Refractive Surfaces, Day 1

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 10 September 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

00:00 PRAYAS The format is going to be
00:03 You know, every twenty minutes we'll skip the question. So we won't
00:10 Conversation.
00:15 And we'll be having these windows of conversation.
00:25 Yeah, Malavika I'm unable to unmute your microphones.
00:34 Is either of you go able to unmute yourself?
00:39 TANYA Yeah, I'm on unmute, Prayas. I can hear you.
00:42 PRAYAS Oh, you can hear me Acharya [?]. Akshay and Malavika, I think you'll have to rejoin to in order to untune your microphones.
00:54 Akshay and Malavika, please unjoin. to you know, kind of unmute your microphones. So the first question is are we stuck in the frames of our perspective or is there any possibility of getting through?
01:14 Are we incapable of communication, of actually listening to each other's story or whatever that might be? Or is it possible to communicate
01:29 TANYA Are you rephrasing the question about frames and perspective?
01:33 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. I'm expanding the question. I'm reframing it. I'm essentially saying is it possible for us to share our experience or isn't? it's not.
01:46 TANYA (?) What is it?
01:47 TANYA (?) I would think that an experience is shared to begin with between because it's always between two things.
01:55 Or two points.
01:59 PRAYAS Right. So the experience is between two points.
02:02 Yeah.
02:05 TANYA So the experience is between the two points. So for them for there to be for it to be shared it has to be between two points and since it's only between two points, it is therefore inherently shared.
02:17 PRAYAS No, but between two points is also a sharing.
02:23 PRAYAS (?) Between two points is also a sharing.
02:27 TANYA (?) Yeah, so you said that experience is between two points and I'm saying that
02:32 I'm saying that an experience occurs in that space between something.
02:39 PRAYAS And the actor

02:47 The two points themselves are not included. You're saying just the space in between
02:54 PRAYAS (?) It's created between in that space in between.
02:59 Yeah, so and the points are not included. You are saying that yeah, r right. I mean that's what you're saying.
03:05 TANYA Yeah, no the points would be included because without
03:08 PRAYAS They would be included. So if they are included, then the space in between can be considered to be a shared space.
03:17 TANYA (?) Yeah, it can be c it is a shared space.
03:19 PRAYAS So then you are saying that for experience to be shared it would already need to be shared.
03:25 TANYA Yeah. To begin with it's already shared. It's about how many more points or do you want to put into that?
03:35 PRAYAS We want to expand the scale of sharing.
03:39 TANYA Yeah, I guess the scheme that would be
03:44 PRAYAS Acha so why do why does experience
03:47 TANYA (?) Question. Can you can you rephrase your question? Do we need to
03:52 PRAYAS Is it possible to is it possible to is there any possibility of getting through? Are we stuck in the frames of our perspectives or is there any possibility of getting through? That's the question the first question which we are going to talk about for the next twenty minutes.
04:10 PRAYAS (?) Okay.
04:11 TANYA (?) You want to have yeah.
04:13 PRAYAS (?) Do we have other people on this forum today?
04:15 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. Hi Veneeth Hi Satya. Hi Malavika. Hi Akshay.
04:20 AKSHAY I
04:22 SATYA (?) Hi Monica [?].
04:33 PRAYAS So where we where we are is really back to the question and our question
04:41 Is are we stuck in the frames of our perspectives or is there any possibility of getting through?
04:48 AKSHAY (?) I think we are not stuck. I think it's a wrong we are not stuck.
04:54 PRAYAS You think it's possible to communicate?
04:58 AKSHAY I think yeah it is it is. But you cannot always leave the perspective. I think you only communicate when you are shifting between the two perspectives. So there is a maybe a small gap area which where your communication can leak out.
05:23 SATYA When you say leaking it sounds like an accident.
05:27 AKSHAY (?) Ah yeah. I didn't intend it to say it's accident, but some like you get a chance. You get a chance at the door.
05:36 Okay, there's a crack.
05:39 The what we had I think last time discussed the edge. You just get that Yeah, the just the momentary glimpse where from where you can communicate, but you can
05:52 Okay.
05:53 Yeah.
05:56 So it's not a accident. So it didn't mean like you leak out without knowing but
06:02 Yeah, it's without knowledge. So in the city [?] different. So
06:08 So can th can there be an intentional shared experience? Can there be an intentional coming out of the frame? And then also there was some questions I was discussing with Prayas, what is the frame in the situation?
06:23 So the frame in this situation would be
06:27 Huh?
06:29 Our perspective, right?

06:32 Yeah, it's everything which we can
06:37 What changed the perspective?
06:40 Everything that we can experience.
06:43 Yeah.
06:45 So all of your
06:47 That our perspective is unfiltered. Basically, it's just open to receiving and receptivity is at its peak. It's just open. It's completely
07:02 Well, I think perspective is depends on the construction of the object.
07:06 Because you feel like you're
07:19 So I mean if you have a certain amount of receptors on your object, so there is there is skin, there is m sensing mechanisms, all of those coming together, they take the inputs and that frames the perspective, in my opinion.
07:36 TANYA (?) Right. Well that's interesting. So how would how would you say that h Malavika, how is your perspective framed? Like do you would you recognize the frame of your perspective?
07:50 PRAYAS I mean everything we experience is our perspective. So we can only experience our own perspective.
07:59 How can we experience something that is you know that we are not exposed to?
08:06 AKSHAY No, it can be read in a way in like real in real architectural terms also that you are walking in a street and what you see is a conscious perspective but many times over roaming around the area you have another of the same area geography. In case. I'm just giving an example.
08:27 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but at a given point of time
08:31 Our frame of perspective is defined.
08:35 AKSHAY (?) Yes.
08:37 SATYA Or what we are aware of.
08:39 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so what we are aware of is finite in a given point of time.
08:44 Right.
08:45 So Tanya, that's what we are referring to. So if your frame has finite amounts of information
08:56 Right.
08:56 And you're only experiencing a frame because you cannot experience where you are not, right? You can only experience the here and now. That's what we are talking about that day. Right. And the so but
09:10 TANYA (?) W what you were saying is so the here and now does the here and now include the past?
09:22 SATYA The here and now happened because of the past, so it does.
09:26 TANYA Right. And is there a way that the past can transform itself into the present?
09:33 TANYA (?) I think it's constantly doing it.
09:35 Right. That's interesting because I think we I was speaking to Prayas earlier this week and we were sort of arguing that the here and now has nothing to do with the past, with Prayas holding that it has nothing to do with the past. And yesterday I was at an event where we were reading doing a reading of Marcel Proust and he talks about these the involuntary invocation of memory via different smells and basically the olfactory system. So when we're talking about the here and now, like Malavika agrees, the pre past is continuously sort of integrated into the present.
10:16 SATYA (?) So I can see both. Now that you now that you mentioned it, I now I'm seeing the other thing where I mean we don't have immediate access to the past at this moment. It's gone. But it has transformed itself. So technically this is not the past, but
10:31 PRAYAS Yeah, technically we only have the here and now.
10:34 Exactly.

10:35 We don't have any access to the past. It's gone.

10:39 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.

10:39 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, the past only exists as a experience. I it just

10:44 AKSHAY (?) As in memory.

10:45 PRAYAS (?) Thank you.

10:46 TANYA (?) Experience.

10:47 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

10:49 But for dinner [?]. Yeah, it's gone. It's it's in a time past.

10:53 TANYA So what you were saying, Prayas, is that the here and now are tangible. Yeah? And the memory is an ephemeral f ephemeral.

11:02 PRAYAS Yeah, because memory can very easily be fiction. I mean, we don't really know if we remember something or if we

11:09 TANYA So are you saying that the here and now is not a fiction and the here and now is it's present, it's finite and at the same time it is it's completely tangible.

11:20 PRAYAS Yeah. I mean tangible in the sense that it's accessible.

11:25 TANYA (?) Right. So what would be what is your here and now at this given moment?

11:32 PRAYAS So my here and now is

11:35 You know, this room, this chair that I'm sitting on, it's not just my physical reality in that sense, it's also my frame of mind. You know, and my frame of mind is a but when you speak about frame of mind.

11:53 TANYA Mind will not the frame of mind be an untangible mass of something, right?

12:00 PRAYAS It's all it's all molecular, it's all tangible.

12:04 TANYA Right.

12:05 SATYA It is also tangible in the sense if I was pissed off right now, my frame would not be I would not you know, that's one frame of mind. So that's pretty tangible.

12:13 Right.

12:19 PRAYAS (?) So what I'm not understanding is that

12:21 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

12:22 TANYA How does the past not have that same sort of bearing in our frame of mind that the present has?

12:31 PRAYAS Because that physicality is gone, right? So the molecular reality of the past doesn't exist. There is no molecule in the head which is not here and now.

12:45 Okay.

12:46 Because everything in the here and now is in the here and now.

12:51 PRAYAS (?) And what is the duration of here and now?

12:54 The duration of now

13:00 Yeah, so that's something which is variable, right? So what is the speed of your experience might not be the speed of my experience. For me things might really happen slowly.

13:10 So what if I have to say?

13:12 AKSHAY I will give it a better definition. it's almost like the food in your stomach right now. Here and now is that. The duration it enters your mouth till it exits your bo exits your body, it's the duration of here and now. It's one way of

13:26 SATYA To me z here and now is zero to infinity. To me here and now it's like I can feel nothing, I can I can experience nothing or it's all there for me to experience.

13:38 Right.

13:38 Yeah, that's

13:39 How much can I d how much can I divide the moment? You know, it's how much can I divide

13:43 TANYA And for me I would say that the now is completely continuous. I what if I d I'm to say that I don't differentiate between now and the past? What if it's just a continuation of now?

13:56 PRAYAS You mean to say what if the present is continuous with the past?

14:01 TANYA Yeah, what if what if I never paused?

14:07 MALAVIKA I mean, yeah.

14:08 TANYA (?) So what if yesterday's

14:12 TANYA (?) What about time?

14:14 MALAVIKA (?) Because passage of time.

14:18 TANYA The passage of time. Time is like a very a very haunting question altogether. We can we can start discussing of

14:26 MALAVIKA Of past and present wha what determines the two is time and if you're talking of perspective.

14:35 TANYA So what I'm saying is that what if time is not linear?

14:40 MALAVIKA It doesn't have to be, but it still is going to differentiate what you think of as a past or a future or a present. And when we're talking of perspective, I would imagine that something that is n not any of these can also be a perspective.

15:04 TANYA (?) Right. Not any of what.

15:06 MALAVIKA (?) The past, pres present or the future.

15:08 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

15:09 TANYA (?) Is without a definition of time.

15:12 MALAVIKA Right.

15:13 Happens to I mean, how do we define ideas?

15:25 PRAYAS But are you saying that ideas how do we define ideas in the sense that ideas exist in multiple zones of time? You're saying that ideas don't exist in a singular frame of time?

15:41 MALAVIKA I think they can traverse through multiple zones. They don't have to be specific. But I'm pitching idea against experience.

15:55 PRAYAS (?) Idea against experience.

15:57 MALAVIKA (?) So when you talk of experience then it becomes very time specific, like what we are where we are now, what we are doing now and what we are experiencing. And when I talk of idea, you can you can conceive or conceptualize a situation that does not need to be defined either in the past or the present or a future.

16:21 MALAVIKA (?) It is just a situation in a certain time.

16:26 SATYA But then we'd be talking about something different then, right? We would no longer be talking about experience. We would be talking about ideas.

16:33 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean ideas and experiences are not interchangeable. So

16:39 MALAVIKA They're not. But if you talk of perspective, my question is why are you only looking b the reason I'm bringing this up is because of today's question being whether we are stuck in our own frames of perspective. the idea of being stuck is can be applied if you're talking of experience.

17:01 But you could stuck in a

17:03 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

17:04 PRAYAS Yeah.

17:04 MALAVIKA You can or you can you can switch between the two.

17:12 SATYA (?) Yeah.

17:14 PRAYAS You can switch between ideas and experiences.

17:17 Yes.

17:20 But are they the same thing?

17:23 MALAVIKA (?) I don't know. I haven't thought about it.

17:25 PRAYAS When you are thinking of an idea, your experience is still

17:29 TANYA I'm gonna say that this

17:36 MALAVIKA (?) Go on, Tanya.

17:38 TANYA (?) And can ideas lead to an experience and can experience

17:42 TANYA (?) Yeah.

17:44 AKSHAY Yeah. It's the same thing. It's the same thing. experience gives you idea and idea gives you the experience. So I think it's again the continuity innovation [?].

17:52 TANYA Truly linked.

17:54 PRAYAS (?) But an idea is a summary of experience.

17:59 AKSHAY It can be it can be.

18:03 PRAYAS (?) No, I mean

18:05 AKSHAY It can be either a synopsis or a conclusion. It can be either. Yeah.

18:09 PRAYAS Yeah, which is shorthand for I mean, it's in f in some form, I ideas are more compressed, they're more, you know, closely packed than experiences are.

18:24 TANYA (?) True. Yeah.

18:27 PRAYAS So I mean I wouldn't think of them as ha inhabiting the same time.

18:34 PRAYAS (?) But what does it do to perspective? It I

18:37 SATYA (?) Idea seems to be perspective.

18:42 AKSHAY No, I think how Prayas put it's it's kind of a summary. It's not really the perspective, it's kind of a summary.

18:49 AKSHAY (?) Summary is one thing. Idea of something is one thing.

18:55 SATYA Okay, but the idea of what's happening to me now.

19:01 On the ideology of being a socialist, therefore I see the world in this particular way.

19:06 AKSHAY That can be a perspective in a perspective, but that can't be a perspective.

19:13 SATYA (?) But that is still a perspective then, if it is a perspective on a perspective.

19:17 AKSHAY Yeah, but it is through your perspective. You so I think there is a window in a window, something like this.

19:24 SATYA But the idea is also mine only, which came through my physicality.

19:29 AKSHAY Yeah, but the f first game is the egg perspective. No, I'm not saying that it is not, but I'm just saying that it is again interlinked in a way.

19:38 TANYA Again, can I ask a very basic fundamental question just for my own understanding from the group? How is a perspective formed?

19:47 That was our

19:49 PRAYAS Yeah, that's what we talked about last time. But

19:53 SATYA (?) Yeah, but just again.

19:55 PRAYAS Perspective would be the aggregation of everything that you can possibly experience.

20:04 PRAYAS (?) So it's aggregate. You know, it's the it's your frame, it's the bubble in which you exist.

20:10 TANYA To know our perspective, do we need to be outside of ourselves? Do we need distance from the situation?

20:20 PRAYAS Yeah, we spoke about that last time as an infinity.

20:23 PRAYAS (?) Okay. So in that space that is infinity.

20:27 I mean, if it were to exist. I mean so you know, this time I'm really in this frame of mind which is that I don't want to escape into the meta.

20:40 PRAYAS (?) So it's like this you know if I can

20:42 AKSHAY We solved it last time and we should stick to it that we don't go on in the meta for sure.
20:47 But I think
20:48 TANYA I think that it be it's already begun with the meta, so how do you bring the meta to something else?
20:54 PRAYAS No, but the perspective is not meta.
21:00 PRAYAS (?) It's very specific.
21:02 PRAYAS (?) Okay. How is this
21:04 TANYA (?) Psychology then.
21:07 PRAYAS (?) How?
21:09 SATYA So for f for me a frame or perspective is quite psychological. It's like that's the physicality. It's not abstract anymore. It's
21:18 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
21:19 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, it's your psyche.
21:23 SATYA Or like if I had O C D, this is how I do things.
21:29 No. So this is how I look at things and this is my frame of vision for the world where I clean my hands five times.
21:36 PRAYAS So that's your frame of reference.
21:38 MALAVIKA That's physiological as well, I think.
21:41 SATYA Yes, physiological, yes.
21:44 MALAVIKA I don't know if you can I don't know. How would you link that to perspective? I thought perspective would be more cognitive.
21:54 SATYA But see my physiology informs my cognition is what I feel like. Like if I'm in pain and I'm constantly in pain and I look at the world and the world is not made for people who are in pain. The world is made for more average people. So in that sense I feel
22:11 PRAYAS (?) Switching our question the questi second question for the day is what is refraction? can we shift from one perspective, one frame to the other?
22:24 PRAYAS (?) Or we can't and
22:29 Can this shift be seen as refraction?
22:34 SATYA (?) So can we switch frames and can this switch be seen as refraction?
22:39 SATYA (?) Yeah.
22:40 AKSHAY Would you define Prayas? I think it's very interesting that now this set of studies is called refraction. It would be nice to define a little bit what is refraction in a way.
22:49 PRAYAS Yeah, that's the question. What is the refraction and can the shift be called refraction or something else? I mean what is the refraction?
22:58 AKSHAY (?) Refraction is what the prism does to a white light, no, isn't it? I think they it
23:04 PRAYAS (?) What does refraction do the p do to the perspective?
23:08 PRAYAS (?) Refraction is what you just did to the conversation.
23:12 MALAVIKA (?) Exactly.
23:13 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
23:14 SATYA And I exactly and also I just wanted to say that the thing that I was talking about, it was very interesting that Prayas brought that question there because I was talking about a person being in pain and looking at the world. The world is not made in that format. But if I'm just an average person who goes through the world as an average person, but now somebody is telling me that they are in pain and I need to understand how they are feeling. Maybe to empathize, maybe to care for them, whatever.
23:41 Yeah.
23:42 Then I have to switch my perspective. I have to change my frame to their frame somehow.

23:47 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, empathy. so empathy should be possible. Is it possible?

23:54 SATYA In my opinion, yes.

23:56 PRAYAS (?) Is it genuinely possible? I mean

23:58 MALAVIKA I don't know. I think it's individual. I do you think some people are more capable of empathy and some people just don't have it?

24:06 PRAYAS Yeah, some people are better actors.

24:08 PRAYAS (?) But I think it is genuinely possible.

24:11 AKSHAY Yeah.

24:12 SATYA No, how c how can you be so sure?

24:16 SATYA (?) I mean we can only talk from our own experience and how

24:19 PRAYAS How do we know we are empathizing when we are empathizing? We haven't validated

24:25 AKSHAY I've if I have gone through that experience what the person in front of me is going through, I can really empathize. Yeah, why not?

24:33 PRAYAS Yeah, but your empathy will not communicate to you that person's real experience.

24:38 That is true. That part is true.

24:40 AKSHAY No, that you are talking about entering somebody's else frame. No, we can come to the point of touching his frame, but we cannot go into his frame.

24:50 PRAYAS No, so refraction is not empathy because we are talking about refraction as the switch from one frame to the other.

24:57 SATYA No, but empathy is also a switch. Empathy is also a switchy. I'm not saying that I know exactly what's going on in that person's head. I'm saying my frame was like this. Now it has shifted a bit.

25:10 I think go on.

25:13 I'm saying you know, i of if I only know to live in a p if I only know to look at the world in a particular way, but now something has caused it to shift a bit. That is a shift. I don't know how exactly it is for somebody else. I only know what is inside my head.

25:29 PRAYAS I like it.

25:30 AKSHAY It brings to doubt your point that what is genuine then. Like mother I can only genuinely validate myself, no?

25:38 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. No.

25:40 When I'm looking into the night sky, what I'm looking at is the far off star. but I'm only looking at the reflection of the past into the present.

25:53 TANYA (?) Right.

25:54 PRAYAS You know, so I can empathize but I'm only simulating what someone else's frame is within the limitations of my own frame.

26:05 TANYA (?) So you're questioning the word empathy itself.

26:10 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean it's a it's a symbol. I mean it's a link. So in language we use the word empathy for you know, this guy is at least at least trying to empathize. In trying to empathize there is a grey zone.

26:25 SATYA There is, but the trial is important, is it not?

26:29 PRAYAS Yeah, because it stretches your limits. It stretches your limits. I mean it

26:34 SATYA Exactly. Yeah. At stretching my limits I'm at least trying. Which means I'm more

26:40 PRAYAS Important. It's important, but it's not shifting a frame. I'm just saying that.

26:46 No, I'm saying that's a good thing.

26:48 SATYA Can that grey zone be a connector? And that's what refraction is, that when you're shifting somehow you also want that connection.

27:00 AKSHAY (?) And I think that way you're locking the frame too harsh, ma that to again we as we are saying, no, we cannot go into anybody's else frame. We can only reach the edge.

27:11 AKSHAY (?) But can we can we go into some I mean let's say we you know we don't talk about the question of the actual shift and we don't try to qualify that, but let's say we just go into what would be a shift? You know, what would be refraction? We just think loosely, we don't think with exactitude, we just kind of I mean, do you think acting is a kind of refraction?

27:41 PRAYAS No. Yes. I don't think so.

27:43 No, why not? Why not?

27:44 Yeah.

27:45 What does act acting have to do with refracting?

27:48 Because you're s transferring some of your self into another frame.

27:54 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, you're assuming a different thing.

27:57 MALAVIKA It's not a it's not an involuntary ref it's not an involuntary whereas I would say a refraction is involuntary.

28:06 No, I don't know

28:06 Oh no why does it have to be involuntary?

28:10 TANYA (?) It's usually an intervention is what I would say. And whereas when one is acting th it's an act, it's a pre planned activity. It's a sort of like pre rehearsed, you know, position that one is assuming.

28:24 But it is still a shift.

28:26 MALAVIKA (?) How is it a shift? It's a it's a it's a it's an act. It's an act is

28:31 PRAYAS You are saying it's simulation.

28:33 TANYA No, it's not a simulation, it's an act. An act is not a simulation.

28:36 PRAYAS (?) What is an act?

28:38 TANYA An act is when one is in the in the in the context of an actor, it's it is to do with acting, which is to actually assume another personality. I don't think refraction has to do with wholeness. But refraction does it fragments the wholeness. It fragments the gestalt of the of the being. So would you say that an actor is fragmented?

29:00 SATYA You know that guy who played Joker, that guy what's his name, Ledger or whatever? Who played the Joker in the Batman movies and then he killed himself saying that he was affected by it. So I guess, you know, even if you put on an act there could be a certain effect on the psyche.

29:17 PRAYAS Yeah, we need we need you

29:21 Do the same role for years together, lose their self, right? You would you were saying that you're saying something like that, right?

29:33 Can you speak, Vinny? I mean, is your mic working?

29:38 Okay, so yeah, maybe Vinny can't So say so

29:43 TANYA Let's let us assume that acting is refraction, right? I mean acting is a form of refraction. It's a form of being refracted. Then what would be the source of the refra of the of the light that is refracting? And what is the surface of acting?

30:02 PRAYAS So the surface of acting is experience because that's how

30:06 Acting is experience.

30:08 Yeah, so if you're if somebody else is in the room when you while you're putting on an act they can experience that you're that your presence has changed, right? So it's not something which just

30:25 TANYA To be an actor does one have to be does one have to know your bi biography, the actor's biography?

30:34 MALAVIKA Why

30:35 MALAVIKA (?) No.

30:36 AKSHAY (?) You need to know the script. You need to know the script for sure.

30:40 TANYA So see Prayas comes into a room, he's acting, right? And you have A, B, C and they are the audience in the room. And it's Prayas saying that the surface of acting is the experience. Now Prayas is already acting, then they don't know that Prayas is acting, right? What if they have not met Prayas before? So then for them Prayas is not refracted, Prayas is who the actor is.

31:02 AKSHAY No, he is refracting the experience to them. It's totally on them how they are going to perceive it.

31:09 PRAYAS Yeah, because their experience of my presence is going to be different from their experience of my presence outside the frame of acting. When I'm not acting, they would just experience me differently.

31:22 TANYA (?) So would they experience you in parts, Prayas? Because what ref as I understand scientifically the you know, the understanding of the word refraction that fragments the whole.

31:35 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so th that's what you that's what you said yourself. You in your question you were asking if the thing is like fragmentation, right? And

31:49 Right.

31:49 And I would I would say yes. it is like fragmentation of the self in many ways and fragmentation of light is what I'm saying.

32:01 TANYA So then is fragmentation and transformation. Is there no difference between the two? Because acting is also a transformation, no?

32:09 MALAVIKA Yeah, it is. But the way I see it, like if you take the script as a frame and an actor as somebody who gets refracted. So if you perform a script and if I perform a script, we're both going to refract ourselves fragment ourselves into that particular role. And the way you do it is going to be certainly different from the way I do it. But it is

32:36 AKSHAY That's a good example.

32:37 MALAVIKA You know, it is after all the same frame that we are getting into.

32:46 PRAYAS (?) So what is not acting?

32:49 AKSHAY (?) Well, that's a good question.

32:51 TANYA Mm-

32:52 And what is not reflecting?

32:53 AKSHAY While we were talking that I think on a everyday basis there is a large part of us as what the world knows is actually a refracted surface.

33:05 SATYA (?) Yeah, we have to put on all these social niceties and politeness and whatnot, right?

33:10 So for me

33:11 So we maybe that's not who we are, but we have to put it on.

33:15 AKSHAY (?) Nu Paradox says sleeping is not acting.

33:19 Backs and like

33:22 AKSHAY (?) Sleeping is not acting, Nu Paradox says.

33:28 PRAYAS He that would be true. So w what Nu Paradox is saying is that when we are not conscious, we are not acting. And consciousness is an act. That's what he's saying.

33:40 SATYA Yeah, and we always ca at least I complain about self conscious acting on screen. So

33:49 Is there any subconscious

33:51 TANYA (?) Consciousness is not necessarily acting, but it's hard to not act or react to consciousness itself. So the acting part is the reacting part really.

34:04 So as I understand, an actor is a person portraying a character, right? Now, would you say that then that character, right?

34:13 PRAYAS The idea of the character is a summary.

34:16 So are you saying that

34:17 Job.

34:18 TANYA And if you are saying that the audience has a refracted experience of the actor, so that means the actor is basically not acting well enough because he's not portraying the character in the dramatic or a comic enough adaptation.

34:32 SATYA No, but there's as many refractive surfaces as there are audience members. Everyone has their own experience of it.

34:41 SATYA (?) That's true.

34:42 TANYA So say you watch you go watch a play, right? And you come out and you say okay, amazing and here I'm looking at acting in a very sort of closed frame, which would be that, you know, supposing that we are not acting right now, but one goes to a theater to act again. It's the theatrical aspect of acting. So if you come out and you say that okay, the person who played the role of Macbeth was an amazing actor, it was completely flawless. So you so the audiences then suppose that they've not got a refracted experience. It's a whole experience of the character Macbeth.

35:20 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, so then where is the

35:21 PRAYAS (?) Refraction taking place then?

35:24 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, you're right. So you're saying that in the acting, what I who I am when I'm not acting is also present.

35:38 TANYA I'm not saying that I would say for an act to be successful, who you are without the act should not be present.

35:47 PRAYAS Yeah. I mean you are saying that yeah, exactly. Because if they're coming out with an experience of who Macbeth was without

35:55 TANYA That would be diffraction for me. Because that is two sort of things intersecting each other's path and refracting. Because then that's Prayas and the actor that Prayas is acting, the two things that are always that are in flux, right? So maybe the act of acting is a refractive act. But perhaps what's the one that's not.

36:17 AKSHAY H here there is a little thing that what you are looking at not having the reflection of the person in the act is you are looking at the pure end result of the splitting of the white light. But what happens in between the surface of say the prism is actually the act of reflection. So the light crossing through the prism is what the acting the script is passing through you.

36:46 Okay.

36:49 PRAYAS That's a process of refraction. That is I mean, I guess you are talking about the process and Tanya is talking about the state.

36:57 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

36:58 AKSHAY What I'm saying is that when she's saying that if the one of the best acting would be that your own persona does not come into it, but that we are looking at the end

37:06 PRAYAS Would that kind of acting be digital? So if I get to know someone only through Facebook, for example?

37:14 Mm-

37:14 And I'm only experiencing their presence through what they write, for example. I mean it's only text. This guy never puts a pictures, it's all it's always Oh, would you say that's the perfect act?

37:30 MALAVIKA Interesting because you know, there are these machines, these computerized things that make music completely mechanically and a lot of criticism for it is in fact the fa you know that they don't have an emotive quotient in them or they would lack one. so this thing of being completely digital, being very pure.

38:00 AKSHAY Yeah, there is a flaw there, like even what Malavika is noting, it at the end of the day you had told me that there is always a program behind somebody had written a program. So even if you somebody had written a code.

38:14 PRAYAS (?) For behind what?

38:16 AKSHAY (?) Behind say this what Malavika is giving the example of

38:21 MALAVIKA Music, yeah.

38:22 Yeah.

38:23 AKSHAY (?) So that code is a refracting surface.

38:28 PRAYAS You are saying that human intervention comes somewhere and that human intervention is the reflection. When I try to communicate when I try to communicate I am refracting.

38:44 AKSHAY Mm. Yeah.

38:47 MALAVIKA But when you're talking of acting, the perf the aspect of performance, you know through time, where human intervention is there right through every moment, I think that makes a big difference.

39:03 PRAYAS (?) How does that make a difference?

39:05 MALAVIKA Because th the very fact that we are saying that human intervention is what defines certain the refraction then if you are taking something that is pre programmed, then the i the intervention occurs only in the beginning and then it just follows suit. There is no improvisation in between, which is possible.

39:34 SATYA Can be inbuilt.

39:38 Even improvisation can be built. But I think w I see where you're going, Malavika, with the human element.

39:43 Yeah.

39:44 The live element that thing is not there. The soul is not there.

39:50 AKSHAY Yeah.

39:50 No, that again we are like going into the process, like digital can be like really the process in a way, but the moment it enters a code, that's the surface where it has entered. No

40:02 Okay.

40:03 SATYA Code is the process. The output is the

40:06 AKSHAY It has entered through a soul. After that what becomes of it? We are looking again as the end result. That's what I am saying, that say when through a prism you see a rainbow, we are talking about the rainbow right now, but what really happens through the prism is the refractive process.

40:21 Business. Yeah.

40:22 MALAVIKA (?) So is the code a perspective?

40:26 AKSHAY Sorry?

40:27 MALAVIKA Is the code a perspective?

40:28 PRAYAS I mean basically we are talking about the digital then as a trigger and not as a not as a state, right? So when pe when I responded to what Tanya said by saying that is the digital representation of presence then the perfect representation because it doesn't involve anything except the act, right?

40:54 Right.

40:55 So basically what we are saying now is that's the trigger and not the not the endpoint of the result. And that it's a trigger for that human experience of an effort of communication. So when you are basically trying to push out something into the into other frames, when you really I mean that's how that's why con conversations are different in the nature from monologues, because I mean you can talk to yourself all you want, but it's not the same as talking to someone. I mean

41:35 PRAYAS (?) Right.

41:35 PRAYAS (?) That's true.

41:36 TANYA So there's another thing is there only a is refraction only a s like is it only like singular or can there be multiple refla refractions?

41:46 PRAYAS So the yeah, I would think that the f the fragments that we consist of are the multiple refractive possibilities that we have.
41:55 PRAYAS (?) Right.
41:58 TANYA And they have the possibility to refract again. So refraction is infinite.
42:05 PRAYAS Yeah, but that doesn't help us.
42:10 TANYA (?) Are we seeking help?
42:12 PRAYAS (?) We are seeking yeah, we're trying to be we're trying to help ourselves.
42:19 TANYA I thought we were tormenting ourselves here.
42:22 No, I think we are splitting the light.
42:26 That's true.
42:27 Splitting hairs, I think.
42:29 Wait, someone on Facebook today posted that the light at the end of the towel tunnel is
42:35 PRAYAS (?) So now we switch to the next question for the day. If refraction is a rule, can we affect the degree of refraction that is caused by an experience?
42:49 SATYA If refraction is the rule, can we
42:52 PRAYAS Affect the degree of refraction that is caused by an experience. So let's say
42:58 AKSHAY I th how we are if we are conscious of it we can, like what when we get drunk is a kind of going into a surface area where we are going to refract.
43:15 Or when you smoke a joint or something you are consciously trying to enter the
43:20 PRAYAS (?) You can't measure it.
43:22 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, you cannot measure. How can you measure gauge?
43:25 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah.
43:26 AKSHAY (?) Okay.
43:26 AKSHAY (?) You can construct the engine
43:30 AKSHAY (?) Measurement will lead us into what Tanya was saying that then we go into infinite. So I think maybe measurement is not the right idea, but the state is can be interesting to explore. The state of refraction.
43:44 SATYA Wait, so when you say effect the degree of refraction, that means we are consciously changing something.
43:51 PRAYAS Yeah. So can we can we cause an effect on the degree of refraction that is caused by experience of someone else, right? So
44:02 TANYA If you are the source, right, the light source. So I are you saying that to cause that change, right? To cause that effect, that degree, do you have to be the source of the refraction? Do you have to be the sort of surface, the plastic box that the thing is refracted off, or do you have to be the receptor?
44:20 PRAYAS Yeah, so yeah, I'm basically putting it out there. I'm saying is the degree of refraction can that be effective at all?
44:29 SATYA So you're talking about control. Can we control how we respond?
44:34 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, can we control the effects? You know, so we are in a complex system. Can we control
44:39 TANYA (?) How much how this is like refracted, the degree of refraction.
44:45 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, the degree of refraction is what you're talking about.
44:49 SATYA We are not talking about control, we are not talking about the degree of refraction.
44:52 PRAYAS No, we are talking about the degree of refraction. So
44:55 They're the same.
44:56 PRAYAS (?) No, they're not.
44:58 MALAVIKA (?) So basically I think priority is one thing does one have agency or not?

45:03 TANYA (?) Yeah. That's what I was understanding. But Prayas was saying that's not what it is.

45:07 PRAYAS Yeah, no. I mean agency is being able to effect at all. And the effecting the degree is about effecting in a specific way. You know, it's not about if at all. It's about if at all

45:24 PRAYAS (?) Control. So we are assuming agency.

45:27 Yeah, we're assuming agency. so we can already act. We can already act, so right. So and as Tanya said, can acting is can be seen as a conscious activity.

45:41 PRAYAS (?) So if acting is seen as a conscious activity, then what is the possibility for manipulation to happen?

45:51 Can I be specific about manipulation? Can I affect the degree of manipulation?

45:57 SATYA I think it depends on how much you have practiced, like how much of a discipline do you have, how much how much you've observed, how much you studied and then

46:06 TANYA I think intent has a lot to play in over here. What is the in intent perhaps?

46:13 PRAYAS But yeah, so can intent yield results. So if I have an intent to manipulate, sure. But just because I have the intent to manipulate do I succeed in manipulating?

46:26 SATYA (?) Exactly. I mean the starting is intent but then you have to know how to do it for the previous

46:31 TANYA What you are saying has to be applied to the here and now without which it is too abstract a ground to converse about.

46:39 PRAYAS Okay. So and that is not okay. So you know we can't remain floating in abstraction because

46:47 TANYA Right now what we're talking about is absolutes that are fragmented and then are then received by a sort of infinite wall. So we need to define maybe in the here and now what is an absolute here, what is refracted, what is the sort of box that is refracting, or what is the prism, and then where is this going?

47:06 PRAYAS In the here and now in the here and now what I am feeling, let's say my frame of mind.

47:16 TANYA Maybe we can begin with why are we here in this group? What are we doing? What is Surfatial doing?

47:22 PRAYAS (?) So we cannot talk about ourselves.

47:27 TANYA (?) Yeah, I mean so.

47:28 SATYA (?) They talk about each other.

47:30 PRAYAS Yeah, we can talk about each other. So you know, because refraction is in the is in the indoor [?] I mean I'm just saying that if we don't get into really the here and now in terms of the pragmatics, you know. Let's say we go beyond the pragmatics, but we still remain in the here and now, but at a very fundamental level. At a very fundamental level. So in my in my actual being, in my being right now, you know, I'm being before I before the computer, before the screen, before Google Hangouts, before everything, I'm still sitting on a chair and if I mean I still exist and that is fundamental, right?

48:21 PRAYAS (?) So i if you are saying that let's

48:26 PRAYAS (?) Let's talk about the here and now. I would say how would my frame of mind

48:34 Be able to change your frame of mind. Can I ch can my frame of mind change your frame of mind?

48:43 TANYA (?) Yeah, I would say that your frame of mind has already changed my frame of mind.

48:47 TANYA (?) How did it do that?

48:49 TANYA (?) I was listening to the Antlers before this and now I'm listening to you.

48:56 AKSHAY (?) So you are saying it's possible?

48:58 TANYA Yeah, of course it's possible.

49:01 TANYA (?) I think our frame of mind is continuously shifting.

49:05 PRAYAS No, but can I can I affect your frame of mind in a specific way?

49:10 TANYA Can you?

49:11 SATYA Talking about manipulation.

49:12 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. Can I can they manipulate you into feeling that you are the emperor of the world?

49:19 TANYA So now you're mixing up with frames of mind, with feelings, emotions, experiences, ideas.

49:27 SATYA (?) No, but frame as in frame constitutes all of those things together.

49:31 TANYA No, I agree that's agreed upon. But so Prayas, what is it that I guess then here again the question goes back to intent. What is your intent with wanting to shift my frame of mind or another frame of mind?

49:45 PRAYAS (?) No, but that's not the question. The question is can it be done?

49:48 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

49:50 TANYA But for it to be done there has to be an intention and there has to be somebody who is willing to let that intention

49:57 PRAYAS You are assuming that I'm a rational being. Let's say I'm not.

50:02 SATYA (?) Yeah. You know, if you have a psychopath and they just want to play with things.

50:08 PRAYAS Yeah. So I mean we let's say I mean intent is a luxury.

50:16 You can't question someone. Yeah.

50:22 TANYA It also depends on the on the on the mind or the strength of the other frame, right?

50:30 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

50:32 SATYA (?) And when I said discipline and practice, I talked about str I was meaning strength of mind in the sense if you are able to control yourself, if you're able to control where your thoughts go and what you're doing with it, there is a possibility of figuring out how much you can allow yourself to be manipulated.

50:52 PRAYAS Right, so you would place the possibility of manipulation entirely on the receptor side.

51:03 SATYA Not necessarily.

51:04 TANYA (?) I was I was we had this conversation but does one does everybody here agree that senses cannot be are not absolute, like our sensory receptors are not absolute, they're not finite and at the same time they're not accurate.

51:21 Are they accurate? Can I say I'm asking, are they accurate? Can they be trusted? Definitely not, right?

51:30 PRAYAS No, yeah, they can't be trusted.

51:40 Yeah, they can't be trusted. Senses our senses can't be trusted.

51:47 SATYA Everything is an approximation.

51:53 PRAYAS So yeah, from the limitations of our senses we approximate the

52:00 Reality.

52:01 Yeah, we exp approximate the world.

52:10 SATYA Prayas, you were earlier talking about putting all the onus on the receiver.

52:16 PRAYAS Yeah.

52:18 SATYA In the act of manipulation.

52:20 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean when you were saying that discipline and c and you know the ability to be aware of the degree of manipulation that you're allowing.

52:35 Yeah.

52:36 When you set that it places the

52:40 It makes manipulation more of a res receptr receptors game than a manipulators game.

52:50 SATYA To a certain extent, yes. I mean the manipulator might want to manipulate and they do what they do which is in their nature, or maybe it's an act of some kind.

53:00 PRAYAS But isn't that nature a skill which basically goes beyond my filters? Otherwise why would he be successful? Why would many the manipulator be successful if the manipulator would not be able to

53:18 Think outside my filters, think in spite of my filters.

53:24 SATYA (?) So you're saying the manipulator is able to figure out the subject, the receiver, better than the receiver can?

53:30 PRAYAS (?) Yes.

53:32 Yeah, in the sense that you know your filters are already decoded and what you can't outthink is what the manipulator will do. Otherwise the manipulator will just get ext will just go extinct.

53:54 SATYA Then that puts the it does put the onus on the receiver then.

54:01 PRAYAS How?

54:02 SATYA The act of manipulation is being perpetrated by the manipulator, but he's just sending it out into the world and trying to look for victi he or she is b looking for victims or the receivers, but the surface of the receiver has to respond to that ray of light coming out from the manipulator.

54:27 And there are different ways of responding to that ray of light coming out from the manipulator.

54:34 PRAYAS Yeah, and your response you are saying that the response decides the success of the transaction, right? Correct. In yeah. So you are saying that puts it back on the re s on the receptor.

54:47 SATYA It seems to put it there, yes, at this point, yeah.

54:51 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

54:53 PRAYAS (?) I mean there's no judgment here, it's just observation.

54:56 SATYA (?) No, that's true, because then the surface of the receiver will define the effect of the ri refraction.

55:05 MALAVIKA (?) Correct. Like how thick is this prism? How is it shape?

55:08 Yes.

55:13 PRAYAS Right. So we are saying let's say in the course of you know this conversation we have agreed that refraction is indeed possible.

55:30 PRAYAS (?) We have agreed on what is refraction.

55:38 TANYA I would think that refraction is not something that can be controlled. It's outside of our control.

55:47 SATYA (?) Yeah, I can see that.

55:51 PRAYAS (?) But

55:51 PRAYAS (?) Contradicts what we just arrived at.

55:54 TANYA As we speak right now, if I'm saying something and everybody present here is the wall that the final refraction sort of refracts upon. But right now, yeah the surface, right now somebody is speaking and as I'm speaking what I'm saying is already refracted. So this continuous refraction.

56:15 AKSHAY (?) Well yeah, I think I think the world full of prisms in a way.

56:21 PRAYAS Yeah.

56:27 I'm not sure.

56:30 TANYA I would say that refraction is a rule.

56:37 PRAYAS (?) So is refraction a rule? Was our

56:42 Yeah.

56:43 PRAYAS (?) Second question.

56:45 PRAYAS (?) No, if refraction is a rule is the third question.
56:50 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
56:50 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. So you are saying you are agreeing that reflection is a rule.
56:55 TANYA Yeah, I am agreeing that I'm saying that refraction is an underlying principle.
57:00 TANYA (?) So it's too fundem it's too fundamental a s a state to talk about because
57:11 TANYA (?) Kick.
57:13 Because it's great to talk about the fundamental things.
57:24 PRAYAS (?) So
57:29 But if it is fundamental
57:33 TANYA In the context that we are putting it in, I would say refraction is fundamental to the sort of act of shifting each other's or affecting each other's frame.
57:49 TANYA (?) Yeah, so you know I essentially was interested in
58:06 Be the opposite of refraction.
58:10 SATYA (?) Yeah, so that's what I was explaining. so let's say the refraction is a fundamental idea, then
58:19 TANYA (?) A black hole.
58:21 Yeah.
58:22 AKSHAY (?) No, I think what Nu Paradox says is right. the other thing of refraction is reflection. You don't take the lights
58:29 AKSHAY (?) It's lossless transmission.
58:32 PRAYAS Yeah. It's a no generation loss.
58:36 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, it can be that also, yeah.
58:38 AKSHAY (?) So
58:39 SATYA (?) Is that
58:40 TANYA A fragmented disposition given that refraction is fundamental?
58:46 PRAYAS Yeah, so it brings us to the object which calls itself the art object, right? And if refraction is not immediate if refraction is not fundamental, then we would have to accept
59:05 TANYA But another thing, Prayas, what you are saying is that for there to be refraction, right? You are saying that there exists somewhere the ideal, the truth, the whole, the gestalt, right? Because if there is no whole, there is no truth, then there is no refraction, because then what is refracting?
59:24 The truth
59:25 TANYA (?) What the sender is sending
59:35 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean we're not defining a meta truth. We're not saying that
59:40 Okay.
59:41 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, we just
59:42 TANYA This is individual perspective truth, right.
59:46 PRAYAS (?) Like
59:48 PRAYAS (?) It's not platonic.
59:50 TANYA (?) No, it's not platonic. It's like if you're saying something, I will hear it. It's just that, right? But if you're not saying something, how can I hear it?
01:00:00 PRAYAS But you need to say something, right? And that saying something is a rule, because you just said that refraction is a rule.
01:00:09 SATYA Wait, if I said nothing wait a second, even if I said even if I said nothing, I can still be interpreted.
01:00:18 PRAYAS See let's say even silence is considered my saying something.
01:00:23 PRAYAS (?) Yes.
01:00:24 SATYA (?) Okay.

01:00:25 TANYA (?) I have an interesting question for you. Can silence be refracted?

01:00:30 PRAYAS Yeah. So that's what Satya's saying that, you know, somebody can I mean can interpret my

01:00:38 Yeah.

01:00:38 Words beyond the l linguistic construct of the words.

01:00:42 Okay.

01:00:43 SATYA And I can actually manipulate with silence too.

01:00:47 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. I mean what you don't say of course matters more than what you are.

01:00:52 TANYA Yeah, w I really would love to ha hear an example of manipulation manipulating silence.

01:00:59 SATYA I think it's very you know, if you read the stupid Mars Venus books about women and their so called cold you know, cold shoulders, that's an example, a stupid example.

01:01:12 TANYA Sorry, I didn't I didn't hear get that example.

01:01:23 Yeah.

01:01:26 MALAVIKA Yeah, but

01:01:32 PRAYAS So you're saying that gender stereotypes. I mean any kind of stereotype.

01:01:37 SATYA Yeah.

01:01:39 You know, I mean there are these very basic stupid Tanya I'm repeating you know, where women are supposed or whatever, you one person gives a cold shoulder to the other person and that is a way of sending a message, right?

01:01:53 Right.

01:01:54 Which could be misinterpreted, it could be interpreted however you want.

01:01:58 SATYA (?) Right.

01:01:59 SATYA (?) So that's an example of silence being

01:02:03 TANYA (?) Ah, right. That's interesting actually.

01:02:08 So it's the implied basically. Silence in this case is would be an implica would be an unsaid implication or a reception of

01:02:17 PRAYAS The answer [?] would like to intervene that we have discussed each of our three questions for twenty minutes each. And now we can either conclude our broadcast or talk about which is beyond these questions.

01:02:36 TANYA (?) Say that right now, currently in Srinagar, the entire city has been refracted by the over flooding.

01:02:52 PRAYAS [unclear]

01:02:55 [unclear]

01:03:00 How is it refracted? How is Srinagar refracted?

01:03:04 TANYA Because the whole city has sort of been displaced, no? So is that is that is that an act of refraction? And the refraction the refractor in this case would be the overflooding of Jhelum?

01:03:17 PRAYAS No, I mean then I would just be making the word too broad and

01:03:22 PRAYAS (?) Mm. But I thought people were talking about the list of terms.

01:03:25 MALAVIKA (?) No, I think we're talking of refraction in terms of a perspective and in relation to one's own experience. So if you want to talk of the f flood in terms of a refraction then it's certainly a refraction for each of the people who are there right now and experiencing it.

01:03:46 TANYA Right.

01:03:47 MALAVIKA But I don't think it's possible to really speak of it in that kind of larger universal

01:03:54 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

01:03:55 TANYA You know.

01:03:56 I thought that no, because for a second I forgot that we're talking about individual refraction. Because the way we've been discussing refraction has almost become a third person sort of meta

01:04:10 PRAYAS Yeah, which is what we are attempting not to let it stop because

01:04:15 TANYA (?) Which is why I was trying to situate it in like my here and now, which would be something that I was reading about today.

01:04:21 PRAYAS Right.

01:04:25 But in the here and now I think the only refraction happening is when you read about that news in Srinagar.

01:04:34 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

01:04:35 PRAYAS (?) And what you make of it?

01:04:39 And what and the picture you know, make in your head. But what's actually happening there?

01:04:49 SATYA (?) But it's interesting because I was in Srinagar in Maine [?].

01:04:54 TANYA And now what I have read has refracted my sort of memory of Srinagar.

01:05:03 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, it's just been like this very corrosive kind of you know, news. It's like we like to think of Nazar [?] as this, you know, very it's you know, it's clamped down and maybe peaceful by force. You know, by

01:05:33 So r yeah, refraction could be corrosive in the here and now.

01:05:42 TANYA (?) So

01:05:44 There's just one and last one.

01:05:54 What happened? I just acted

01:06:03 PRAYAS (?) Yeah I couldn't hear you very clearly, your voice was breaking. But

01:06:12 MALAVIKA Yeah, it sounded very musical actually.

01:06:15 TANYA (?) Yeah.

01:06:18 More audible now, is it clear?

01:06:19 SATYA Yeah, now it's fine.

01:06:21 TANYA Yeah, it's 'cause my speaker has fallen.

01:06:25 I w I was talking about like you know, h so we're presupposing that refraction is a rule, refraction is an underlying principle. So then what we are continuously experiencing the whole in f in fragments. Does anyone have to say anything about fragmentation?

01:06:42 TANYA (?) The fragmentation of the self is what we considered to be a rule also and in terms of you know the thought of acting and reflection to be related.

01:07:05 PRAYAS So refraction causes fragments to in that sense

01:07:11 You know, persist and we spoke about that. so with this I think we conclude our broadcast

01:07:22 PRAYAS (?) Thank you.

01:07:23 TANYA Okay.

01:07:24 PRAYAS (?) And we meet again tomorrow at seven PM.

01:07:28 TANYA Okay. Bye everyone.

01:07:31 SATYA (?) Push it.

01:07:31 SATYA (?) Bye.

01:07:32 PRAYAS (?) Bye.

01:07:34 TANYA (?) Oh my

01:07:36 MALAVIKA Bye.