Refractive Surfaces, Day 3

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 12 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 MOSES SAM Mm-

00:01 PRAYAS Our question for the day, the first question for the day. This time the format is that we talk about each question for twenty minutes.

00:10 MOSES SAM Okay.

00:11 PRAYAS And I switched the question at twent the twentieth minute so I keep track of time and so essentially we talk about this

00:22 MOSES SAM We talk about what?

00:25 PRAYAS We discussed three questions in sixty minutes.

00:28 MOSES SAM Okay.

00:30 PRAYAS Yeah. So our first question is can we think of a refractive process?

00:35 MOSES SAM Mm.

00:37 PRAYAS That is not personal.

00:43 MOSES SAM Can you think of a refractive process that's not personal?

00:49 PRAYAS Yeah, so in the you know, in the last few days

00:52 MOSES SAM Mm-

00:53 PRAYAS We have spoken of refraction in a way that's similar to the process of understanding.

01:02 MOSES SAM Right.

01:04 PRAYAS You know, so

01:07 You know, when you try and model somebody else's perspective within yours

01:15 MOSES SAM Mm-

01:19 PRAYAS That's

01:22 Been spoken of as refraction.

01:26 MOSES SAM Okay, I mean I

01:29 PRAYAS Right. So I mean

01:30 MOSES SAM But

01:32 PRAYAS I'm not but I'm not sure if that's the only way to look at refraction. I mean I'm trying to figure out if there is

01:43 A way, you know, of thinking of refraction as a very

01:49 Objective process, like

01:52 MOSES SAM Okay.

01:54 PRAYAS Something that's not personal.

01:59 MOSES SAM Right. Right. okay, so

02:06 No, okay, so it's interesting because I was reading something very similar to this. but anyways when I went through the first days of you know the pictures that you're posted there what I found amusing was that you are very particular about the surface. whereas I was thinking refraction is predominantly you know something that's mostly affected by the medium because it the light travels from one medium to another and that's where refraction happens, right? It's not just the surface per se.

02:42 PRAYAS Yeah the surface is at the edge of the medium.

02:46 MOSES SAM Correct. Yeah, then I realized okay, so it's the edge, right? So a surface is where two different mediums meet, essentially.

02:55 PRAYAS Yeah, and where they get differentiated.

02:59 MOSES SAM -huh -huh.

03:01 PRAYAS So actually for us every act of seeing is like refraction because the moment light that is reflected from some object hits our eye and you know from air it goes on to tissue.

03:19 PRAYAS (?) Correct.

03:21 Refraction happens. So at that level today's question is trying to figure out if refraction can be an objective process, like you know, an optical process which is not personal.

03:39 MOSES SAM I mean so when you say it's subjective for me, you know, the surface or the line that differentiate two different mediums is the set of moral values each person has, right? So let's say you live in your own reality, in your own set of rules, but then I'm perceiving it from my ethical and moral values, right? And then there's this line that separates both of us.

04:09 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, i if you look at as at refraction as a personal process, then.

04:20 You know, so the moral values come into question if you look at it as a personal process.

04:26 PRAYAS (?) Thanks.

04:26 PRAYAS (?) Oh.

04:29 Before that, you know, before you are even a person, before you are individuated, you know.

04:38 MOSES SAM (?) Before

04:40 Before you are you are an individual.

04:44 PRAYAS (?) Right.

04:46 MOSES SAM When

04:49 PRAYAS (?) When you experience something

04:53 MOSES SAM Huh.

04:55 PRAYAS When you are when

04:58 MOSES SAM So you're saying without those filters, right? Without those values. So try to look at it without those filters, then what do you see? Is that what you're asking?

05:09 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, because you can't do it right. You can't look at something without your filters, but it can happen in an unfiltered way. But by the time you get to know of it'll of course be filtered.

05:24 PRAYAS (?) Correct.

05:26 SATYA I'm sorry, Prayas, when you say individual, does it mean a person who is self aware?

05:32 PRAYAS No, I'm just saying an individual so you know, like if a person is standing in a in an empty room

05:40 Yeah.

05:41 What differentiates the space, the coordinates of the space where this person is standing from empty space? You know, so what differentiates this

05:55 You know, this block this person, this body from thin air.

06:05 PRAYAS (?) Or from another person actually, just to be more precise. From another person. So
06:13 Where does the characterization start?

06:18 SATYA I mean the most obvious thing is the construction of the individual, right? I mean
06:25 Yeah.
06:26 Chemical or whatever.

06:28 PRAYAS Yeah. So before that construction begins, you know, the so when you look at something optically
06:40 The moment when light is actually the reflected light is actually hitting you, that has nothing to do with you.
06:51 Right.
06:52 PRAYAS (?) That is a purely optical process which will happen in the same way for everyone.
06:57 PRAYAS (?) Right.
06:59 And at that level, so we are talking about it in the sense of at the physical level, physical in the sense at the level of physics.
07:10 Okay.
07:11 So
07:12 You know so p so you know Parvais [?] shared this talk show in his Facebook group and he talked about it as something which is not about physics.
07:26 Okay.
07:27 And which is when it struck me, you know, actually it is only about physics.
07:34 Gash [?], I should look this up.
07:41 Moment of r you know, the where the refraction happens in your eye.
07:47 Yeah.

07:49 SATYA Yeah. Yeah, you're not a person.
07:52 It's a prism there. I mean it's clearly a physical phenomenon happening before the other stuff happens. I mean before cognition and before values and before all of that.

08:07 MOSES SAM No, but yeah, so that's reality, right? Like as we know it and as we perceive it. But you know, if you look at how the world is moving, you know, virtual reality is becoming more real, right? Yeah. So you look at Oculus Rift or something like that, it's another way of saying reality is a conceit, right? It provides the seem sometimes you know, virtual reality or the real virtuality, you know, I don't even know how to call it. If you have experienced Oculus Rift, it's so real that you don't even know what's real anymore.
08:45 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.
08:46 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, there's this c this seamless continuity between the world outside and the world within or the world that you perceive.

08:57 SATYA (?) But the still the perception happened after physics, right? Like after the optical phenomenon happened.

09:05 MOSES SAM Yeah, but then there's no physical element there, right? Because that's it's just something. It's you're looking at a screen there. You're not looking at a physical person there.

09:17 PRAYAS No, but that's much later. That's much later.
09:22 Okay.
09:22 You know, you need to have been a person to switch the computer on.

09:30 MOSES SAM Okay.
09:36 Right. And

09:39 PRAYAS (?) So you know, it happens much later.
09:43 PRAYAS (?) The cognition of it, right? Or the interpretation or whatever it is.
09:47 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, and the like the digital the digital reality
09:51 Yeah.
09:52 You know might be actually might not involve physics at all, but it happens much later. You've got to turn on the computer, you've got to look at the screen, to have eyes that work.

10:11 MOSES SAM Right.

10:15 PRAYAS So I'm not sure if it's so immersive that you forget all of that.

10:22 SATYA (?) Yeah, so it's not seamless. There is a s there are seams.

10:26 PRAYAS (?) At some level in the sense if you don't forget to breathe, right?

10:33 Right.

10:34 I haven't heard of people dying while playing games because they forget to breathe.

10:40 MOSES SAM (?) No, there are not because they forgot to breathe, but because they forgot to eat and drink water. People have died in China and Japan. Yeah. Yeah.

10:52 PRAYAS (?) Because drinking water takes effort.

10:57 PRAYAS (?) But you can't say they forget to breathe, right? But because for if breathing is such an involuntary action, then you just do it.

11:04 SATYA No, but still even drinking is also an involuntary action. You know you're thirsty, you drink. It's an it's an action. But there are certain hindrances that happen. There may be some obstructions.

11:16 SATYA (?) I don't know if it is forgetting.

11:20 MOSES SAM (?) Drinking is a voluntary action, right? I mean so then that it

11:25 No, thirst sorry, thirsty involuntary.

11:29 SATYA (?) What is that? Sorry.

11:31 MOSES SAM Thirst is involuntary.

11:34 SATYA And the next level of it is drinking, which is sort of you can't you will go and do it. But there may be a situation where thirst malfunction.

11:48 MOSES SAM I mean we

11:48 Haven't experienced yeah, exactly. So we haven't experienced it, so we don't know. But people have actually died while gaming.

11:57 MOSES SAM (?) Okay.

12:01 PRAYAS No, but you know that is that is about effort. I mean you know, you don't want to get up and drink water but breathing doesn't require you to get up.

12:16 PRAYAS (?) Great. Yeah.

12:19 So getting up is okay. I mean getting up is not okay while breathing is okay.

12:28 Yeah.

12:29 I mean I'm just saying when you are when you really don't want to do any effort, then breathing is cheap.

12:39 SATYA Okay.

12:40 PRAYAS So in that sense yeah, so the it's cheap and that's why you don't forget to breathe. And but you know it's if you're for example, one of the ways that people die from smoking up is forgetting to breathe. They're so high that they forget that you know, they have to breathe.

13:03 And that happens because at that at that level they have even lost yeah, they've lost control of the co unconscious involuntary functions also.

13:17 MOSES SAM (?) Huh.

13:21 PRAYAS But it's possible. So I mean I'm just saying that the digital reality, the virtual reality

13:30 Mm-

13:31 I'm not sure if it's seamless and so immersive that it just makes you forget everything else.

13:41 MOSES SAM I mean we are not there yet, we are not there completely, but you know, we are progressing in that direction obviously. You know, Oculus Rift is the next step. And then something else would come in where you don't have to wear those gigantic goggles or Android devices on your face, but then you know, you'll just see everything and then pretty much you won't be able to distinguish between the reality and the virtuality. So it becomes the real virtuality then.

14:12 PRAYAS But is isn't that you know something that we are I mean, we don't know it for sure. We don't know it as real yet.

14:22 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

14:24 SATYA We have it and

14:25 SATYA (?) It's like that Catch twenty I'm reminded of that Catch-22, that patient, where there's one pipe going in and one pipe going out. And then the guy asks, Why not just remove the guy in between and just join the two pipes? So why what I mean Oculus Rift just why is that person even there?

14:46 PRAYAS Yeah, it might it might be just pixels. So the I mean the digital reality actually wants to drown erase the individual.

14:56 Yeah.

14:57 MOSES SAM It could happen, it could happen. Okay. So because there was this quote by Elon Musk who said we are we are not the end of evolution. We are just like a comma there, you know. So the next evolu evolved species is obviously gonna take over us and we shouldn't be worrying about it, you know, like what will happen if machines have brains and now what if they start to dominate us and everything, because that's the natural progression, you know. Neanderthals are not there to even think about those things because you know we were smarter than them and those guys died, right?

15:31 SATYA At a personal level we will worry.

15:34 SATYA (?) Yeah.

15:35 SATYA (?) But yeah, but I see your point. I mean the world and the universe moves out as it has to.

15:41 SATYA (?) But do you agree with that?

15:44 MOSES SAM I mean even if we agree or not we i that's the flow and we just have to accept it.

15:49 That's flow, yeah.

15:50 PRAYAS Yeah.

15:50 No, but do we have to accept it? How do we know we have to accept it?

15:56 MOSES SAM Okay, if you accept it, there won't be pain. I mean

16:01 SPEAKER 3 Yeah, I mean at a global at a higher level if you look at it, things will happen, right?

16:08 AKSHAY Fatalist.

16:09 Way of looking at things. Like if we don't want to evolve the way we are seeing the future, we have to stop it.

16:17 PRAYAS I mean I'm not saying that i the idea of evolution is faulty. I'm just saying that what if we are evolution? So you know

16:28 AKSHAY (?) We are even putting that into what we have.

16:31 PRAYAS (?) So what if evolution is progressing through us, not in spite of us?

16:38 PRAYAS (?) I mean it is.

16:39 SATYA I mean it's both. It's both ways. I mean it's it if we were to remove ourselves completely it'll be all fine. I mean, you know, the trees will be fine.

16:50 But at this moment we are also evolving and we also have some paths to go through because this is also one channel.

16:58 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean the cyborgs of the future

17:02 PRAYAS (?) -huh.

17:03 PRAYAS (?) Might be us, you know. So we might be I mean what I'm saying is

17:07 MOSES SAM Very true, very true. Okay. So this guy's m George McKenna, he said the moment that we invented language, biological evolution stopped and evolution became a cultural epigenetic phenomenon.

17:23 MOSES SAM (?) Okay.

17:23 MOSES SAM (?) So th this goes back to, you know, our discussion about language and you know, all this problem came out because we invented language and we have to speak, you know, those kind of things, right?

17:34 AKSHAY I would take it back to the day we developed any tool like anything like the in fact I have split the entire evolution to a point where the moment you decided to do a sedentary kind of life.

17:51 MOSES SAM (?) Huh.

17:51 MOSES SAM (?) Because

17:53 SATYA Isn't that affecting our physicality? Isn't that affecting our biology? For example, recently I saw something about how our reading habits have changed. Like we are taking in information bit very quickly now. Like how our eyes move has changed. So that must lead to some change in our biology, no?

18:10 SATYA (?) In the brain maybe, I don't know. Yeah.

18:12 MOSES SAM Okay, so then that's again biology.

18:18 AKSHAY Anyway, sorry, you were saying something Moses, that the McKenna said that the language developed was that we broke from the biological world.

18:29 MOSES SAM I mean he said I mean till then it was more like a biological evolution, right? Like as Satya was saying maybe, you know the oxygen content reduced, so we came out with better ways to breathe, you know, our physicalities, our features changed. But then in the future it'll be more epigenetic phenomenon in the sense, you know, we'll be creating our own exoskeleton of sorts, which will be these technological wearable devices, you know, which we are seeing, right? Is that biological? So though they are not huh? So that's exactly so if you look at it as a biological evolution then you're accepting the fact that these technological exoskeletons are part of you. If you don't look at it as a biological evolution, then you look at it as two separate things. You're looking at it as a as a Robocop, right? Like a human being surrounded by technology or something.

19:24 SATYA Yeah, but you know what, that person who's inside that exoskeleton, their skin colour might change because of lack of contact with sunlight or something. What I'm trying to say is there is biological evolution.

19:37 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean you cannot deny that just because we have cultural evolution. Just because you know after a point I mean I wouldn't say that after a point biological evolution got replaced by cultural evolution. It just became two channel. So, you know, along because of language we have been undergoing this cultural evolution, but also the biological evolution hasn't stopped.

20:05 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

20:07 SATYA And also language, the way we speak. Like s some languages are in some ways. They use their facial muscles and their tongue in some particular ways. Other languages use it. If their if that goes on forever, then maybe our bodies adapt to that. Or if we all speak English, our bodies change to adapt to English.

20:27 PRAYAS (?) So the second question for today is can refraction be a curse?

20:36 And is it voluntary or is it involuntary?

20:45 AKSHAY Yeah, refraction can be a curse and I think maybe it is mostly involuntary, I don't know.

21:03 Many times by doing the refraction you realise a lot of things you won't have bothered about in a way. And they become a noise, extra noise.

21:23 PRAYAS No, we spoke about the possibility of refraction being something that's

21:31 Before the individuation process, so b it's not po as it possibly not being personal.

21:41 Mm.

21:42 So in that sense, if it's not personal, it might be involuntary or not. I mean that's the question and

21:53 Can it be a curse in the sense that if is it a compulsion that we have to bear the consequences of or

22:08 It's something that adds possibly meaning. So like you're saying Akshay, does it add noise or does it add meaning?

22:18 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, so it depends it depends on the output of refraction, right?

22:25 W what's the output of a refraction? Have we established that? Did I miss that?

22:31 PRAYAS Effects no I'm not sure if we looked at that yet. We spoke about the effects of refraction.

22:41 Which could be I mean, which could be the same as outputs.

22:46 PRAYAS (?) Mm.

22:46 PRAYAS (?) But

22:48 AKSHAY (?) Yeah, I think okay, if you are looking at the output, it does produce as meaning.

22:53 PRAYAS But does it? I mean, I'm saying that okay, if refraction is something that's happening involuntary as an involuntary process, just by experiencing things without filtering them because it's happening before our personhood is even active.

23:16 Then you know what if you want to check out, you know, we really want to check out, but we are stuck

23:26 AKSHAY (?) No, are we talking about the input here or are we talking about the output?

23:30 PRAYAS We're talking about the

23:34 Output of refraction, the input for the person's experience.

23:42 SATYA Wait, output of refraction.

23:45 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so refraction has occurred on the surface as an optical process.

23:51 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

23:52 SATYA (?) And so that becomes the input of the perceiver, right?

23:55 PRAYAS Yeah the person. And at that at that level it'll

24:04 You know, prevent you from checking out.

24:07 AKSHAY (?) That will take us to our yesterday's discussion whether it can be we can the per surface can be opaque or reflective or what.

24:15 AKSHAY (?) Right.

24:17 PRAYAS Yeah, it's just I think another way of looking at that question, but I think it ca it could possibly shed a new light on that question. If it feels like we are going nowhere, we'll switch to the next one.

24:32 SATYA So we are n now not considering personalisation anymore, are we? Because see, when we use the word curse, there is a judgment to it, meaning and curse, right?

24:44 PRAYAS Yeah, so it's a bad it's a bad tangent. It's being on the so you know, may bad things happen to you. That's a curse.

24:54 SATYA (?) But are we attributing meaning to curse as a personal meaning or is it just curse as in something an in unwanted tangent?

25:05 PRAYAS Yeah, unwanted tangent. So, you know, just like a magical thing. So imagine an animal cursing an animal.

25:13 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

25:15 So just like a you know, like a magic you know, just like a spell.

25:25 SPEAKER 4 No, but how can you define then that it is negative? Animal cursing animal

25:31 PRAYAS No, I mean an animal curse might be may you get eaten tomorrow morning.

25:38 Yeah.

25:39 MOSES SAM May you be born as a human being in your next life.

25:43 Yeah.

25:43 -huh.

25:45 MOSES SAM (?) Especially if you're a cow, right?

25:51 PRAYAS No, I mean I'm just saying that the curse as in the
25:57 Does refraction take us on roads that we don't want to walk on?

26:03 SATYA Yeah, I would yeah, I think so.

26:08 PRAYAS And that's a
26:08 Sense yeah, preventing us from checking out and forcing us to consume.
26:15 PRAYAS (?) Or forcing us to conform.
26:20 But yeah, confirming yeah, confirm yeah, conforming to compulsive necessary experience.

26:29 SATYA Yes. You are forced to be there. So it is involuntary and you're forced to be doing certain things that they don't want to be doing.

26:39 PRAYAS Yeah, so isn't this compulsion absolute?

26:44 SPEAKER 3 Yeah, I think so. I mean at a very fundamental level it is.

26:48 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so I mean in the sense y we are here and like n Nu Paradox is saying whether we like it or not.
26:56 Okay.
26:58 PRAYAS (?) And we are here and
27:03 PRAYAS (?) That is a curse.

27:05 AKSHAY (?) But I think that is taking us into a meta again, like please.

27:09 MOSES SAM (?) Is it taking us into the meta?
27:11 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

27:12 NU PARADOX (?) Right a cast. [?]
27:13 NU PARADOX (?) But
27:15 That's a pessimistic outlook, I think. Why is it a curse

27:21 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I'm not sure if it's

27:26 AKSHAY Yeah, even I had a doubt if it's meta like that, how can you define that it's a curse? Like it's very abstract if you cannot deal with it and it's already input for us.
27:39 A given, yeah.

27:41 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
27:41 PRAYAS (?) But we differentiated between the abstract and the meta yesterday.
27:49 I think

27:50 SPEAKER 5 Is it?

27:52 PRAYAS I mean that's what we figured that it's not. I mean if anything we have two things and that's the abstract and the meta and it's worthwhile to differentiate b between these two.
28:09 PRAYAS (?) Yes.
28:10 So
28:13 We are wondering if refraction can be a curse and if it's voluntary or involuntary. and yeah, so if being here is a is a curse, then what's to be done from it? I mean

28:35 SATYA I mean it depends on the surface. Like if the refraction feels it depends on how it is being refracted. For some people it well I mean, not people. For some surfaces it might be a curse, for others maybe it's not.
28:49 SATYA (?) Depends on how things are being refracted, no?

28:52 PRAYAS No, but if re Yeah, sure. Right. So yeah. So
29:00 But if it's involuntary
29:04 Yeah.
29:05 We can't avoid the we can't avoid experiencing the refraction from surfaces which are cursed.

29:17 SPEAKER 3 Yes.

29:21 PRAYAS (?) So that means we can't really we are really at the mercy of the world in the sense that

29:30 No, if I want to if somebody really wants to mi have you experience
29:37 Something really thick and sodid [?], I mean in that sense undesirable.
29:41 Yeah.
29:42 Then you can't do s anything about it.

29:44 SATYA Yeah, I mean that's true at so many levels. Like our consumer our economics, our political structures, like at so many levels that's true.

30:02 MALAVIKA (?) But what does a curse do besides mapping out an undesirable tangent?

30:12 PRAYAS (?) Curse can also provide momentum for a new tangent.
30:19 PRAYAS (?) Right, before we go into looking at it as desirable or undesirable.

30:30 NU PARADOX Cause
30:31 That's...

30:32 MALAVIKA The next step, I mean
30:35 To decide whether it is a curse or not comes after much analysis I would imagine.

30:46 PRAYAS Yeah, so half the times we don't even know whether we are dealing with a curse or a
30:52 Yeah.
30:52 Or a good thing.
30:53 True.

30:54 MALAVIKA And especially if it's involuntary then you don't even consider it I mean you don't take it into consideration to analyze in the first place because you just know that it's involuntary things are happening and I don't I don't see how
31:16 Or when you start thinking of it as a curse.

31:21 SATYA Yeah, and what you thought of a curse at one point may feel like a not a curse at another point, when you've reached a new place.

31:31 MALAVIKA Yes, and maybe I'm just wondering if other responses would have already begun to take place before one is considering a kind of a value judgment about it.
31:46 Yeah.

31:47 AKSHAY Yeah, that's what I meant. I think refraction produces meaning and how we take it can be either a meaning or a noise for us. So that the moment it enters us then it's kind of we can define whether it's curse or a boon.
32:05 It makes sense.
32:07 AKSHAY (?) But overall refraction produces meanings. So it is in a way positive.

32:19 MALAVIKA You mean to say either of it prompts a response?
32:24 Go ahead.
32:24 Y you mean to say it either way prompts a response and so it is positive.

32:30 AKSHAY Yeah, I'm in the sense like say if we yeah, it is always creating a meaning. So it's on our situation whether we like look at it as a negative, positive. That's why I think this curse is a bit of a problem to
32:46 Right.
32:47 Imply a pessimist point of view.
32:49 Yeah.
32:50 Right.

32:51 SATYA Yeah.
32:51 No but what also?
32:55 Sorry that's why I was asking, when we say curse, does is that what we are meaning it to be? Like is curse negative or is it like you said, an animal cursing another animal? It has to happen and it happens. So it is an inflection point.

33:10 PRAYAS Yeah, and I mean if you look at it as infection, you know, so if a curse were to be infective. Infecti infective, yeah. Infectious actually, sorry.

33:24 SATYA Okay, I said inf I said inflection, but infection is kind of

33:31 PRAYAS So if a curse were to be infectious so i if it had some effective, you know, kind of result in the sense

33:46 You know that it really changes something on impact. So it's like an accident on the road and not like bad news.

33:58 SATYA (?) Right. So it's noise versus

34:02 PRAYAS I mean it's like an accident on the road. So you know if something is going to hit you at high velocity, your whatever you are if you're if you're walking you'll die. If you're in a car it'll get dented.

34:17 For sure.

34:23 So if the if the impact itself has a corrosive nature

34:31 Then the I think the matter of judging it doesn't come up.

34:38 But what is corrosion?

34:41 Mean corrosion could be a really I mean corrosion is

34:47 PRAYAS (?) Cindy. [?]

34:47 PRAYAS (?) Generally seen to be physically

34:51 Degradation? No, perhaps.

34:53 Yeah, phys a physically degrading process.

34:57 SATYA But if the degradation did not happen, the stardust wouldn't form and then we wouldn't come out of the stardust.

35:07 I think that's

35:08 PRAYAS I didn't get that.

35:11 SATYA (?) I'm sorry, I was quoting Carl Sagan again, we are made of star stuff as he says. So I mean things great.

35:17 NU PARADOX (?) Otherwise it's a union, not degradation. It's a it's the coming together of elements rather than falling apart of things.

35:27 PRAYAS No but you know if the if the a if the accident happens on the road

35:37 You know, it's a immediate it's going to have an immediate effect.

35:43 PRAYAS (?) Right.

35:44 So that kind of impact. So if a curse is something which you could possibly I mean the cultural curse, you know, the words that you say with bad intention, if those words I mean that's just a cultural notion of a curse, but if you say those words and if they could kill someone on hearing them

36:12 AKSHAY You are talking interesting, I have been listening to these Kabir songs and he said only people who are struck by words wake up. interesting, I don't know.

36:24 PRAYAS Yeah, so if only people who hear words wake up and it might be the same about, you know, going to sleep.

36:34 AKSHAY I'm getting your meaning it a little better now because when you're talking about curse the Kabir song basically says struck by words. So you basically it's like you are struck by a curse in a way.

36:48 PRAYAS Yeah, and that's before you assign values to it.

36:52 Mm.

36:53 SPEAKER 5 Yes. events. Yeah.

36:58 AKSHAY (?) Okay, so I don't see now it has a my it does sound negative, but it has a positive.

37:04 SATYA (?) Yeah, that's what I was saying. It's an it's a change in direction. It's a catalyst.

37:10 PRAYAS So can you look at the road accident as a as a catalyst or as a change in direction?

37:16 SATYA I mean for the person who's getting hit, you know, that's an unfortunate or a fortunate, who knows? But immediately it looks unfortunate. But it you know, there are so many of these movies where a chain of events happens and somebody gets affected, somebody gets somebody meets somebody else because of this accident.

37:33 SATYA (?) Dai. [?]
37:33 SATYA (?) I don't know if we can I don't know.
37:35 NU PARADOX I think it's not as simple as black and white. Events happen and we color it with meaning through our expectations or h understanding or whatever outcome that we expect out of it, you know, to our benefit or not. So I think events happen deriving something
37:59 MOSES SAM When do we color it though? Do we color it at the point of impact or do it at a later point in time? Where then it becomes narrativizing, right?
38:09 NU PARADOX So immediately, in fact, as soon as it happens, right, there's no delay because you respond, you react, you try to give meaning to what happened.
38:17 PRAYAS Butterfly effect is meta. I mean you just I mean by the benefit of continuity, you might think that some things are connected and all of that, but you don't really know it. So I mean in the construct that we differentiated the meta from the abstract I would think
38:37 SATYA If you go went down the line of your own reality and that eventuality may not have happened without that butterfly effect taking place. So if you look at it from a different p time point in time.
38:51 PRAYAS (?) I mean so in the sense th that's a popular kind of scientific stance, but I mean correlation doesn't suggest mean cause causality. Yeah.
39:04 SATYA Not necessarily, but that something happened and there is in this situation we are talking about co causality, we are not talking about correlation.
39:15 We are talking about a curse. And what does he have? [?]
39:18 PRAYAS We're talking about causality, so exactly. So we I mean what I'm saying is we don't know if the butterfly effect is a chain of causal events or a chain of correlated events. We don't know that.
39:35 AKSHAY What is the butterfly effect? Sorry to be ignorant.
39:40 NU PARADOX (?) It's all connected and we all have to do it.
39:42 MOSES SAM (?) Flaps its wing in small island in Indonesia and storm happens in Western Europe, you know. So it's all connected.
39:52 Connected.
39:53 SPEAKER 3 It's no it's actually like an amplification, right? Like a small event causing an amplification.
40:00 SATYA (?) Isn't that what that's what I understood?
40:02 PRAYAS So I mean which basically sa it's like pattern recognition at a very large scale.
40:11 PRAYAS (?) So
40:12 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.
40:14 SATYA (?) So the initial the what happened in the initial conditions has a huge change in the final outcome. If there is a slight difference in initial conditions, there's a huge change in the final outcome.
40:25 SATYA (?) Yeah, but that is just fiction. I mean, I don't know if I can really take the butterfly effect for s I mean, for serious.
40:33 I mean they measure it, right? I don't know. But I see your point. I mean we can't measure everything.
40:37 PRAYAS I'm just saying that is something that happens after the fact. I mean.
40:43 PRAYAS (?) Exactly. Yeah.
40:44 MOSES SAM Yeah.
40:44 Butterfly effect is just another popular narrative.
40:48 PRAYAS Yeah. And with this we go on to the next question. we've spent twenty minutes on the earlier question. Does refraction keep us here?
41:00 PRAYAS (?) And would we would we float away if not for refraction?

41:05 PRAYAS (?) Yes.

41:08 SATYA (?) I mean there's so many questions. What is here? What is floating? What is
41:15 No, I think yeah I

41:16 AKSHAY (?) Can I make this float away also?

41:18 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

41:20 AKSHAY No I think it has an interesting meaning. Float away in the sense you get mired in the in the internal refraction and forget about the refraction. So it refraction does ho give us a hook.

41:37 PRAYAS Yeah, so by cursing you, does it hold on to you? Does it cling on to you?
41:44 PRAYAS (?) Yes. I think

41:47 MOSES SAM (?) Could it. It depends on the strength of your surface.

41:52 PRAYAS So strength in the sense how much I get impacted by the curse.
41:58 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

42:00 MOSES SAM (?) I think it depends on the strength of the perceiver. Huh, okay.

42:05 PRAYAS Strength of the perceiver, yeah, it's the same thing.
42:09 I mean it's the same thing, right? I mean not the surface. So who's the perceiver?
42:16 PRAYAS (?) Receiver.
42:18 Oh who is the receiver?

42:22 MOSES SAM (?) Receiver is the one who paints that picture that comes out of refraction. Essentially data comes out of refraction and then
42:29 Mulligan. [?]
42:30 You paint a beautiful picture or a horrible picture based out of it and that guy becomes the receiver or the perceptor.

42:38 SATYA (?) And it could be more than one surface. It could be that surface itself, it could be the surfaces around it.
42:45 SATYA (?) But I don't mean

42:46 NU PARADOX Than a receiver.
42:49 We're more of a
42:50 NU PARADOX (?) Medium than a receiver.

42:53 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, the deep. [?]

42:55 NU PARADOX (?) At the same time.

42:57 MOSES SAM That's
42:59 MOSES SAM (?) We can hold all that. It passes through us.

43:02 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, some of it.

43:03 MOSES SAM (?) Yep.

43:05 SATYA (?) We just give it meaning and it's out of us again, you know. But I don't want you to hold everything.

43:10 AKSHAY (?) That's what Mo Moses is trying to define, I think that the moment we paint that picture, the moment we define we are the receiver.

43:19 MOSES SAM Right. I mean if you s consider yourself as the medium then there's no difference between the surface and the medium itself, right? Like the surface is part of the medium then.

43:28 PRAYAS But I thought we were looking at refraction as an objective process before that happens, before the individual comes into question.

43:39 AKSHAY But then how do you define the receiver?

43:42 PRAYAS Yeah, so the that's what I'm saying. So the receiver is the individual.

43:48 SATYA Yeah.
43:48 Well, the surface has to receive first and then it can transmit or do whatever it wants with it.

43:55 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but then at the time of reception there is no receiver.
44:00 PRAYAS (?) So that surface is also an individual receiver then.
44:03 AKSHAY (?) Yeah.
44:05 SATYA (?) There is no individual. I mean
44:06 SPEAKER 6 Oh but the refraction is defining the individual.
44:11 PRAYAS Not as not like we spoke about it today in the sense that you know, it could be a purely objective purely optical process. It could be an objective process in the sense that it has nothing to do with the individual.
44:27 SATYA (?) So there is a surface that's receiving something.
44:31 PRAYAS Yeah, that's okay. But does the reception imply a receiver?
44:38 SATYA It may or may not. You're right. It may or may not.
44:42 Because the im imply reception means when you say reception then there is some processing happening after the reception has happened.
44:50 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean so you can imagine a radio but if you imagine somebody listening to the radio, then the individual comes into question. And
45:05 AKSHAY No, so in that if you say radio and listener, who is the receiver then?
45:12 PRAYAS Yeah, there is I mean the listener, but I don't think the
45:18 The receiver exists. I mean the list I don't think the think the listener exists. In this c in this model.
45:25 PRAYAS (?) Right.
45:27 SATYA Why did not exist?
45:28 SATYA (?) You're saying that the eardrum exists.
45:30 PRAYAS Yeah.
45:35 Akshay, it doesn't exist because we
45:39 We tried to zoom in today and in the zooming in we were talking about refraction happening at a level before the individual even exists.
45:54 MOSES SAM Okay.
45:54 Yeah.
45:55 AKSHAY So I don't get it. How does it define the eardrum then? Whose eardrum?
46:01 PRAYAS So as a very physical process, as some I mean not physical in the sense of tangible, but like about defined by physics, as framed by physics.
46:14 MOSES SAM Mm.
46:17 AKSHAY Okay.
46:23 MALAVIKA But if you're zooming in to that extent then where did the question of curse come in?
46:29 PRAYAS I mean that's why the curse was it was a good joke to yeah, I mean in the sense bring in because it sounded like it's you know, a curse sounds like it's a bad thing and badness is defined by culture and culture involves individuals, but then we spoke about the curse as a as something that has a corrosive effect by default, irrespective of culture, irrespective of language. And so that kind of took care of the curse as in as not being something outside this
47:12 And what about floating away?
47:14 SPEAKER 3 Exactly.
47:18 SATYA So if you have the surface and the surface which is kind of like an eardrum is receiving, who's floating away?
47:27 MALAVIKA You can still float and receive while floating.
47:30 SPEAKER 3 Exactly. Yeah.
47:33 PRAYAS (?) So the what keeps the eardrum l in the same place

47:42 AKSHAY (?) Is it the sound?

47:43 SPEAKER 6 It doesn't it's not in the same place.

47:47 AKSHAY Why?

47:48 AKSHAY (?) Bem. [?]

47:49 PRAYAS How is it moving?

47:51 MALAVIKA Why is it not moving? Nothing is still.

47:55 PRAYAS Seriously, I mean how

47:57 MALAVIKA I'm curious, if you talk of floating away, if you talk of the reci receiver floating away and you're talking of the receiver the eardrum being the crucial part, then why would it have to be stationary? Why are we assuming a stillness?

48:15 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, I mean I'm just saying okay, the sec the second part of the question maybe is just qualifying the first part. So basically maybe the only question here is does refraction keep us here?

48:31 AKSHAY (?) It's irrelevant.

48:34 MALAVIKA (?) Whether it keeps us here or not.

48:36 PRAYAS (?) Exactly.

48:38 MALAVIKA (?) Goodbye. [?]

48:41 AKSHAY (?) Because the refraction is happening one way or another.

48:44 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, it's involuntary, so

48:48 I mean I'm just I'm just wondering if this compulsion to experience that we talked about this you know involuntary refraction is this what is defining our presence, our kind of you know, our being here. And if this were not to be, if the noise were to disappear, would we disappear also?

49:17 MOSES SAM Yeah, we would.

49:23 MOSES SAM (?) Obviously. Because

49:26 ADITYA Because we would not be connected with the stream of this consciousness then.

49:32 PRAYAS Yeah. So I mean in that sense it's not really a funny question.

49:36 ADITYA Absolutely. It's not.

49:40 SATYA If the physicality is not there, then

49:50 We're not here.

49:52 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean the so it's like these claws that are going out and you know, if these claws grip you are here. If it they don't grip you're not here.

50:05 MALAVIKA (?) Wait a minute. where did consciousness come in when we're talking of the eardrum?

50:12 PRAYAS It's the consciousness is the it's the sound that's hitting the h eardrum.

50:19 ADITYA Yeah.

50:29 SATYA (?) We were talking about floating away and staying here.

50:32 Yeah.

50:33 That's why

50:36 PRAYAS And here is in the sense of you know, always bringing it I think using the word here always brings in consciousness.

50:47 By default, I mean you can't talk about a notion of here without okay if here then where, you know? So it's in a I mean here lives in a pocket of consciousness.

51:08 MALAVIKA Effectively.

51:09 ADITYA Yeah, consciousness is as simple as I hearing something or I seeing something. It's if I'm conscious I'm seeing and it's not a spiritual word if at all it sounds like that.

51:22 PRAYAS It's the container though. And you know so yesterday we were talking about her talking about the container.
51:32 When we are actually contained
51:36 PRAYAS (?) Is the meta and that's something which we are trying to do less of this time.
51:45 ADITYA (?) But if you define if you are describing it like that, the eardrum seems to be part of the meta.
51:50 SATYA What is part of the meta?
51:52 PRAYAS (?) The eardrum?
51:54 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. Okay. How is the eardrum part of the meta?
51:57 SATYA (?) Because even if it's me sitting inside a airplane or if it is my consciousness within the shell of my body, the vessel.
52:08 SATYA (?) Mm.
52:12 SATYA (?) Where do you draw the distinction?
52:14 PRAYAS No, if I if I have a camera with a really big lens, you know, and I'm looking into a mirror into a mirror image of my eardrum. Mm- and I can actually notice the vibrations caused by the act of listening something.
52:37 Okay.
52:41 PRAYAS (?) I can actually do that. So I'm not sure if it's something which I can only imagine and not do.
52:55 PRAYAS (?) So why would it be like s thinking of the airplane in which I'm sitting?
53:00 SATYA Mean you can still see the engine running or you can have a video camera showing you how the engine is running in the plane.
53:10 PRAYAS Okay. No but okay. Right. Right. No, but I can look at a mirror image and mirror image is not a mediated image, but yeah, y no but you're right. So I'm looking at something that I don't know.
53:32 Yeah, I can't look at it directly, you mean?
53:35 SATYA Yeah, I mean it just feels like the vessel and whatever are the recipient surfaces seem to be meta to me now.
53:43 PRAYAS Right. So I can I because I'm inside the body
53:48 Yeah.
53:49 For me to look at the body from the outside.
53:52 Yeah.
53:53 Is necessarily meta and we cannot do that.
53:57 Yeah.
53:58 Okay. So Aditya then before consciousness we actually go we have to roll back even before the eardrum.
54:11 ADITYA (?) And because we cannot talk about the eardrum.
54:19 PRAYAS But that takes us right away back. I don't know what where we were before that.
54:27 SATYA (?) Is it a curse?
54:30 SATYA (?) Right.
54:31 MALAVIKA Yeah.
54:32 PRAYAS No, we were we were cursed before that. So essentially we have to start thinking about this the third question all over again within six minutes.
54:41 MOSES SAM (?) I think the third question has to be twisted the other way.
54:45 PRAYAS (?) Okay. So feel free to twist.
54:50 MALAVIKA Tell me the untwisted version then.
54:52 PRAYAS (?) Does refraction keep us here?
54:55 MOSES SAM Ah okay. So w we are able to perceive refraction only because we are there.

55:05 MOSES SAM (?) So refraction does keep us here.
55:08 MOSES SAM (?) No we keep refraction there.
55:12 Yeah.
55:13 SATYA (?) The caption [?] keeps us there but not here.
55:17 MOSES SAM No there and here means the conscious self of being. So we are conscious at some point in space and we perceive refraction. And if we don't perceive refraction then it's not happening.
55:33 NU PARADOX (?) Correct.
55:35 Yeah, the two both.
55:36 NU PARADOX (?) Is it possible to check out?
55:39 PRAYAS To chicken out.
55:40 PRAYAS (?) To check out.
55:41 Same thing. Same thing, yeah.
55:45 SPEAKER 3 Yeah, thank you.
55:49 MOSES SAM (?) Tree falls in the forest question, right?
55:54 No, it's possible to check out only if you know that refraction is gonna happen. But what if you don't know?
56:02 ADITYA No, it's possible to check out only if you know that refraction is not going to happen when you check out. But within this frame, from this frame that we are refracting, and this frame that is refracting, right in its own frame, there is the inference that has been there is an inference that is that there is refraction. But what is refraction and how do we know how do we know
56:32 That checking out would disable refraction or checking out would not be this or how different would it be? How do we know anything apart from this thing, this state?
56:47 Fa fain. [?]
56:49 Yeah.
56:57 PRAYAS (?) But you are assuming that we want to experience a refraction.
57:05 And you are assuming that refraction is not spam.
57:10 It's not undesirable.
57:13 Or not a curse.
57:14 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, or not a curse.
57:21 ADITYA Wait.
57:22 But
57:23 It can be spam or not based on how I look at it. Based on what
57:29 PRAYAS No, but the curse can be the accident on the road. It will dent your car.
57:37 NU PARADOX (?) You don't want your car to be dented.
57:40 NU PARADOX (?) But maybe I'll get a new car.
57:42 ADITYA (?) Exactly. Maybe I'll maybe I like dents.
57:47 SPEAKER 5 Maybe we'll get a good challenge cable. [?]
57:51 PRAYAS (?) No, but you can't I mean I don't know if anyone would consciously hope for an accident.
58:00 NU PARADOX Oh, many do. Insurance claims, yeah.
58:03 Yeah.
58:04 ADITYA (?) Dogs hope for accidents. I've seen a sparrow standing right behind the wheel of a car waiting for the car to back itself and
58:12 MOSES SAM Because it wants to test its flight.
58:15 MOSES SAM (?) Yes.
58:21 MOSES SAM (?) I'm pretty sure all of us throw our throw ourselves off cliffs.

58:26 SATYA At least the ones who are in this room right now.

58:29 PRAYAS Right. But so the twisted version of this third question works. So
58:39 What you said, Sam, that we keep refri refraction there.
58:49 PRAYAS (?) Does it work? So I mean, is that what we have established?

58:53 MALAVIKA That looks
58:56 MALAVIKA (?) We keep refraction there.

58:58 ADITYA We are responsible for the refraction that happens.

59:01 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. That's a better way to frame it.

59:04 SATYA The other way round.

59:08 PRAYAS Right. So there is there is a possibility for the actor to turn the script around.
59:20 And to simultaneously be scripting and acting out.

59:26 SATYA Exactly. Yes, exactly.
59:29 SATYA (?) Yeah.

59:31 MOSES SAM User centric design.

59:37 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, but that's not funny, it's true.

59:39 ADITYA It is true.
59:39 That self-organized

59:42 SATYA Also

59:43 MOSES SAM If it's funny it's not.
59:45 MOSES SAM (?) No, but I found it funny only because user centric design is funny because it doesn't work.
59:56 Tell that to Steve Jobs.

59:58 PRAYAS (?) I mean I would I'm sure he would agree because he never did that.
01:00:08 PRAYAS (?) I mean in the sense that when you when you start imagining a user, you start reducing, right? You start assuming.

01:00:18 SATYA (?) Right, which user are we talking about?
01:00:20 Yeah.
01:00:21 SATYA (?) All right.

01:00:22 PRAYAS (?) Right.

01:00:24 NU PARADOX As many as possible.

01:00:27 PRAYAS And we are not talking about user and s user centered design because we are saying that the user is created by the product.

01:00:35 MOSES SAM (?) Correct. So if
01:00:37 The
01:00:38 Creator looks at the user as the reflection of himself or herself, then it won't work. But if he sees the user as a refracted material, then it could work. It could.

01:00:49 PRAYAS (?) Yeah sa a user being someone created by the product.

01:00:54 SATYA A user is an approximation.

01:00:58 PRAYAS But the product's approximation, not ours. Not the not the user of the product. so we are

01:01:06 SATYA Product is created for an approximated user. So it's an approximation for an approximation.

01:01:15 SPEAKER 6 It's approximately manipulated then, the user.

01:01:19 MOSES SAM (?) No but
01:01:19 MOSES SAM (?) Rand [?] on approximations, approximately.

01:01:23 PRAYAS No, but the only approximation that makes sense here is if you look at
01:01:32 The product you know approximating its u its own user. So in the sense that

01:01:45 You know, the actor I mean we keep refraction there, right? So I mean I'm just trying to extend that into the user centered design.

01:01:57 So it was so I think it's a good place to stop today. our twenty minutes for the third question are up and let's meet tomorrow we'll for the day four of Refractive Surfaces at seven PM.

01:02:17 Thanks everyone. Good night.

01:02:18 Okay, for me.

01:02:19 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:02:19 PRAYAS (?) Thanks. Bye.