Refractive Surfaces, Day 2

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 11 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

02:32 MALAVIKA So
02:38 MALAVIKA (?) Hello everyone, can you hear me?
02:41 PRAYAS Yeah, hi.
02:42 Hi. Yeah. Yeah, so I repeated I'll repeat the question that I introduced. The first question of the day. how do we feel the effects of refraction and is there any way to be opaque?
03:02 MALAVIKA Okay.
03:07 PRAYAS So after refraction has occurred
03:13 Is it possible to discern
03:21 MALAVIKA And said [?], I need to read this question.
03:30 It's the first question.
03:40 How do we feel the effects of refraction?
03:43 PRAYAS Yeah, so how do we discern that refraction has in fact occurred? So yesterday we were talking about validating a change.
03:58 Against a surface that hasn't changed, for example, like the actor.
04:06 SATYA (?) Right.
04:09 MALAVIKA But yeah, so I'm basically taking up from there. So how do we
04:17 PRAYAS Validate, how do we feel the effects of refraction?
04:22 MALAVIKA I think what we established yesterday is the fact that there are two diff distinct surfaces or mediums and when one tries to intersect with another, you see that there is some sense of fragmentation.
04:40 And I think that maybe the fragmentation is what discerns the effect. What kind of fragmentation is occurring.
04:50 PRAYAS Yeah, but if we I mean today I fe I felt like we can repeat that in the sense that we can
05:01 You know, good in a way look at that discernment that state of discernment in a more
05:14 St you know, give it more time. Basically give look at it in a more yeah, just because I'm not sure if fragmentation is the
05:28 Only way to discern that refraction has in fact occurred.
05:34 MALAVIKA What would you say about the Doppler effect?
05:37 PRAYAS (?) So the Doppler effect would be the
05:41 The gradual
05:44 Change in frequency.

05:45 PRAYAS (?) Change in frequency, but in that sense why you are using that as an analogy is by saying that

05:57 MALAVIKA Would you consider that also as a kind of refraction that we are referring to?

06:02 SATYA (?) You know, that's ki I would look at it as a kind of refraction in the sense of time affecting experience. In the sense like, you know, there's that saying objects in the rear view mirror. There was a song, objects in the rear view mirror appear closer than they are. So that's a kind of a Doppler shift in the sense I'm seeing this right now, but as this goes

06:31 SATYA (?) And or I am moving into the future, the way that object affects me or it the effects of that refraction through my system are slightly different perhaps.

06:47 MALAVIKA It's still a change, a transformation that rather gradual that is perceived.

06:55 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.

06:57 Yeah, there is

07:00 It is still like

07:04 MALAVIKA (?) In the cra in the case of a prism and if you're talking of light, it is still the light that is transforming itself into different colours or different rays. But it's

07:17 SATYA (?) The light transforming or it's being made to transform?

07:21 MALAVIKA (?) Exactly. There's a medium that changes it.

07:25 SPEAKER 1 But the fragments the fragments the rays of colour which are getting distinguished.

07:36 PRAYAS Are these bands of colour do they exist at all?

07:42 SPEAKER 2 No, that's the that's because of the way we perceive it, no?

07:48 SATYA Yeah.

07:48 AKSHAY They know this, no? [?]

07:52 PRAYAS (?) No they exist do they exist or what exists is a lens for seeing only the colored component of the band of light.

08:04 SATYA Both exist.

08:07 Yes.

08:08 PRAYAS So the colour exists in isolation as well.

08:13 SATYA Yeah, 'cause there are mm all these colours and what are visible it depends on who's seeing, but they're all there.

08:23 AKSHAY Yeah, and then I think if we are just looking at that, light is not just colours also. There's a lot of other things also which don't have colours.

08:30 Yeah.

08:30 Yeah, like frequencies in that, yeah.

08:33 SATYA Yeah.

08:34 PRAYAS Visible light, yeah.

08:39 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, we will have to think of it in terms of what we understand from human perception.

08:45 PRAYAS Yeah, so the bands of colour you are saying are effects of the refraction.

08:53 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

08:57 PRAYAS So the bands of colour are not an abstraction.

09:04 Meaning?

09:05 SATYA They are being perceived, so they may not necessarily be abstractions.

09:11 PRAYAS So they are in that sense they

09:15 They are there. It's not necessarily an abstraction to model their existence.

09:21 SATYA That's what I think. I mean they I mean we could create abstractions if we like, but what they're there.

09:28 Number I think. [?]

09:29 SATYA (?) Colours are there.

09:30 AKSHAY (?) Yeah the colours are there but our experience is abstraction, no. As what we had discussed that we do have a taste, but the taste is the abstraction.

09:43 SATYA Oh no, but there is taste also and experience itself is the taste, but our interpretation is the abstraction, no?

09:51 AKSHAY Yeah, that's what I was saying. That's what I was saying. But like the way like say we eat something bitter, we know it is bitter, but wha how we perceive the bitterness is the abstraction. We cannot really gauge that it is it is ten percent, twenty percent or something like that.

10:07 Yeah.

10:08 PRAYAS So if we look at the question how do we feel the effects of refraction, then we basically feel the effects of refraction through what is there.

10:21 Yes.

10:22 MALAVIKA (?) Through our lens.

10:24 PRAYAS Through what is there I mean through what is not abstract.

10:33 MALAVIKA (?) Yes, we there has to be some kind of like Satya puts it, I think lens is a nice word.

10:40 SPEAKER 1 No, but Satya, you said that the colors exist even without the lens.

10:46 SATYA Yeah, and we are experiencing them also without the lens, but what we are aware of is through the lens.

10:57 PRAYAS So are these the same lens? The are you talking about the same lens?

11:01 SATYA No. I'm talking about the lens of perception a and like what Akshay had just said about what word did he use? Not interpret.

11:12 Interpretation, yeah.

11:13 PRAYAS Yeah.

11:16 MALAVIKA (?) See but the lens should have be the same because the very lens that is making us see those colours is the same lens that is making us see them independently as well as at the same time when there is refraction.

11:31 SATYA See, I guess what I'm trying to say is, you know, we had discussed about experience being more than what we are conscious about, like our we have different ways of perceiving things which we are not even aware of, like our skin perhaps or

11:45 Mm.

11:45 And that is another lens, but the one of our consciousness is another lens.

11:52 SATYA (?) Yeah.

11:53 MALAVIKA (?) What we interpret is another lens.

11:55 SATYA (?) Right there, yeah.

11:57 MALAVIKA (?) And what we conclude is another lens.

12:00 AKSHAY Exactly. Yeah.

12:01 AKSHAY (?) So in a given experience then how do we

12:07 PRAYAS I mean we experience everything equally, right? So we experience that which is mediated by a lens and that which is really there. We experience both these things equally.

12:20 SATYA (?) Yeah.

12:21 PRAYAS How do we in a given experience figure out what is there?

12:29 SATYA (?) And that's where the limitations come, no?

12:36 PRAYAS I mean if it is there it's finite. I mean it's

12:41 SATYA Okay, and I guess then we have to fine tune ourselves. We have to ha you know, focus better.

12:47 PRAYAS (?) Is it up to us to be sensitive or is it up to the thing that's there to make its

12:59 To establish its presence.

13:03 SATYA That depends because if we are talking about observing a f a natural phenomenon, it really doesn't care, it's just there. But if we are trying to make ourselves understood by somebody else, then it is the sender's prerogative to make themselves understood, if they want to be understood.

13:23 PRAYAS Yeah, but so this understanding is it a matter of hearing or a matter of speaking?

13:30 SATYA Both.

13:35 PRAYAS Yeah, so but if you

13:36 MALAVIKA (?) Understanding would have to be more in terms of understanding comes from perception.

13:44 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I mean we are we are slightly loose right now in terms of the use of words, but not to not get stuck in this in the linguistic you know constructs. But

14:02 I mean if you just think understanding to be some kind of process, you know. So

14:12 SATYA Is understanding the effect of could it be thought of as an effect of refraction?

14:18 PRAYAS Yeah, so that's what I'm saying. So I'm tr trying to get at that. So the if it's an effect of refraction, then it won't and if it performs differently through different ears, I mean through different acts of hearing.

14:37 Then the refraction is occurring in the hearing actually and not in the speaking. So

14:45 SATYA (?) Okay. Okay.

14:47 PRAYAS Given voice which is speaking all the time, there will only be certain ears that can make sense of the sound, you know, the vo what the voice is saying.

15:02 SATYA But can the sound it so it's a question of the intent also in the sense if the s speaker is trying to make themselves understood by a certain listener, receiver.

15:17 Yeah, that's what I mean, I don't think that's important.

15:21 Okay.

15:22 SATYA (?) I mean I'm just s putting this here you I mean you can

15:31 PRAYAS You know, kind of unpack this. But I mean I'm saying that I think irrespective of your of your intent

15:45 What you're saying?

15:48 Will be understood by someone in the way that you are speaking.

15:56 Yeah.

15:56 Without you know so they will be

16:02 I mean if it's some encryption there'll be the d the decryption is the negative space of the encryption. So it'll exist.

16:24 SATYA So okay, so we are looking then at the No, we are not. What I just what just came to my mind was when the refract when the sender sends and the receiver receives and the refraction happens, a response comes out of the receiver and maybe that comes back to the sender.

16:43 It's some kind of a feedback.

16:45 PRAYAS Sure. I mean but these are multiple processes then. I mean these would be a cycle of multiple acts of hearing and speaking and

16:55 SATYA (?) Right. And these are the effects of the refraction.

16:59 PRAYAS Yeah, they're mediated through it, so that's when conversation is possible, when you have that have those cycles going.

17:08 Right.

17:09 PRAYAS (?) But then is there any way to be opaque?

17:13 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

17:15 PRAYAS (?) I mean is there any way to

17:19 Be sure that no one is able to hear.

17:25 MALAVIKA To some extent I would imagine so.

17:28 Yeah.
17:28 You shut some you stop receiving.
17:35 You consciously but it has to be a conscious act.
17:38 MALAVIKA (?) You could stop receiving, but can you stop transmitting?
17:43 PRAYAS Yeah, you can put a put on some filter which sends out only certain things out.
17:50 So I mean, linking back to what
17:56 We were talking about yesterday. So even if you put on an act
18:02 Yeah.
18:03 PRAYAS (?) What will get mediated will be more than what you put on.
18:08 I agree.
18:09 So it's like your exam
18:12 SATYA For example, yesterday about Facebook, right? Like some person might be sending out certain types of statuses.
18:20 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. So
18:24 You might be just you might be silent, but and we spoke about silence as well yesterday when we were talking about manipulation.
18:35 SATYA (?) Yeah.
18:37 SATYA (?) So, I mean how do we truly be opaque then?
18:42 PRAYAS I mean, is it possible to be opaque? Is there any way to be opaque?
18:48 PRAYAS (?) What does it mean to be opaque? Does it mean that others do not understand the opaque object?
18:57 I mean optically it means you don't let p light pass through.
19:05 Joined. [?]
19:08 You could also take it to mean something that's
19:15 Absolutely silent or let's say not contributing to the
19:23 Soundscape of the environment.
19:26 But opacity can reflect.
19:30 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
19:30 PRAYAS (?) So that's where we I mean
19:36 Yeah. I mean so that's what we end up with. I mean, is it is there a way to be opaque or your location, your p positioning, your occupying a space
19:54 In the maybe cannot be [?]
19:55 PRAYAS (?) Opaque, you can be camouflaged.
19:58 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.
20:01 SATYA (?) That can be one way of being opaque.
20:06 PRAYAS (?) That's interesting.
20:09 MALAVIKA Yeah.
20:10 PRAYAS (?) So jumping to the next question, is the abstract equivalent to the meta?
20:20 So what we want to do is hold on to something and not go into you know talking about which things which neither of us have actually experienced which is you know the infinity or the I mean just basically the container, right? So as long as we are inside, we can't talk about what we are contained within.
20:56 AKSHAY Mm.
20:58 Or can be.
21:02 PRAYAS When yeah, so I mean, but every attempt to talk about
21:08 AKSHAY (?) The container will
21:12 PRAYAS Will be
21:15 A reference, it will be a link, it will be

21:23 You know an imagination. It will be it'll o obviously not stem from experience because you can't if you're inside, you can't go outside.

21:34 MALAVIKA But you can talk of it from the inside, which you can't do from the outside.

21:39 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but you can't go out and come back in.

21:43 Why not?

21:45 I mean how do you do that?

21:47 How do you go out?

21:50 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. I mean how do you

21:53 Actually go out and come back inside. I mean, is there any way to I don't think there is any way to die and come back to life?

22:03 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

22:06 SATYA (?) So we're talking then everything is abstract only. Like all this stuff is abstract.

22:11 PRAYAS Yeah, it has to I mean, okay, so what I'm I'm proposing this kind of distinction between the abstract and the meta by saying that so the abstract can

22:27 Can be the speculation of something that is here, something that is still experienced.

22:37 And there are numerous things like that, you know, we feel things and feeling is real but it's a speculation of about what it might be.

22:50 Right.

22:52 But the meta is attempting to describe what we cannot possibly mean that to describe what we actually do not hold in our experience.

23:08 PRAYAS (?) So one is a fiction.

23:11 SATYA How are they different?

23:13 AKSHAY (?) Yeah. How are they different? Yeah.

23:18 Satya and I see [?] one is a fiction and one is a documentary.

23:23 Interesting. Yeah, that's right. Yeah.

23:27 You know I was

23:29 Even the pure fiction can have some documentary form.

23:35 Yeah.

23:35 Yeah, the documentary is a pure documentary.

23:38 AKSHAY (?) Correct.

23:39 PRAYAS I is it is the is the is do does documentary include the

23:49 Speculation this you know the speculative

23:56 Yeah, I think Dr. Seekhar [?] is mostly speculative in a way.

24:03 So it doesn't

24:07 Try to

24:12 PRAYAS (?) Describe in a in an accurate way.

24:16 AKSHAY (?) I think so. They always provide facts and positions of other people but again they are all speculation of people in a way.

24:26 SPEAKER 2 No, it's magic. [?]

24:30 MALAVIKA Sorry.

24:31 MALAVIKA (?) Well.

24:32 SATYA There's a selection.

24:36 AKSHAY Yeah, say like I don't know, even if you look at anybody's biography or even an auto-biography, even to even go to that kind of personal extent, it is actually a speculation of our past memories if you look at the autobiography.

24:56 Yeah, that's true.

24:59 So it's a approximation of the experience in a way.

25:08 PRAYAS So it's the abstract is abstract and specific at the same time.

25:17 AKSHAY Yeah, I think what we have discussed today, you know, about the taste, like you can describe the taste, you can give a personal measurement to the taste, but you cannot make it a meta.

25:31 AKSHAY (?) Do taste the peg. [?]

25:33 PRAYAS (?) No reasonable. [?] Good.

25:36 AKSHAY (?) Sorry?

25:36 AKSHAY (?) Sorry.

25:37 PRAYAS Th there is an anchor. There is a there's something that holds the ab abstraction to the here and now.

25:46 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

25:48 So does this distinction help us? does it help us in any way is as we modulate the format in which we hold these conversations. So if we distinguish the abstract from the meta and so we can confidently, you know, model abstraction

26:13 While at the same time avoiding going into a

26:18 The fiction of the meta.

26:21 Wait, I thought we said fiction was abstraction. Actually I don't think we discussed meta enough, at least for me. I what is meta?

26:33 So the if I'm sitting on a chair

26:38 And I know that I'm sitting on a chair, then mm I mean the chair is here.

26:47 Right.

26:47 So what is not the meta is what is here and what is I mean basically what is present.

26:58 So I mean from what I if I'm eating

27:00 SATYA Something and I'm tasting it.

27:04 Yeah.

27:06 PRAYAS It's the taste is an abstraction, but in the same at the same time it's real because

27:16 There is actually a chemical

27:19 Right.

27:19 Process that is that the f that is exuded from

27:27 The act of eating the food.

27:30 PRAYAS (?) Right.

27:33 SATYA So I think that we can safely call the abstract because I'm trying to, for example, use correlations of

27:42 PRAYAS You know, with of language of words of different ki different kinds in different ways to communicate the taste and I might not get it right.

27:52 SATYA And that you're calling meta?

27:54 PRAYAS No, abstraction, so. And the meta would be, for example, talking about

28:03 Infinity

28:05 Mean so no wha what I cannot possibly so basically if you're sitting in a plane, if you're sitting in a jet plane

28:14 You cannot actually possibly look at the plane itself if you're inside.

28:23 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

28:26 So that would be like the meta in the sense you know the container

28:31 SATYA (?) So you know that there is a container you're inside it. You know that it's there.

28:38 PRAYAS You are speculating that it's there. So you don't even know it's there because all you know is what you can experience and you can only experience the inside of the container.

28:53 SATYA Wait, so I thought meta was a reference, like a self reference. That's my understanding of the word meta. I mean I remember reading an example, the this sentence has thirty four letters. And I guess if you count it there will be thirty four letters or something, you know. So this sentence has thirty four letters.

29:14 SATYA (?) So that's a medical [?]

29:15 PRAYAS It's self dis it's a self description
29:20 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
29:21 In a way that you clearly know what is the larger set and the smaller set. You know the there is a there are two scales operating.
29:33 PRAYAS (?) Exactly.
29:36 So and the and the larger scale is usually something which you cannot actually experience.
29:45 SATYA (?) Okay. The sentence can't experience itself, I can see that.
29:49 PRAYAS Yeah. So I mean that is n and that's the reason why it's one of the biggest problems that we
29:57 Deal with today because
30:01 We are all actors who don't really know
30:06 Why or what we are acting out?
30:09 AKSHAY (?) So the distinction is between abstraction the fiction of the so abstraction is actually more accessible to us than the meta.
30:22 PRAYAS Yeah, and I mean so the abstract will s still have some root in the here and now. So if you investigate well enough you'll find some evidence.
30:35 AKSHAY (?) I think meta is a given and abstraction is something we can mold or stretch.
30:42 Make up.
30:43 Yeah.
30:45 Yeah, and but even the given is not entirely given. So
30:50 AKSHAY (?) Yeah. Yeah, it can be challenged.
30:53 AKSHAY (?) Piece together puzzle pieces of the puzzle, but you don't really know.
30:57 PRAYAS Yeah
30:58 SATYA (?) Given exists. I mean the given is there, we are not able to put it together.
31:04 SATYA (?) But we don't know if it's there.
31:05 SPEAKER 2 Experience is again limiting. You're only how do you define that experience when you say you can't experience something from when you're inside it, you can't experience a container from the outside. Like
31:26 MALAVIKA (?) Then you have already got a preset notion of what you need to experience.
31:34 SATYA (?) Right.
31:36 PRAYAS But experience is already evident in terms of what it means. So we don't at least to me
31:49 SATYA So if I'm sitting inside the plane, that is the experience, the meta is me experiencing myself with the container.
32:02 PRAYAS (?) Yes, so the m the meta will be trying to piece together the
32:09 The picture of the plane actually flying in the sky when I don't have any really real means to
32:18 See it.
32:19 PRAYAS (?) See it that way if I'm on the inside.
32:24 SATYA Yeah. Yeah.
32:29 So I can make up stories about myself sitting in the plane flying and you know, this is how the clouds would feel and this is how the birds are and this is how the temperature is outside, but I don't really even though that's really happening, I can't really feel that. I mean
32:48 PRAYAS You don't know you if for example if somebody told you that actually you're just sitting in a room.
32:56 Yeah.
32:57 PRAYAS (?) And there is some kind of magic and you reach the other place.
33:02 Right.
33:03 And you step out step outside the room and they're playing a movie in your window.
33:08 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
33:10 SATYA (?) You don't know it might be true.

33:13 PRAYAS Right.

33:15 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, but yeah, it is in a way true because many times you can experience it like that also.

33:23 When you have this expectation no, that oh my god, time just passed because it even in your everyday life many times you pass through a year and you come back to the pain point and you feel oh my god.

33:34 PRAYAS Yeah, if you just sleep all the way through.

33:38 Yeah.

33:40 You won't remember flight at all.

33:48 SATYA (?) And that's another expected. [?] So there's actually three things what I'm experiencing, what is the meta of it, and what I'm abstracting it to be.

34:01 PRAYAS Yeah, and the second one is fiction in our model and the third one actually has a has an anchor in the here and now. So it has some evidence.

34:15 Right.

34:16 So if we have if we distinguish

34:22 You know, these two in this way. And then we go back to the earlier question of how do we actually feel the effects of refraction?

34:34 So then we have two possibilities. Then we actually

34:40 Have the possibility that we can feel the effect of refraction through an abstraction.

34:50 Right.

34:51 And through an act of understanding, both. I mean is the underst is understanding abstract?

35:03 It would be.

35:04 PRAYAS (?) Yes

35:05 SATYA Yeah.

35:13 PRAYAS But it's not a good thing. [?]

35:14 SATYA And if you have inputs coming and you're making an inference based on some inputs you're reconstructing and rationalizing, then maybe that is the part which is not abstract, but the rest of it is pretty much what you're making up of the situation.

35:34 PRAYAS Yeah, but we looked at understanding as a kind of hearing, as a kind of listening that is happening in correspondence to some speaking, to some voice.

35:54 ADITYA Okay.

35:55 PRAYAS So if it's happening that way, then it's a very analogous experience in that sense. I mean, it's not an abstraction because you can actually

36:14 Hear someone, I mean I'm not h hearing not but not as in sounds, but if you if you can perceive something to exist

36:29 Mm-

36:30 How would that be an abstraction?

36:36 Because we spoke of abstraction as the speculation of the into the you know, the qualities of

36:46 The experience so

36:48 SATYA But what you're suppose you're experiencing somebody saying something and in your mind you are reading between the lines and you're forming a picture that's based on your own frame and your imagination of what you want the other person to be saying.

37:09 Maybe you know, it's like a telepathic communication sometimes between people.

37:16 SATYA (?) And not telepathy in terms of parapsychology.

37:18 PRAYAS That would be an abstraction and a an understanding at the same time.

37:23 Right.

37:26 PRAYAS (?) But if s if someone is just saying something and you're just listening and

37:33 SATYA (?) Through that very simple act you

37:39 PRAYAS You know, a refraction occurs in that sense and

37:44 Something gets communicated.
37:49 Right.
37:50 So why would this simple act be an abstraction?
37:58 SATYA (?) Well, it is an abstraction because we don't know the what really the other person is saying.
38:07 SATYA (?) You know it very clearly as you heard it.
38:10 I only hear words but I don't know if the words mean what they are in what they sound like.
38:25 PRAYAS So you are saying that if something is not plain speech
38:32 SATYA I mean I don't even know if it's plain speech.
38:35 PRAYAS (?) You don't know if there is any plain speak, if you don't know if there's anything called plain speak.
38:40 SATYA Yeah, that's where I have a problem because I might s I might ask somebody if they are cold and they'll say no, but maybe they are.
38:51 AKSHAY (?) Right. So Yeah, so all of so all of understanding is abstract. So understanding is abstract in the sense.
39:03 I'm yeah. This is something I got to yeah.
39:09 PRAYAS So if we jump to the third question for the day, can we if and we so third question is can we specify our isolated experience at all? And how do we gauge refraction? What is the base state?
39:36 So let's so before the abstraction is
39:43 You know, before we go into the abstraction.
39:49 Can we specify our without going into abstraction, can we specify our isolated experience at all?
40:02 MALAVIKA (?) For a version. [?]
40:05 AKSHAY Sorry.
40:06 MALAVIKA So I was thinking of instinctive senses, like a sensory response that's instinctive.
40:16 AKSHAY I think we can be specific about our own experience our own abstraction. We can we can have those scales for ourselves, but maybe we cannot communicate to others.
40:31 AKSHAY (?) Right.
40:32 PRAYAS Not going into abstraction.
40:34 AKSHAY Yeah, without going into abstraction. But in inside ourselves we can have very clear scales.
40:42 SATYA But even that could be an abstraction, right, inside ourselves.
40:46 AKSHAY No, I think inside ourselves we are quite clear. It's very logical. I know that I don't like, say, too much bitter, so I know my scale that how much I don't like.
40:57 SATYA (?) Okay, but if I ask you a question that if somebody s if somebody spoke to you and they said something and you inside you yourself you heard something but maybe they meant something else.
41:15 AKSHAY Yeah my I my that but even that inside me is a scale. Outside me I cannot judge. Without going into abstraction I won't be able to judge what I said. But inside me I'm very clear that this is my scale of tolerance or this is my scale of listening or something like this.
41:36 AKSHAY (?) Okay.
41:36 AKSHAY (?) So we can be as the question goes, we can be very specific about the abstraction within us. But when we go out to communicate we can only be in abstract.
41:51 PRAYAS Oh what do you think Parvez? can we be specific about our own experience in the sense can we distinguish from the abstract and the
42:08 PARVEZ I don't know. In fact I just came in, so I don't know where we are at.

42:14 PRAYAS So I mean today at this time the format is that we look at different questions every twenty minutes.
42:20 Yeah.
42:21 We have just taken up this question.
42:25 PRAYAS (?) Okay. And the question is whether
42:28 PRAYAS (?) Specify our isolated experience at all?
42:33 PARVEZ (?) Can we be very specific in terms of experiencing them?
42:38 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, can we specify?
42:40 Yeah.
42:40 Our isolated experience. So is there
42:47 PRAYAS (?) A way to
42:51 PRAYAS (?) You know, specify our experience without going into abstraction.
42:55 SATYA When you say specify, do you mean communicate?
42:59 PRAYAS No, just state it. Just state it in so many in a frame that is internal or external. I mean that isn't really matter in this context.
43:11 PARVEZ I think b specifying whether to ourselves or to another person the there are two different things because to ourselves one doesn't need to ex specify, one just needs to experience it. So that is the experience in itself. The idea of specifying it comes from this idea that i it needs to be communicated either to oneself or whatever, and that's where I think last time's discussion about how the language is constructed construction which is so im enforced because we are taught that we even think in those terms, that we need to specify it. So I think we it's wizard [?]
43:51 PRAYAS We try to we try to know ourselves.
43:55 PARVEZ No, but no knowing what does knowing means? I mean we experience ourselves, we experience life. This idea of knowing is again I'm wondering if that is a construct the way we think no knowing has to be. I mean knowing is experiential, knowing is experience, knowing is seeing and just going through. And that is where the abstraction of all that comes. But we are trying to break that abstraction by creating constructs which could be which are various kinds of expressions or through language, through various kind of languages even and medias. so I think that's where the whole idea of specifying falls in that domain where man thinks that we need to specify to understand to move in that kind of forward, whatever that means. So for me I
44:48 PRAYAS If we go if we if like Akshay and you both saying that within ourselves we don't need to specify and there is an there is a way of knowing that is before specification
45:08 Yeah.
45:09 So I have a question.
45:10 SATYA I have a question here with this. Be I think, okay, if I am not socialized in a particular society, I'm socialized elsewhere and I have a way of experiencing things, but I have to consciously make I want to integrate now in this new place. So how do I you know if I don't specify to myself, like if I don't become self aware of what is going on and what is my response to situations, how do I modulate, how do I attenuate my expression or do you see what I'm saying? Like I think that there is value in specifying in the sense, you know
45:50 To become to learn, it's like a self learning sort of self awareness.
45:57 PARVEZ See the idea of self-awareness again comes from this whole I mean I would put it in a different frame. So one is the systemic framework in which we live, where specifying becomes part of communicating either to ourselves or to another. And sometimes we are communicating to ourselves so that we are clearer when we communicate even something else to others. So that you know the there is a stress that one needs to understand one's experiences. Whereas I'm saying if suppose there is no society and there is an individual in vacuum, then you experience something, but do you need to then specify or you just experience you have five senses to

experience a thing. So which one is a construct and the and then the second issue you use the word need, so it comes to necessity. And is this again a necessity which is an inborn and a and a natural necessity, or is it a construct which is enforced by the system within which we are?

46:59 SATYA Right. I see what you're saying. But the thing is if you're human and we are supposed to be self aware beings and doesn't it become a human need to understand itself?

47:10 PARVEZ (?) Y that's what I'm saying, but you j just said that if we are supposed to now where how why are we supposed to? I mean where is that supposed to be from the system or as a natural instinct?

47:23 Right.

47:24 AKSHAY I think Parvez it's interesting what you had said that most of the time we are always in that trap of trying to know. But actually there is nothing much to know.

47:34 SATYA I don't know if that's true because i we are living within structures. Unfortunately of all I would love to live outside a structure, you know, just be myself or whatever, but there are structures imposed upon us and how do we negotiate these structures? So we have to sort of

47:49 AKSHAY That's precisely what I'm saying, that we always bring this outside to inside and create a complexity. That's what Parvez has I think pointed very interestingly, that knowing, what is that knowing? It's actually a web in a way for our own self to get trapped.

48:08 SATYA Is it a trap, though?

48:11 I see I see that

48:12 PRAYAS (?) When you say Akshay that there is nothing to know

48:19 No, I don't know.

48:20 AKSHAY There is not nothing to know. Is that we complicate the process by putting the first question like this that we need to know?

48:30 SATYA But it is a human need.

48:32 PARVEZ No again the question would be where is that why is it a need? But Akshay, I will just I think add a bit of this thing to your thing. That it is not that sorry no what did you say? Yeah, there is nothing to know. It's not that there is nothing to know. I think there is a lot to know and life has evolved around that idea that there's something to know. That's why perhaps life is continuing to propagate. but that knowing as we have started to understand it, is that the real way of knowing? Or i can it still be experiential rather than a constructed way of knowledge in which you know the way knowledge is passed on, be it in the caste system where the Brahmin holds this way, because he knows in a certain way, not necessarily that he or she knows the reality of life. So that is where all the elite in

49:29 PRAYAS Knowing is through an abstraction as well. That's what I mean you are saying that specifying is a kind of to specify something you need to know it and to know it you need to have a handle on the abstraction. I mean so knowledge is a is an abstraction. There is actually nothing

49:54 PARVEZ Yes. Yeah, i it is not nothing stable, it's abstract and it's probably intangible but experiential. However, we try to break it and present it as tangible specifiable pieces, and that is where I think the whole problem is that a person who does not possess the skill of specifying is considered unloj unknowledgeable. You know? Whereas he or she might be holding more knowledge.

50:22 AKSHAY Yeah, so I think Parvez sorry I have to leave early, but I think I would agree I didn't mean by saying that flat that there's nothing to know. But I think as the first block we do as I think you are again specifying it better. Again saying specifying. But yes, I think the moment we first start with this that we need to know puts us in a jeopardy.

50:44 Yeah.

50:45 Yeah.

50:46 Yeah.

50:47 Okey, semua. [?]

50:48 Huh.
50:49 What
50:53 AKSHAY (?) What is the base state then? I mean, what is there that is not sp specified? I mean, if we
51:04 PRAYAS Take it for a fact that what we don't know still exists and
51:14 And that is the I mean based state in a way, that which we do not manage to abstract, right? So we can't abstract our own life in a way that
51:31 If we die, we die. It's absolute. You know, we can't really abstract our own mortality.
51:42 SATYA (?) So I mean what would you consider to be the base state? I mean I'm just pulling an easy example of the mo the mortality into this, but how would you expand on the base? I mean what doesn't need to be abstracted? What doesn't need to be known?
52:04 PARVEZ (?) No w it's not about what doesn't need to be known. I don't know how you're ca can com comparing abstraction to not knowing.
52:15 I am just questioning the idea that what is knowing and how does one know and still be considered knowledgeable in terms of if there is another way of knowing.
52:26 PRAYAS (?) No, you said that what we do not specify
52:30 Yeah.
52:32 Is taken to be
52:36 Yeah.
52:37 PRAYAS (?) What we do not know because knowledge has
52:42 Yeah.
52:42 In that sense become a parameter of that which can be specified.
52:49 Right.
52:50 SATYA (?) No how is that? Just because we don't specify it, we don't know. I don't think that
52:57 MALAVIKA (?) No, that's that holds true, it's assumed, it's an assumption. We don't say that it's true.
53:02 Yeah.
53:03 MALAVIKA (?) I think what Parvez said is that it is made as an assumption.
53:08 PARVEZ Yeah. Yeah, I mean I am seeing sorry, please go ahead.
53:12 SATYA I guess I just complete saying that for example, wisdom, right? Like wisdom is not necessarily always an elucidated. There are some things that there are some people who are just wise. Like you said, like just because you are in a certain rung in the caste system doesn't mean that you don't know the ultimate truth about the universe. So but you may never have you had the language to specify it. But you know it in your being.
53:39 PARVEZ Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, I mean I when I was saying those specify are considered unknowledgeable and that is a problem because they actually may be holding more knowledge and at times you see that they are holding more knowledge but they only do not know how to specify in that particular way where knowledge is judged. So the whole idea of judging and understanding knowledge is based on this idea of examining people, you know, testing people.
54:08 PRAYAS (?) I mean I just flipped it around and I basically said that if you look at the unspecified knowledge.
54:18 Yeah.
54:19 PRAYAS (?) You know, that which is known but not specified. the negative space of what is specified.
54:26 Yeah.
54:26 Th so that still exists, right? inspi I mean that is never known, but it still exists. So would you describe that in some way as the
54:48 As what lies out outside the I mean as that which is something that we can hold on to as the here and now, as the

55:00 PARVEZ I would say this is this is what lies outside the curriculum and the textbook. Something as simple as that. In a in a much obviously larger way. That this is the experiential knowledge which is there, which is lying, which may be understood through and experienced with whoever holds that knowledge rather than, you know, specifying in specific terms and definitions and theories at times.

55:28 PRAYAS No, but I mean if we if we are not looking at the I mean okay, so it exists outside the books but and we cannot we do experience it but we cannot specify it, so we are not able to abstract it.

55:48 You did that.

55:49 PARVEZ Abstract already, but they we are not able to specify it.

55:56 PARVEZ (?) I mean that's a good thing.

55:57 PRAYAS I'm I'm basically b continuing thread from our earlier con questions, which is we

56:08 Took it for took it to mean that to abstract, I mean to specify something, you need to be able to abstract it because

56:19 AKSHAY (?) Mm- Okay. Okay.

56:22 PRAYAS (?) In that sense that what you re what you actually experience

56:27 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

56:29 Some part of that you are speculating on.

56:32 Yeah, right.

56:33 That is abstraction and some and that is what you specify.

56:39 PARVEZ Right. Okay. So you create another s abstraction from an abstract experience to be able to specify.

56:47 PRAYAS Yeah. So then basically and this question what we are s trying to get at is there a base state at all? So again linking to yesterday that how do we know that refraction has happened when we if we can basically contrast it with a base state and is that and that base state is not an abstract notion as we just discussed and so what is it then?

57:19 MALAVIKA (?) Experience, the moment of experience where is when it's not yet abstracted, no?

57:27 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

57:29 PRAYAS (?) So

57:31 SATYA And I think that would be a base state. It is not the negative and it isn't the abstracted either.

57:40 PARVEZ Yeah. Which means the present, the here, essentially.

57:46 SATYA And refraction is the rule, right? we know that everything we are whether specifying, unspecifying, whatever it is, everything has gone through a lens.

57:59 PRAYAS Yeah, so what Malavika just said, so then how do we

58:05 You know, how do we think about it in the sense of refraction being a rule?

58:13 SATYA Because we don't have access to the what was just discussed of what the here and now.

58:21 PRAYAS We don't have access to it and trying to have access to it will mean trying to

58:27 Okay.

58:28 Abstracted.

58:30 Will be?

58:32 SATYA Having access trying to access the here and now passes through refraction.

58:39 SATYA (?) Mm.

58:41 PRAYAS But can we access the container? I mean I mean when we discussed the question of the meta, we actually I thought that's where we figured that we cannot actually exp r even attempt to reach the container within which we are contained.

58:59 PRAYAS (?) But are we aware that there is a container? If we are aware that there is a container, that's a starting point.

59:06 MALAVIKA But we th I thought we answered that question of whether the abstract is equivalent to the meta. That they are in some sense equivalent. So even if you can't if you are speculating on the meta because you can't completely experience it. And even your understanding is an abstraction. So it's like one speculation versus another speculation.

59:34 SATYA Yeah, it I think it's all speculation.

59:38 PRAYAS Yeah, but I didn't understand from our previous discussion that we considered them as equivalent. I thought we had distinguished them and we were holding them in that distinction. we are holding them apart in that distinction that we drew. And I wasn't sure we were considering them equivalent.

01:00:00 SATYA (?) Well I think we said we have three things, right? Like the present, the abstraction of the present and the meta.

01:00:11 SATYA (?) Like the fixing well. [?]

01:00:12 SPEAKER 1 The

01:00:17 PRAYAS We had the three distinctions, yeah, like you said.

01:00:22 MALAVIKA But th what I saw as common in the three is the fact that they were all abstractions.

01:00:33 Mm-

01:00:34 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

01:00:35 SATYA Two things are abstractions. The present is not what we experience is not abstraction. The other two are abstractions.

01:00:42 MALAVIKA Ah, so the present is not really considered in when you're talking of the meta or what we think of an abstract in terms of understanding.

01:00:56 PRAYAS Yeah, and as how Parvez was describing, even the experience can be considered to be an abstraction.

01:01:08 Because we don't really know.

01:01:10 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:01:11 PRAYAS (?) What is

01:01:15 PRAYAS (?) If that is passing through

01:01:19 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:01:19 PRAYAS (?) So we are assuming that there is a present.

01:01:23 Yeah, I mean and we assuming that after it has it is passed, that's it.

01:01:33 MALAVIKA So where do you pin things down?

01:01:36 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

01:01:38 Where do you pin things now?

01:01:40 Now we are actually I think we just have two now. We just we don't have three. We have two and we have the abstract and we have the meta and we don't have any we don't have anything else actually. I don't think yeah, so that's where we go on from tomorrow and that's the day three and we stop today's broadcast here.

01:02:11 No good. [?]

01:02:12 Okay.

01:02:13 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, thanks everyone. Good night. Tomorrow again at seven thirty. Good night.

01:02:17 PARVEZ (?) Good night.