Refractive Surfaces, Day 4

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 13 September 2014. Watch on YouTube

---

I made this transcript by machine from the recording and corrected it against the recording's description and my own records. I have not checked the words by ear. I checked a sample of the speaker names by ear, and corrected those I heard differently. [?] marks a word still in doubt and [unclear] a passage that could not be made out. A speaker is named only where the broadcast's screen or the recording's own words say who is speaking. Fillers such as "uh" and "um" are left out. Times are from the start of the recording.

A name followed by (?) was read from the screen at a moment when it changed from one speaker to the next, so the turn may belong partly or wholly to the speaker before or after.

Prayas Abhinav · prayasabhinav.net/videos

00:00 PRAYAS Yeah
00:03 Were yesterday one of the places we where we were yesterday. I mean we were all over the place. if we keep the refraction here
00:16 Then what keeps us here?
00:25 SATYA (?) What
00:26 CHETAN Hi Prayas.
00:28 CHETAN (?) Yeah, hi.
00:30 CHETAN (?) I thought we established yesterday that we keep the refraction here and not the other way around.
00:37 SATYA (?) Do you know what method I think I did? [?]
00:42 CHETAN (?) We generate this refraction. So it depends on us rather than the other way around.
00:53 SATYA (?) I don't we clearly establish that this.
00:54 PRAYAS Depend on us so we keep a refraction here. It's yeah so if we keep a refraction here, who keeps us here?
01:07 So how do we manage to hang around? How come we are still here and
01:15 CHETAN (?) Because of the code.
01:17 CHETAN (?) It's cool. [?]
01:17 CHETAN (?) Code, intelligent design, we are designed to pick on certain things and
01:22 So we are designed
01:24 Yes.
01:24 Yeah.
01:27 CHETAN (?) I think we're part of abstraction.
01:30 MALAVIKA (?) Be a part of the refraction.
01:34 PRAYAS So that's why and look and so you're saying that it's a loop.
01:39 PRAYAS (?) Yes.
01:40 Because we keep refraction here and because refraction also keeps it here. It's both at the same time.
01:48 We also
01:49 SATYA We also keep ourselves here.
01:54 SATYA (?) Perhaps through refraction.
01:55 CHETAN Yeah.

01:57 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so we keep ourselves here because we keep refraction here and refraction keeps us here. I mean because of that we keep ourselves here.

02:07 MALAVIKA (?) We are a result of the refraction.

02:11 Yeah, I'm just saying that it's a chain.

02:13 MALAVIKA (?) But also the converse is true.

02:16 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

02:18 PRAYAS (?) The fact that refraction is a result of us. The converse is also true.

02:22 CHETAN (?) That's true.

02:24 PRAYAS Yeah.

02:24 That's it.

02:25 Yeah we just we just all like being here, we'll think that it's a it's a it's a loop.

02:37 We do something and something does us at the same time.

02:41 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

02:43 PRAYAS (?) So it's a loop.

02:47 So

02:48 SATYA (?) We also do ourselves.

02:52 PRAYAS So besides doing

02:55 Something.

02:58 We also do us.

03:01 SATYA (?) Yeah.

03:03 How is that?

03:09 The f the reason that anything is here is because we are here.

03:16 PRAYAS How do we know that?

03:19 We don't have to do that.

03:20 CHETAN (?) I think it's the tree falling in the forest.

03:24 Yeah, correct.

03:25 CHETAN (?) Yeah.

03:26 PRAYAS No. yeah, it's meta, right? I mean it's something which we cannot talk about. We don't really know.

03:36 PRAYAS (?) There we go.

03:36 PRAYAS (?) Observing ourselves.

03:41 Yeah, but can we observe ourselves? Can we I mean th that's what I'm saying, we do that, sure. I mean we might, but isn't that meta?

03:51 SATYA It yeah, it is yeah. It does seem meta, yes. And like we talked about yesterday, we observe ourselves, that doesn't mean

04:00 SPEAKER 4 We are feeling

04:02 SATYA (?) That process as the process is happening or I don't know how to say it.

04:10 PRAYAS Yeah, so we cannot we can I think it's if it's a loop, it's more a viable as in idea than thinking that it's something else.

04:31 MALAVIKA (?) Right? So that's true. Yeah. So it just helps us if we help us go on, if we just

04:39 Go with the loop.

04:40 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, you just go with the loop.

04:43 SATYA (?) Right.

04:47 CHETAN I think things seems to make sense if we go without judgment. to arrive at whether it's a good thing or a bad thing, you know, the fact that it's a loop.

04:58 PRAYAS (?) But is the loop also not too big an idea? So is i maybe we can't even talk about the loop because maybe even the loop is meta.

05:10 SATYA That's what. I mean, it's h the description is where we're having trouble.

05:16 SATYA (?) And

05:17 PRAYAS We should try and describe it in a way

05:21 Yeah.

05:22 PRAYAS (?) That is

05:24 Big enough but not bigger.

05:28 CHETAN But why describe it in the first place? Ex is it experience good enough? I mean do we have to use words and communicate with each other to perhaps complete our experience or

05:41 CHETAN (?) I guess

05:42 SATYA (?) I would like to communicate to myself. It's like one of my interests.

05:48 PRAYAS Yeah, conversation is an opportunity to also generate content, right?

05:56 CHETAN Yeah, thinking could be considered a conversation with oneself.

06:01 PRAYAS Involves thinking.

06:07 SATYA (?) But you know what, when there is a conversation that generates content which my thinking cannot bring up.

06:16 PRAYAS Yeah. I mean so and so isolated thinking will not bring it up.

06:21 Yeah.

06:22 That's why we yeah, I mean we need

06:24 CHETAN (?) I mean when you say bring it up, what do you mean exactly?

06:28 SATYA (?) Like I cannot get ideas that you get. You might be a genius from whom I can learn.

06:36 PRAYAS (?) No, it's not about the other person actually. It's about the

06:40 CHETAN Yeah, the objective thing.

06:43 SATYA (?) It's not even it's another idea which cannot arise within me. Like when I think I won't get that idea.

06:50 SATYA (?) Yeah.

06:51 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

06:52 PRAYAS (?) That's true. But I'm saying it's not about the other person. It's about

06:57 PRAYAS (?) The idea.

06:58 SATYA That person called.

07:01 Yeah.

07:06 PRAYAS So yeah, that's why we are describing.

07:10 MALAVIKA (?) We think we think we describe.

07:21 CHETAN So I think meta is the white light and refraction through, you know, perception. They are the various colours and the gradient and

07:31 PRAYAS (?) I mean meta is not the white light only because the white light is not taboo.

07:39 PRAYAS (?) I don't understand.

07:44 CHETAN Taboo. Why is meta taboo?

07:47 PRAYAS (?) I mean because it's it is really outside the scope of discussion for us. It's like if we skip into a tavern [?]

07:54 Endless regression.

07:55 PRAYAS (?) Position.

07:57 Yeah, okay.

07:59 That's why we're just trying to keep it out and by trying to do that we have it nicely cut out for us in terms of okay, this is the rule.

08:09 SATYA (?) Okay. Framework within which you work.

08:15 CHETAN I don't know, is it?

08:21 SATYA I feel like white light is m everything. It's all the information that's hitting the surface.

08:31 CHETAN The hive mind.

08:37 Everything put together.
08:39 Mm.
08:39 It excludes nothing.
08:42 CHETAN (?) Yeah.
08:45 SATYA (?) Doesn't leave anything in it.
08:48 SPEAKER 4 I mean when you say hive mind that again becomes a container of sorts.
08:54 CHETAN But it's all our awareness and perception ideas put together and treating it as a whole, like a union of everything.
09:07 SATYA (?) Yeah.
09:09 CHETAN So I don't know, without which there'd be void, right? I mean that's everything we know put together. So you le you take that out, then th there's nothing left. It's the void then.
09:25 CHETAN (?) Again, void is a concept too, so I don't know.
09:29 PRAYAS (?) No, but if you try to remain with the question
09:33 CHETAN (?) Yeah.
09:35 PRAYAS What do we do with this? So we arrived at the and one of the thoughts we arrived at was that refraction keeps us here.
09:45 And today we are thinking that if a refraction keeps us here, do we also keep the refraction?
09:54 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I think that's essentially the loop. You feed it and it feeds you.
09:59 Yeah, but and but also we figured we are not okay with the loop because the loop is again something that we cannot talk about. It's too big it's too big.
10:11 PRAYAS (?) So we're not
10:12 Too big. Too big.
10:15 Mm.
10:16 SATYA (?) Is it too big? In fact it comes the closest to description. I mean describing experience has been difficult for us. We have felt that. But I feel like describing this loop is actually feeling little more accessible.
10:36 PRAYAS But how can we how can we move the loop?
10:40 SATYA Well, like Malavika just said, we re whatever Malavika just said and I'm unable to re replicate
10:48 MALAVIKA It feeds it and you know, we are fed by it, you know. It's interrelated.
10:53 SATYA Yes. And that seems like a accessible concept.
11:01 We feed it and it feeds us. It's like art and life and art, that sort of thing.
11:10 PRAYAS (?) So we are okay with that.
11:14 SATYA (?) I mean I feel like there's something there. I don't know if you are
11:18 So yes.
11:19 PRAYAS I mean I'm we can go on. So we can just take it that okay the loop is okay. okay to something okay to you know stay with it. And then the second part of the first question is what role do we play? So if this is a loop and if everything that we do is counterbalanced by something else, so we are essentially one part of a loop. We are not individuals.
11:54 Yeah.
11:54 Who are you to decide your role?
11:58 SATYA Sorry?
11:59 SATYA (?) Is that a trip here? [?]
12:02 PRAYAS (?) Yes, this is until. [?]
12:04 I'm
12:05 I'm saying that who are you to decide your role?
12:12 SATYA I mean I could di I could think about deciding my role. I'm an individual in the sense of my own description of myself.

12:21 PRAYAS But ca in a in a complex system can we decide what we what role we want to play?

12:28 SATYA Right, that's besides the point, yes, I agree that but as a who are you to decide the role? I am a I'm a I'm an individual who thinks that I'm an individual who can decide my role.

12:41 PRAYAS Right. I mean we can decide. We don't really know if that decision will change our role.

12:47 MALAVIKA Yeah, and since you're part of the loop you can you can choose a role. You have a role already. You're already part of the loop.

12:54 CHETAN We have to begin to question what is individuality and what is this separateness that we talk about. What is individuality? What is this separation? What is this identity? We have to define that first.

13:08 PRAYAS (?) The personal experience is the separation, right?

13:13 I mean what the question what the question is pointing towards so the question what role do we play, what's that trying to point towards is if we are essentially part of a loop

13:29 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

13:30 SATYA Do we matter?

13:33 MALAVIKA (?) Yes, I think we will need to and also we will need to define the parameters of that loop.

13:42 PRAYAS (?) What are the parameters of a loop?

13:46 SATYA And there's it feels like there are different loops here. One is the loop of the medium, that is refraction in a collective, versus sorry, and also a loop within the individual, which is the individual defining the role and then the role defining the individual. While the individual is being defined by the refractive surfaces and the refractive surfaces being defined by the so called individual.

14:24 PRAYAS No but

14:27 The loop in context of the surface and context of the refraction.

14:35 Is the same right because in one we are the surface, in one we are the other.

14:42 Right.

14:44 So

14:45 MALAVIKA (?) It have to be the same.

14:47 PRAYAS I mean if you look at something flip flop or flop flip, it's the same thing.

14:54 SATYA No.

14:54 Are there two flip floppings happening? I mean we were trying to just before this we were trying to say is there an individual, what is individual?

15:04 SATYA (?) Yeah.

15:04 SATYA (?) If we go there then there you know, if I don't have the other in front of me right now

15:11 Yeah.

15:11 It's only me or the individual or the you know. Then there is that loop there and then when you take that loop and put it inside another loop.

15:25 PRAYAS Which loop is that? So what do you yourself inside?

15:30 SATYA I guess like we talked about having multiple refractives the collective.

15:38 PRAYAS (?) The collective of what?

15:40 PRAYAS (?) Of multiple refractive surfaces.

15:43 Acha, okay. So if we think of it as a world.

15:47 SATYA Yeah. Like a medium of some kind where the white light is not just e emanating from one source, but there's multiple white light sources.

15:59 PRAYAS But when we are experiencing any one thing

16:05 Do we have a sense of remembering the

16:11 The s second thing, you know, the other thing. So can we think of the world where we are locked into conversation with one part of the world?

16:22 SATYA I mean whether we like it or not, the world is hitting us.

16:28 I mean whether we think about it or not, it's all there.

16:32 PRAYAS Mean that depends on the degree to which the here and now holds you. If you're totally if you're immersed, if you're here

16:41 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

16:42 SATYA (?) And you're only here.

16:45 PRAYAS (?) And all you know is what is this here?

16:50 MALAVIKA See that's what I'm calling the p the parameters of the loop because also you they're not interchangeable like we discussed yesterday, when you're receiving something, when you perceive something how you perceive it depends on where you are.

17:09 And if you're the inverse of that means you're sending out a signal and you're not receiving your the stimulus. So then you would be different. So the flip flop flip won't work in my understanding.

17:30 PRAYAS So flip flop flip doesn't work because it cancels itself out.

17:38 PRAYAS (?) No, they just

17:41 MALAVIKA Independent of each other.

17:43 PRAYAS (?) Flop and flip are independent of each other.

17:45 Yes. Yes.

17:47 MALAVIKA But how can flop and flip be in independent of each of each other?

17:51 It's like black and blue.

17:53 MALAVIKA (?) No, but flop was refraction and flip was us, right?

18:00 PRAYAS (?) Attracting.

18:01 Yeah. And we also exist and the refractive surface also exists and refraction is also happening as far as our experience tells us.

18:13 PRAYAS (?) Right.

18:14 So how can we not exist?

18:18 SATYA Or how can they not be independent?

18:21 MALAVIKA No, it's about direction. The direction of the refraction. Whether it's going from flop to flip or from flip to flop.

18:30 MALAVIKA (?) But then

18:31 PRAYAS You are saying that they don't know that they are part of a loop.

18:36 MALAVIKA (?) Yes.

18:38 SATYA I what I heard from what Malavika said is there is a component of unidirectionality but there is also apart from that there is also feeding going on back and forth.

18:52 MALAVIKA (?) Right. It s sounds like alternating.

18:57 PRAYAS Is not a self conscious process. That's what he's saying. Actually.

19:05 PRAYAS (?) What is not a self conscious process?

19:06 MALAVIKA The feeding.

19:09 SATYA No it could be if it's some kind of a marketing advertisement sort of thing.

19:16 It's good.

19:17 Be a less conscious process.

19:20 PRAYAS (?) No, I mean like ordinarily in a regular I mean it's like it's as a rule.

19:30 SATYA But we have talked about manipulation and manipulation is self conscious.

19:34 PRAYAS Yeah manipulation is self conscious but at the a I mean le I mean we I think we changed our magnification suddenly because we were talking at the level of the analog process, the physic physical process.
19:53 Okay.
19:53 We're talking about the person now
19:58 PRAYAS (?) So did we change our magnification?
20:05 I mean we had all zoomed in. Today did we zoom out.
20:12 SATYA I guess I'm still stuck with being zoomed in.
20:15 PRAYAS No. So are we deciding to zoom out? We can zoom out if
20:21 If you do that mean to the money. [?]
20:27 SATYA (?) Yeah, I suppose zooming out would be harder to comprehend, so that's maybe more interesting.
20:34 SATYA (?) Yeah, so we can zoom out. And if we zoom out, what role do we play?
20:52 What role do we play?
20:54 PRAYAS Is we are switching to the next question now.
20:58 PRAYAS (?) Okay.
20:59 What role do we play was our I think what we came back to as the last question. It was just we're just coming back to it.
21:08 [unclear]
21:09 Tracked in the secondary rather than the primary event. [?]
21:13 Is experience basically banal.
21:18 SATYA Yeah, which is interesting because it ties in very nicely to what you just said, right? The
21:26 PRAYAS What role do we play? Yeah.
21:29 CHETAN We're alchemists, we're piecing things together constantly in terms of concepts, ideas.
21:35 PRAYAS We can't sorry, I can't hear you clearly.
21:39 CHETAN We're alchemists. We're piecing things together. That's the role we play. We're integrating things. Like chemistry fuel.
21:48 PRAYAS But are we integrating as a function of our surface or are we integrating as a function of our individuality?
21:58 CHETAN There is a degree of individuality to it because the tendencies dictate what you pick on and how you perceive certain things, in which way or direction would you go and so there is a sense of identity there or separateness if you will. We don't know what identity is. Because it's all out there anyway. So can we speak for reflection?
22:21 PRAYAS As the second
22:22 PRAYAS (?) [unclear]
22:24 PRAYAS (?) Rather than the primary event.
22:28 PRAYAS (?) Sorry?
22:29 Can we look at refraction as a secondary rather than the primary event?
22:36 SATYA Yeah, maybe that's one way to look at it because if we really talk about two loops existing then maybe that's the secondary loop.
22:46 PRAYAS Yeah. because I mean maybe what we are actually doing when we are in front of when we are part of an experience is experience. And maybe diffraction is produced by analysis. So you know, so when you experience something and then you understand what your experience meant.
23:12 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
23:14 SATYA In a sense it is meta.
23:17 PRAYAS No, is it meta or is it analogous?
23:22 SATYA It is an it is analogous but making sense is making an explanation which

23:33 PRAYAS I mean I'm not saying making sense. I'm saying making I mean acknowledging.

23:40 SATYA Okay.

23:45 PRAYAS (?) What's the one?

23:45 PRAYAS (?) Analysis, but

23:47 PRAYAS (?) I mean, even

23:48 SATYA Acknowledgement is a kind of an analysis, but yeah, I see what you're saying, yeah.

23:58 PRAYAS So if it's a secondary

24:03 Event.

24:06 Then w what we are saying is we have more time. We are not really s constrained to the moment, the split second when

24:23 Our surface actually receives

24:31 SATYA (?) We are not constrained by that moment.

24:33 PRAYAS Yeah, so we have more time. So because at that moment when something hits our surface, it's only experience.

24:46 We have time.

24:48 CHETAN I think rhetorics is meta, really.

24:52 What is better? [?]

24:53 CHETAN (?) Rhetorics.

24:55 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so what is a retired? Yeah. [?]

24:57 CHETAN (?) Is that true product? [?]

25:00 We can we can just go on because it's a loop again, we all know that.

25:06 PRAYAS (?) No, you can

25:08 CHETAN What to do here is basically apply words onto experience. It's always a catch up game, basically, it's never gonna catch up with it. Play as much as you'd like because

25:23 Experiments

25:24 PRAYAS Is rhetoric. Language is rhetoric.

25:30 CHETAN It's a medium of communication. I don't know about rhetoric, maybe as a good commutation to the word rhetoric. But it can go on forever, is what I'm saying. [?]

25:40 CHETAN (?) That's the loop.

25:42 SATYA R rhetoric means

25:48 Communication, right? Like using words to communicate, right?

25:51 CHETAN (?) Yeah, too yeah. Effectively.

25:55 SATYA So we are when we try to construct

26:01 Like refraction is sort of like rhetoric.

26:05 CHETAN (?) It is the degree and all that depends on how well you piece your idea together.

26:13 PRAYAS Is it much simple is it much simpler than that? Maybe

26:17 Yeah.

26:18 SPEAKER 4 Yeah, it could be, yeah.

26:20 PRAYAS It could be just about acknowledging and in that sense just about

26:28 CHETAN (?) What does that change?

26:30 CHETAN (?) Acknowledging the change you're saying.

26:33 No, what does it change? Acknowledging what is going on.

26:36 Yeah.

26:38 CHETAN (?) Change anything.

26:40 CHETAN (?) Or did they change anything?

26:41 CHETAN (?) The experience still remains as is or yes, you know.

26:45 PRAYAS (?) No, because in acknowledgement is by default a filter. You don't ever get acknowledge everything that's part of the landscape. And that is that's why it's analogous to experience because it's not the person has still not come in, you know, so we are talk still operating at the same level of magnification where the person the individual has still not emerged.

27:15 SATYA E acknowledgement seems like the beginning of analysis.

27:20 PRAYAS Mm. No, it's more basic than analysis. Analysis will

27:24 PRAYAS (?) Comes before that.

27:26 PRAYAS (?) Let's see.

27:28 SATYA (?) Yeah.

27:32 PRAYAS But

27:32 Acknowledgement is the file is the you know, the description, the

27:37 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

27:37 PRAYAS (?) File name of the data file.

27:42 SATYA (?) Do file names i impact what happens inside a piece of code?

27:50 For me, you know, I can I can argue that they might. They put me in a state of mind. If I th if I really put effort into thinking about a file name for a piece of code I'm gonna write, it puts me into a creative state. And I'm

28:05 PRAYAS I mean I mean yeah, the label will definitely I mean the packet, in the sense the packet of something

28:14 Yeah.

28:15 We'll definitely have an

28:22 CHETAN (?) Does it give you purpose, direction, identity, if you will?

28:29 SATYA It provides impetus.

28:33 SATYA (?) It's like I know I'm clear access. Sorry? [?]

28:36 CHETAN It will continue regardless of acknowledgement is what I believe.

28:41 PRAYAS N yeah, so I mean we ca I mean we can go on experiencing without acknowledging experience. We are saying that acknowledgement

28:50 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

28:51 CHETAN Not necessary.

28:53 You can go on experiencing without acknowledgement, truly is what it

28:57 CHETAN (?) Yeah, yes, exactly.

29:00 SATYA But what I'm saying is if you acknowledge it, then the way you experience might change.

29:09 CHETAN (?) Does it? That's the question. That's a question, really. Why is it?

29:12 PRAYAS (?) It's a filtered version of experience. It's a filtered. It's a it's a reduced set.

29:18 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

29:19 MOSES SAM (?) Right. It's a reduction, really. So

29:22 PRAYAS So being a reduced set, it's actionable.

29:27 SATYA (?) Yeah.

29:27 SATYA (?) Then it's already questionable because you've reduced it to something more than what it is.

29:34 Yeah.

29:34 [unclear]

29:35 SPEAKER 1 It's what the it's where the person emerges from.

29:48 SATYA (?) From where does the person emerge?

29:50 PRAYAS From the acknowledgement. I mean because everything is ready, then after you acknowledge something then you're just about you are in a state to take the acknowledged experience and analyze it. I mean it's a more basic form of analysis, so

30:13 Right.
30:14 And I mean I'm just saying that acknowledgement is operating at us at a scale of magnification that we are still okay with. In the sense it's still before the emergence of the individual.
30:29 SATYA (?) Right.
30:31 SPEAKER 2 Two things here. sorry, go on second.
30:35 PRAYAS No, sorry.
30:36 SATYA Quickly but acknowledgement is e still depends on the individual, right?
30:45 CHETAN (?) No, how
30:46 PRAYAS (?) So I think what totally
30:48 CHETAN (?) Depends on the individual. I mean
30:50 SATYA (?) Yeah.
30:50 SATYA (?) I think it is.
30:52 PRAYAS No it's an analogous process to experience. It's analogous. It's an analog experience.
31:00 PRAYAS (?) I don't know if it means the same thing or it's or parallel?
31:05 Yeah, it's both similar, it's similar and same. So in the sense that it's also analog. So it's happening because of the because of its own conditions, not because of a specific talent. So as an individual you don't have a have a facility of acknowledgement. Acknowledgement is something which is going to operate in a very sensory way, whether your brain I mean your individuality is intact or not. So even if you are
31:50 SATYA No, but that is individual, right? Because i if a p if an in if a particular surface is not equipped to acknowledge that or to receive that signal, then that acknowledgement won't happen.
32:07 PRAYAS So that I mean, are we calling the individual the body now?
32:12 SATYA No, the surface. Oh no, I'm sorry. yeah, you're right. That's okay.
32:16 PRAYAS That's not the individual.
32:22 PRAYAS (?) What is the individual then?
32:24 SATYA (?) I mean, I don't know, but
32:26 Okay, so w here's what I was trying to go to that we said acknowledgement happens despite the individual. Is that what you just said?
32:36 SATYA (?) Yeah.
32:37 Okay, and what I'm trying to say is acknowledgement might depend on the individual if that container is not equipped.
32:51 So if that container is constructed in a particular way.
32:57 PRAYAS No, I mean equipped with what?
33:01 SATYA And so for example, if it is a fully reflective surface or an opaque surface, then it will re respond in a particular way, but if it's an absorbing surface, then it'll behave in a different way, right? So the acknowledgement will be different in both cases.
33:18 PRAYAS I touched
33:21 Acha, okay, yeah, sure. I mean so as a surface it can be a different kind of surface, so it might perform acknowledgement in a different way. That's what you say.
33:32 SATYA Yeah, and what I'm next saying is that leads to how the individual then receives that signal from that surface.
33:42 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so it'll depend on your specificity, your the condition in which you exist.
33:54 MOSES SAM Yeah. That too.
34:08 PRAYAS So we are okay with refraction being a secondary surface, like a secondary event. We are okay with that?
34:19 So can we move to the subsidiary question which is experience banal?
34:30 And is refraction the flavor that's in your is refraction the rasa and is it is the rasa dinal. [?]

34:39 CHETAN A few other

34:43 PRAYAS (?) The refraction is the rasas.

34:45 CHETAN Yeah, that's the spectrum.

34:48 CHETAN (?) [unclear]

34:48 CHETAN (?) Yeah.

34:49 PRAYAS Let's do your one. Excuse me.

34:52 PRAYAS (?) [unclear]

34:55 Right. So Aditya is suggesting that it's Adhaviran [?]. Then refraction is the residue of experience.

35:05 So not the effect of experience, but the residue which is I mean I

35:11 CHETAN Ah totally. It is a process of condensing or distilling or subtracting from so it could be said that yes it's

35:22 PRAYAS Banal. that's something which is like unproblematic. We are we can agree with that, can we?

35:31 PRAYAS (?) Sorry, what?

35:32 Experience is banal. So by itself without refraction

35:38 MALAVIKA (?) What yeah.

35:39 I don't know. Why would you say that?

35:42 CHETAN Yeah, banal, I don't know why banal. Why the word there's so many other words to pick from when you pick banal. And you automatically want us to see it in a through a certain frame, you know, with banality. You limited yourself to banal.

35:57 PRAYAS Is adding the flavor, the specification of the experience.

36:05 Then th the unspecified experience, is it basically yeah, is it unspecified? So

36:14 Unspecified is the good way to put you.

36:17 Our bias is apparent in the question but

36:20 Right.

36:21 Right, yeah, they do.

36:23 I mean you can I mean I can

36:25 Already.

36:26 Can help us speak the question in a less biased form. [?]

36:31 SATYA Th I mean you mu maybe you had a reason to call it that word though.

36:36 PRAYAS (?) Unspecified.

36:39 CHETAN See, those are the tendencies, right? You pick on certain things.

36:42 PRAYAS So are p is risking uncontaminated [?]. Why? Why uncontaminated?

36:47 CHETAN (?) I don't necessarily think refraction pollutes it, basically refines it or sees it in a particular manner. I don't know if it's

36:55 CHETAN (?) That it's more of a thing.

36:56 Has a negative connotation. I wouldn't use the word pollution.

37:02 PRAYAS (?) You are saying it's distillation.

37:05 CHETAN Distillation again is questionable because it's not

37:11 But that's not.

37:11 You of everything there is but a certain part, an aspect. So it's not necessarily

37:17 PRAYAS (?) That's it.

37:18 CHETAN Presenting the whole, that would be distillation because it's a pure form of the everything. But here it's just one section or a couple of colors of on the spectrum, in the whole spectrum. So it's partial. It's not whole. I wouldn't use distillation either. Residue, yes. I don't know what how do you arrive at residue? What happens?

37:47 SATYA Residue sounds final actually. It's as though everything is like the process is over.

37:51 SATYA (?) End with yeah. Yeah, it sounds like post apocalyp apocalyptic. Apocalypse.

37:58 PRAYAS Is residue a synonym of flavour?

38:03 PRAYAS (?) No

38:04 CHETAN (?) No.

38:06 MALAVIKA Yes. Because the flavour stays back.

38:09 PRAYAS It's yeah, so flavor stays flavor is the residue of experience.

38:16 PRAYAS (?) That's an aftertaste.

38:17 And the flavor is the taste and flavor provides taste to the unspecified.

38:25 Right.

38:26 CHETAN But Adidas tastes are already there. [?] We are not creating tastes as such, it's already there.

38:32 PRAYAS Taste is the I mean fl I mean we are saying I mean flavour is a residue in the sense that after the experience is through, that's what remains.

38:43 SATYA That makes sense.

38:47 PRAYAS (?) So

38:49 PRAYAS (?) Memory perhaps a memory yeah.

38:52 CHETAN So then distillation also works.

38:55 PRAYAS Yeah distillation and

38:58 PRAYAS (?) I have my doubts over distillation then.

39:00 CHETAN (?) Mission?

39:02 PRAYAS (?) And residue.

39:04 SPEAKER 1 That's it. You are the number one.

39:06 CHETAN (?) They seem

39:07 PRAYAS Isn't the residue form

39:11 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

39:12 PRAYAS (?) Yes, so you when you're distilling something, it is a residue. It is a

39:16 SATYA (?) Yeah.

39:18 PRAYAS So there's no end. So we are moving to the next question. If refraction can be a curse, can it also be a pleasurable conversation? And Malavika has suggested a different construction, can it also be a

39:37 MALAVIKA (?) I what did I say? I think I said pleasurable curse, yeah.

39:46 PRAYAS (?) I think it's a pleasure because

39:48 It's a pleasurable curse.

39:50 All of course pleasure.

39:52 PRAYAS (?) Irony or paradox in there if not it's not complete.

39:56 PRAYAS (?) No, how can it be a pleasurable curse?

39:58 Could only be a paradox.

40:02 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, paradox.

40:03 SATYA (?) Paradoxes can be fun.

40:05 SATYA (?) That's why it is funny.

40:07 PRAYAS Yeah.

40:08 No but paradox is I mean paradox is refraction. The experience is n not paradox because the experience is unspecified.

40:20 Yeah.

40:21 So, I mean nothing can be paradox by default. Maybe you have to

40:27 CHETAN Paradox is a loop, it's not one thing or the other. It's both

40:30 SATYA (?) Yeah. Yeah, it's both. So experience is that experience could actually be a paradox.

40:37 PRAYAS This could be a paradox, okay. Or refraction could be a paradox because we are talking about the refraction actually. So a pleasurable curse means

40:48 MALAVIKA (?) I said both. Which is why it's a paradox.

40:53 MALAVIKA (?) Experiential paradox.

40:56 PRAYAS (?) No but so what's a paradoxical about refraction?

41:01 CHETAN (?) It isn't it was your idea that it's refraction is paradoxical.

41:05 SATYA Yeah.

41:05 Yeah, I said it. and see what we said about paradox is a sort of duality, both the duality existing, right?

41:16 PRAYAS (?) So pleasurable curse suggested the idea that it's a paradox. So why would it be a pleasurable curse refraction?

41:25 PRAYAS (?) Because got both the rasas.

41:28 CHETAN (?) It's

41:29 PRAYAS One thing.

41:30 PRAYAS (?) [unclear]

41:32 CHETAN It's also a curse, it's also pleasurable and

41:36 PRAYAS (?) But it's a question.

41:38 CHETAN (?) The noise and the silence in it.

41:42 PRAYAS It's a question. Can it also be a pleasurable curse? It's not a statement, it's a question. We don't know if it is.

41:50 CHETAN (?) Let's assume if it were the case, what would it be?

41:55 PRAYAS But we haven't assumed it. So did we want to assume this statement?

42:03 CHETAN That's we're just probing aren't we, I mean, we're all probing into certain concepts.

42:09 PRAYAS So do we accept it? No so do we accept

42:14 CHETAN What's under that's what's under discussion? Do we accept that?

42:17 CHETAN (?) Accepting.

42:17 CHETAN (?) If he is

42:19 PRAYAS Accepting that refraction is a legible curse [?], that refraction is a paradox.

42:27 CHETAN Well I don't know if refraction is a paradox. That's your idea. I'm not convinced yet. And if yes, I mean if you could further on that.

42:38 Absolutely.

42:39 It's a reflection with standards.

42:41 MOSES SAM The point the point of the point where the light meets the medium or the surface, that's a paradox. Now it can either reflect or refract. So we don't know that yet.

42:54 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, so

42:55 MOSES SAM (?) There's a duality there. So we can't call refraction or reflection as a paradox in itself. But the point of impact is a paradox.

43:03 Yeah, because it can flip either way.

43:06 Yeah.

43:07 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah. Okay, that's

43:09 PRAYAS But we're not even talking about reflection. We don't even know about reflection. We have never used the word before. So are you saying we should start talking about the word reflection now?

43:20 CHETAN Yeah, totally. If we are talking about refraction you should also cover reflection.

43:23 CHETAN (?) Exactly.

43:24 PRAYAS (?) Well

43:25 MOSES SAM Is scary.

43:26 MOSES SAM (?) Thanks.

43:27 PRAYAS (?) A boom read, yeah. [?]

43:30 MALAVIKA No, we did speak about it when we spoke about opaque surfaces. Whether light can pass through or not.

43:37 PRAYAS Okay, so it's okay. So

43:40 PRAYAS (?) Like then it said what is the opposite of refraction? That was a question we had once.

43:45 SATYA Yeah.

43:46 SATYA (?) Thank you.

43:46 SATYA (?) Perhaps we can't.

43:51 Right. And there were two sides to it, which is either it's lossless transmission or it is reflection.

43:58 PRAYAS So we are we are accepting this statement and

44:03 SPEAKER 6 So then it's not duality, then it's a trinity. So there could be a lossless transmission, reflection or refraction.

44:11 PRAYAS No, what's the trinity? Refraction, reflection was the third.

44:15 The lost trans.

44:16 Thank you.

44:17 PRAYAS (?) What is

44:19 CHETAN (?) Right, what is basically?

44:21 CHETAN (?) Just pass us through.

44:22 PRAYAS Well yes. But experience, refraction and reflection are not in the same set.

44:31 CHETAN I don't know if you can see differently than reflection though, and if yes, how?

44:35 No, it's a

44:36 CHETAN (?) Transmission. I don't know if there is a certain generation loss with reflection. It transmits back what is already there.

44:44 SATYA (?) Look at the boundary infinity conditions, right? Look at the infinity, the two edges. The middle is refraction.

44:50 SATYA (?) Yeah.

44:53 PRAYAS (?) I have a black thing [?] because zero is lossless.

44:56 And how is it different from refraction?

44:57 View [?] and one is refraction and one is reflection.

45:02 Exactly.

45:02 No, but reflection is unspecified, right? And in that sense, refraction if you spoke about as residue and distillation, and we spoke about refraction as a reduced set, then refraction and reflection are definitely not at the same level of magnification as exactly. No they are not.

45:25 If they're not part of the same level of magnification, how th how can they belong to the same set?

45:32 SATYA (?) No. They are just conditions of the same event.

45:37 SATYA (?) Yeah.

45:38 They are part of the same set in the sense like you have if you take a prism or whatever, I mean y or surface and you are saying that it can pass through it's a ideal surface. Which ideally refracts hundred percent like a black body, it absorbs hundred percent or something. I don't know, using just some random words, but

45:59 They are all conditions of the same event.

46:02 PRAYAS Yeah. So the basically if we are parametrizing everything.

46:10 SPEAKER 4 Yeah.

46:10 SPEAKER 6 Ah, the whole yeah.

46:12 SPEAKER 1 But is it parametric every universe of that meta? [?]

46:20 SATYA I mean, why do we even need to go here? Because this thing we are looking at refraction. So why even go towards reflection and

46:27 PRAYAS Yeah. Yeah, so s Sam, we need to zoom back again. So

46:33 MOSES SAM I brought that up because you guys were talking about duality oh the paradox.

46:41 PRAYAS Yeah, it's a paradox. So and you were suggesting that refraction by itself.

46:47 I

46:49 PRAYAS (?) Ah, okay.

46:52 PRAYAS (?) So but we can go back to the paradox.

46:56 MOSES SAM Okay. So someone explain why refraction in itself is a paradox.

47:05 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so it is.

47:07 CHETAN He a Prayas asked the question whether it's a paradox. I didn't quite agree to that and we were probing that when we came to

47:17 CHETAN (?) Yeah, I don't agree. I don't agree.

47:21 MOSES SAM (?) Okay.

47:23 SPEAKER 1 But it's the general opinion

47:30 SATYA (?) Yeah, I think we're being pretty surfacial here and we're not going

47:33 CHETAN No, w the tabling things and the you know, dissecting it and figuring out what's in it, you know, behind these words. Right. So we came up with this

47:42 SATYA So we just generally randomly all of us said let's say that refraction is a paradox. Now let's track this.

47:51 It's like a proposal. It's like a

47:52 MALAVIKA I think it can be a paradox because it isn't definite. So you can't say it is, but it can be. It can contain a paradox because you don't know its effect.

48:08 And its effect can counter its itself.

48:14 PRAYAS (?) No, just because it's not exact doesn't mean that it's a paradox.

48:22 PRAYAS (?) It's not exact only before it

48:27 It's T. I mean before it happens.

48:33 MALAVIKA So certainly not before it happens it can't be anything.

48:36 PRAYAS Yeah, so but be but after it happens it is exact.

48:42 Is it exact? I don't know. Why?

48:46 Right then.

48:47 PRAYAS (?) What is it?

48:49 Yeah, experience is unspecified, but refraction is specified.

48:57 If reflection is unspecified also, then it's basically experienced.

49:02 MALAVIKA But I thought that's what we covered that day or have I not followed up because didn't we agree that refractions also abstract?

49:13 PRAYAS (?) No, I mean I don't know. Did we? No, I don't think so. I mean I think we arrived at the point that all that we have is the abstract and the meta.

49:30 MALAVIKA And so where are we locating the refraction now?

49:34 PRAYAS (?) We are back to wondering whether it is a paradox or not.

49:48 And

49:51 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, while we are at it, I think we can also

49:56 Connect that to w whether I mean because the pleasurable curse is also a paradoxical idea.

50:07 MOSES SAM (?) So if it's a paradox then it's also a pleasurable curse. If it's not a pleasurable curse, then it's also not a paradox.

50:14 SATYA (?) But why is a pleasurable curse a paradox? I'm not able to see why it is a paradox.

50:19 SPEAKER 6 Yeah, that's a better name.

50:23 SATYA See, I mean you can enjoy I mean I can enjoy shooting up all the time and then just die. You know? Why is it a curse though to die?

50:32 SPEAKER 6 Yeah, it's a blessing.

50:34 PRAYAS (?) Right.

50:36 MOSES SAM (?) I like the term duality and stuff.

50:41 So I was saying I like the term duality instead of paradox. Duality makes a lot more sense to me, you know. There is this experiencing self and the remembering self at any point in time, you know, with this

50:55 PRAYAS Distraction [?] is arrived at through I mean through refraction.

51:02 MALAVIKA Yeah, that does make sense.

51:04 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. So paradox is not a simple concept, it's a refracted concept.

51:13 MALAVIKA (?) Paradox is a loop.

51:15 PRAYAS It's a refracted concept. So it's not something which you can understand in a physical way. I mean in the sense of I don't know if physics has paradoxes by default. The paradoxes are apparent in stuff you do with physics. I mean it's the imminent condition. But by default, I don't know if things are paradoxical.

51:39 SATYA They are, no? I mean some of the theorems I don't know much, but you do hear about paradoxical like I mean the Schrödinger cat, whatever, that's like paradox, right?

51:49 PRAYAS Yeah but th those are entire items of thesis. I mean that's something which you arrive at. That's not like something you begin with.

51:59 SATYA But it eg see, it is part of the fabric. It is part of the fabric so it exists. So it's all it's there.

52:08 MALAVIKA You know the structure in which we are arguing this is very similar to Zeno's paradox.

52:15 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

52:17 Yeah.

52:20 MALAVIKA Oh what is that? well I'll just share a link and but we're not gonna do that. I thought we're not going to use references.

52:28 SPEAKER 1 Yeah, so we're not going to use links, but if you can tell us.

52:34 MALAVIKA (?) No, I can't tell you right now in ten minutes.

52:38 MALAVIKA (?) Okay.

52:39 Well it's basically that you know, it uses the aspect of syntax to play with logic. So if you say A is equal to B and two sides of this of the sa triangle are the same and one is A and one is B, then what is it? So it's kind of endless. What I have understood of it is it's endless and it uses the supposition as the

53:15 PRAYAS That's it.

53:17 What?

53:17 Is it a recursion?

53:20 PRAYAS (?) I can't hear you too well.

53:22 MALAVIKA (?) Is it a recursion? is it a recursion?

53:27 I think it is.

53:34 PRAYAS Right, so the when talking about duality or paradox, we are talking about recursion.

53:48 SATYA (?) But why talk about all this?

53:50 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. Right. So we can just talk about pleasurable curses. So

53:59 CHETAN (?) It's the class of the case. [?]

54:02 PRAYAS That curses why pleasurable curses at all? I mean you didn't even like the I mean the construct. I mean wh why would some curses be pleasurable and why would those pleasurable things be curses? I mean, it didn't make sense, right?

54:19 SATYA I mean it does make sense because of various constructs. We have o examples of this all over the place but and the question was is refraction a pleasurable curse?

54:32 PRAYAS But I mean okay, so in the sense that if I mean I'm not talking about the cause and effect kind of pleasurable curse, but I'm talking about so you know what you were talking about that day as intent, right? So if something is pleasurable by default, but the intent behind that pleasure, at least for one of the perpetrators of that pleasure is

54:59 Yes.

55:01 You know is a curse. So you are in a way being aggressive.

55:10 CHETAN Well perhaps curse is an illusion and so is pleasure. So

55:16 CHETAN (?) First.

55:17 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, go ahead with this.

55:18 CHETAN But I never vision. [?]

55:19 SPEAKER 6 Mm.

55:21 PRAYAS No why is it an illusion?

55:25 CHETAN Because it's not the only thing, its opposite also exists, so you can't see something half of something and try to understand the whole thing, right? Because it's not a complete.

55:38 Vision of experience, the whole spectrum of experience. You can't stop at one thing and say, Okay, it is only pleasurable experience. There's so many other things that go with that. And we don't just stop at pleasure or curse. There is plenty more in the band on offer.

55:55 SATYA So you're looking refraction with a bigger lens. You're not just saying you're saying it's not just this.

56:01 CHETAN I don't know if we were macro or you know, zoom bone or something.

56:05 MOSES SAM (?) He's saying there are fifty shades of grey in between.

56:13 PRAYAS No but is illusion an optical process? Can we talk about it? Can we I mean, is it at the s same scale as refraction, reflection and experience? I mean it's is it in the same

56:27 MOSES SAM Bigger scale.

56:30 It's bigger than refraction or reflection or whatever.

56:34 PRAYAS So it is it is after the emergence of the individual.

56:39 CHETAN Is perception saying and what is it?

56:42 CHETAN (?) [unclear]

56:44 PRAYAS I mean we're not using we haven't used the word perception yet.

56:50 MOSES SAM Mm.

56:53 So do you want to use it?

56:56 MOSES SAM (?) I mean we are opening it up on

56:58 SATYA Much more then you're opening it much more if you say perception.

57:02 PRAYAS Yeah, so I think it's a it's a good idea to reduce rather than expand.

57:08 SATYA (?) And in then in that case I think regression should not come in. I don't think illusion should come in because that is tied with perception.

57:15 SATYA (?) Yeah.

57:16 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so I think yeah, illusion is perceived. It's not happening by default.

57:22 MALAVIKA (?) But so is curse and pleasure. They're all perceptions.

57:27 PRAYAS No, so we spoke about an animal cursing another animal yesterday.

57:31 Yeah.

57:32 So it can also be the dent in your car after an accident on the highway.

57:42 CHETAN (?) No.

57:44 CHETAN (?) It could be a beneficial event is what we said. And how does an animal curse the other?

57:49 PRAYAS What?

57:51 SPEAKER 3 Yeah, that feeds me too.

57:53 MALAVIKA Yes, I think.

58:00 PRAYAS So it's so a pleasurable curse is possible.

58:05 SATYA (?) Yeah, I would say it is. If the question is

58:10 CHETAN It's also possible, you know. It could be some other equation too. It pleasurable curse is also possible.

58:18 CHETAN (?) That's right.

58:19 Other equations that go along with it.

58:22 PRAYAS Some questions go along with it. Okay, so we can deal with those questions tomorrow.

58:30 CHETAN (?) Equations meaning two other tendencies, if you will. Not questions.

58:35 PRAYAS Okay, so we are basically we are we are okay with things not being simple, right?

58:45 I mean, if things come along with pleasurable curse as a construct

58:53 We are not averse to it or are we saying that something should be should make sense in isolation? Are we saying that?

59:02 PRAYAS (?) No, yeah.

59:03 SATYA (?) Then we'd be limiting ourselves to just have

59:07 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I but I mean

59:10 CHETAN Can we, can we is the question, right? Can we? I mean, do we decide beforehand or can we arrive at a certain idea and say, Okay, yes, you know, this makes sense? Or can we just keep probing and dissecting and there's nothing there then?

59:24 CHETAN (?) Yeah, I mean I

59:26 PRAYAS (?) Way in the metal. [?]

59:27 We are more worried about it at least making sense, not if making sense and more. I mean it can be it can also not make sense, but if it also makes sense, it's good enough.

59:43 CHETAN Yeah, then we're closer to the truth. If it doesn't make sense and make sense in the same way.

59:47 PRAYAS Because what we what we are looking for here are handles to you know, to go on and to progress with the questions. So we're not I at least I figure we're not trying to hold on to the details and get stuff like that.

01:00:12 Thanks everyone for being on day three, day four, and I'll see everyone on day five. So tomorrow evening, seven PM.

01:00:22 MALAVIKA All right.

01:00:23 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, thanks for

01:00:24 PRAYAS Yes.

01:00:25 SPEAKER 6 Bye.