right? So if you yeah, if you in a way render these concepts as being dry and devoid of subjective layering of stories. But is that is that possible? Is it possible to I mean I think so far we have stuck we have stayed within the narrative folds of looking at things

49:02 In their objective dryness rather than their you know the subjective emotion or you know intensity. But I wouldn't know if that is realistic or that is safe.

49:19 SATYA You know, personally I would say looking at it like that actually gives us a new perspective because by habit we tend to look at things with our lens of emotion or whatever it is, whether we accept it or not. But I feel like having that dryness is also an important perspective. If the goal is to identify what the self is.

49:44 PRAYAS So do we do we move ahead with our model of the other being of paths with equal importance or do we configure that a little bit?

50:10 SATYA (?) Both are looking interesting to me.

50:12 Yeah.

50:12 What is more interesting at this point is the flatness actually. Because in our realistic situations we tend to deal with power structures and all this all the time. So to not have any of that just seems more interesting.

50:29 SIDDHARTH (?) Yeah.

50:31 KRISHNAMURT Can I add something to this flatness argument? See, we you talk about power structures and the fact that they've always existed and all that stuff. The my opinion is that power structures are formed when there is scarcity of something. Right? Now, the question that we might need to answer is are there absolute scarcities that people are then taking advantage of, or are people creating the illusion of scarcity so that they can hold on to power? That might help in the way that we deal with the world. Because you might have a situation where an entity is trying to create an illusion of scarcity and therefore take power.

51:15 KRISHNAMURT (?) Yeah, very much.

51:16 SIDDHARTH (?) You don't buy into that you're not giving away power.

51:19 SATYA Exactly. Yeah. If you don't fall for certain perceptions or certain pyramid schemes and you look through it, then yeah, that's right. Then you don't fall for it.

51:31 PRAYAS So is are social systems essentially pyramid screams? [?]

51:38 Because they engulf you at some level and they make you part of the game in a in a way that you are assigned a role and then you fulfil

51:52 The needs of the system and not of yourself in a way.

51:58 SATYA (?) Yeah, I mean it's a choice you make, right? Like you might want to fulfil your own needs by either partaking of the larger pyramid or creating your own pyramid or it's a choice you make.

52:19 So I mean do you participate in the power structures or what do you do? And like we had talked earlier about not being a I think Akshay [?] had talked about it this is not one pyramid, it's like multiple pyramids feeding into each other.

52:33 UTTAM No, but then we said it's compulsive, right? It's a compulsive game. So I ch I think choice is illusion. Based on what we spoke about like a couple of weeks ago, a couple of days ago.

52:48 PRAYAS Right, but and so r at this point we are looking at the other as consisting of lots of paths which are of equal importance. And

53:05 That helps us feel ourselves. So be let that helps us be ourselves because

53:16 You know, we have accepted everything and rendered let it be rendered in equal importance.

53:28 But is this act how is this act performed? Right? So you c you can describe that if you think this will happen, right? So if you if you're happy, then you're happy. But then

53:43 How do you be happy, right? So how do you picture everything in equal importance? I mean, I think that itself is a

53:54 Even if you accept that does help you feel that does help you be yourself. But how do you how do you do that?

54:05 UTTAM How do you picture import everything as of equal importance? Is it what you are asking, Prayas?

54:09 PRAYAS Yeah, so how do you disengage from power play? But to basically connect it to what Satya was just saying? How do you how do you not participate or participate in play in that sense?

54:25 So if you're considering everything be to be of equal importance, yeah.

54:34 KRISHNAMURT So I wanna add something here that might be a topic for a further discussion. But I think what we do when we are talking about such things is we confuse two very different entities. One is happiness and one is peace. Right? So when you s I mean my opinion is that when you say happiness, it automatically has that negative possibility of sadness in it. Right? If whereas if you actually look at everything as equal, what you will attain is peace. You can't you can't look for happiness and equate it to peace. It doesn't it doesn't work that way. If you're looking for happiness, there is the possibility of sadness, and that happens in an unequal society.

55:13 SATYA So what you're saying is if I accept that things are unequal, then everything becomes equal.

55:21 KRISHNAMURT Yeah, if you choose not to participate in that game, then you will find peace, but you cannot say you will find happiness there.

55:29 PRAYAS No, but is that choice for you to make. So can you actually just not play the game suddenly? I mean because the game is compulsive, you know, like we looked at it a few days back. And so then if it's compulsive that means that you can't the key is not in your hands. You can't just suddenly snap out.

55:52 SATYA So I feel like if you're participating but you're aware that you are participating and that this is what it is, you accept that things are not equal. That acceptance there is a key to peace in that acceptance. Is that what you're saying, JK?

56:10 KRISHNAMURT (?) Yeah. So what yeah the corollary here is you said there are many different pyramids also, right? So what you can choose is which pyramid you want to play in, right? So you might have the ability to play the game at the at the topmost pyramid. But you're choosing not to do it because you know the downsides that come with it.

56:31 SATYA Yeah.

56:35 KRISHNAMURT (?) I think that differentiation between happiness and

56:40 PRAYAS Yeah, that was just an example. I mean I was

56:44 KRISHNAMURT Very important. Well

56:47 PRAYAS Yeah, I was just g I just give that example in terms of in

56:54 How do you argue give instr give an instruction set for a thought, right? So happiness is a grand idea, you know, which is you know beyond the course of conventional you know game world rewards. So g happiness is something which is very f which is perceived to be very fleeting.

57:21 KRISHNAMURT Perfect.

57:24 PRAYAS And so but then can this understanding of acceptance of everything to be of equal importance not be fleeting? So does this how would you characterize this acceptance?

57:42 SATYA Yeah, it does feel less fleeting to me. Because then you're aware of what is fleeting and what isn't also.

57:51 PRAYAS So then you have this perspective and then you're able to be yourself, right?

57:57 SATYA (?) Perhaps, yes. Or at least you're on the threshold of finding out who yourself is.

58:13 PRAYAS Right, because you are you are st you are still in the picture. So you are only at the threshold. You're not
58:23 You know actually
58:27 You know, being yourself yet.

58:29 SATYA It could be, yeah.

58:33 KRISHNAMURT (?) Yeah, maybe it removes the noise that might help in your self discovery.

58:38 SATYA (?) Right.

58:40 PRAYAS But then the next stage of the puzzle is modeling other perspectives, right? So in the sense you're switching frames. So the whole the whole game of perspective studies is worth playing because you can you know at some point be switching, right? So you can look at any one thing in a million different ways and by doing that you understand it more.

59:12 SATYA Absolutely. Yeah. And I feel like the idea of flatness helps with that switching of perspectives because if you look at everything of as of equal importance, then you'd it wouldn't be that difficult to switch perspective to something else. Whereas if you thought that something else is of not that much of an importance, then you wouldn't even care to switch to that perspective.

59:34 SATYA (?) Right.

59:39 PRAYAS But you know the switching the switching exercise, the switching the episode of switching is always even if you had accepted that everything is equal, in the switching exercise experience that will change because when you accept that everything is equal and you still have yourself, right? So you still retain yourself, then it's fine. You're not in that much of a danger, right? But when you have to give up yourself and accept I mean you're giving up your perspective, not yourself, but you're giving up your frame and accepting another frame that you're going to bear.

01:00:28 I mean I feel then it's a very then it's a dangerous then it's a vulnerable moment, right? It is so

01:00:34 SATYA Yes, it's scary.

01:00:37 PRAYAS (?) And that so that performance of switching
01:00:42 Is actually
01:00:45 Yeah, when you when you have to switch you will always feel a sense of love for your own frame.
01:00:52 Yeah.
01:00:52 Attachment for your own frame. So I'm not sure if the flatness helps here because the flatness dis evaporates.

01:01:02 SATYA (?) Yeah, so you're saying that the self becomes more important than the other?

01:01:07 PRAYAS (?) Especially when you have to leave it. Like especially when you are about to die, you actually you might discover that, you know, life is really worth living.

01:01:18 PRAYAS (?) Right.

01:01:20 SATYA Right.

01:01:23 SATYA (?) Also.

01:01:24 DHRUV (?) Right.

01:01:26 SATYA (?) Yeah, good.
01:01:27 No, please.

01:01:29 DHRUV (?) Yeah. What I was thinking was
01:01:33 Let's say I assume that the things are flat and every single pixel is of equal importance.
01:01:42 Why would I switch then? As in first thing and secondly, if at all I want to switch to what position will I jump to after switching, as in if everything is of equal importance?
01:02:01 How will I choose then to what to switch to? As opposed to that, if I see things as not flat, then I'll understand that something is of greater importance than another. Then I'll have this curiosity of switching to that thing.

01:02:28 KRISHNAMURT No, I don't understand why the need to switch. If you can if you can move up the reference frame, then you'll realize that a mountain is just as important as the sea, even though the mountain is at a different level than the sea. So the sea does not have to suddenly shift to the mountain's perspective. What it has to do is get out of its own perspective and then it'll all become clear.

01:02:51 SATYA But getting out of its own perspective means going somewhere else, right? Which could be a mountain.

01:02:59 KRISHNAMURT Yeah, so the I mean if you look at it from the old chessboard analogy that we talked about, the more you the more you see, the more you realize that I mean the if all of us are as important, all our jobs and all our activities are just as important, if you stay within yourself, confined by the traditions and the values that you've been given, regardless of whether you travel around or not, if you stay

01:03:28 You will never see

01:03:41 Are you guys there?

01:03:44 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, we y your voice was breaking a bit, so we're just waiting for it to come back.

01:03:49 KRISHNAMURT Okay. Okay.

01:03:52 SATYA I think from what I understood it is like the process of exploration is necessary for understanding. So switching those perspectives is

01:04:02 SATYA (?) Right.

01:04:04 PRAYAS It's part of the exploration. So you know you would once you get into the game a little bit, you want to verify that what you're seeing is really what you're seeing, right?

01:04:17 KRISHNAMURT Pretty [?] yeah.

01:04:18 PRAYAS And then you don't trust your senses anymore. So you want to try on different lenses to see if it's still the same.

01:04:28 SATYA Yeah. And it could be a random lens. I mean I the decision may just be a throw of a die.

01:04:35 PRAYAS Right. So and for that to happen, because the switching is our idea for tomorrow, which is also a concluding day. And so we have to in a way connect what we are talking about today to that idea. And so I think the m the idea of the other needs to be one which allows this switching in a painless or rather in a in a self facilitating manner. And what Dhruv was suggesting I think was that if you if you have this current economic system where aspiration and desire are the motivations for switching, I mean that seems to explain where we are right now, but that doesn't s seem to

01:05:35 Really offer another model like the equal importance model was in that sense, right? So I don't know if you can configure that equal importance model a little bit to account for switching.

01:06:01 SATYA (?) So I feel like if we see everything outside of us as flat, then it seems accessible. I can actually venture and go and explore it.

01:06:13 PRAYAS (?) Right. So there is also less aversion or less resistance from the other frames.

01:06:22 SATYA Yeah.

01:06:25 UTTAM You know, I think this smoothness and the roughness whatever conflict we're having I think it's more like there is roughness, but when you look at others you apply this blur function to the roughness so that it makes you look at it as smooth. And then you can easily venture into it. And then that make that enables you to like encounter a different perspective. I think the transition just to make a transition you need to apply this blur filter and look at things as smooth.

01:07:00 SATYA Right. So for the transition to P yeah, that makes sense.

01:07:03 PRAYAS (?) So when you are getting to know someone new, you have to think of them as being very good.

01:07:14 To facilitate the formation of an exchange and of a relationship. So th what you're saying is that we lubricate the switching by the investment of hope.

01:07:28 UTTAM Mm-

01:07:31 PRAYAS Is that what you say?

01:07:33 OBTUSE (?) I don't

01:07:35 Understand why you should alter your perspective, identity just to just to perhaps make the make the other more comfortable or acceptable or I don't see why one has to do that. If you're integrated well enough you'd be who you are and that's good enough for the other because why do you have to change yourself?

01:07:59 UTTAM No we're not

01:08:00 OBTUSE Specific.

01:08:03 You're saying you have to Prayas mentioned something that you have to make the other comfortable by

01:08:09 PRAYAS No I was saying that you know, so as okay, I'll go back to the problem that I stated. As saying that the switching exercise is inherently problematic because when you are taking on another frame you are in a way giving up your own.

01:08:31 Then you have all these you know, you have

01:08:37 Attachment issues, right? So you want to hold on to your frame. So that discourages you from switching in the first place.

01:08:47 But that's the

01:08:48 PRAYAS (?) Empathy though.

01:08:51 SATYA (?) I think it's

01:08:52 Empathy. Empathy.

01:08:56 OBTUSE Yeah, I mean I think it's all integrated. Sorry. Sorry.

01:08:59 SATYA No, go ahead. No, go ahead.

01:09:03 OBTUSE Well, I was saying if you are integrated, you don't have to adjust your frame at all because you see the cohesion or the coherence between different frames alter. Right? And you don't have to alter your frame or switch or make transitions from hard to smooth or none of that. You see the whole picture. You see it as is. You don't have to alter your perspective at all. I mean I but how do

01:09:29 PRAYAS You see the scene as is.

01:09:33 OBTUSE By merely observing. As it unfolds, you merely give it time and you observe. You don't judge you don't try to alter your perspective or try to understand by changing.

01:09:43 PRAYAS Always be from the limitation of our own perspective, from our own frame. So I mean

01:09:49 SATYA Well, you are if you are an integrated self then you will not have trouble retaining yourself when you look at s another perspective.

01:09:57 Got it. Yeah.

01:09:58 SATYA (?) Right, yeah.

01:09:59 Yeah. So but then to see something else, it might help to empathize with the other, with the else. And by empathy I mean look putting on a new perspective on your existing perspective. And it becomes

01:10:13 PRAYAS Call it empathy and not Yeah it's not necessarily

01:10:18 OBTUSE Or I don't see why I'm pretty. [?]

01:10:20 SATYA Right? Like it that this is a transition we are talking about and we were just talking about how to make the transition smoother.

01:10:26 Yeah.

01:10:27 If we want to make the transit if we wanna do that, then maybe it's one way.

01:10:32 SATYA (?) What I'm saying.

01:10:33 PRAYAS Hope are same, you're saying?

01:10:34 SATYA Yes, agreed, yes.

01:10:35 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

01:10:36 OBTUSE What I fail to understand is why we view it as a confrontation to begin with.

01:10:42 SATYA It's not a

01:10:42 A confrontation as a negative confrontation, right? It's a move it's a meeting of two things. But I'm not able to see how you are not I mean, I need to understand what you are saying.

01:10:54 OBTUSE Now we are trying to throw in empathy and hope. Now w when do you hope? When you're despic when you when you

01:11:00 SATYA No, it's not I wouldn't give it a colour. I wouldn't give empathy a colour. I it's and even hope, I mean it's not hope as an emotional hope, it's more like a sense that I can understand I can attempt to understand the hope that I can understand.

01:11:21 OBTUSE So mere openness to another frame.

01:11:23 SATYA It makes it easier for Yeah, openness. Yeah, openness is a better word, yeah.

01:11:34 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, openness does the same thing for us. It we basically during the switching we basically don't want

01:11:44 PRAYAS (?) The side too. [?]

01:11:45 Shut down and not

01:11:50 SIDDHARTH (?) Openness really destroys our frame.

01:11:55 OBTUSE (?) But if we are integrated it won't, no?

01:11:57 OBTUSE (?) Yeah, momentarily it sort of suppresses our frame and

01:12:05 PRAYAS Yeah and you will have yeah what you what you were saying about an integrated individual, so in that moment of destruction in a way, you will know that this is temporary.

01:12:30 Right and that your frame will you will assume your frame again in some time.

01:12:36 UTTAM Which moment of destruction? The destruction of our frame?

01:12:40 OBTUSE No, but it's not a good thing.

01:12:42 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, when our frame is displaced by another frame

01:12:49 Okay.

01:12:51 At that point you know that your that this other frame, this new frame is going to also be displaced

01:13:00 Back by your own frame in some time if you want.

01:13:09 UTTAM (?) I think transformation is a better word than destruction. I don't see how

01:13:16 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, destruction is malicious.

01:13:22 OBTUSE (?) Or fusion.

01:13:24 PRAYAS It seems to imply a will.

01:13:27 OBTUSE Q J. [?]

01:13:49 PRAYAS So I think it is this act of switching that we will go deeper into tomorrow as you know the that's the topic for tomorrow and that's where we have arrived at today. So that's we are in a good place. And we'll actually attempt to see how this happens in our personal experience, right? So in a in a way is this switching really happening very fluidly if you are just open or empathetic or is it more complex than that, right? So I think tomorrow we can we can bring in more openings into the switching experience. Thanks everyone for being part of the discussion tonight and I hope you're part of the discussion tomorrow night. That's the last day of the Perspective Studies study group and it's great to have you back.

01:14:54 PRAYAS (?) Right.

01:14:55 PRAYAS (?) Thank you.

01:14:55 PRAYAS (?) Thanks very much everyone. Thanks for asking.

01:14:57 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:14:58 SATYA (?) Thank you.

01:14:59 UTTAM (?) Yeah.