

## Session 4 Week Six, Unit 12

### **Transition and Orientation**

In the last phone call, we talked about the way in which we give priority to objects (and to the objectified subject, or person) over the field. This orientation is so fundamental to our way of seeing the world that we never think to question or challenge it. The object, with its well-defined borders and its unmistakable identity, is sharp and clear, while the field, which pervades like a mist or a fragrance, is tenuous in its claim to be real.

But in the TSK vision, this distinction is reversed. The field is more fundamental, and objects emerge out of it only within the context of one possible way of seeing.

To shift from one way of seeing to the other, or (better) to learn to be equally adept at both ways of seeing, we need to embark on the project of ‘challenging the established’ introduced at the end of last week’s reading. It is just such a challenge that we embark on in the reading from KTS.

The question under investigation in the first chapter of the reading is what it means to perceive a ‘thing’ or an object. The suggestion made is that ‘what a thing is not’ is more fundamental to its being than what it claims to be. Whereas the latter depends on the past, on previously established constructs, the former is immediately available. One question to ask, then, is how this availability of the ‘not’ (which could be said to reshape identity as the ‘not not’), relates to the field as ‘the range of what is possible.’

The reading for this week goes in this direction of the field of the possible by directing our attention to the ‘field of knowledge’ and the notion of multiple dimensionality. Notice that the knowledge at stake here, unlike conventional knowledge, manifests within indeterminacy (371).

Multiple dimensionality, a theme that comes up as well in DTS, is linked to a multiplicity of fields. To navigate this multiplicity, the reading suggests, we could focus on the transitions between fields. Here is something to explore on your own: how could you go about focusing on such transitions. Let this question be the assignment for the week: what approaches come to mind? What approaches seem fruitful? The focus in the reading points toward transition via sense perception, but you may find other kinds of exploration more fruitful.

The chapter called “Field Determination” suggests numerous ‘variations’ we could use to explore conventional structures. By investigating the field of the conventional, we open the possibility that the field could be re-determined, perhaps after first becoming ‘indeterminate’ (379). If you reflect for a while, you will see that this possibility could have profound consequences on how we engage the limitations and reactivity that structure our lives.

These and similar considerations begin to introduce the structure and dynamic of time into our inquiry. We see this quite specifically in the reading from TSK, but it also comes into play in the selections from KTS. How are these two treatments related?

### **Assignment**

Explore and then write on the question raised above: what way(s) do you find to focus on the transition between fields.

### **Walkabout**

Practice letting the space you inhabit be pervaded with meaning. Try this in various ways; for example:

- The physical space you inhabit.
- The space defined by a problem
- An intention you want to act on. (Don't try to fill space with the intention; rather, let space 'be filled' with it. Does this seem a meaningful distinction? Can you enact it?)