Perspective Studies, Day 4

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 4 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 AKSHAY It was very simple. He said that we don't come up with ideas. It's the ideas which come up with us. So like it was meaning like this, that there are ideas floating around in the universe and they find the right receptor.

00:18 So that reception means how attentive you are at that moment about that idea.

00:29 JOSEF (?) They take sense. [?]

00:30 PRAYAS No. hi Josef. you know, but we are talking about the immediacy of experience, the tick level of the experience. And I mean I'm just bringing us back to that in a very stubborn way because I find that very a very interesting thing to talk about. I think it's I mean I don't get to talk about it often, you know the immediacy of experience and I'd like to talk about that. What does everyone feel about that?

01:08 AKSHAY Then I think you have to e expand more on what do you mean by tick level explanation.

01:14 AKSHAY (?) Experience.

01:15 PRAYAS Yeah, so Raja what do you what do you think about this?

01:18 RAJA GOPEN Yeah, I want to know first that when we are saying experience, are we meaning that anything and everything that we are experiencing on a physical level or something which we can make meaning out of consciously?

01:34 PRAYAS You know, before you know what is the difference between physical and meaning, you know.

01:44 At a very basic level. At a very basic level your neurus your neural network is a is a live wire, you know. So as things are happening in the cosmos

01:59 RAJA GOPEN Mm.

02:00 PRAYAS You are in a way sensitive to them.

02:03 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

02:04 At that level, we are calling it experience.

02:08 RAJA GOPEN So by that logic maybe the time required for the least number of neurons to fire. That might be the instant

02:18 Or for the minimum possible activity in my brain.

02:22 SATYA (?) Or the very first neuron that fired.

02:24 Yeah.

02:27 PRAYAS Yeah, to make it less technical, what I would say is we don't care about the number of neurons as far as we are getting to the number of neurons that we're sensitive about, you know? So what I'm saying is if there is a chunk of twenty five neurons and that's the minimum resolution of our experience.

02:51 RAJA GOPEN Yeah.

02:52 PRAYAS Then that is the minimum resolution, you know, we don't know anything finer than that.

02:57 RAJA GOPEN (?) Yeah. So now who decides this minimum resolution or who decides the quantity of this minimum resolution? Now

03:06 PRAYAS We don't have to decide it. it's already there, right? Yeah.

03:10 Happens.

03:11 Yeah.

03:11 What is it?

03:12 MALAVIKA In the way we determine it through meaning.

03:18 PRAYAS No, we can either you know measure it or speculate over it, you know, experimentally. So in the sense that if you're sitting in a sitting in a forest or you're sitting on a street and if you if you play a game which is like which is the finest thing that you are sensitive to? You know, which is the

03:41 PRAYAS (?) Which is the finest thing that you are able to observe in this environment?

03:47 SATYA Right. And that's like granularity and it brings back to a the point to attention. Like how fine is your attention?

03:53 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I mean if you can be attentive to details which you know others can't even imagine.

04:04 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

04:05 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, but again that again brings us to the hierarchy, no? You cannot be a f flat attentive all the time.

04:13 PRAYAS So you know so Akshay, that's right. So in the sense we there is a very clear hierarchy. What is at the top?

04:19 SATYA (?) Yeah.

04:21 PRAYAS What do you think?

04:21 MALAVIKA I don't understand why hierarchy.

04:25 PRAYAS No, I mean what Akshay is talking about is what we had mentioned earlier, in the sense that the that of the of the things that affect us, there are some things that affect us more and some things that affect us less. You know, there is our attention is not equal in terms of the kinds of stimulus it spreads itself for, right?

04:47 MALAVIKA Is that generalized or specific to each individual?

04:53 SATYA I mean the concept is generalized. Like for each individual, what are you experiencing at a given moment? And why do you experience one thing more than another thing at a given moment?

05:03 MALAVIKA (?) Oh.

05:08 PRAYAS Cheryl you are you there?

05:13 So wha what do you think how can we get at this granular sensitivity, you know, what how can you define the tick?

05:22 PRAYAS (?) I

05:23 CHERYL Attention spans are definitely they are dependent on individuals. For starters, I have a very short attention span. So you've got to keep on I just keep on flitting. So if something doesn't grasp me, I'm already thinking something else. Another point I wanted to I think it has

come up. I think attention span or attention is a little different according to me to attention to detail.

05:52 PRAYAS What's the difference?

05:55 CHERYL I guess attention is something you know, you l it could be something which you see, observe, and the processing could happen much later. Attention to detail is seeing something and observing minutely that okay, there is something to this detail and everyone has that to a different degree. It's how much we want to see of it also. What is our experience, what is our exposure, or what kind of perceptions we have, right? So

06:26 PRAYAS You are say you would say that the attention to detail is about training and attention span is about capacity.

06:34 CHERYL I wouldn't say training. It's it wouldn't be right to say training. It would be something as to you know, it's not like education if you mean training. But it's

06:46 PRAYAS Is it habit?

06:48 CHERYL It's not e it could be habit if you have OCD but it could also be something where I think you generally some people get it naturally in fact.

06:59 Yeah. It's construction.

07:00 PRAYAS I think OCD is a very good association to make here because the duration of the moment for some someone who is compulsive.

07:12 You know, it's far shorter.

07:18 What do you think?

07:19 CHERYL I get it.

07:22 PRAYAS (?) You know, so there's a number of things that bother you.

07:25 CHERYL Yeah, that's true. Yeah.

07:28 PRAYAS (?) Are you saying something, Satya?

07:30 SATYA I'm sorry I don't want to digress too much, but it's like what if you're an ant? How what is your attention span then? in the sense like if you see the world like an ant

07:44 Are the details you know, what are the I don't know. I don't know where I'm going with that.

07:53 PRAYAS Yeah. We can hear you.

07:56 JOSEF I think for attention I think you have to make like two distinctions, like a little bit you mentioned about attention like span and attention itself. So I think like and now you mentioned the ant. So I think like one thing is attention on a kind of unconscious level where it works like a kind of stimulus and response. So that is the ant or something, right? You they just react without thinking about it. But as humans I think we have another like level and we can consciously influence attention. And that's more a kind of like process which is I think directed by us and we can we can control it, right? You can it's like when the in the school someone tells you don't pay attention, you should pay attention to the teacher, you are paying attention to something else. So this is something you are controlling. But there is also the level which you don't control, which is like a reaction to some danger or when you hear a sound or something, it's just pick it's just connected to your senses directly. So I think y we should we should kind of look at this like two different ways which come together in attention. And it also and the fact that one you can influence and one you cannot influence, it also relates to how you perceive the time.

09:13 PRAYAS Right. So you know we talked about these two kinds of attention. One that is before thought can happen, so one which is not cultural.

09:24 Yeah.

09:25 And one which is instinctive, you know, so what you are s what you're what you're talking about when you say a sensitivity to danger.

09:35 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

09:37 So that is the other so but I think at this point most of us are interested in the idea of attention before thought because I don't know, it's that's about me because that's the kind of attention that I personally know the least about.

09:56 SATYA So attention before thought is kind of sounding like what is going on in the unconscious, which you are not aware of, right, in the unconscious brain.

10:05 SATYA (?) Yes.

10:06 JOSEF (?) All I can do. [?]

10:07 PRAYAS I mean if you believe in the unconscious

10:10 SATYA No, it's not belief. No, it's like the construction of the brain is such that of course, I mean, it's still up for research at this point, but there is a part of the brain which isn't like the frontal lobe versus the you know, the lizard brain area, whatever.

10:25 PRAYAS No, so you are talking about the expressive. You're talking about the expression and the latency. Are you talking about that?

10:32 SATYA No, I'm saying more like things that you know h like fight and flight responses, where do they come from? Survival, like the very primitive brain area.

10:43 SATYA (?) Yeah.

10:44 AKSHAY That's what I think Josef said with the uncultured attention, no?

10:47 AKSHAY (?) Right. Yeah.

10:48 JOSEF So something is more like a reflex, right? Like your iris will get bigger and smaller based on the amount of light coming in or something. Something is almost like that, right?

10:58 PRAYAS Yeah, like

10:58 SATYA So like your heart beating.

11:00 SATYA (?) Control.

11:01 PRAYAS So Josef, what would you think about this kind of attention? So let's say, you know, your experience before thought, the one that you cannot control, the attention that you cannot control, what do you think about that?

11:18 JOSEF (?) Mm. Well that is before thought, so

11:22 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so what so what's before thought how do you think about that?

11:29 JOSEF You mean like how fast it is or

11:33 PRAYAS You know, we like w we can I think we can reflect on its quality

11:40 On the quality of that attention and through that reflection we'll find out lots of things, you know, we'll find out about the length, we'll find out about its intensity, we'll find out I don't know, other stuff.

12:00 JOSEF (?) I think it's very much dip connected to our senses, right? It depends on some kind of like output input from the outside, like whether it's like vision or sound or something. So

12:15 PRAYAS But that's what Satya is talking about not being the case, in the sense that there's stuff happening in your psyche, if there's stuff happening in your in your s subconscious in that sense, unconscious.

12:29 Yeah.

12:30 I was confusing unconscious and subconscious as for a moment thinking they're the same things. Because subconscious is a is a fabrication, which I don't believe.

12:40 SATYA Okay.

12:42 JOSEF (?) So it I think it's in our mind.

12:44 SATYA I just wanted to tie in also what Akshay said about the idea what you talked about that filmmaker and that brought to mind Carl Jung's collective unconscious which is also a theory which is you know I just wanna throw that in there.

12:58 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but you know, I am very I'm biased towards Carl Jung, you know. I mean I would I mean I'd I'm bi biased and I would place my bets there.

13:15 AKSHAY I don't believe in I've not read Carl Jung and all, so I won't go into it. But I just believe this entire idea of I think what Josef also was defining that there we can distinguish the attention in two ways. One is maybe a universal attention which we are part of and one can be this cultured attention. So as I think I can see you are more attentive towards the universal attention right now.

13:44 PRAYAS So when you call it universal attention, do you mean the attention that the cosmos is paying to us?

13:51 AKSHAY (?) I think so. Because that's where then if you're denying unconscious everything then we become part of that universal attention in a way. Because everybody experiences

14:01 PRAYAS But does the cosmos have a mind?

14:05 AKSHAY (?) No, I don't think so it has a mind. You cannot define attention only as a mind. No.

14:10 PRAYAS No, is there is there a kind of attention does a m does a machine pay attention to you? So will you say that the computer pays attention to you when you use it?

14:19 AKSHAY No. See don't go on objects. Keep on as the concepts. No, you yourself denied objects. So I'm not saying why machine I'm just saying there is a thought of a universal attention and that you can be part of.

14:33 PRAYAS No, I'm just trying it I'm just finding it difficult to imagine universal attention. You know, a cosmic attention

14:42 AKSHAY As Josef said and I think earlier also somebody had said that see fear can be a universal attention. Or reflexes as Josef had said. It ki it is a universal attention in a way. you don't know what happens to your eye when it starts contracting and all. But these are physical features we know of, but there are many other ways also where you are part of a universal attention. You many times you don't know before a thought comes to you, your heart is beating, you are anxious, there are many other kind of things which you don't know what is really happening. And that is more because of your universal attention being agitated.

15:23 AKSHAY (?) And that I would call that the unconscious.

15:26 Since he is denying it, so

15:30 PRAYAS No, we were confused about subconscious and unconscious. Unconscious

15:34 MALAVIKA (?) Different from instinct.

15:36 SATYA Instinct is the unconscious.

15:40 SATYA (?) Is it?

15:41 JOSEF I think the way now Akshay described it, I think it's close to the idea of the inst the instinct or yeah. So I think it's something like inherent to every organism maybe. Yeah, it's like kind of

15:59 AKSHAY Yeah, that's what I meant by calling it universal attention. Yeah.

16:03 JOSEF And I think it also ties to this idea of like kind of like frame rate or like minimum like minimum amount of like reactivity or minimum amount of time needed to of a of a cycle or something, right? Inside of this

16:23 AKSHAY It's very interesting because just before the talk opened I was thinking of this frame rate and I was thinking there is somewhere a somewhere a basic minimum finite frame rate running. Otherwise we won't see anything.

16:37 Yeah.

16:38 SATYA Right, I mean d that depends on our physicality, right? Like we are just measuring objects in some ways. We are just instruments and we resonate with what happens around us, but that resonance is depends on what material we are constructed of. And that material is physical, it's mental thoughts, whatever, right? Our culture, our energy, our metabolism.

16:59 AKSHAY Yeah, but that means you can manipulate with the speed of the frame rate. That's not what I'm saying, but there is al already a motion there. There is already a finite speed running, you can fasten it or maybe even slow it.

17:14 AKSHAY (?) Okay.

17:15 PRAYAS (?) So but can you can you change it consciously?

17:19 RAJA GOPEN Can I add something?

17:20 PRAYAS Yeah, please.

17:22 RAJA GOPEN Yeah, while you were discussing about this, I ran into a parallel thought process while I was listening to it. So I what I think is that the universal frame rate or universal attention, what we were talking about. So it's not that we it has any frame rate. maybe it's always attentive and infinitely attentive all the time. It's our perspective through which we are trying to give it a measurement angle, through which we are trying to measure the frame rate. So what I mean to say is the I'm not able to explain it properly.

18:07 PRAYAS No, that's I think I quite

18:11 MALAVIKA Yeah, I don't know.

18:12 PRAYAS I think it's quite a nice idea.

18:15 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.

18:17 PRAYAS (?) You know, in terms of that it's always a parallel track and you know, it just it just breaks out now and then, but it's always active.

18:27 Yeah.

18:29 SATYA That's kinda like what we spoke about yesterday, about the infinite always being there, but us having our frames, right?

18:35 PRAYAS Yeah, and coming in through the holes.

18:38 SATYA Yeah.

18:41 PRAYAS (?) But does the does talking about the in infinite take us towards

18:51 You know take us into a spiritual direction.

18:57 MALAVIKA (?) Maybe.

19:00 SATYA (?) Or it could I don't know, it depends on what spiritual is. I mean, are we going towards religion or what is spiritual?

19:07 PRAYAS No, I mean the idea of spiritual would basically be defined it would begin it would start making sense in terms of a belief in the spirit, you know? Like do you think the there's something called a spirit that exists?

19:25 MALAVIKA It doesn't have to be spiritual. I mean the idea of the infinite is you know, it crosses all studies. It starts with mathematics to art to everything. So I don't know if you would I don't know what is the point in trying to label it or try to find whether it is spiritual or not. And I think each person's definition of what is spiritual also will vary.

19:54 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

19:55 RAJA GOPEN Given. [?]

19:58 PRAYAS No, but what is the content? You know, what is your object in a spiritual

20:06 JOSEF (?) And you know.

20:06 JOSEF (?) For me sp spiritual means basically like transcendent. It means there is something which transcends your physical

20:13 MALAVIKA (?) Existence.

20:18 PRAYAS (?) That is actually a clearer way of looking at it.

20:22 Yeah.

20:23 It doesn't bring in a ghost.

20:26 AKSHAY It brings us to yesterday's thing, no, that the frame the transcendence is at the edge of the frame.

20:34 RAJA GOPEN (?) Oh.

20:36 PRAYAS How does it bring us to that?

20:39 AKSHAY Because it's that's where you are transcending, no? You are going beyond what you are Yes.

20:44 AKSHAY (?) Yes.

20:45 JOSEF I agree, yeah. So it's like there is something like even if like you disappear, like you disappear, your frame disappears, so you something will be left, right? That's the idea, yeah.

20:57 So I see the connection.

21:02 JOSEF (?) Yeah.

21:03 AKSHAY So

21:04 PRAYAS So if we come back to the edge, then where we were yesterday was discomfort keeps us on the edge.

21:16 RAJA GOPEN (?) Right.

21:18 PRAYAS (?) So wa do we want to do something with

21:23 SATYA You know, I actually was wanting to talk a little more about or dis all of us talk a little more about the holes. What is a hole?

21:31 PRAYAS The hole? what are the holes?

21:34 SATYA Right. How do we make them? Like why do they happen or and not even why, but what are they?

21:44 MALAVIKA You know Josef just mentioned this thing of transcendence and what is left behind. And sometimes I wonder if that which is left behind, like a trace, is can be the hole as well.

22:04 PRAYAS (?) Right. So when you pour something in, what gets left behind when you pour it out?

22:17 So if that is a hole.

22:19 SATYA Right, the nothingness of it, of that thing is a hole.

22:23 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I mean it will you know, usually be estimated in terms of, you know, percentile points.

22:35 MALAVIKA Yeah, it's also like the inverse of what we were trying to say yesterday. Yeah. Because I think it has to be looked both ways. It has to be self reflective also.

22:46 PRAYAS Yeah, it's like you know the that song which said that you know, every world has a every world has a crack because that's where the light comes in.

23:02 PRAYAS (?) So when the light comes in, the light is what you're talking about. You're right, you inverse the idea.

23:10 MALAVIKA (?) And which you were talking about yesterday about looking at the frame from the outside.

23:15 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

23:18 PRAYAS Yeah, but I mean because that means that, you know, instead of talking about going out, we also have to acknowledge that it's coming in.

23:33 MALAVIKA (?) Yes.

23:35 MALAVIKA (?) And that's uncomfortable.

23:39 PRAYAS Right, so that is the that is the agony of experience.

23:45 SATYA (?) Right.

23:58 PRAYAS Cheryl, you there?

23:59 CHERYL Yes, I am.

24:01 PRAYAS I if you've been finding it you know difficult to jump in, you know, if you just want to take some time.

24:08 CHERYL No, actually I just while you all were talking about these holes, what I just felt is if you really think that is can there s be something like a hole truly? Because the minute if you take for example or a glass or something, you put something in it and then you remove it, there's always something left behind. So is there something really like a hole? If you think of

an experience, something affects you. There's always something left behind that changes you. So is there something really like a hole? Do holes really exist?

24:44 SATYA I guess Cheryl, what I would look at it as like that change in you is the hole.

24:51 SATYA (?) Mm-

24:52 Now it's leading you somewhere else or it's showing you something new.

24:56 CHERYL So then it doesn't really become a hole. It actually changes you and morphs you into something else. But you still have some matter in some sort of content in you. A hole by definition would mean emptiness or nothingness. So can something truly be nothing? Can we really

25:19 PRAYAS (?) A hole would be a puncture, you know, it would be a cavity.

25:26 CHERYL (?) Yeah, but there's truly nothing which is empty, right? There's always space. So even a black hole it absorbs a lot of matter. So what is holes do they really exist? Isn't it a way or isn't this like perspective it's a perspective?

25:45 SATYA Yes. And I think what I meant by hole was when that perspective starts cracking because you learnt something new or now you're seeing something new. And you're seeing that something new through your current perspective. Through a crack in your current perspective. I guess that's what I meant by a hole.

26:03 CHERYL So probably crack I could read it. [?]

26:07 PRAYAS Crack is a better word you're saying.

26:09 CHERYL Not okay, to a degree. To a degree. I mean, yeah.

26:14 PRAYAS (?) So Satya, are you o okay with replacing the word hole with a crack? The word crack?

26:21 SATYA (?) Okay, no follow. [?]

26:22 RAJA GOPEN (?) Has a negative connotation to it.

26:25 PRAYAS What's the negative connotation?

26:28 RAJA GOPEN (?) Crack generally we don't associate with

26:33 RAJA GOPEN (?) Things which

26:34 PRAYAS Being whole with a W, right?

26:37 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

26:40 But then you know, is there anything unbroken anywhere? Isn't is there anything whole?

26:50 You know, I would more I would m more easily accept that everything is cracked a little bit than accept that everything is whole.

27:00 SATYA Holy. Everything is holy.

27:02 SATYA (?) Yeah, exactly.

27:07 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

27:10 PRAYAS But Josef, going back to you know, just going back to you know, in the sense if you j if you want to add something to this.

27:21 MALAVIKA Yeah.

27:23 JOSEF Like I think yeah I mean the crack is more like I re related to like some like you said something is breaking or something. So maybe you can use some word. The hole is a little bit more neutral. But I mean as a metaphor it maybe is not that precise, but maybe you can find some other word which is neutral but expresses this kind of thing that there is some kind of like it's always there, yeah. It's not like something like you make a hole. But I think it is true like that there is always a kind of there are some kind of cracks, yeah. But I wouldn't associate it like with something breaking or something being a whole and then being like being one, like being a whole, like one, I mean, and then having the cracks, but I would say there is always some kind of like you know places you can kind of see through, right? It's more like you discover some places to see through. Don't create the holes, right?

28:25 PRAYAS Why do you think we should be neutral in the sense do you think if things are subjective or if things have the colour of sentiment, like you know, we were talking about the day four do you think they become less absolute.

28:47 JOSEF (?) I think it expresses some value judgment. Yes, so it is less absolute.

28:55 JOSEF (?) Right, so it's less objective.

28:57 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

28:59 AKSHAY I would add another thing here that I think if you're talking about crack, your entire frame can crack. But hole is a better thing because it's a experience and it's sometimes it's also a self healing hole.

29:12 Yeah.

29:13 PRAYAS So Cheryl are you okay with going back to the word hole and discard you know for the moment the word crack?

29:21 CHERYL I didn't really have like a disagreement as to what you call it. I was just asking a rhetorical question as to can a hole really be a hole? Is a hole ever whole?

29:33 SATYA (?) No, I've got another image in my mind which is like a hole

29:36 AKSHAY (?) Like a filter

29:37 SATYA You know how we make those like when you press when you make chaklis, you have that thing which has holes in it and then you press it.

29:45 SATYA (?) Yeah.

29:46 Like a filter like thing, you know?

29:50 AKSHAY (?) I think th I will agree with Josef and the that it can be a self healing hole. Let's not look at as a permanent hole as happened in the frame. It can also

30:01 PRAYAS (?) The f the frame is like a tubeless tire.

30:07 MALAVIKA (?) I f I find cracks more organic.

30:11 MALAVIKA (?) Right. It's some more material property.

30:15 AKSHAY No, but that's what I said, the crack can happen to the entire frame. Your entire frame can crack, dis and dismantle and you may have another frame. But we when we are talking holes in the frame, it can be a very organic self healing hole like you said tubeless tire. It's interesting, I was thinking about it. So w your little gas goes out and then you again come back. So your frame remains but you don't disintegrate.

30:44 SATYA Ac with the with the crack it sounds like there has to be destruction and there has to be a movement forward. But with the as Akshay is d is describing it sounds like the whole with a W can remain, can regain itself.

30:59 MALAVIKA Yeah.

31:00 SATYA So it doesn't have to move anywhere.

31:02 PRAYAS Yeah, and I think it would be important to hold on to the whole, the you know, the entirety of the of the entity. Because if we fragment the whole, if we you know, go into a fragmentation of the one, then we'll have to deal with you know, multiple agents in a world that you know that will trouble us because I mean I don't think it's possible to conceptualize multiple agents and

31:41 MALAVIKA (?) What kind of multiple agents?

31:44 PRAYAS You know, it's like so you have the concept of Advaita which is

31:50 Right.

31:50 Not two. so not two means one.

31:54 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

31:56 PRAYAS (?) So in Advaita it is impossible to think of the other. You know, there is no other in Advaita.

32:08 PRAYAS (?) And I have not been able to shake off the influence of Advaita actually in my in my perspective. In and I would like it you know to be sh shaken off if you know if we can talk about it.

32:26 SATYA So Advaita means non dual, right? So there is no there is no boundary.

32:32 PRAYAS Yeah, but that's the English translation in the in the in the sandhi of the of the Sanskrit word itself. It's not two. It's not that it's yeah, so non dual means in a way it doesn't bring in very clearly that it's not two. Actually not two would be a better translation.

32:53 MALAVIKA Not two can be many also.

32:59 PRAYAS Yeah, no you know, we were thinking about it a few days back and the not two you know, if you're not thinking integers if you're thinking float point values.

33:11 MALAVIKA (?) What is that? What do you mean?

33:13 PRAYAS You know zero point one, zero point zero one, zero point zero, okay.

33:16 MALAVIKA Okay.

33:17 PRAYAS (?) If you're going into decimals, then all of infinity could exist between zero and one.

33:25 SATYA Right. Yeah. This is like Zeno's paradox or something, right?

33:29 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean, you know, so there are innumerable holes in every hole.

33:33 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

33:39 PRAYAS So the I think the innumerable holes in every hole is a good idea of the whole.

33:49 MALAVIKA That's like the Mandelbrot set.

33:52 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, it's fractal.

33:53 PRAYAS Yeah.

33:54 SATYA (?) Yeah.

34:01 MALAVIKA But where does the Advaita come here?

34:04 PRAYAS No, so I'm saying that for us to discard the whole, you know, the entirety of the entity so if we were going to discard you know the word what Akshay just said, you know, that you cannot

34:31 You cannot imagine that there's something which is broken and then needs to g needs to be re-constructed, you know.

34:42 Because if there is something broken and it needs to be reconstructed and if there is a cyclical nature of the whole

34:52 Then when the hole is not whole, what is it?

34:58 PRAYAS (?) So you know, it becomes more about a dual model of the universe, like the yin yang, or the dark energy and you know, the energy itself.

35:10 AKSHAY Yeah, but that's what I was saying, no, it's a self healing hole. You it exists for a moment and then it closes back and you again have another hole.

35:21 MALAVIKA I don't know, this need to be reconstructed is yeah, like Akshay says it's self healing, so it doesn't have to reconstruct itself to what it was. It can become whole in itself even as a fragment.

35:38 SATYA Yeah, I feel like there are two things here. One is conceptualizing the perspective which cracks and then goes forward to the next shape. And then there is the c there is a there is an entity which has holes in it, which morphs itself, like it has holes which, you know, heal themselves. So I feel like there are two things here.

36:03 Yeah, I need to talk about it.

36:04 AKSHAY (?) Yeah the same thing. What I was saying is that the frame can crack.

36:09 Right.

36:09 So holes in the frame can self heal. Depends.

36:13 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but I'm basically wondering why would it self heal? What makes it self want to self heal? Is there a mind

36:23 AKSHAY (?) Si

36:23 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.

36:24 Precisely what I'm saying that it depends on your intention or your experience whether it can remain a permanent hole or it can be a self healing hole. But ideally if you have to run on a tubeless tire, it has to be a self healing hole, otherwise your tire will go flat.

36:43 PRAYAS (?) But

36:45 SATYA Sorry, i is it a self healing tire that is running over a road of glass, of glass sheets which each fragment and one cracks then you go to the next one and

36:57 AKSHAY Not glass sheet, but full of thorns. The field full of thorns.

37:01 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.

37:02 Yeah, so it will bring us to our point of yesterday discomfort.

37:06 SATYA (?) Yes. And yeah.

37:10 PRAYAS Puncture is experience.

37:15 SATYA Puncture is experience. Yeah.

37:21 Yeah, you ha talked about novelty of experiences too, so it's like something you're experiencing, yeah.

37:30 MALAVIKA But hey, there's also this aspect of poetic license in this whole exercise. So if you wanna see it as a crack or if you want to see it as a hole, it's it is finally going to give you different experiences and different interpretations accordingly.

37:48 SATYA Agreed, yeah.

37:51 MALAVIKA And that is gonna change depending on how one chooses to

37:57 AKSHAY What Raja had said and I think even Josef had agreed we when we imagine a crack, we imagine a very brittle surface. And when we are imagining a hole, we are imagining a very fluid surface. So either then we go and define what surface we are at and then we define whether it's a crack or a hole. But I think I would go with more of the fluidity because our experience, our everything is fluid.

38:28 PRAYAS But the fluid doesn't have within itself any idea of the violent and I think the s the nature of our surface, like you like you very helpfully brought it in. The nature of our surface definitely, you know, involves violence in its in its in its puncturing, in the in the you know

38:55 AKSHAY Puncturing a hole is also violence, but as Josef had also said, that it's not negative.

39:04 PRAYAS If you if you would puncture a liquid, it wouldn't be violent, it would be fluid.

39:09 AKSHAY (?) Oh how do you know?

39:11 SATYA (?) I mean the bo the puncture itself is where the violence is felt.

39:15 SATYA (?) Yeah, the moment of the puncture is violent.

39:17 The act of the

39:19 PRAYAS For the fluid, I'm saying for a fluid would it be violent?

39:23 AKSHAY We are talking about the moment of the puncture. We are not I mean the surface.

39:29 SATYA Exactly.

39:30 Yeah.

39:31 PRAYAS Yeah no, I'm saying you take a glass of water and you pour it down a sieve, you know, so there is a surface with lots of holes. As much water as you pour on it's going to end up at the at the bottom, right? So there is no loss.

39:48 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

39:49 So why does the li why would the liquid mind a puncture? It has no issues, you know, so there are there is no violence in the sense there is no loss.

39:58 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, but that's precisely what I said, that then you define the surface. The crack would go on for a brittle surface and the puncture would go on for a fluid surface. So then you define what exact surface are we looking at.

40:13 PRAYAS (?) So Josef, what would you say our surface the surface is like?

40:26 JOSEF Surface it's like

40:29 I think this is like we are getting too concrete for discussing, you know, this because yeah, of course we can say surface is so we could like I think like now you mentioned it would be good to say maybe crack is the thing for the phys for the like solid and puncture is more for the liquid, but yeah, I think it's what is the surface like?

40:53 I think it's fluid. I think it's fluid. If you want to like agree on some like the how to say yeah field. So I think it is fluid because really our experience everything is kind of right, it's not like discontinuous. It's because crack is very much like related to the to the physical material. So I think for us if we talk about our experience and about things like that, so I think that is very fluid and continuous. No matter whether it breaks or cracks or something, or you change your perspective, so I think it is always a kind of like ongoing process. It's never binary actually, I think.

41:37 RAJA GOPEN I beg to differ on this. I have a parallel on this. I think that the surface nature of the surface depends on the nature of the person, nature of the observer. Like for example, if I'm having a experience which is shaping my next frame. So if I am of a rigid frame, to speak in another words, if my surface is brittle, then that experience which is pushing my existing frame will leave a mark on it. Then I'll look at it as cracks on my rigid frame. Otherwise, if they are self healing experiences, then it might not be fluid surface. sorry, it might not be a brittle surface. Then I'll say I have a fluid surface. So maybe it depends on the self healing nature of the cracks which decides or which determines the nature of the surface or vice versa.

42:33 PRAYAS But when you say that it's about the observer, you bring in you again take it away from the from the neutrality. You make it less absolute. So and

42:45 AKSHAY And I think Raja what you said again you cannot be brittle all through your experiences. No, you cannot be solid. And that's why Josef makes more sense that we are always changing. So it is more fluid. Even if we are solid at some point, we are f liquid at some point. So we are in a continuous fluidity. So it is more a fluid and not a not a flat

43:10 PRAYAS But if you repl if you switch the words around, if for the word solid you use the word fluid and if for the word fluid you use the word solid, I mean I'm saying that at this point I think we're also getting trapped in a language game.

43:25 Yeah.

43:26 PRAYAS (?) No, it's a good thing.

43:27 AKSHAY No what Josef meant by this interchange in the surface only I'm not saying that it's solid, liquid, or whatever. No, just this

43:36 PRAYAS The question that Josef had that, you know, at this point we are getting very technical or specific about describing the surface. I mean I'm saying that is happening because we're getting in getting lost in words to try and describe it and words mean different things to different people, you know.

43:57 SATYA Yeah, I guess when I when I said hole, I had talked about the rift. Basically, what is it that takes us from one frame to the next? And that's what I meant by hole at that point.

44:06 PRAYAS Okay, and I would and if you hadn't shared this, I would have always thought that a hole means, you know, something a circular puncture that you cut through a football.

44:17 MALAVIKA (?) Well, okay.

44:19 PRAYAS I mean, you know, it helps to understand what's your model of a hole.

44:25 SATYA (?) I mean if you take the concept of it, even if we leave that aside, crack or hole you know, i it's the concept of something that is a rift.

44:38 SATYA (?) I mean I don't know if we want to talk about that or if we want to continue talking about what we were so far.

44:45 PRAYAS (?) No, it's we'll talk about what we are talking about.

44:50 RAJA GOPEN (?) Maybe the surface could be dynamic also. Maybe it might not be completely fluid all through the time. Might not be completely solid all through the time.

45:01 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, that's what Akshay was trying to say too.

45:04 RAJA GOPEN Yeah.

45:08 PRAYAS You know, I'm saying that we won't have words to describe this, but struggling to find words is productive.

45:16 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

45:17 JOSEF Yeah, I would like to add a general comment which is basically about levels of absta of abstraction. Because I think al always right when we when we talk, even in language already, we are using some kind of level of ab of abstraction. So this kind of thing of either like binary oppositions or you know, discussing what is something like. So we always we can in a way we can only talk in abstractions. And I think like now when we are talking about we are talking about some kind of like materiality of it. So I think we are kind of linking some levels which are difficult to link. Yeah. So I think as someone mentioned, it doesn't really I think matter so much on the word because I think we should accept that all the words are kind of approximation of something we are talking about.

46:15 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so you know, going back to the concept, like Satya said that we look at it look the look at the hole as a rift.

46:23 MALAVIKA Yeah.

46:24 PRAYAS You know, we look at a rift, when you know, when I hear the word rift I imagine two land masses floating away from each other.

46:36 What do you imagine when you use the word rift?

46:41 PRAYAS (?) So what are you approximating?

46:43 AKSHAY (?) It's very interesting what you're saying, floating away from each other, but if you look from the other way around they are also coming to each other. if you're talking in the what has happened to the formation of the continent they might be seeing

46:57 PRAYAS We don't know we don't know if they are on the spherical body, you know. So I'm saying that just their going away communicates the idea of rift. So if we look at the abstraction, at the levels of abstraction, then it makes sense to look at what is it that you're trying to approximate.

47:18 SATYA (?) To me that is like it's like moving towards knowledge is what I see.

47:25 PRAYAS (?) So if you drift apart enough, then you will discover the knowledge.

47:36 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

47:38 I don't know if that distance of drifting will actually determine it. I feel that any kind of movement, any kind of rift which defines a movement is a sign towards getting some kind of knowledge.

47:56 SATYA Yeah. They're getting some new inputs. Because of the rifts there are some new inputs, yeah.

48:03 AKSHAY And I would still call it a spherical experience because suppose you are going through a tunnel, suppose you are in a metro and since we are talking about perspectives, what you see in front of you when it crosses you it seems to be going apart and when it goes behind you it again collapses back into another joint reef [?] like that.

48:30 PRAYAS No, but imagining a spherical world.

48:33 AKSHAY No, I'm just saying the entire experiential world around Yeah, I'm imagining a spherical world. if you are saying that don't imagine a sphere, I would still imagine a sphere. Because we are

48:44 SATYA (?) Look, I'm sorry, Akshay, even if you see two parallel lines, which is the track, like you said, w going forward they seem to meet, behind also they are meeting.

48:53 AKSHAY Yeah. Yeah. So we are in any case, in any kind of experience, we are moving in a spherical formation.

49:00 PRAYAS But when you look at the tracks and when you see them meeting in the distance, it's because you're in you're in the spherical world. No? No. H the way perspective works actually doesn't matter if you're on the flat ground.

49:14 AKSHAY Yeah, no. I'm not saying that they are meeting or not meeting. They seem to be meeting.

49:20 PRAYAS Yeah, but why does this why do they seem to be meeting?

49:24 AKSHAY (?) Because that's how we are perceiving it. No, this is what we're

49:28 PRAYAS If we have binocular vision.

49:31 AKSHAY No, it's even if you are binocular, even if you can see with a telescope on the tracks, they will n not seem to be eh they won't be meeting physically, but they would always seem to be meeting. You get it?

49:44 SATYA But then I think what Prayas is saying is that this happened this phenomenon is because we are on a spherical surface, which is finite.

49:51 SATYA (?) Or our vision is very good.

49:55 RAJA GOPEN I think what Prayas was trying to say is we have binocular vision saying that our eyes have convex lenses.

50:04 SATYA Okay, so it's not the sphericality of where the parallel lines are.

50:09 SATYA (?) Yeah.

50:09 SATYA (?) But it's because of the observer.

50:11 SATYA (?) Yeah.

50:14 AKSHAY Yeah, so the entire surface depends on the observer, how you're observing it.

50:21 PRAYAS That's interesting, you know, I would never have thought about it this way, in the sense of being able to bring it back to the observer in some way that didn't seem like you were limiting the idea.

50:36 SATYA So I'm sorry, I'm I hate to admit, I don't know this, but if we had an infinitely flat surface and two parallel lines on it, would we perceive it that they are meeting somewhere? We would perceive it that they meet, right? The parallel lines, even if the surface is flat.

50:52 PRAYAS So who like Malavika, do you know about how perspective works in drawing? Like how do we model perspective in representation?

51:03 MALAVIKA There is no singular way. I and that's why I think

51:07 PRAYAS (?) The Cartesian method.

51:11 MALAVIKA I don't know, I just th like what Satya just spoke about, the two parallel lines on an infinite plane. I will not assume that they meet.

51:27 SATYA (?) No, but what do we see? I guess I suppose we will

51:31 MALAVIKA I don't know, I would choose to move along with the lines. I will not try to see from one point of view. And somehow I have always been comfortable with moving and not fixing myself to one place to try to see what is going on as a consequence of what is left from here.

51:55 MALAVIKA (?) Because I find that I find that too conclusive.

52:01 MALAVIKA (?) Okay.

52:02 PRAYAS (?) So and I don't know and since you bring up

52:05 You're asking Malavika that why would you be anywhere? You could keep moving and change your position. So the position of the observer is dynamic for you.

52:16 MALAVIKA Yeah, b and that's why I think I like miniature paintings and that's why you know, to answer your question about drawing and perspective you can just enter it from anywhere and there isn't a s single point of view perspective that is used in miniature painting and

52:37 PRAYAS So it gets cubist.

52:40 MALAVIKA I don't know if you can call it cubist because cubist is still referring to a kind of a perspective of how the world is seen and how you try to represent what is seen on the other side. what the miniature paintings actually do is address this aspect of knowledge, how you know a thing to be, how you know an object to be so it goes a little more into an imagined perspective in parallel.

53:13 PRAYAS So it has nothing to do with observation.

53:16 MALAVIKA No, it has. So I think I think it's a it's a wonderful meeting point of the imagined and what is observed.

53:27 PRAYAS (?) Okay, so it's a hybrid.

53:29 MALAVIKA Yes.

53:41 PRAYAS So we don't know about what we will see if we're on that infinite flat land.

53:48 MALAVIKA Yes, you won't know.

53:49 MALAVIKA (?) We don't know.

53:50 MALAVIKA (?) Yes.

53:52 PRAYAS I mean I can't even imagine. I can't imagine being on a flat land because my imagination is i is spherical.

54:01 AKSHAY No, we are on a flat land, there is one dimension which is flat, which is time.

54:07 AKSHAY (?) Right.

54:07 AKSHAY (?) Is not flat.

54:10 AKSHAY (?) The dimension, the way it is perceiving.

54:14 PRAYAS It's linear, you mean.

54:16 AKSHAY Yeah, so it's a flat surface.

54:19 Right.

54:19 Time is a flat surface. We can imagine being in time.

54:24 JOSEF (?) Right.

54:31 PRAYAS Right, so if you can if you use time as a surface on which you imagine yourself to be, then I can imagine lines not meeting ever.

54:41 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

54:44 PRAYAS (?) Can you imagine that, Satya?

54:46 SATYA I'm trying to, yeah. I mean I'm being limited by my vision because now I have that thing of binocular vision and so I'm seeing like it's going to meet because of me. But if I remove that, then it's never gonna meet.

55:00 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, because you know, we don't expect the past and the future to meet.

55:05 MALAVIKA Yeah.

55:06 PRAYAS (?) So the past and future are Yeah, it's they're parallel lines that never meet.

55:15 MALAVIKA (?) What are the odds of any two random human beings on this world to meet?

55:22 PRAYAS There would be some kind of yeah.

55:24 SATYA (?) There is some there is that thing, right? Like that you are six degrees separated from you know the

55:28 MALAVIKA Degrees of separation but for it to actually happen, I'm talking of meeting.

55:34 SATYA But then that's what determines the statistical possibility. I mean this is all I don't know though.

55:41 PRAYAS (?) And like we spoke on w about on the first day, statistics has noise. So there might be a statistic that says that seventy percent of the people will meet seventy percent of the time. But then that still means that thirty percent of the people will never meet thirty percent of the time.

56:06 And thirty percent is a b is a is a is a lot of people.

56:09 MALAVIKA (?) Yes.

56:11 MALAVIKA (?) Especially nowadays.

56:13 PRAYAS Yeah, exactly. So I mean what's of noise value to statistics? Can be an entire world.

56:23 SATYA Yeah, correct.

56:28 PRAYAS So does that mean we can discard any kind of knowledge that's based on statistics? Because we don't know.

56:37 SATYA I don't know if we can discard the reason being we ourselves are limited. We ourselves a approximate things as survival mechanisms. That's how we operate.

56:49 PRAYAS But do you think we use a statistical method or a toss the coin method?

56:55 SATYA We I believe there is some kind of computation happening within the organism.

57:03 PRAYAS Right, so there is a statistical method, that's what you said.

57:06 SATYA Feel that way. Like there is a bunch of factors that are hitting you and then somehow something approximates somewhere.

57:13 PRAYAS But then what about intuition?

57:17 SATYA Yeah, that's

57:23 SATYA (?) I mean there are people who are

57:25 AKSHAY Intuition is the what we had discussed earlier, no? It's the universal attention.

57:30 PRAYAS No did we think about that? We spoke of the universal attention as instinct, not as intuition.

57:38 AKSHAY Yeah, but I would put it in the same category.

57:41 PRAYAS Instinct and intuition. No. Intuitive is that which is not an instinct.

57:48 AKSHAY Yeah, no, I'm talking about the universal attention.

57:53 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I don't know. The I don't I they don't overlap for me.

57:57 RAJA GOPEN Yeah, I think this is miserproduction [?] and I totally agree to this. it makes a lot of sense to me to put intuition as universal attention. Both of them in one category.

58:11 PRAYAS How does it make sense to you?

58:14 RAJA GOPEN I d I personally don't find any other eg explanation for intuition. Like what else could be called as intuition that you're attuned to the universal attention.

58:29 RAJA GOPEN (?) Or you can tap into the stimulus from the universal attention.

58:36 SATYA But that still sounds like some computation happening somewhere. I mean, y these are unconscious inputs coming in which compute and comes out as an intuition.

58:45 AKSHAY No, that we agree that it is stat statistical. That we agree.

58:50 SATYA (?) No, we didn't. We didn't agree, right?

58:52 PRAYAS Yeah, I don't really agree because what we are talking about is intuition being the negative space of the statistical method.

59:02 AKSHAY No, but I think again what Satya is saying that computation, what she is also meaning is there is we are maybe not conscious of it. Again, sorry, conscious, whatever. But there is always a computation going on.

59:17 SATYA (?) Maybe. Maybe that's one way of trying to think about it.

59:21 PRAYAS Josef, would you think that intuition is computed?
59:29 When the

59:30 JOSEF I think I play with words, but I think now what you mentioned that intuition and universal attention, I also feel there is something common. Yeah. I think it's like you know like depends how you look at it, yeah, because it's like different words I think for the similar thing because attention I think always includes for me this idea of like stimulus and response. So I mean it has some kind of reaction. While the other idea about the computation or something like more like background, yes, I mean there is always something going on and you could say it's some kind of like frequency or some kind of movement, yeah, what we discussed before. Yeah, the definitely I think it's there. And then you can say attention is more like a kind of outward manifestation, something you can observe maybe.

01:00:24 JOSEF (?) Yes.

01:00:25 PRAYAS But Jung would call intuition to be an expression of the collective subconscious.
01:00:35 Collective unconscious.

01:00:36 SATYA (?) Yeah. Yeah.
01:00:40 Yeah.

01:00:43 PRAYAS But the collective unconscious is an is an idea that's similar to universal attention.

01:00:49 JOSEF Yes, so it all comes together.
01:00:52 JOSEF (?) Yeah.

01:00:53 PRAYAS Yeah. So i it can actually, you know they can the both those ideas can sit very well together.

01:00:59 JOSEF Yeah.
01:01:05 So I agree with that.

01:01:06 PRAYAS Yeah. So if we are if we are stopping today at this thought that intuition is instinct.
01:01:19 In would that be a fair grasping of the of the gist of what we are so you know, I published these posters which are which compress the day's discussions into one sentence, right? But I don't discuss that what that one sentence should be with all of us and I just, you know, come up with those things and I think we should talk about it.

01:01:49 PRAYAS (?) So how could we yeah.

01:01:51 RAJA GOPEN There's one sentence which I had written down while you were talking. Innumerable ho innumerable holes in every hole. It made a lot of sense to me.
01:02:01 Would it represent
01:02:04 RAJA GOPEN (?) No, I don't think so. It'll represent the every the gist of the whole discussion.
01:02:11 Just you're saying about the poster so I

01:02:14 PRAYAS No I'm saying a poster that represents everything. So you know it's something like a it's like a summary in that sense that tries to compress it you know, so we're trying to compress the one hour into three or four words.

01:02:35 RAJA GOPEN I don't know.

01:02:37 PRAYAS But what

01:02:41 SATYA I don't know if we can say intuition and instinct is the same thing.

01:02:49 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, I differ also.

01:02:51 PRAYAS (?) But that's what he said that the universal attention and intuition are similar.

01:02:56 MALAVIKA (?) Similar, not the same. You can't say this is that.

01:03:01 PRAYAS In the same time, universal attention is same. [?]

01:03:04 AKSHAY No, we I don't think so.
01:03:07 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, no.

01:03:08 JOSEF (?) Close.

01:03:09 They are close but I think it goes back to the distinction between the kind of conscious and like the wi the will the willing, you know, m direction of thoughts and the and the unwilling because the intu intuition is something like your decision making and the other thing is related to the subconscious reaction.

01:03:38 AKSHAY I think instinct is very personal and intuition is universal in a way. That's what I was trying to bring it. Instinct can be very personal.

01:03:49 PRAYAS So would you like to suggest a compression then? How would you compress this?

01:04:07 SATYA (?) I'm seeing a rainbow with cracks and holes.

01:04:12 Sorry to be I'm sorry, I'm being flippant.

01:04:17 PRAYAS (?) So you were being flippant.

01:04:19 SATYA Yes.

01:04:20 PRAYAS (?) Okay. Yes. I was wondering why d where did this rainbow come from?

01:04:28 Okay. Yeah, so I don't know if we need to put ourselves on the spot right now. I just thought I'd throw it there and if it if some if some words occur to anyone you could just write in.

01:04:40 So we can w we'll stop the broadcast here for tonight and I hope to see many of you for tomorrow's broadcast which is at the y usual time. It's at nine PM again. So it's back to nine PM. It was just seven PM for one day. So it's yeah. Bye. Bye everybody.

01:05:06 PRAYAS (?) Thank you.

01:05:07 JOSEF (?) Thank you, bye.

01:05:08 PRAYAS Yeah.

01:05:08 And a good match between Germany and France.