Perspective Studies, Day 2

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 2 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 And the second tool is
00:06 Yeah, no, I was just saying the second surface is the
00:13 The f the lines of text with the colored background on Facebook.
00:19 PRAYAS (?) Mm-
00:20 And you know, those are sentences which if you read them they'll trigger a process
00:29 Through which knowledge can emerge, right? So our broader objective is designing formats of conversation which
00:39 Well.
00:39 Are open to the emergence of knowledge.
00:42 PRAYAS (?) Right.
00:44 So th they are these are both experiments in the same f for serving the same purpose.
00:50 AKANSHA Okay, but how does how do they come together? Do you have you kind of found a format for it or I mean form I mean the it's happening every day, but does it come together at some point or it's or your Facebook page is the only way, mechanism?
01:07 PRAYAS No, so basically conversation is the only way. Right. So you can talk to us or you can read us, but there is no representation of this project that
01:22 That does not offer presence. You know, so there is no subsidiary product that can be a stand in.
01:31 AKANSHA No, but it's also closed in a way because the I mean most of your statements and most of your one liners are like talking to oneself.
01:44 PRAYAS (?) Tal I like talking to oneself.
01:46 AKANSHA Yeah, I like most people like talking to oneself. You're talking to yourself.
01:51 PRAYAS Yeah, and that's not that's not bad. You know, talking to oneself is not a bad idea.
01:58 Well no, I think so.
01:58 That you know, that conversation that self conversation is the conversation we want to trigger.
02:07 AKANSHA (?) Mm.
02:09 PRAYAS So because that's a conversation in which knowledge can possibly emerge.
02:16 You know so knowledge is not going to emerge when I speak to you.
02:20 AKANSHA So what's your what's your what's your no, but I mean I f I mean l a lot of my work is about conversation. I mean but I treat what we produce together as a form of knowledge. So it's not I mean this is

02:34 PRAYAS (?) Reproducing the conversations together in like a book or something like that. I'm not saying that will not happen, but that does not need to happen right now because it hasn't emerged as an internal need.

02:49 Any form of exchange?

02:55 No, at this point I don't feel the sense of responsibility towards the audience.

03:01 AKANSHA Course you should. Yeah.

03:04 PRAYAS (?) You know, so at this point I don't want to serve.

03:08 At this point I would rather attempt to find a tactic that works.

03:13 PRAYAS (?) Hm, okay.

03:14 PRAYAS (?) And after that I will be interested in Surfatial to scale up.

03:20 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

03:21 At this point we're just trying to figure what works.

03:26 MALAVIKA Mm-

03:35 PRAYAS (?) The Satya, you saying something?

03:37 SATYA Oh I just

03:38 Said that at this point it sounds like you're exploring what's what the possibilities could be, I guess. It's pretty early, I guess, right?

03:47 PRAYAS Yeah, it's just like a you know, a very young project. It's just like a few months. it took six months in the cooking, but you know, few months of practice.

03:57 PRAYAS (?) Right.

03:59 So it's not it's not enough time to take these kind of decisions, you know. It's just like you know, we're just trying to make it work first.

04:09 AKANSHA You know, I mean I've been seeing your statements coming since last few months but in the last couple of months it's been it's been becoming more and more aggressive and more and more concrete in terms of presenting a perspective.

04:27 AKANSHA (?) Yeah.

04:28 PRAYAS (?) I mean I was I have been drafting the voice.

04:33 AKANSHA (?) Yeah, it has yeah, so the voice has come. Voice has I mean and then it has a kind of a look function way of and processing tests. [?]

04:44 PRAYAS Yeah, so it worked started as a personal experiment and then it became this whole entity which is Surfatial and which is not me. You know, s the Surfatial is definitely not me in the sense that you know it's a rule based game. So what works for s it's a persona. So what works for Surfatial works for Surfatial, what doesn't work doesn't work. You know, I'm not in the picture.

05:08 AKANSHA Yeah. Okay, so what do we do now? Is now the couple of more

05:13 PRAYAS Sam was here a few moments back. I think we'll start and we'll just let it let people come in as they do. It's time.

05:24 That's good.

05:24 Yeah. Yeah. So yesterday we ended with the thought that to experience infinity we have to surrender our perspective.

05:40 SATYA (?) Right.

05:44 PRAYAS (?) And

05:46 The thing is that, you know, that's not such a such an easy thing to do.

05:51 SATYA Right. And we talked about a few different ways of possibly trying to surrender perspective, like dreaming and things like that.

06:01 PRAYAS Yeah. but essentially, you know, the thing is I think we should just be very slow with this question.

06:14 Because this question is essentially going to stay with us for the next fifteen days.

06:19 SATYA (?) Right.

06:21 PRAYAS I mean e why Perspective Studies? Because perspective is the thing that keeps us away from the experience of infinity.
06:30 PRAYAS (?) Right.
06:33 And so we need we need to know it. We need to w know what this thing is before we try and offer a solution to the world.
06:41 PRAYAS (?) Right.
06:45 And that's what we are going to do. So in the sense we can just, you know be very guarded in our response.
06:54 AKANSHA What do you think Prayas is infinity is? I mean how do you advance it [?] or how do you visualize it or not I mean or think about the experience of infinity, what it could be like.
07:12 PRAYAS No, sorry, I didn't get you. The audio wasn't very clear. Can you please repeat?
07:18 AKANSHA I'm asking I'm asking what how do you envisage infinity? Why is this desire to experience infinity? And what do you think what are your pre n pre notions of infinity? I mean you haven't experienced it yet, right?
07:37 PRAYAS You know, yesterday we were essentially you know we were all talking about how a perspective is a limited view of experience.
07:49 AKANSHA Mm-
07:50 PRAYAS So the only
07:53 Escape of perspective is
07:57 You know, experiencing infinity. So infinity is the only thing that is outside
08:04 Pers a perspective. You c you can never know the landscape as it is, we can only know it through a perspective of it, through our
08:16 PRAYAS (?) So that led us to
08:21 You know, think about this thing called infinity if it exists and if it's
08:27 You know, if it's what we're after.
08:31 PRAYAS (?) Then let's know this a little bit. What is this about?
08:35 AKANSHA Yeah, so what is it about I mean what all the
08:39 PRAYAS Yeah, so why don't I mean why don't you share your perspective on this. You know, so we're all in this in this conversation right now where we can each of each of us can flip the question around, you know, anytime. So there is no particular role that we are playing except that I'm an anchor. But as an anchor I'm not responsible for
09:06 Perform any function in the conversation.
09:13 I'm gonna see all the times now. [?]
09:15 Yeah, so s Sam, what would you say? What is the experience of infinity that we're talking about for each of us?
09:25 MOSES SAM Oh you want me to say that?
09:28 Yeah, why not?
09:28 Infinity is the point where we lose track of time as a concept.
09:37 PRAYAS Yeah.
09:37 And yeah. Okay.
09:40 So it's it br it is a it is a break from the measured time that we
09:46 MOSES SAM Yeah, exactly. Yeah.
09:48 MALAVIKA Giant. [?]
09:51 Why only time?
09:55 MOSES SAM (?) Why are we trying? [?]
09:56 PRAYAS Why do you think
09:57 MOSES SAM (?) Time.
10:00 MALAVIKA Why not anything else? Because
10:03 MOSES SAM Like what?

10:04 MALAVIKA That is no, yeah, it can be because anything that is measurable.

10:13 PRAYAS I mean time is a necessary condition, it's not just a sufficient condition.

10:20 You know, so if not presence, if not if not vi vision, if nothing, you know, it's fine. But if not time is absolute.

10:37 AKANSHA I'm quite intrigued by the way Sam defines it as a point.

10:46 MOSES SAM (?) So wait. I didn't mean it in a geo geometric sense where you know point is what? a circle with radius zero. I didn't mean it that way. But a point is it's something in the a context of space. That's why you know I was asked Malavika as well, you know, wha what does she mean by the other dimensions that she's talking about? But it's not just space it could be space. So what's the other dimension? So let's time the space, then what's the other one then?

11:20 MALAVIKA It could also be like even in terms of experience when you can't measure like what we were talking about yesterday. When you can't measure something, especially if you're talking of perception and what we are experiencing. There are and we were talking about complexity also yesterday and the inability to break things down to very definite entities or definite explanations sometimes that ambiguity itself is something that is not measured.

12:02 It's not quantified.

12:07 Something without a rational can also be considered to be non measurable.

12:22 PRAYAS You know, but we when we are looking at time

12:26 And calling it a necessary condition.

12:33 We are saying that if at least time is measured

12:40 Then you need to break out of it. You know, we can we can break our point of contention down into a single sentence and that's like, you know, we can just say this.

12:51 SATYA So if we have an objective of breaking down time first, of ge getting rid of time, if that's our objective, then maybe we move an a centimeter towards experiencing infinity.

13:05 PRAYAS Yeah, in the sense you know, if we can only do one thing at a time because we are only experiencing time itself at one moment at a time.

13:13 Right.

13:16 So it's that unitary nature of experience that we need to break down because you know it's that one at a time is what

13:29 Has to be you know in the

13:34 SATYA Yeah. It kind of reminds me of how, you know, big data right nowadays. Everybody wants to it's like everyone wants to measure everything and use that as the means of coming up with an answer, but actually during the measurement process you've lost a lot of in between stuff.

13:55 PRAYAS Right. It's like I say that, you know, statistics is a you know, statistics itself is a science of which has very clear levels of you know, tolerating noise.

14:08 PRAYAS (?) Exactly. Right.

14:10 And every percentile rounding of

14:15 Yeah.

14:18 It's not

14:20 Right. Yes, I'm you're saying so. [?]

14:23 MOSES SAM I said it's linear as well, you know.

14:32 It's linear the curve.

14:36 Yeah.

14:38 MOSES SAM (?) Linear the curve. Yeah, that's interesting.

14:44 MOSES SAM (?) No, I meant statistics itself is linear. That linearity

14:50 -huh.

14:51 Right.

14:55 Huh. I mean you can say it, right? Like okay if the if the

14:59 Diameter of the curve is so big, then it looks like a straight line at some you know between two points. But no, what I'm trying to say is I think I want to go back to the point that you mentioned that we take one dimension at a time and then to experience infinity, right? Yeah, correct, to distract that. And so if time is one dimension that we are looking at, and obviously there's space, I'm just trying to understand what's the third dimension you know that would give us more perspectives into this particular topic. because I don't know in quantum physics there's this whole concept of Flatland, you know, that the land that's completely made of two dimensions. And so in that, you know, if you think of a land with two dimensions everywhere, then we have the third perspective because as human beings we have this third, you know, the depth, we see the length, breadth, and the depth as well, right? So if we see only what we know, how does anyone see anything new? Correct. So if all we see is what we know in three dimensional space, and someone who has a better understanding of the fourth perspective, and they would see things okay so that's what you think of the [?]

16:23 PRAYAS (?) What you say is the exact reason.

16:25 MOSES SAM (?) Huh.

16:27 PRAYAS You know, why novelty is the most fetishized service that anyone can provide in the market, you know. So you go to you go to someone in the business of promoting art and you tell them that I promise you that I'll m help you reach to the newest artist, to the most critical artist, to the most visionary artist, and that guy will say, Please do.

16:55 Right.

16:56 SATYA (?) Okay.

16:58 PRAYAS (?) You know, so it's like everyone's really

17:02 Struggling with the idea of seeing what they don't know.

17:06 MOSES SAM (?) Exactly. Oh my god, that's very well put. Okay.

17:10 AKANSHA You know, I would I would like to bring in here this idea of superconductors.

17:17 -huh.

17:18 Superconductivity.

17:20 Okay.

17:21 Seemingly seems to be finite but can be considered as an example of infinity. Superconductors can produce and transmit transfer energy without any kind of loss.

17:37 MOSES SAM (?) Can be.

17:39 PRAYAS (?) Yes, so the conductor's can so that long. [?]

17:41 MOSES SAM (?) I think theoretically

17:43 Relatively.

17:44 PRAYAS Yeah, but it's never been.

17:46 AKANSHA No loss. But this idea of no loss happening in the process of transmission or any kind of any kind any kind

17:56 PRAYAS (?) Idea of no loss, which is basically the idea of no noise.

18:02 AKANSHA (?) Yes. Mm-

18:04 PRAYAS Is w which is basically the idea of no noise. You know, no loss is no noise essentially. So in statistics that would mean no noise of data. Absolute no absolute data.

18:19 You know, that's a myth. I mean what I'm saying is that's exactly

18:26 MOSES SAM The construction

18:27 Not a it's not it's not a myth it's theoretical.

18:37 SATYA I mean from a human system and human experiential perspective it is a bit of a myth, right? It's actually a hubris, so a lot of people think that, wow, I have so much data, so I'm making these great predictions, but actually you don't.

18:51 SATYA (?) Big data. Okay, let's talk about that.

18:54 But before that I wanted to say Paul that Sam, sorry your that idea of Flatland, it just brought this image of Carl Sagan's Cosmos. You know, I don't know if any of you have seen it, but maybe you have. You know, he d makes this demonstration of a piece of paper and he draws the two dimensional world and then he has this apple that's hovering above, which is the three dimensional alien.

19:20 SATYA (?) -huh.

19:21 Kinda funny, just I j I was just reminded of that.

19:23 MOSES SAM Okay.

19:27 AKANSHA Can you talk a little bit more about the Flatland?

19:31 MOSES SAM Oh me?

19:32 Yeah.

19:33 Okay, so Flatland is basically a land where everything is two-dimensional. Okay, so you won't find cuboids or spheres there, you'll just see circles and squares there. Okay. So if we as human beings enter that land, for these people, we would look like a you know, if you put your finger between any two objects in that Flatland, you would look like a circle, right? Because that's what they'll see. And you can see everything that these people own and possess, okay? because you have this extra perspection which is the depth, right? And then if you try to explain to them that there is one more dimension. And it's very difficult to explain in the first place. And if you bring someone, it's a fear of unknown, right? So everyone would be afraid in the beginning. And so if you take out one circle and then you bring that person to a three-dimensional space as in a sphere, and then this person kind of levitates or you know elevates from his two-dimensional space, and he looks at his own flatland. And then he or she would understand what we are trying to explain, right? But if you extrapolate to us, you know, where we see everything three-dimensional, and someone tries to explain to us the presence of a fourth dimension I can't grasp it practically, though theoretically you know mathematical models are there to prove that these things exist. I still don't know how these things would look like. But that's the extra perception that we should have to experience infinity. I think that's what Prayas is conveying.

21:26 PRAYAS But Sam as you were saying that, I was struck by the fact that our vision

21:32 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

21:33 Our vision is in fact two D.

21:37 MOSES SAM (?) What is it?

21:39 PRAYAS (?) Because

21:40 MOSES SAM No what your vision or your dream

21:42 We...

21:45 PRAYAS No. we our vision in the sense what we see, right? So what we see is two D because the retina of our eye

21:52 MOSES SAM (?) No. Biology whatever we see is three dimensional. Okay, so I'll prove it to you. Okay. So you take your you point your finger up, okay

22:01 PRAYAS I'm just saying that the eye has no empty space, you know. So when I see something physically with my eyes, I'm not forming a miniature physical model of that in my in my eyes. You know, I'm essentially seeing a projection.

22:17 SATYA (?) Yes.

22:19 PRAYAS And this projection is two D. It can't be two D b it can't be three D because the eye has no space.

22:27 PRAYAS (?) The it's the brain which is putting together two separate two D images.

22:31 SATYA (?) It's a simulated condition.

22:33 PRAYAS Yes.

22:33 We are seeing this world because we can only see it this way.

22:37 MOSES SAM Yeah. Okay, so you so you're saying you don't have to see the fourth dimension, you just have to put it together.

22:45 MOSES SAM (?) Makes sense.

22:46 PRAYAS I'm saying that we don't have to see the fourth dimension, we have to see the third.

22:50 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah. Whatever dimension. Yeah, great.

22:53 PRAYAS Because we are living in a two D experience.

22:58 MOSES SAM Okay, so t tell me about this. Okay, so if you point your finger out and you try to touch that tip of the other finger hold on. so you take your right hand, point your index finger up, and then you try to bring your left hand from above with your forefinger pointed out, and then you try to touch these two fingers, you know, the tip of these two fingers. You know, if you're if you're having both your eyes open, you'll be able to do it perfectly. But then if you have one of your eyes closed, right, you'd never be able to do that. Because you won't find the depth. Your brain won't be able to capture it.

23:37 Wha what we are seeing is essentially three D or you know what we are perceiving is three D always.

23:45 PRAYAS It's our you said it right. So you know our perception is 3D. Our experience is not three D.

23:54 MOSES SAM Now our experience is three D but then our vision is two D.

23:59 PRAYAS (?) Exactly. I mean basically if you zoom into experience and you reach vision, then vision is not three D, vision is two D. So I mean I was essentially responding to your you know, to the reference to four D in reference to what Akansha was saying was as a loss as a lossless media of transmission, which is you got off talking to [?] as a mythical entity.

24:25 Right.

24:25 Is you know the idea of science that to establish authority you can only sell mythical

24:34 You know tenet of knowledge which nobody will ever be able to verify and so everybody will always be faithful to you. You know, it's like religion.

24:47 PRAYAS (?) Mm.

24:50 SATYA (?) So if you

24:51 AKANSHA (?) If it had a practical, tangible

24:55 PRAYAS Yeah, you're saying something, please go ahead.

24:57 AKANSHA No, I just I mean I so you're simplifying religion and you're simplifying myth by calling it mythology or that you're simplifying it. It's not myths do not

25:12 You know, it's I mean it's theoretically proved. So it's you know, it has it has a certain basis. So in practice and in the way we see a practical world. I mean, you know, it's similar to what

25:24 PRAYAS (?) You know, a w a basis cannot be established theoretically.

25:28 Sorry?

25:29 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

25:30 PRAYAS (?) Basis cannot be established theoretically. A basis is established by experience.

25:36 MOSES SAM (?) Experiments.

25:37 BANDISH Experiment.

25:38 PRAYAS So but experiment is an experimentally verified theoretical notion.

25:46 A theoretical a theory will only propose something until it's

25:51 AKANSHA It's not a myth. Myths are different.

25:54 PRAYAS (?) Proposal is a myth, I can propose.

25:59 AKANSHA (?) Proposals mix. [?]

26:03 These are two different bodies of knowledge.

26:07 PRAYAS (?) I'm not saying that it's nothing.

26:09 SATYA (?) Proven anything that's not yet been experimented upon or proven is a fiction, right? A fiction is like a myth.

26:14 AKANSHA (?) Hypothesis. Hypothesis is not mythology. Mythology is something else.

26:19 PRAYAS (?) No I'm saying that it is possible. It's possible. It's possible that it's true and it's possible that it's not true.

26:31 Exactly. Yeah.

26:33 PRAYAS (?) Ab is not provart is niyukt nahin hai [?]

26:44 BANDISH (?) Mythologies are not about truth.

26:47 AKANSHA (?) Mythologies are not about

26:49 AKANSHA (?) Are not about truth. They're not they're separate from this idea of verifying or from

26:55 MOSES SAM (?) Oh, okay. So I get it. So what she's trying to say is the way we start up saying something, right? So a hypothesis is stated with the intention of trying to do it. Whereas a mythology is started with no intention of anything like that. Correct.

27:12 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean something becomes a mythology when it has a deeper cognizance of in a in a person's psyche than simple operatives of

27:24 And true story. And we all know it's not true, but it doesn't matter.

27:35 MALAVIKA (?) No, it may not be entirely untrue either.

27:40 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, it might have some bases.

27:42 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

27:45 PRAYAS (?) Like you know, it might come from somewhere.

27:52 SATYA So at the fundamental level a myth and a hypothesis could very well be, you know, equivalent.

28:01 PRAYAS Is too bad? [?]

28:03 SATYA At a fundamental level, like at point zero, a myth and a hypothesis could be equivalent. I mean when what happens next? If somebody's trying to prove it or if somebody is not trying to prove it?

28:15 PRAYAS Yeah. So Akansha, what were you saying? We cut we cut the off new story. [?]

28:21 PRAYAS (?) You're saying something and you know, we just got stuck with this mechanism of looking at it. Can you please continue?

28:29 BANDISH (?) You're asking me.

28:31 AKANSHA (?) Yeah.

28:32 No. I just wan I mean, yeah, so you were saying something and I interrupted you but with this

28:37 PRAYAS You were talking about this capacity of loss transmission in superconductance.

28:47 You know, this facility of lossless transmission in superconductivity, that's what you're talking about.

28:54 AKANSHA (?) Yeah, so for me f I mean for me the you know this idea of no loss happening would be would be a great perspective to understand infinity.

29:06 BANDISH (?) Okay, no loss.

29:08 AKANSHA That's a

29:12 PRAYAS (?) Very good. That's a very good analogy because you know when you're talking of measured time.

29:21 We are talking of loss.

29:25 RAJA GOPEN (?) Yeah.

29:25 RAJA GOPEN (?) Can you measure time in lose time? [?]

29:30 PRAYAS (?) You lose granular granularity in the your resolution.

29:41 BANDISH (?) If you shift the girl [?] from time to energy, then what?

29:47 PRAYAS Yeah, so when you when you don't look at measure time, you might actually be looking at energy. But so Sam, would you think that energy is infinite?

29:59 MOSES SAM (?) And maybe it's what?

30:01 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

30:02 MOSES SAM (?) Infinite, but what we can harness is finite.

30:06 PRAYAS (?) When you harness energy it's finite.

30:10 MOSES SAM Yeah. Because there is going to be a loss.

30:14 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. So but energy in its pure state, in its unharnessed state

30:19 MOSES SAM It's infinite, yeah.

30:23 PRAYAS So we c we can actually jump from measured time to energy.

30:30 BANDISH (?) Okay.

30:31 PRAYAS (?) I mean we have been searching for words to describe infinite

30:36 PRAYAS (?) Right. Hold on

30:39 PRAYAS (?) Saying that energy is a word, that it could be a stand in.

30:44 AKANSHA (?) Yes.

30:46 RAJA GOPEN (?) Time can be energy.

30:49 MOSES SAM (?) Raja, what did you say?

30:51 RAJA GOPEN (?) I said time can be energy.

30:54 BANDISH (?) Time can be energy.

30:58 BANDISH (?) Wait, how?

31:00 MOSES SAM (?) How c how can time be energy? Okay.

31:03 RAJA GOPEN Does time move anything?

31:06 PRAYAS No, I'm saying that if you I mean time is a unit of measurement. If you move from measured time to energy, which is what let's say

31:21 [unclear]

31:27 RAJA GOPEN (?) Sorry, I couldn't hear you properly.

31:30 BANDISH (?) So you asked the

31:38 RAJA GOPEN Yeah, I asked, does time move anything?

31:42 MOSES SAM Time.

31:43 MOSES SAM (?) Mes energy. [?]

31:44 RAJA GOPEN Time moves mountains.

31:46 RAJA GOPEN (?) Time moves ideas.

31:48 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah. But what you first said was time moves entropy, right?

31:53 MOSES SAM (?) No. He said he asked, Does time move energy anything? Anything.

32:00 PRAYAS But I think this is a misheard production. I mean, you know, time moves, entropy is actually it might it's it might be true. So condition of entropy is broken.

32:12 MOSES SAM Thank you.

32:13 MOSES SAM (?) Right.

32:15 MOSES SAM (?) Time also adds to entropy.

32:21 MOSES SAM (?) Right.

32:21 MOSES SAM (?) Thanks for being a

32:22 PRAYAS [unclear]

32:31 RAJA GOPEN So time could be looked as energy, right?

32:35 BANDISH I somehow had to differ on this point.

32:41 PRAYAS Yeah, Bandish was I mean you wouldn't agree with yeah.

32:47 BANDISH Yes, because I th I think the time and energy are different elements. to me energy as is I see it as one element which can be trans transferred or converted into a mass or an element. Whereas time is completely a separate element. I think the mass or energy and time are not interconvertible.

33:21 RAJA GOPEN Space and time can be inter interconvertible.

33:25 BANDISH (?) A minute.

33:27 BANDISH (?) Space and time are intertwined b and connected to gravity.

33:30 BANDISH (?) Not convertible.

33:32 Yeah.

33:32 That with the middle. [?]

33:34 MOSES SAM They're affected by gravity.

33:37 BANDISH Well, by one theory sure.

33:39 RAJA GOPEN (?) Yeah.

33:43 BANDISH (?) But as far as time is concerned, I mean I d I don't think time per se on its own is an energy.

33:54 PRAYAS You say spam [?] cannot move things.

33:58 BANDISH Huh.

34:01 He says fan [?] cannot be converted.

34:03 PRAYAS (?) Yeah and time cannot make things.

34:07 Okay.

34:08 BANDISH No, I also agree on that point. Time cannot move things, but if things are to move, then time is must. things cannot move in a zero time. The zero time

34:22 PRAYAS (?) Animation cannot happen in with still images.

34:26 BANDISH (?) True, exactly.

34:31 PRAYAS (?) But it's not necessary. It can it cannot cause motion.

34:38 BANDISH But if something if a motion is to be caused, then time is a necessary requirement.

34:45 AKANSHA (?) Right.

34:47 RAJA GOPEN It need not be the reason behind the motion, but it's necessary.

34:51 BANDISH Yes, that's how I understand.

34:55 PRAYAS (?) So we cannot move from time to energy.

35:01 BANDISH Yes.

35:04 PRAYAS Right, so we'll m let's move somewhere else. So where do you think we can move from time to as a as a word, you know, we can we can play with different words and discard them by talking about them.

35:18 And these cannot be words which stand for infinity, possibly.

35:24 So which word would you like to propose next?

35:27 MALAVIKA (?) Moving.

35:29 MOSES SAM Stillness.

35:30 BANDISH Distance.

35:32 BANDISH (?) Is this

35:34 MALAVIKA Resistance.

35:35 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

35:38 MALAVIKA (?) As a movement first, yeah.

35:40 Movement, stillness

35:42 I say resistance.

35:45 BANDISH (?) Who said this?

35:47 BANDISH (?) I s I said distance.

35:49 MALAVIKA (?) So I say resistance.

35:52 PRAYAS (?) I say illusions.

35:56 BANDISH (?) Illusion.

35:58 PRAYAS Concreteness. Concreteness. So which word do we start with? We have a lot of words here.

36:05 PRAYAS (?) Oh yeah.

36:06 MOSES SAM (?) Tell us, tell us.

36:09 PRAYAS (?) Okay, so you know unless somebody really wants us to move with their word first, we can just start with stillness.

36:18 MOSES SAM (?) Yes.

36:20 MOSES SAM (?) And they don't want

36:21 That's the point of stillness.

36:23 PRAYAS Yeah, exactly. We'll move to whoever is really the most eager.

36:30 MALAVIKA I'm moving all the time.

36:34 MOSES SAM No, okay, so I just wanna okay, I just wanna understand what happens when a person walks. Okay. So he or she moves through time and space by expending energy, right?

36:47 Yes.

36:47 Whereas in infinity what I would ideally want to experience is stillness, like nothing is happening, okay? Like time, space like no one is moving through like nothing is moving through time and space, so no energy is being wasted, so you can harness the infinite energy.

37:10 Yeah.

37:11 PRAYAS Yeah, but so stillness is can only operate in the absence of time.

37:18 BANDISH I mean I mean I in the world that we live in it's I cannot think of a anything which is still actually. I mean with respect to I mean your book on the table may be still with respect to the table and table may be still with respect to the land. But the earth itself is moving and so is the solar system and so is the whole universe. I mean in i in a way if you are compl you think of complete stillness then probably that probably that was a stage before Big Bang or that might be the stage after big crunch. but in a in a state that we live in today I don't think anything is still.

38:00 SATYA (?) But stillness could also be a perspective. I mean that's one physicality of stillness, but there may be another way of looking at it.

38:11 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

38:12 MOSES SAM (?) No, it's stillness with respect to the observer. So for me everything is still. It doesn't mean you know, literally everything is still, right?

38:20 RAJA GOPEN (?) Yeah.

38:23 BANDISH I mean w when we when we think about, you know making an optimal move so as to conserve and preserve all the energy and in presence of stillness, as someone was suggesting, that we will be able to move to infinity and I'm just trying to imagine how was that?

38:44 MOSES SAM Saying stillness is the point of infinity. We are not moving towards infinity through stillness.

38:51 PRAYAS (?) I mean what you're what you're saying, Bandish, is that stillness is impossible.

38:59 BANDISH (?) Yes.

39:01 PRAYAS (?) Right. And I mean I would agree because I mean I would say that the universe exists because of vibration.

39:12 BANDISH Yes.

39:13 Yeah.

39:14 BANDISH (?) No, but
39:14 BANDISH (?) By pressure.
39:15 PRAYAS Oh.
39:16 AKANSHA (?) Is a change of state.
39:21 PRAYAS Yes.
39:22 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
39:24 PRAYAS (?) Hm? No, I didn't get that.
39:29 BANDISH Yeah, vibration. I mean someone or something put the things in motions and here we are and I d I it has been a continuous motion and I don't see it ending anytime soon.
39:45 PRAYAS Yes, so vibration happens because of because of an unstable state of energy, right? So the energy is not stable. So it causes some transitions to happen. And those transitions are
40:03 You know, like vibration.
40:05 BANDISH I mean, what do you mean by stable energy or unstable energy?
40:08 PRAYAS (?) I mean there is unstability, there's instability at the core of our condition.
40:22 PRAYAS (?) Like the only reason which makes us feel stable may be continuity. And that's continuity is imagined.
40:37 BANDISH I don't know. I don't know. I cannot imagine this situation being under
40:45 Sensi if he [?]
40:47 PRAYAS You know, if you go back to our question for the day which was why do we see what we see?
40:53 Right.
40:54 You know, so from if you imagine a slideshow with a low frame rate.
41:01 PRAYAS (?) Like.
41:02 And you're seeing one image
41:06 Every few minutes.
41:10 RAJA GOPEN (?) Okay.
41:12 Yeah, I think that
41:13 PRAYAS (?) You would at some point question
41:18 Why do I see what I see? You know, so in a sense you will question why is this transition happening?
41:27 BANDISH (?) Right.
41:29 PRAYAS And that is that is, you know, to for us to not accept what we see very easily.
41:39 It is necessary because you know vision finds it very easy to
41:49 And trap you.
41:53 So you have to challenge it. You know, you cannot accept it very easily.
41:58 But our exp our f the frame rate of an experience is so fast.
42:04 BANDISH Yeah.
42:05 BANDISH (?) Yeah.
42:06 PRAYAS (?) We didn't get a chance.
42:07 RAJA GOPEN Yeah. We don't pause to challenge ourselves what we see and why we see that.
42:16 BANDISH (?) [unclear]
42:23 PRAYAS (?) Question what we see?
42:25 Yeah.
42:27 MOSES SAM (?) Prayas so when we were talking about stillness someone mentioned vibrations.
42:35 Right.
42:36 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

42:37 Okay, so I was I got disconnected at that point. so I was about to say if every particle's vibration in the entire universe, you know, is similar, then for each other we look like we are s completely still.

42:55 SATYA Yeah.

42:56 MOSES SAM Right. So that's what I mean by stillness. So you're in complete unison with the movement of the universe or the vibrations of the universe.

43:09 And that according to me is infinity, you know, like complete stillness, which means that you're in

43:19 RAJA GOPEN This brings us to a very interesting point. Like as you mentioned, stillness can be relative. Like it's still according to the observer. So can infinity also be relative? Like as you said, that if every particle in the universe is still with respect to each other.

43:36 MOSES SAM Right.

43:37 RAJA GOPEN So is it not?

43:40 MOSES SAM That's my perception of infinity.

43:45 So your perception could be different or Malavika's perception could be different because she said motion and I said the exact opposite. Right.

44:01 PRAYAS (?) How about Sam, how would you ensure that all the cycles of vibration across all the particles in the universe are in sync?

44:16 MOSES SAM (?) How could I make sure? What but why should I make sure? You know, so if I

44:21 PRAYAS (?) As possible.

44:23 MOSES SAM Huh, go ahead.

44:25 PRAYAS No, I was just saying for them to be same or similar

44:30 PRAYAS (?) They have to be in sync.

44:32 MOSES SAM (?) Right.

44:34 BANDISH No, but there is a

44:35 So

44:36 MOSES SAM Nature. Okay, go ahead.

44:42 PRAYAS No, please, Sam. I'll yeah.

44:44 PRAYAS (?) Whoops.

44:46 MOSES SAM No, I said by nature has a certain type of vibration, right? And w once you've become one with nature, then that's stillness but then you don't have to worry about bringing other people into the same type of vibration.

45:06 Or is that the point? Like are you trying oh okay, so are we trying to make everyone experience infinity? Or as a person that I should experience infinity?

45:20 PRAYAS (?) I mean

45:22 No, s the we were actually talking about stillness because you proposed it as a word.

45:27 PRAYAS (?) Right.

45:29 For infinity. You know, so y yesterday we were talking about how difficult it is to describe infinity.

45:37 MOSES SAM Correct. So yeah, so like I was saying it's my perception of infinity. My perception is stillness and this is the way I would go about it. So

45:50 MOSES SAM (?) But as it holds together.

45:55 BANDISH (?) Falls

46:00 Holds together word.

46:04 Good description of infinity.

46:08 MOSES SAM It looks like a good description to me, I'm convinced, because I proposed it.

46:18 So now you guys have to question me how I can defend myself. No, it is difficult, definitely. But I think like for me, you know, personally I think that's a good explanation, as in

46:34 So okay, so think about it so we can move to the next one. Okay, I'll just give you an analogy, right? So there is in again in quantum physics, a particular particle or electron can alter its behavior based on who's observing, right? So, you know, you must have heard of this infamous double slit experiment where electron goes through these two slits and then it behaves like a particle or it behaves like a wave based on who is observing. Right. If there is an observer, it behaves like a particle. If there's no observer, then it behaves like a wave. Right. So our I think my perception about infinity is like that. So when I observe infinity, I look at it certain way. And then if I close and if I close my eyes and then I you look at it, you could look at it completely differently. So yeah, let's move it let's move to the next word.

47:31 Yeah.

47:32 SATYA Say because I'm

47:32 Quite eager.

47:33 Eager to push myself forward with the word movement, which I'm appropriating from Malavika. And I'll s and I'll shut up after that. To achieve stillness you have to have movement is the thing that struck me.

47:48 Okay.

47:49 A different perspective. I have to move out of where I am to see from a new place. And then maybe slowly I keep seeing new things. It's like I lived in India, but then I moved somewhere else, so I have all these new insights about India or something, or wherever my home was. And similarly, you know, eventually maybe I'll reach a place where I have deconstructed and seen my original point, original place of existence or whatever by moving away from it.

48:21 BANDISH (?) But okay, so there is I think Tao quoted saying

48:31 BANDISH (?) The best way to travel is to travel inward. So you don't have to move away from the point, whereas you have to move towards the point.

48:40 BANDISH (?) Right.

48:40 BANDISH (?) Oh yeah.

48:41 SATYA (?) Moving away also can lead you to moving inward in a way, right? I mean you are in a new environment which gives you new inputs.

48:51 AKANSHA Expand on that a little further. You know, motion could be thought of also as a rhythm. You know in a rhythm

49:02 I'm sorry.

49:04 PRAYAS (?) In a rhythm.

49:07 AKANSHA When you're moving in a rhythm, you can actually achieve stillness.

49:11 MOSES SAM Yeah, but it's still that is also a rhythm.

49:17 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, like a rhythmic equilibrium.

49:19 SATYA Yes.

49:20 Yeah, it's actually moving really quick, but you it's stationary.

49:23 Right. So it's a it's a kind of so zero. Zero is only a set of probabilities. It's not an absolute ex you know, absence of everything.

49:37 I mean

49:37 It's a low enough range of va values so that it's nothing.

49:42 Or like white noise is the combination of all these frequencies.

49:47 Right. okay. So yeah, there is a tolerable ba threshold of noise and that's silence.

50:08 But Sam, what did you say to responding to what Akansha said about movement in a rhythm? Okay, you said that stillness is also a rhythm.

50:20 Mm-

50:23 So it fits your model.

50:27 Yes.

50:29 Okay. So we are going to the next word now.

50:31 Okay.

50:33 PRAYAS We are going to Satya, would you like to go with concreteness or would you like to ask?

50:42 SATYA Actually I was attracted to the word movement because of personal experience, but concreteness, you know, now that I think about it, concrete doesn't feel like infinity. I mean it's more like a distillation or a crystallisation of infinity, but it doesn't feel like concrete could be a good word for infinity now that I think about it.

51:10 Okay, not yet. Okay. So

51:15 MOSES SAM So you don't think concreteness is a concrete word to describe infinity?

51:20 MOSES SAM (?) You have your back. [?]

51:22 SATYA Yeah, 'cause I feel infinity is bigger or I don't know, beyond all of that.

51:27 Okay.

51:29 So the word concrete itself sounds quite limited to me.

51:33 Yeah, me too.

51:35 SATYA (?) Yeah.

51:36 RAJA GOPEN Of connotations to it.

51:37 RAJA GOPEN (?) Yeah.

51:40 SATYA (?) On the other hand, if infinity really is a thing, then it has to be pointed, I guess.

51:52 PRAYAS Sorry for with stillness. Let's say with we just looked at stillness.

52:01 So in stillness with stillness what would be concrete?

52:06 BANDISH (?) Nothing will be concrete.

52:11 I think the stillness will be concrete.

52:14 AKANSHA When we talk about an example comes to my mind of a state of

52:22 That can be considered. you know the state in of Bhishma Pitamah on the arrow bed.

52:32 In where he's not really participating but is in that in between stage of

52:40 Of withdrawn withdrawal but yet not fully

52:46 Yes, participating.

52:50 AKANSHA (?) Would that be can that be considered as stillness?

52:55 PRAYAS (?) So participation as movement.

52:59 AKANSHA (?) Parti it I mean it's it's an action that actually consists of both, you know, withdrawal as well as participation. It's not dead yet.

53:09 PRAYAS The rhythm of movement would be from between participation and withdrawal.

53:16 PRAYAS (?) Participation and withdrawal. Yeah.

53:19 PRAYAS (?) And withdrawal. Yeah. So what do you think of that? All of us, I mean I'm throwing this question open to everyone. What do we think of this binary replacing the you know anonymous binary between the poles between some vibration was happening in a very unmarked kind of way. And instead of those unmarked poles, we put the words participation and withdrawal.

53:50 SATYA (?) That's actually reminding me of Arjuna too, because he was in a state where he was supposed to participate but he had actually with withdrawn.

54:00 It's like he's a it's like participation and withdrawal, it's like standing on a threshold.

54:06 AKANSHA (?) Yeah.

54:08 RAJA GOPEN That reminds me of my daily life.

54:12 BANDISH (?) Save mine. [?]

54:18 PRAYAS (?) But I would wonder why you would want to give names to these poles. Like isn't the unmarked always a bigger frame than the marked?

54:30 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.

54:31 RAJA GOPEN (?) Yeah.

54:35 BANDISH (?) So you know what is what is nothing in particular can be anything.

54:41 PRAYAS (?) But that which is something cannot be anything. It is already something.

54:48 RAJA GOPEN Otherwise it could be anything.

54:55 BANDISH (?) But then stillness is nothing and the nothing could be something for somebody.

55:00 SATYA (?) Yeah.

55:03 PRAYAS (?) But could nothing be something for somebody?

55:07 SATYA (?) Is that isn't that a perspective?

55:12 PRAYAS Yeah, somebody could get tuned into the zero state.

55:15 SATYA Right. Right.

55:19 PRAYAS See you now you can just turn the machine off.
55:25 Can just stop experiencing.

55:28 BANDISH (?) The withdrawal.

55:30 PRAYAS Th that's withdrawal. So yeah, I mean maybe the words just work for this kind of you know, withdrawal and participation. But I would wonder why.

55:47 SATYA I feel they're all representing concepts which are which replicate in nature. Like everything is self referential in a way. Like every like nothing, withdrawal, stillness, these are all concepts that relate to different physicalities but the abstraction of it is pretty similar to me at least.
56:09 Maybe that's why they work.

56:16 RAJA GOPEN (?) So you I think that it's okay to use them?

56:20 PRAYAS (?) I'm sorry.
56:22 You're saying that it's okay to use these words and go from unmarked poles to marked poles.

56:31 SATYA (?) Maybe it is only a crutch for understanding.

56:36 PRAYAS Okay. So you know so for moving forward we'll take Akansha's words, participation and withdrawal and let's see where it takes us.

56:48 RAJA GOPEN (?) Yeah.

56:53 AKSHAY Yeah, I'm joining late. Can you
56:55 What our conscious

56:58 PRAYAS So you know as far as I understand, un unless Ak Akansha, unless you want to represent what he said.

57:05 AKANSHA No, you go ahead.

57:07 PRAYAS You know, so what I got of what she said was that we were talking of the move the movement of a of a rhythm and Sam was talking about this rhythm of stillness. So the rhythm the so the movement of rhythm being still and
57:29 You know and then Akansha offer these words that if the movement the rhythm of movement is between the poles of participation and withdrawal

57:44 BANDISH (?) Then what? So that's where we are.

57:51 RAJA GOPEN Okay.

57:56 PRAYAS So you know, participation. So I was going on to say that to me, participation and withdrawal are very human names, you know, human words. They bring in sentiment.
58:07 Yeah.

58:08 AKANSHA But they're ways of engagement.

58:12 PRAYAS Yeah, it's just I mean, it just brings up sentiment in me with
58:16 I just
58:17 It's big.

58:22 MOSES SAM Well, what becomes when the distance between these poles is zero?

58:28 PRAYAS Yeah, so you know when you take away sentiment concepts become concepts become in that sense very p flat, you know, and that surfatial nature of

58:43 PRAYAS (?) Knowledge is what you're looking at. You know, we are looking at its most immediate form. So, you know, when you look at something which is associated with emotion.

58:54 BANDISH Okay.

58:55 BANDISH (?) It takes few time to understand that.

58:58 PRAYAS And more.

58:59 Is not immediate.

59:05 AKANSHA Yes, then the point is to experience infinity, one has to undergo a rhythmic movement.

59:14 MOSES SAM (?) Between these two poles

59:16 AKANSHA (?) The geology. [?]

59:18 Ah, okay.

59:19 RAJA GOPEN Someone said that what if the distance between these two poles becomes zero? I suddenly went into a third chain of it. [?] I feel like if the distance between these two poles b become zero, that's the point where we become still. That's the point where we experience infinity and harness all the energy.

59:38 MOSES SAM (?) Yes.

59:40 RAJA GOPEN So it's like you are participating as well as you are withdrawn at the same time.

59:44 RAJA GOPEN (?) Exactly.

59:45 PRAYAS So but the when you release the list [?]

59:48 MOSES SAM No so we have to talk about this zero.

59:52 Distance.

59:53 Yes. Because someone mentioned distance, right? When we were

59:57 MOSES SAM (?) Who mentioned distance?

59:59 BANDISH I did it.

01:00:00 PRAYAS (?) Right. So Akshay, just to fill you in, we were talking of words that can describe the concept of infinity.

01:00:11 MOSES SAM Okay.

01:00:12 PRAYAS And of such words distance was one word suggested by Raja in that sense. So could distance be a word to talk about infinity?

01:00:24 AKSHAY That's how we always imagine infinity, that there is a some infinite distance. But I think as what is being talked we are always between withdrawal and engagement in a way.

01:00:40 BANDISH (?) You know, but we have when we have moved the distance between the two poles to zero

01:00:47 BANDISH (?) The sentiments have become concepts.

01:00:54 AKSHAY (?) Oh.

01:00:58 I think so either.

01:00:58 That.

01:01:00 SATYA (?) It's like an abstraction made an abstraction of a sentiment. Like the you moved through humanity, you worked through your humanity, your failings, your limitations, and then you reached a place where these are mere concepts and abstractions.

01:01:15 SPEAKER 4 I mean to say.

01:01:19 AKSHAY (?) And we are

01:01:19 AKSHAY (?) Because we are

01:01:24 At the same time. So it's zero and infinite is at the same moment.

01:01:31 Okay

01:01:32 SATYA (?) At infinity.

01:01:35 What do you?
01:01:36 We it I kind of heard that as we are already at infinity because we are engaging in whatever it is that we are supposed to be engaging in at the same time right now.
01:01:46 AKSHAY Yeah, but when we imagine infinity we always see also a point zero.
01:01:55 Is there is no distance as such.
01:02:01 PRAYAS You know you see the point zero only if you're self aware. But when you're looking into the distance, you un you're only looking out. You can't see yourself.
01:02:14 MALAVIKA (?) But you are part of that.
01:02:17 PRAYAS (?) Your perception, your perspective is part of that, but you are not part of it because you are the source, you are zero.
01:02:26 BANDISH (?) But that's where we are drawing the line from, no, to infinity.
01:02:31 BANDISH (?) Ah, see you are a part of it. Right.
01:02:33 AKSHAY Yeah. Well we are point A in a way and whatever point B we are imagining is infinite maybe, but that can be anywhere, within us also and within without with outside of us also.
01:02:46 PRAYAS (?) Right. So it's part of us. I mean it's where it starts from.
01:02:53 BANDISH (?) Yeah.
01:02:55 And it's where it ends also, no? It's a cycle in a room. [?]
01:03:04 PRAYAS But there is no movement. But you know there it's a ray. When you're looking out inf into the bounds of infinity.
01:03:13 Yeah.
01:03:14 It's not a vibration between infinity to zero and zero to infinity because infinity itself is not known. Right? So
01:03:23 What I'm what I'm talking about.
01:03:24 SATYA Ross. [?]
01:03:27 SATYA (?) Sorry, in the process of looking at infinity, you're you could also be looking inwards at the zero because when you look at the perspective of infinity, it maybe it reminds you to look at inwards towards the infinity inside. So in that
01:03:42 AKSHAY Yeah, I would say in the same way like say if we imagine Earth in orbit, that means when you see the infinite round it's a infinite round from point of earth if you are looking out, that same point comes back in a orbit and comes from the backside. So it is crossing through
01:03:59 BANDISH (?) Through us in a way.
01:04:07 BANDISH (?) You are talking of a loop. You are talking of a loop as a as a concept that can represent infinity.
01:04:19 Yeah.
01:04:22 AKSHAY But infinity is that loop. See, even if you look at the symbol of infinity it is a loop.
01:04:28 AKSHAY (?) Right.
01:04:30 AKSHAY (?) It's a it's a loop.
01:04:32 PRAYAS (?) So I mean it's as a hall of mirrors.
01:04:37 AKSHAY (?) No
01:04:39 No, I don't think so. It's a hall of mirrors, no?
01:04:42 PRAYAS No, you know the mathematical concept of similarity.
01:04:48 AKSHAY Yeah.
01:04:49 PRAYAS (?) Talks about a hall of mirrors. It talks about the universe l seeming to be much bigger than it is.
01:04:59 So you know, one side is reflecting another, but what we think is unique is only a reflection.
01:05:06 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
01:05:08 AKSHAY (?) Limited then.
01:05:09 SATYA (?) Mm.

01:05:10 That means in that sense infinity is actually just one thing which is reflecting so many times. So actually it is limited.

01:05:20 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so it I mean I'm saying that's another proposition.

01:05:24 BANDISH Yeah.

01:05:25 MOSES SAM (?) No, it depends on how many times it's being reflected.

01:05:29 SATYA (?) Right.

01:05:31 SATYA (?) Yeah, oh right. So the facets of reflection might be infinite.

01:05:35 MOSES SAM (?) Yes. So Bandish talked about distance, right?

01:05:41 BANDISH Yes.

01:05:42 MOSES SAM (?) Okay. So what were you thinking when you said distance?

01:05:46 BANDISH I mean when you think of the word infinity, the first thing you see is that, you know

01:05:54 The distant point where it goes on and on and on. And I think when we talk about an infinity it's a

01:06:07 It's a comparative measure that you know with respect to this point, it's never ending. I mean it's it is a it is always relative. It is never on its own a measure. It's a relative measure. So when I thought of a distance I it was natural that

01:06:33 In relation to any point there is an infinite distance around that point. That's what the infinity is. Because i if you don't pinpoint a relative point to begin with, then y you can't begin.

01:06:57 MOSES SAM So what is distance? Like how do you define distance?

01:07:04 BANDISH I mean a distance in time, a distance in space, a distance as a as we earlier talked about you know say whether to do or not to do.

01:07:20 The dilemma of Krishna or early [?]

01:07:25 BANDISH (?) Mm-

01:07:26 So it's always a distance between two points or a point and the never ending. But there has to be one point and the other never ending or the other point where the distance is infinite.

01:07:42 PRAYAS Bandish we spoke of collapsing the distance between the two poles to zero.

01:07:49 PRAYAS (?) That I am having some difficulty of imagining and

01:07:54 MOSES SAM Okay, I'll tell you. So I don't know why I keep bouncing back to quantum physics. So there's this concept of entanglement, right? So where you know you have one electron in one universe, and then you know the other electron would be in another universe. But then if you are parallel universe or multiverse, right? Anything. So but then if you alter the

01:08:17 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

01:08:19 Yeah, exactly. So if you alter the properties of one electron in one universe, the other electron in the another universe responds to it in a similar way. So if that's the and it has been proven, right, in quantum physics it happens. So these two electrons, though they are light years apart, they behave in a similar way. So if that's the case, so what happens to the concept of distance? You know, either they are connected somehow or there is no distance, they are always touching each other.

01:08:51 BANDISH Yeah. I read the articles about you know time travel and wormhole and connecting parallel universe. But somehow I'm yet to completely

01:09:03 RAJA GOPEN Yeah. Pandila. [?] I have a parallel view about distance here.

01:09:10 BANDISH Yes, please.

01:09:11 RAJA GOPEN What I feel is distance or time or all these things which are measured or which are entities which can be only measured. They're all illusions. They're all

01:09:25 Yeah.

01:09:25 Made for our own

01:09:28 A delusion.

01:09:29 Constructed illusions, exactly. So even if we talk about distance, it's always the difference of the point from zero. Like the distance between you and me would be the difference of our dis-

tances from a point zero. Whereas there is no initial zero point anywhere. So these are all just for made for our own sake, and these are all constructed illusions.

01:09:56 AKSHAY Yeah, that's what I meant by the Earth's orbit, no? When w we you can put that point zero anywhere in the orbit.

01:10:03 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.

01:10:03 AKSHAY (?) Be anywhere and it can end anywhere.

01:10:05 RAJA GOPEN Yeah.

01:10:07 BANDISH (?) Mm-

01:10:09 So

01:10:10 AKSHAY That is the what we have the perception like similarly once I was thinking when we think about our life from life when we are born to death, it that is not a that is not loop, it's a spiral. So in a spiral you come close to many points which have you have crossed in your earlier life. And that something is always creates an illusion that deja vu kind of feeling that oh we've again come back to the same situation.

01:10:43 PRAYAS Yeah.

01:10:44 AKSHAY Actually we are not in the same situation. That is a spiral, but otherwise when we look at everyday life or the way we are looking at say the filter of perspective, we are in a we are in a loop from zero to infinite but it's all through us.

01:11:00 PRAYAS Yeah.

01:11:00 So ha have we come back to the point I think Akansha has left the room, but I'm just trying to pull the threads back here. have we come to the point where we are saying that it's okay to look at

01:11:18 Infinity as movement between participation and withdrawal. Are we saying that?

01:11:27 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:11:29 RAJA GOPEN (?) By saying that distance or time are constructed illusions, I meant to say that we are already in infinity and we are experiencing infinity but we are not aware of it. Or we d these constructed illusions are keeping us from being aware of it.

01:11:50 MOSES SAM Yeah, I would agree to that.

01:11:52 MOSES SAM (?) Correct.

01:11:52 MOSES SAM (?) Oh I didn't.

01:11:53 MOSES SAM (?) So there is a constructed distance between withdrawal and participation and once we are aware of that this distance becomes zero. So eventually it's the same point and then that's one experience stillness, which is infinity.

01:12:07 AKSHAY Yeah.

01:12:09 Yeah, because like the same as Earth's orbit, we if we look only from one side, say from American side, and we only see a round going around, but we don't see that the point comes back into India somewhere.

01:12:21 Yeah.

01:12:22 AKSHAY (?) Imagine the globe. So yeah, if we are not aware of it we see it as a distance.

01:12:27 AKSHAY (?) Absolutely.

01:12:28 PRAYAS But what were you saying, Satya? You were saying something to add on to what Raja was saying, I think.

01:12:38 SATYA (?) Aye, what was I saying? No, I don't remember the side.

01:12:42 He acknowledged.

01:12:43 I think I said I agree. Yeah. That

01:12:48 SATYA (?) We are experiencing infinity but then

01:12:51 But yeah. Yeah, we are unable to vocalize it and when we try to vocalize it becomes not infinity in a way because of our limitations.

01:13:00 SATYA (?) Yeah.

01:13:03 RAJA GOPEN (?) Right. So but huh.

01:13:05 SATYA I'm sorry. the other thing which I think Akshay had said about life you know, from birth to death, that to me is not limited. To me that itself is an infinity. To be alive is infinity.

01:13:20 AKSHAY Yeah. Well that's what I said that if we don't imagine it from when we are born to death, at every moment we are in infinity. But if we see in like we were discussing about the distance, then the two the two separate can be viewed like this, that life to death is a distance and what we are talking is infinite at this moment.

01:13:43 Got it, yeah.

01:13:44 Yeah.

01:13:49 PRAYAS So where does that take us? so Satya what you just said that the movement in life need not be a movement between points of birth and death, but itself in free floating in infinity. Where does that take us? That does take it to a place where we can accept that what we are going to do is work these two words or that does not seem necessary and we can move on from these words now.

01:14:20 SATYA I somehow like the word rhythm which Akansha had mentioned and I like the word stillness. I feel like there is something, you know, because words is all we have, I guess, one of the things we have. But participation and withdrawal are seeming a little limited to me in this discussion. I feel like stillness and rhythm seem to have more potential, at least to me.

01:14:47 AKSHAY I would agree because I think when she's saying p withdrawal and participation, basically if now we think that they are at point zero, they form a rhythm. Because they are interchanging at a at a certain speed maybe. And how you perceive a withdrawal can be infinite, how you perceive participation can be infinite, but it is a rhythm, I will agree.

01:15:14 Right.

01:15:16 Yeah, but I'm not very sure about the stillness because I didn't hear what she said about stillness. what does she mean by stillness?

01:15:25 PRAYAS Yes, Sa Sam had you know, initiated this whole discussion about stillness and I think at this point we're you know, we're very close to the time we should stop. So I'll just say that, you know, Akshay we can see the recording and

01:15:37 AKSHAY Yeah, okay.

01:15:39 PRAYAS Go back to it. but I would just like to, you know, pause to go on to tomorrow and so I would like to pause with taking what was just said in terms of rhythm and stillness.

01:15:58 Mm-

01:15:59 Being the two

01:16:02 Poles that we can talk about. And we can talk about it more and see where that takes us.

01:16:10 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

01:16:14 PRAYAS (?) Right. So did I capture it right Satya? rhythm actually.

01:16:18 BANDISH Yes. Very much. Yeah.

01:16:23 BANDISH (?) So then yeah we'll meet again tomorrow at nine PM.

01:16:27 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

01:16:28 And at this point we just stopped the broadcast because it's been one hour and you might have to get back to other things.

01:16:36 SATYA Thanks. Thanks everyone. Bye.

01:16:38 SATYA (?) Thank you.

01:16:39 AKSHAY (?) Yeah. Sorry, I was late. I'm sorry.

01:16:43 PRAYAS Yeah we can so we'll start again tomorrow and then see where it goes. Bye.

01:16:49 RAJA GOPEN (?) Okay, bye, good night away. [?]

01:16:52 AKSHAY Bye guys.

01:16:54 Right.