Refractive Surfaces, Day 5

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 14 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

00:07 PRAYAS We're starting the
00:10 Day five podcast.
00:15 Of Refractive Surfaces. The
00:21 First question.
00:24 For the day is thinking about refraction refracting in itself.
00:36 And are paradoxes apparent in the description?
00:50 SATYA Suppose the question was is refraction refracting itself?
00:54 PRAYAS Yeah. So does the act of thinking about refraction itself mean going through exp a kind of refraction? So
01:10 In the sense you could think of it as
01:15 Experiencing being an experience
01:19 SATYA Right.
01:20 PRAYAS In a certain context if it happens to be so.
01:27 SATYA Right. Experiencing experience.
01:30 PRAYAS No experiencing something being an experience in itself.
01:35 SATYA Right, I mean.
01:38 PRAYAS So like sometimes you I mean in a in a very
01:45 Culturally stereotypical way, some t I mean, you move to standstill.
01:55 SATYA Is it like a self awareness or a self consciousness?
02:00 PRAYAS No, it's ch I mean I'm saying that if you if you change the
02:09 By thinking about this you change I mean I think I it's basically about observation and it always includes the observer.
02:23 SATYA Yeah.
02:25 Yeah, and the observer influencing the experiment.
02:29 PRAYAS Yeah, if not influencing at least it failing to approximate the frame without itself.
02:37 SATYA Okay. Yeah. Okay. It is part of it, yeah.
02:42 PRAYAS Yeah.
02:44 SATYA And if that is the case, then
02:49 Thinking about refraction would include refracting.

02:54 PRAYAS Yeah, and if that is the case, then can we speak about refraction from the outside or does it really mean
03:06 Some other way of you know, dealing with the concept so that it doesn't remain a concept.
03:15 SATYA So there's a question of distancing involved then. Is there a way to distance?
03:20 PRAYAS Question of placement, of positioning. So I'm not sure where we should position ourselves.
03:27 SATYA (?) Right. So should there be a distance between what is and what is the position?
03:35 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, should there be distance, should there be proximity? What should what should what should be there?
03:43 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
03:46 SATYA And even if distance were there, would that still guarantee a result that we want to talk about?
03:55 PRAYAS Yeah, so but so if you think of it the other way round is positioning oneself in a specific way.
04:05 Yeah.
04:06 Lead us to a better chance of actually figuring it out, figuring out what refraction is.
04:17 In that sense if there is a f if there is a possibility of figuring out that is
04:23 SATYA (?) Yeah.
04:27 My immediate response to it would be distance does provide closeness.
04:37 That's my immediate it's a distance does provide understanding. However, someone else might have a different experience.
04:52 PRAYAS Right, distance from what? Of whose I mean whose distance?
04:57 MOSES SAM (?) Distance of
05:02 SATYA We're talking about positioning the
05:06 PRAYAS The individual undergoing refraction, the I would say the surface undergoing refraction and refraction itself, right?
05:15 SATYA (?) Right. Yeah.
05:21 I mean it's almost like the way I feel like is when they when the two when the surface and the individual are in proximity the default is that there will be confusion for the individual.
05:42 PRAYAS If this surface and refraction are in proximity meant.
05:48 PRAYAS (?) Or the individual. Yeah, I mean, did you mean the individual?
05:53 SATYA Yeah. Like if the individual is very close to the surf when the individual and the s refracting surface are close to each other, then the way I'm seeing it right now is that there is ra larger chances of confusion, that is not understanding.
06:12 PRAYAS Yeah, so you are saying that
06:16 Refraction is not enough but a way of understanding the framework within which the refraction is happening.
06:28 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
06:30 PRAYAS (?) Is necessary to make sense of something.
06:35 SATYA Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, because the individual has see who's making sense? The individual is making sense, right? It's trying to make sense.
06:46 PRAYAS But what is making sense? Making sense is about successfully being able to place something within a framework. Yeah, within a framework.
06:56 SATYA Right, exactly. So and the question is whose framework?
07:02 Yeah.
07:03 SATYA (?) Yeah.
07:04 PRAYAS Mm. Yeah, because in the sense

07:14 Yeah, if we go back to our question, if it is if thinking about refraction is refracting and paradoxes
07:26 Are apparent in the description or not. I mean
07:31 And
07:34 You said that distance helps, right? So
07:38 Yeah.
07:38 Extends helps for towards what? What does it extend its help towards? So
07:46 SATYA Towards resolving the paradox perhaps, or understanding the paradox.
07:52 PRAYAS (?) Right, but okay.
07:57 SATYA But I guess that's not the question. The question is there a paradox or
08:03 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I think the this question is it's quite specifically small in that sense it's not a large question. It's just a question to figure if thinking about refraction is refracting in itself. So in that sense
08:25 SATYA Okay. So it thinking about is thinking about refraction refracting. And I guess what I'm trying to s get at now that I think about it is proximity makes a difference when you think about refraction from a distance
08:44 The refraction may be a little less.
08:53 PRAYAS Yeah, so if you if you are able to
08:58 Look at it from enough if you're if you are able to maintain enough distance
09:05 Yeah.
09:06 You're saying that if there is enough distance then you can actually
09:12 Even observe in this case.
09:15 SATYA Right, and maybe reduce refraction through
09:19 PRAYAS (?) Okay yeah, right.
09:21 SATYA But I'm assuming the ground condition that thinking about refraction is refracting also i it is. I'm saying yes. Yeah.
09:31 PRAYAS And you're saying that what how we could address it is by creating distance.
09:37 SATYA Yeah.
09:40 Okay.
09:46 PRAYAS (?) And then we were talking about how making sense of
09:53 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
09:53 PRAYAS (?) S something. involves placing it in a framework.
09:58 Right.
09:59 But that framework being what? I mean it being as something as simple as a personal
10:10 Philosophical framework, theoretical framework, I mean a framework being what?
10:17 SATYA Right, and that's a big question because it is a it could be an aggregation of various frameworks that form one framework.
10:26 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean if it's the individual framework then it is attempting to summarize and represent
10:36 A lot of influences.
10:38 SATYA (?) Right. Right.
10:43 SATYA (?) It could be a reflected framework.
10:47 SATYA (?) Reflected.
10:49 So in the sense like if the individual does not have the agency or does not have the understanding or whatever or the to create a framework themselves, maybe they adopt somebody else's framework.
11:06 PRAYAS Right. That also. I mean
11:08 PRAYAS (?) See, that's a good point.
11:11 NU PARADOX (?) A reflected framework. Hi.

11:13 PRAYAS Can you hear me?
11:14 Yeah.
11:15 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah.
11:15 NU PARADOX (?) I sorry. I think thought itself is polarized light. As soon as we try to make sense of things, we colour it.
11:27 NU PARADOX (?) Right.
11:28 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
11:31 NU PARADOX So the dispersion depends on our predisposition, the intelligent design and where we are placed and what we are bent toward, basically, our tendencies.
11:46 PRAYAS So it make does it make more sense to leave things ununderstood?
11:53 NU PARADOX Yeah. I think you're better off because you're not arriving at something that's reduced.
12:04 Because you're not able to comprehend the whole. So it's a compromise of sorts. You're better off not understanding
12:10 PRAYAS That would place us in a very radical position. So for example so you know basically what you were talking about is that refraction is not enough, and when that refraction is made sense of by placing it in a framework or basically having it I mean figuring its context in a way, then it makes sense and then it's useful, but otherwise refraction by itself is not enough. So if that place us places us in a radical position because if we act on that impulse, that rad refraction is not enough.
12:51 NU PARADOX Well if scraping on the infinite, I guess you gotta be radical. You can't be conservative and expect to scratch the biggest.
12:59 PRAYAS You said you just said that it doesn't make sense to make sense. It makes more sense to
13:08 NU PARADOX (?) But
13:08 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah.
13:10 NU PARADOX (?) It's trying to
13:13 PRAYAS Right. So I mean the radical position in this sense what I was describing would be of not of refusing to make sense.
13:24 And working on a very instinctive impulse whether instinctive impulse of attaching value to the refraction itself and not to the to the sense or meaning that emerges from a kind of you know analytical
13:47 NU PARADOX Yeah, but I guess understanding is not necessarily restricted to the angular differences we create through subjective perception. So I think we have to open. We have to leave it open to other possibilities.
14:05 NU PARADOX (?) So is it possible to understand anything by being really open
14:12 Understanding is the flaw, that's the thing. Or rather trying to understand and arrive at a
14:18 PRAYAS (?) Prevent understanding from happening, right?
14:20 Yeah, okay.
14:22 So if you prevent understanding from happening then you are acting out in a in a way a radical imp impulse of just l listening being sensitive to your instincts, your refractive instincts.
14:39 NU PARADOX Whereas you're trying to be straight and not bend this way or the other. You see? You're just trying to be straight.
14:47 SATYA (?) You can't try itself. You can't try. You can't try though because you are at the mercy of the surface.
14:55 I mean you have a conference [?] for it.
14:56 SATYA (?) Somehow.
14:57 NU PARADOX (?) If you choose to
14:59 SATYA (?) Yeah, and that's a compensation. You have to be understanding of the surface then and then you'll have to compensate for what the refraction is happening.

15:06 NU PARADOX Right, but Sat we decide the direction. It doesn't necessarily have to go a certain way. It can be it's open. It's also yes, can be, but also open to many other possibilities. So why not

15:20 SATYA (?) I'm saying but even before that you'll have to be aware of the refraction and you'll have to I'm saying can everyone actually That's the default.

15:29 NU PARADOX We are aware of it. But how we respond to it i is where the refraction lies.

15:36 SATYA I feel like more people actually or more surfaces actually are not aware. They're just d doing what you know, they just

15:43 NU PARADOX (?) We don't know we don't know it's outside of us. We don't know. We can only

15:48 PRAYAS I'm actually quite excited about the possibility of what I was trying to frame earlier, which was if we look at content, if you look at any content and refuse to make sense of it and only respond to it from the perspective of how refracting it is by nature.

16:11 Then I for me that would be a really clarifying process because it disturbs me that by default even if some content is, you know, not really refractive in a sense, but as a secondary process of analysis it is rendered as meaningful because of some framework that it is contextualised in.

16:37 SATYA So you're saying do away with the frameworks?

16:40 PRAYAS Yeah, so we can

16:41 SATYA (?) Understanding altogether.

16:43 PRAYAS Yeah, and that I mean that to me sounds like a very radical gesture which would I think manage to maybe even rescue us from this you know this tragedy of c tragedy of culture.

16:58 SATYA (?) It's more comedy actually. So funny how everybody has their friends [?].

17:02 True.

17:05 SATYA (?) Yeah, actually, yeah, I would agree with that too. It's like I'm trying to force meaning upon something where it's why grapple with something when it's just there. I might learn more information if I don't fight it.

17:17 NU PARADOX (?) To reduce it for our convenience, you know, it's very selfish acting.

17:21 PRAYAS Because remain making [?] as you know

17:25 SATYA Selfish as in to be judged because everyone's just trying to get

17:28 NU PARADOX (?) Understanding and get the upper hand and you know, overview if you will.

17:32 SATYA (?) I mean even no, but that's one position. The other position is being self-preservation.

17:41 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah. There could be many other possibilities. That's the beauty of it. You have to leave it open to everything.

17:47 Right.

17:50 PRAYAS No, but you know n I mean because most of the meaning making that's happening is projection, right? So

18:05 It's it cannot be seen as an intrinsic process that is you know, some intrinsic to the content. It's necessarily a projection.

18:23 SATYA Everything is necessarily a projection, that's what you're saying.

18:26 PRAYAS No meaning making is a projection.

18:30 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, limited in its scope. It's just restricted to your knowledge, vocabulary and all of that.

18:37 NU PARADOX (?) Your container, yeah.

18:39 NU PARADOX (?) Because you can only contain it so much with language alone, you see.

18:44 PRAYAS Yeah, and this takes us nicely to the next question which is does refraction involve thought at all?

18:53 And when things refract, is there any residue? which is what we talked about yesterday briefly. But does refraction involve thought at all?

19:08 NU PARADOX (?) Most definitely does, I think.
19:10 Yeah, I agree. I do think so.
19:12 PRAYAS So what is this thought? Is it meaning making again w what we were trying to do away with?
19:23 SATYA So I mean a subset of refraction is thought.
19:27 PRAYAS But what kind of thought? What is that thought trying to achieve?
19:31 SATYA Yeah. and it is trying to make sense or just processing. Even just processing is I don't know if processing is equivalent to making sense, but
19:42 NU PARADOX You know, it's like a big s piece of steak in front of you. Steak is a bad example considering I'm vegetarian. But you're trying to cut it into bite sized bits so you can put it in your mouth and chew on it.
19:56 PRAYAS Right, so processing it like Satya is saying.
20:00 SATYA (?) Right. And even before processing comes observation and even observation consciously done involves thought, I think.
20:12 PRAYAS So if it involves thought and thought is a is a learned process, right?
20:22 SATYA (?) I mean is it learnt? I mean it's somewhat like breathing, right, for a human being?
20:28 PRAYAS Is it? I mean thought can be qualified by so many kinds of thought.
20:36 No
20:37 SATYA (?) Isn't the brain built for thinking? I mean at this point in evolution?
20:42 [unclear]
20:43 NU PARADOX (?) I mean
20:45 PRAYAS Differentiate thinking from cognition, from cognitive effort, right?
20:51 Yeah.
20:54 PRAYAS (?) So I would say that the brain is built for cognitive processing, sure.
20:59 NU PARADOX So let's say it's matter based. Is it matter based? do we agree on that?
21:03 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah.
21:04 PRAYAS (?) So I mean matter is a medium. Matter is a medium to refract light itself. So thought could be a little bit more than a little bit more.
21:10 Basically everything is molecular in the brain, so it's chemical. So, I think that's a good thing.
21:15 I don't know.
21:16 PRAYAS (?) That's matter.
21:18 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, it is certainly.
21:21 NU PARADOX (?) But I was talking electrical signals. I don't know if that's matter.
21:27 PRAYAS That's I don't know what electricity is contained within. It's contained within a kind of waveform, I'm sure, right? So
21:35 Rarity [?] if you will.
21:36 NU PARADOX No potential.
21:40 NU PARADOX (?) Pure potential. That's what it is.
21:45 You can use it for your benefit or not.
21:48 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but I don't know of how anything could not have not be based in matter.
21:54 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, I cannot see anything beside matter. I'm made of it, so
21:59 PRAYAS I mean antimatter is a whole different level of I mean complexity which I don't know if we can take up here.
22:10 SATYA No, we I don't think we can. The theoretically we can make up some theories, but
22:15 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, it's just I think outside the scope of you know, like something that we talked about. Yeah.

22:25 SATYA I mean not just language, understanding also. It's not just language. I think langu language is much maligned, but without language they're really nothing, right?

22:35 NU PARADOX Instincts are way better than language because instincts can give you some really good insights as opposed to language. Because they're so colored, language is colored.

22:44 SATYA Things could be flawed like just like language.

22:46 NU PARADOX (?) Language involves processing, you know. And processing is subjective.

22:51 NU PARADOX (?) Processing.

22:52 NU PARADOX (?) Instinct is yeah, it does, but it's way more immediate, yeah.

22:57 Yeah.

22:58 PRAYAS But presence takes care of generating instincts in a way that doesn't use language. But if you're working over a distance, if you're working telematically in that sense, you have to rely on some form of language. I mean

23:16 PRAYAS (?) Like an anchor to hold on to.

23:20 PRAYAS (?) Mean yeah, I don't know if you can encode

23:26 You know that kind of those instincts in any other form. I mean they're not

23:35 SATYA Now there was an experiment that happened apparently for between two people in India and France where they sent you know telepathically messages. So maybe if we went down that direction I can see it. But I don't I can't dismiss language at all.

23:52 SATYA (?) Yeah, and telepathy must involve a language.

23:55 PRAYAS (?) I think language is obsolete technology, we have to get past it as soon as possible.

24:00 SATYA I can see that. I can agree with that, yeah. But language has its also its own art form.

24:06 We're all clinging onto it, we make money off of it

24:09 NU PARADOX (?) I don't call it training. I don't want to call it

24:11 I'm surviving through language. If not for language, I'd probably not make my meal or something.

24:19 PRAYAS You know, but I mean I don't know if we have to go beyond technology in the sense that develop capacities that we don't have which we use technology for. But I would say that it means that we you know, use what we already have, the capacities that we already have, that we just lazy to you know, to put to work because there are simpler ways. I would say language is m more often a sign of laziness than any

24:57 NU PARADOX I agree, it's an escape.

25:00 SATYA (?) No, I don't think so. I think language is a tool. Language is a tool which the lazy use very often. But the people who work hard also can really work closely with language to

25:12 NU PARADOX (?) There are better ways for it to come through.

25:14 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I'm saying that do wouldn't you agree that we live in an environment of over communication, right? We

25:22 NU PARADOX Yeah, totally.

25:23 PRAYAS (?) And

25:24 NU PARADOX (?) You want to fault a graduate [?], you want to fault a user.

25:28 PRAYAS No, it's the fault of language in the sense that we see an see a tool so I would agree that language is a tool, but if you see a tool that's easily usable for a purpose and then we don't try harder.

25:42 SATYA (?) No, the thing is we are blaming language for us not trying harder.

25:49 Yeah.

25:50 SATYA (?) But that's us not trying harder.

25:53 SATYA (?) No, right emphasizing on the limitations of language.

25:57 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. So I mean when I said that language is a sign of laziness, it's our laziness. It's I mean language is not a not an individual in that sense.

26:07 PRAYAS (?) I can see how language gets it.

26:09 SATYA (?) I can see that we can have a we could work towards having a better tool than language, is what you're trying to say, right?

26:15 Yeah.

26:16 SATYA (?) Yeah. I could see that.

26:17 NU PARADOX (?) Upgrade it. Yeah.

26:19 PRAYAS I see that, yeah.

26:21 No, in the sense that, you know, performance sometimes reveals capacities for communication which are far beyond language. But

26:30 Yeah.

26:30 Yeah, and I wouldn't say that those capacities exist only in actors or own I mean actor in a very broad sense. I mean whoever is performing whatever whichever medium. But I would say that those capacities exist in all of us, but there is a general hesitation to perform.

26:49 SATYA Agreed, because it's very difficult and I can see that's where we are not willing to work that hard. I could see that.

26:55 Yeah.

26:55 But I would still want to say that those things that we are talking about, that sensory sensitivities, may not be that present at an equal degree as language the capability for languages, perhaps. I'm just making this up, but maybe it's harder to smell that chocolate note in a glass of red wine for some people than it is for others. But you could argue saying that we developed the language medium than we didn't develop the nasal medium. I could I could see that.

27:32 PRAYAS I mean it I'm just saying that language with language we opa o overcompensate.

27:39 Yeah.

27:41 So y so you know what we can't make out sensorial through our sensorium, we overcompensate so for example when you can't enjoy something just by experiencing it

27:55 SATYA Yeah. We talk about it.

27:56 PRAYAS Yeah, you talk about it over.

27:58 And we pretend with words.

28:00 NU PARADOX Fi yeah, finality of some sort. I should begin and by itself. [?]

28:04 PRAYAS Yeah, you can you can be part of an experience while at the same time trying very hard to say that.

28:11 NU PARADOX Who knows? We can't contain it all. So we have to just channel it out through language or art or something or music.

28:20 PRAYAS No so yeah, I'm just saying that these faults of ours that we

28:27 PRAYAS (?) [unclear]

28:29 NU PARADOX (?) Yes.

28:31 I mean creating stuff out of the experience is reflection.

28:37 PRAYAS Or refusing to create.

28:40 NU PARADOX No the residue

28:43 Is the creation.

28:46 SATYA Yeah.

28:47 SATYA (?) The reflection happened and you're creating our

28:51 The nation. [?]

28:52 SATYA (?) Song. [?]

28:54 SATYA (?) Yeah. Creation is going on.

28:56 ADITYA (?) Yeah. And whatever Yeah, whatever is there is getting created every moment and the rest of the

29:06 NU PARADOX Basically we want to get credit by doing this and that.

29:10 Yeah.

29:11 Okay.

29:12 SATYA (?) You want you want to have the package for it, right? Saying this is what I did and
29:16 SATYA (?) Understood and tagged and filed in opening.

29:18 NU PARADOX I see.

29:20 PRAYAS No, but what Nu Paradox was saying about creating things from creating things in that sense from that experience also being about refraction. I mean I would say it's more not creating that would be refraction. I mean that would be
29:43 How?
29:44 Because creating is a processing of material in a way that
29:54 It distracts you from the moment actually. So you don't you're not generating enough new material while you're busy working on your old material.

30:04 SATYA (?) No, but
30:04 SATYA (?) But while you're creating you are generating material, it is giving you moments to be in.

30:11 NU PARADOX See the thing is we're trying to focus on the shadow than the light.
30:17 Yeah.

30:18 PRAYAS I would agree. I mean in the sense that you're applying yourself, right? You're applying yourself to the to a to an outcome in a particular format.

30:31 SATYA But we are making this linear then and I don't think it's a linear process. I think it's a parallelly occurring thing that's going on together, simultaneously.

30:40 PRAYAS (?) Right.
30:45 But leaving things
30:48 I mean leaving experiences alone and not bothering to fill in the gaps of gaps in a reading with
31:00 Language, I mean that's what you're talking about, I think allows more parallel events to occur.
31:07 Okay.
31:08 PRAYAS (?) Then you know, so you fill in the gaps with language and

31:13 SATYA (?) I mean unless you're using language as a tool of creation, then you know.

31:17 PRAYAS Yeah. I mean I'm saying whichever language, whichever so I mean
31:23 Okay.
31:24 W but I mean so when you f fill in the gaps in sensing something or being able to read something, being able to experience something with products of language

31:39 SATYA You're reducing.

31:40 PRAYAS Yeah, I think you limit the possibilities of those parallel sequences to operate.

31:47 SATYA Okay, because we are ex expending energy in the packaging rather than

31:52 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, there are essentially four possibilities, right? When the light hits the surface, could either be absorbed by the surface, right? Or be scattered. Or be partially scattered and partially absorbed. Or it could just reflect it. So

32:13 SATYA (?) Three.

32:16 NU PARADOX Could be reflected, absorbed and scattered, and then absorbed and scattered separately, right?

32:28 SATYA (?) It's reflected, it's scattered, which means partly absorbed, partly reflected.

32:35 NU PARADOX Yeah, so four possibilities. First is
32:39 Okay.
32:40 Four possibilities.
32:43 NU PARADOX (?) Absorb reflected and absorb reflected separately and then the reflection. So five.

32:56 SATYA Okay, but where were you going with that?

32:58 ADITYA Yeah. So I mean how do you

33:00 NU PARADOX Many possibilities so one cannot arrive at a certain outcome of the event. That's what I was saying. So one can't just sit on one possibility and say maybe yeah this is what it is. But it's not because it's one of them.

33:21 PRAYAS But filling in that sense is definitely a reduction because what you fill in with is not necessarily as potent as what was already there.

33:37 SATYA Yeah.

33:41 ADITYA (?) Correct, it's reducing it to something one can launch on [?] one can.

33:47 SATYA It's just the limitation of language.

33:50 NU PARADOX Our perception basically, we are like with five senses and we're limited. It's multi dimensional. Nature is, you'd think, or s space, the universe is. So we have to admit our capabilities are limited. And then through this shell we try to decipher things by inventing what we're capable of. Language is one of them.

34:19 PRAYAS (?) No, but I mean more than language I'm interested I think in

34:26 What you

34:28 NU PARADOX (?) Experience cannot be communicated not effectively.

34:33 NU PARADOX (?) Right.

34:33 NU PARADOX (?) It will fall short, surely. Because words are dead. They're inert. It doesn't mean emotion. You know I don't know because it's not as potent as emotions and y it's not as accurate, if you will.

34:50 No, for the case.

34:52 SATYA (?) Yeah.

34:55 SATYA (?) Where it would bring out a certain emotion in another person.

34:59 Focusing on the individual. What about what about

35:03 So

35:05 What's between individuals? What is the aqueous medium or whatever it is, you know? How about w you know?

35:14 PRAYAS No, I have a good analogy here. I think between words that are spoken and words that are written, what do you think is more alive?

35:25 NU PARADOX (?) I think the ones that are spoken. I for me I don't think

35:30 That's a very personal thing, right? Like that's

35:32 Totally subjective.

35:33 It is subjective, exactly, yeah.

35:36 PRAYAS But wouldn't you be able to make a universal distinction that sound has more material than

35:49 PRAYAS (?) Sound is more immediate.

35:51 NU PARADOX (?) What the process?

35:53 NU PARADOX (?) A printed word you'd need to pro I think if when it hits the waves hit you in a certain pattern, I think it registers better than you having to pick it up through words which are printed for dead and having to process them in effect.

36:08 SATYA I'll flip that saying that if I hear somebody talk to me, I don't have the time to process what they're telling me. I might take offense on something that's being said, whereas if I read that in writing, I might not I might have the time to think about it. So

36:23 I have plenty of time.

36:26 PRAYAS But if we are in a conversation

36:28 NU PARADOX You see, that's your instinct and I think that's more truer than processed meaning.

36:34 NU PARADOX (?) I don't

36:35 SATYA With that.

36:36 PRAYAS If we are in a conversation.

36:37 NU PARADOX I don't know, that's my perspective, but you don't necessarily have to because there are so many possibilities again.

36:43 SATYA (?) Exactly, we have many possibilities.

36:45 PRAYAS I'm just saying that if we are in a conversation and if we both want to be in the conversation for example, then if I if I understand that you took offense at some point, then I have the ability to go back and detail my what I was saying in a way that diffuses the offense.

37:09 SATYA No, but that's no that depends you're saying that you have the ability to do that.

37:15 SATYA (?) Mm-

37:16 SATYA (?) I don't I don't have the ability to do that.

37:20 PRAYAS (?) No, but I'm saying that possibility exists in conversation. That's what I'm saying.

37:24 Maybe it

37:27 NU PARADOX Yeah.

37:27 You have the ability to do that.

37:30 I don't know how.

37:31 No, the thing is you're perhaps judgmental toward it and you want it to unfold in a certain way.

37:37 NU PARADOX (?) No, judgment is a strong word. What I'm trying to say is

37:40 SATYA All I'm saying is

37:42 Yeah.

37:43 NU PARADOX Immediacy is happening regardless of what fantasy or fiction one creates, once it's happened. You see, that's more truer. I mean there's no two ways about it.

37:56 PRAYAS No so let's go back to our question. Let's put this thing aside, let's go back to our question. That what do you think makes words come alive?

38:08 PRAYAS (?) Oh, okay.

38:10 SATYA (?) I think that's a that's a fairer question.

38:12 PRAYAS (?) Ex experience. Experience is one word for it.

38:17 SATYA (?) The individual makes them come alive.

38:19 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, and experience because you have to associate the word with a certain memory that you've lived through, that you've experienced. That's how you make meaning of these dead words.

38:31 PRAYAS (?) So irrespective of reading, irrespective of listening, a word which has to come alive will come alive.

38:39 SATYA Yes, that's true.

38:40 NU PARADOX It doesn't even have to be a word, it could be an object and still an experience would give it meaning, right?

38:48 PRAYAS So c basically coming alive is a shorthand for reflection refraction, right?

38:55 NU PARADOX Maybe.

38:57 SATYA Partly

38:58 PRAYAS I mean a refractive surface is essentially coming alive for you in some form.

39:04 It's responding to it. So it's coming alive.

39:07 Yeah, I mean it is not a it is not a banal surface. It is refractive, so it's causing some it's altering your perception of itself in some way.

39:22 NU PARADOX I think the light is sort of kaleidoscopic and what we see depends on the kind of shapes of glass, broken glass that we picked up along the way.

39:34 PRAYAS (?) Right.

39:36 Yeah, so our next question i is actually seems to be linked to this that if our if optimising the refractive potential of a surface is our goal.

39:54 What should we do?

39:57 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

39:57 NU PARADOX Isn't that the last question? Oh we are at the fag end of our session.

40:02 PRAYAS (?) It is the last question. it's seven forty, so we are switching into the third twenty minute question.

40:13 NU PARADOX No, I don't make that.

40:16 But yeah, if

40:17 PRAYAS Optimising the refractive potential of a surface is our goal.

40:22 What should we do?

40:24 PRAYAS (?) Right.

40:26 NU PARADOX I'll be nice.

40:27 SATYA I think the surface.

40:29 ADITYA (?) Mm-

40:30 SATYA (?) We start with studying the surface.

40:34 PRAYAS (?) So the but the let's say we are optimizing the surface, so in the sense we have some control of it.

40:43 Yeah.

40:44 NU PARADOX I think a good idea would be to buy a pair of shades to begin with. No side I mean.

40:51 So it's controlled by the I mean, you're not you're not blinded by the light.

40:57 PRAYAS (?) Right.

40:59 NU PARADOX (?) I think that's a good thing.

41:01 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah.

41:04 You are really one in fire [?]. Sorry?

41:10 Really?

41:11 PRAYAS (?) We control this surface so we have the ability to change its refractive potential.

41:22 SATYA But how do we change? In which direction do we change? So for that we have to observe first, like what do I need to change?

41:28 SATYA (?) So but then we're observing ourselves because

41:33 NU PARADOX (?) Trying to or b you know, seeing it in a manner that you can change it is kind of naive, if you will, because

41:42 SATYA (?) How is it naive?

41:44 NU PARADOX One can't change it, one can really understand what's going on. How can one change what's going on?

41:50 NU PARADOX (?) No, they're

41:51 SATYA We are not talking about changing i what is hitting us. We are talking about how the surface res

41:56 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, how d how do you transfer? [?]

41:58 Us of course.

41:59 PRAYAS How do you transmit in a way that it causes optimized you know it causes optimal refraction?

42:08 NU PARADOX (?) By being as far as possible from yourself because

42:14 PRAYAS How can you be able to do that?

42:17 NU PARADOX Would be limiting it to a frame. I think idea is to be open to as many possibilities. Seeing it as a possibility would be a good we it's a good point to start.

42:31 SATYA (?) And this brings us back to putting distance between the surface and the individual, I think.

42:36 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. Right. But can we create that distance within ourselves?

42:44 SATYA (?) And that's a I think it's possible.

42:46 NU PARADOX (?) Maybe it's possible because through practice perhaps it is possible.

42:51 PRAYAS (?) No, but isn't that

42:55 I don't know. I mean I would think that if you are if I mean see, okay, so you're you have no choice, right, to in question of yourself in the sense no matter what you do, you're still yourself.

43:09 See

43:11 PRAYAS (?) So how do you create distance between yourself and yourself? I mean, who is the other self then?

43:18 SATYA No, but we do that by making a deliberate choice.

43:23 NU PARADOX And then how far you go apart depends on what kind of lens you have on. You see if you have a telephoto, good on you covered a better range.

43:35 PRAYAS But you're looking we're not looking out.

43:39 NU PARADOX No, we are already looking out because there's a seer and the seen. So there are two perspectives here. Ongoing.

43:50 PRAYAS (?) What were what were you saying, Satya? You were

43:56 SATYA I've kind of forgotten. But you talked about u using different lenses, Nu Paradox.

44:05 NU PARADOX Yeah, I talked about the range of coverage.

44:09 PRAYAS (?) Right. And that choice of choice of use.

44:12 NU PARADOX (?) The distance between the self and the seen. Oh or rather yeah, the seer and the seen.

44:19 SATYA Okay, but I guess where I was trying to go was use choosing that different lens is the choice that the individual can make.

44:30 PRAYAS (?) I'm still confused about

44:32 NU PARADOX Be making the choice, who knows? I'm not very certain of who makes the choice. It could be the seer and could be the seen. Who knows?

44:40 PRAYAS (?) No, I'm still confused about is it possible to observe yourself? Doesn't that involve

44:49 NU PARADOX No, we are constantly observing ourselves. In our waiting. We are totally.

44:55 PRAYAS How are you doing that?

44:56 NU PARADOX Observing ourselves all the time. And how I think we weren't because I don't know.

45:03 PRAYAS (?) No, how do you do that?

45:05 NU PARADOX Are you not doing it now? I mean, are you not observing you conducting a talk show on hangout and leading and probably looking at time and it's seven forty, let's switch to the third question. It's all observation and you make your decisions as per your observation, right? You intended it to be a certain way. You intended it to unfold a certain way. Hence you're observing yourself, so you can direct it in a certain

45:32 PRAYAS Yeah, but these things are these things are happening outside of you. I'm saying that how do you exactly inside?

45:39 NU PARADOX (?) Of you. That's the illusion. It's not happening outside of you. It's happening inside of you.

45:45 PRAYAS Right. So observing anything per se is observing oneself.

45:55 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah. It is. It's a reflection of ourselves. Or a refraction of ourselves. Yeah. Refraction's a better word, I would think.

46:04 PRAYAS So the only thing

46:06 SATYA (?) I guess it's not a self aware observation always.

46:11 NU PARADOX (?) But it's all coming out of us. It's not something external. It's coming from within of within us.

46:17 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah, it's

46:18 SATYA (?) And say okay something.

46:21 SATYA (?) Mm-

46:23 SATYA (?) It's not independent of us. It's just

46:26 I mean there are a lot of times g going back to how you talked about observation, there are so many times we say things to other people which we didn't should not have said or we think later I should not have said that. But if I had observed myself at that moment, I would not have said it.

46:44 So that's what I mean by self conscious observation and unself conscious perhaps.

46:50 NU PARADOX The thing is that's a again, going back to limitations of words, you want to re you rearrange them.

46:57 No, I think we should have a lot of things. [?]

46:59 Your own perspective and understanding and

47:05 A certain way yourself because you can you can sleep well basically now that you put it to rest through rearrangement of language. But the event is the same. You know, it could be perceived as the other person perceives it as a

47:22 PRAYAS (?) You are saying that all that we ever experience is ourselves.

47:30 That's what you're saying.

47:31 NU PARADOX Yes, we are re reacting to stimuli, but essentially what we all s what we see all along is ourselves.

47:38 SATYA But the question we have is can we change what we are looking at?

47:42 SATYA (?) That's a yeah, interesting one. We have to ponder on it and let it brew for some time.

47:47 NU PARADOX (?) And that's the question.

47:48 PRAYAS Yeah, because rev if we are saying that we are responding to stimuli, that already means refraction.

47:55 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, it's reflective. You're responding to it.

47:58 NU PARADOX And the question is can we do something to how we are reacting or how we are responding? Isn't that the question, Prayas?

48:05 PRAYAS Yeah. So if we if we want to optimize the refractive potential of a surface, what should we do?

48:13 NU PARADOX What do we mean by optimizing? I mean work for us to our benefit. I think leverage some sort of value out of it. I don't know what optimization is.

48:26 PRAYAS Optimization just means I mean I'm just I mean it's just a word. I mean what I meant was just I mean you really want to make things

48:37 NU PARADOX (?) Is also delicious, you know, you want it to unfold a certain way, you know. Yeah you push it this way and that way and change the degree.

48:44 PRAYAS You want to make things intense. You want to make things intense beyond a point, right? You really want to

48:50 NU PARADOX The thing is it is already intense and

48:53 PRAYAS No, you want to make it more intense.

48:56 NU PARADOX (?) Are we paying attention is the question. It's already got every potential. It might be it might be

49:02 But people-

49:03 SATYA Aside, let's put that part aside, that intensity of externalities that's hitting us. Let us keep that aside. Let's shift to us. Can we attenuate ourselves is the question.

49:13 PRAYAS Yeah, because at the same time as intense as everything might be already, there are people who are observing and who are getting burnt out in a way because of their capacity of
49:28 Econom accommodating or you know coming to terms with this intensity is expanding. So I mean I would say thirty years of watching television has killed our capacity to look at images.
49:44 Right.
49:45 So I mean I'm talking about that. So then we need to know how to pump the volume higher.
49:53 Because everything is already deafeningly loud and we are not able to get through.

50:01 SATYA (?) Right. And I think Nu Paradox already suggested the solution which is to wear shades.

50:07 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah.
50:10 NU PARADOX (?) Right.
50:10 NU PARADOX (?) A good idea. Good get a good pair of shades.

50:13 SATYA But at the same time you also use the word polarization, which means that we have so much noise around us. What are we trying to filter ourselves? What are we trying to align with? I mean, are we listening to what we is more beneficial, what is more optimal to listen to, or what are we li are we just getting overwhelmed by everything that's hitting us?

50:32 NU PARADOX Yeah we are. I think we're trying to make the overwhelming understandable.
50:38 NU PARADOX (?) Exactly.
50:38 NU PARADOX (?) Our limited perceptions and futile act. It's something that we do with our time, you see. Try to take a job and create an identity and I won't limit [?]

50:50 SATYA I mean I don't think we should I don't know if we should be giving colours to it. I mean it is a futile IPS [?]. there's no I mean at the foundation what is meaning itself, right? But

51:02 PRAYAS (?) So yeah, how do we optimize our transmission?
51:11 We are wearing shades now, so let's say we are getting burnt out at a lesser rate, but then we still need to transmit in a more sharp way.

51:21 NU PARADOX Digestible.
51:24 Manner.

51:24 PRAYAS Yeah, at least yeah, in a more sharp way. Like we need to So how do we begin to do that? I mean I'm not talking in a conceptual way, in the sense I'm not talking about new ideas which have, you know, infinite resonance and all of that.

51:44 SATYA I personally think that one of the ways is observation. Observation is the beginning. And the other thing which we talked about earlier about what was that about letting everything in, not having frameworks at all?

51:57 PRAYAS Yeah, so n refusing to make sense.

52:00 SATYA Yeah, exactly.

52:01 NU PARADOX Yeah, we should just be gl gluttonous about knowledge.

52:05 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. I mean it's coming at us anyway, why not eat?

52:08 SATYA (?) Let's just take it all like

52:12 PRAYAS Right. So we optimize the refractive potential by
52:20 By

52:23 NU PARADOX (?) Trying to give it a medium.

52:26 PRAYAS (?) You know, so basically

52:29 NU PARADOX Look for it and see what happens. Maybe magic happens there.

52:34 PRAYAS Huh, no, I'm trying to relate what these two things that just got stated that you refuse to understand and you wear shades and you observe. So I'm trying to connect these three things actually. So

52:49 SATYA For me it's like observing is non judgmental. Taking everything in is also non judgmental. So I'm no frames are going to be put there.

52:59 NU PARADOX I think observation is sort of judgmental.

53:02 SATYA Shade at the same time. The paradox is having the shade. Shade means you're stopping things from coming in, right?

53:08 PRAYAS (?) So we can do without shades.

53:10 NU PARADOX You know what, Satya, shades is the judgment. You see.

53:16 Right.

53:19 Trying to cut it to something you understand.

53:22 SATYA (?) Right, so I'm trying to say non judgmental judgment.

53:26 NU PARADOX It's judgmental. I don't know what's non judgmental about shades.

53:31 PRAYAS No, so which I mean like you said that so r the refusal to understand is non judgmental in that sense.

53:40 SATYA Exactly.

53:41 Yeah.

53:41 You're taking it all in without judgment. But you're trying to protect yourself with the shades.

53:48 NU PARADOX Yeah, well put.

53:53 PRAYAS (?) So that helps us okay.

54:01 But yeah.

54:01 But that talks about one side of the process. Let's say we yeah, we sh sharpen our capacities by taking it all in.

54:11 NU PARADOX (?) Right.

54:12 PRAYAS By wearing shades, but that doesn't talk about the output.

54:16 What good? [?]

54:17 NU PARADOX Goal. What is the goal, Prayas?

54:19 PRAYAS (?) The goal is to Yeah. The goal is to Yeah, so Aditya is saying we can't do without judgment and we'll look at

54:31 It's okay.

54:33 In a bit, bro. [?]

54:33 On with that, innate. [?]

54:35 I'll just address your p I mean, you're saying so what's the goal? The goal is to yeah, just keep things real, right? So in the sense you just want to realize

54:47 PRAYAS (?) We don't have to do anything.

54:49 No, you want to be able to get through.

54:52 NU PARADOX (?) Okay, perhaps that's the goal, but it's already real.

54:56 PRAYAS And by wanting to get wanting to be able to get through, automatically m you have to constantly optimize because the capacities on the other side are you know, they're reducing all the time.

55:14 NU PARADOX See, one has to take into account other observations or observations of other people and how it's affecting the light. Right? So it's not just your observation that's affecting the light, but others also. Once you take that into account, maybe you're less judgmental because

55:37 We can't think of what we're open to.

55:39 Possibilities again because it could shape itself to something you never imagined. Possibility is there because others are watching it too.

55:48 PRAYAS But can we think of others?

55:51 NU PARADOX (?) Obviously we can because I know you exist, I know everybody else exists.

55:56 PRAYAS Yeah, but you were saying that all we experience is ourselves.

56:01 NU PARADOX What we arrive at is ourselves. The experience is it's vast, it's massive. It's more than us. We are merely responding to this. We are not the experience, we the experiencing.

56:26 I don't know if that makes sense.

56:28 PRAYAS Right. I mean it seemed that what you were saying earlier was that whatever we are experiencing is only the reflection of

56:38 Us we are what we are.

56:40 PRAYAS (?) So yeah, so in that sense you are saying that we are only experiencing

56:44 Ourselves.

56:45 NU PARADOX (?) Ourselves.

56:47 Through our limitations, yes.

56:49 Yeah.

56:49 But the experience has a potential for everything. You could be somebody else, you know. Or you could experience something else, depending on who you are.

56:59 So I can

57:00 NU PARADOX (?) Question.

57:01 PRAYAS Yeah.

57:08 PRAYAS (?) But maybe that aids us towards answering the question.

57:11 Huh, I mean yeah I mean we have some we have some helpful let's say

57:20 Ideas for dealing with the on flux but not necessarily for dealing with the you know what you put out there and how we contribute in that sense. I mean

57:38 SATYA That seems the output part seems to be a whole another discussion to me actually.

57:42 NU PARADOX (?) Oh they are feeding off it, they're not contributing to it.

57:46 PRAYAS Yeah, we are I mean you can look at it in a malicious way. You can look at it like a curse or you can l look at it like a pleasurable curse.

58:00 NU PARADOX (?) But different.

58:01 SATYA We don't have anything to we are contributing to what we feed off of. It doesn't exist without our contribution to it.

58:09 NU PARADOX No, it exists see again, tree falling in the fall. I don't know I can say I don't know whether it exists aside of us. But I'm surely and I can acknowledge my experience of it and my perspective of it. But I can't speak for it because I'm not it. How do I know?

58:31 SATYA But I don't know if maybe we it would be helpful to come down to a level down where we are talking about trees not falling in forests, but a p a flux where which is more present, like which we are aware of.

58:48 NU PARADOX I think it's all sensory perception and then a matter of degree in terms of how intensely can you sense things.

58:57 NU PARADOX (?) Okay.

58:58 PRAYAS (?) Right?

59:00 SATYA Yes, that's one part of it, but I think Prayas had talked about the output part of it too.

59:04 PRAYAS Ah. So I mean and maybe like Satya suggesting this needs to be like a whole new discussion and that's the day six which is the last day of Refractive Surfaces the study group. So and that's tomorrow. And but you know if you if either of you if any of you have suggestions for framing the question for tomorrow, you can you can message me the question on Facebook and you know so before I post it tomorrow morning.

59:39 Okay.

59:39 I can I can use it because yeah, I'll just try to frame it one way or the other, but if you have suggestions you can share them.

59:48 PRAYAS (?) Sounds good.

59:48 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

59:49 NU PARADOX Yeah.

59:50 But I asked you a question for sure. [?]

59:56 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, sure. Okay. Thanks everyone for being part of Day five and see you tomorrow.

01:00:01 Thanks, bro.

01:00:02 PRAYAS (?) It's

01:00:03 NU PARADOX (?) Thank you.

01:00:03 NU PARADOX (?) Yeah.

01:00:03 NU PARADOX (?) Bye.