Refractive Surfaces, Day 6

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 15 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

00:10 PRAYAS (?) Is how does one refractive surface affect another? This was the question suggested by Satya.

00:20 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

00:22 MALAVIKA (?) And so we'll take this first.

00:37 How are we going to look at two simultaneously? So what is are they two in de are they independent?

00:46 SPEAKER 2 This is how I felt it. That they are independent.

00:52 MALAVIKA (?) So there are two simultaneous refractions happening and you're trying to see what the relationship is with one affecting another.

01:04 SATYA Right, that's one aspect of it. Now I feel like there's multiple refractive surfaces, multiple individuals. And individuals could be of any sort. They could be groups of they could be collectives of individuals, it could be something else.

01:24 PRAYAS (?) It could be just one individual, yeah.

01:26 SPEAKER 2 Yeah.

01:26 PRAYAS But how do we know that there are multiple individuals?

01:34 SATYA (?) If we are part of a collective and we sense ourselves to be an individual, then we assume that there are other individuals out there.

01:44 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so it's an assumption.

01:46 SATYA It's an assumption, yes.

01:48 PRAYAS (?) So

01:49 MALAVIKA Or does the do we have to go back to this aspect of identification that somebody else brought up that day?

02:00 MALAVIKA (?) I mean if we start off with the premise that we don't know anything.

02:05 SATYA Then we only have approximations and assumptions.

02:13 PRAYAS (?) No, we I mean at we at least accept that we

02:20 MALAVIKA (?) Only know what we know.

02:23 SATYA Right. And therefore we model the other based on what

02:30 We know of ourselves.

02:32 PRAYAS Yeah, so if we are there then s others are also there.

02:38 SATYA (?) Kind of. I mean, yeah, I guess that's why we think there are aliens out there.

02:43 PRAYAS Yeah, right. So it's like so
02:49 You're accepting everyone's being, you're and not just your exclusive being.

02:59 SATYA It's an interesting paradox because most of we only know ourselves but we think we know that there are others out there.

03:12 PRAYAS (?) But do we know that there are others out there or we did we do we believe it?

03:17 SATYA We believe it, we assume and we based on our empirical observations, we create models of others out there which seem to be based very much on our own models.

03:29 PRAYAS Yeah, and which seem to be subst getting substantiated every day.

03:34 SATYA Seem to be yeah.
03:36 But I think we don't I don't know if we call that actually knowing or accepting the possibility.
03:43 Okay.

03:46 PRAYAS (?) So what is this acceptance of possibility?

03:54 MALAVIKA That will relate to any kind of assumption that you it's relative. So if i it's like inferring something. So you see your own world, you know that A B C makes up your world and so you think that if the conditions for A B C can make up your world, a similar condition of A B C and maybe D can make up somebody else's world.
04:22 Right.
04:23 So i it's based on an experiential knowledge that this assumption is made.

04:34 PRAYAS (?) But it does not have to necessarily be true.

04:38 SATYA Correct, yeah. And I think one way of thinking about that is that I may not even know that A B C D make my world up, but somebody else told me that A B C D made it up. Another surface told me, therefore I accept that it is so. And I guess that's one way of how surfaces affect each other.

05:04 MALAVIKA So what does that make stories?
05:10 So if somebody tells us a story
05:12 Yeah.
05:13 We believe it as to be as long as it
05:23 Relates to what we can identify.
05:27 Correct, yeah.
05:28 And even if we don't identify with it, we are willing to believe it. Is it because it's being told by somebody who is similar to us or
05:38 MALAVIKA (?) Who we believe in.

05:41 SATYA They may even if somebody is similar to us, they may not believe in them.

05:47 PRAYAS So we don't find them believable and that's why we don't believe or we just think they're not credible.

05:55 SATYA Both are the same.
05:57 SATYA (?) Unbelievable stories also.

05:59 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, which are credible. So we have yeah.
06:04 So I mean believability and credibility is not the same thing, right?

06:11 SATYA (?) Mm, yeah, you're right. Okay, yeah.

06:14 MALAVIKA Is the what yeah we have to look at.

06:20 SATYA But believable is a very powerful thing. I believe credibility is much less than believability is, you know.

06:29 PRAYAS Yeah, so because I mean that is a format whereas credibility is a
06:38 Series of checkpoints.
06:40 Right. There is a process too. Yeah.
06:42 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, if you have a good track record you're a credible person in that sense.

06:47 MALAVIKA So is credibility more factual? I mean if you have facts and

06:53 PRAYAS (?) It's more validated.
06:55 I believe perhaps.
06:56 Yeah. So more third party. It's an externally arrived at thing. You cannot do anything about it.
07:07 SATYA I mean you could go and check if you have the disposition of checking you might go and check.
07:15 Checkpoint.
07:16 SATYA (?) Va validate, basically, verify if you wanted to do it yourself.
07:21 But belief is
07:22 Something else. You don't take the steps you don't take steps. Belief is just is. It's a leap.
07:29 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean because we are talking of believability and not belief actually.
07:36 PRAYAS (?) And we can do it.
07:38 SATYA But believability is because somebody created a story that I believe in without stopping to verify it.
07:50 PRAYAS But is it a story that I believe in or it is a story that I find believable?
08:00 SATYA Well, if I find it believable, yes, there is a subtle difference, but there is a larger chance that I might believe in it.
08:09 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I'm just saying that if it is believable, it is basically we are saying that it is a construction.
08:21 Which is following a certain set of rules. Whereas if we are saying that we believe in it, we are just saying that it's our fault.
08:33 SPEAKER 2 Fault, what do you mean?
08:34 PRAYAS I mean, you know, belief is can be called a fault in the sense that, you know, no matter how much the evidence is stacked against something, if you believe you believe.
08:48 It's not a rational thing. It's not a rational thing.
08:51 SATYA Sounds like an act.
08:54 PRAYAS Yeah, it sounds like a construction.
08:56 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
08:58 SATYA But so what? I mean it's still with the intent of that removing the element of verification.
09:08 PRAYAS (?) Of verification.
09:10 SATYA I mean it's not you're not worried about credibility. You're more concerned about believability, which means that
09:19 No.
09:21 MALAVIKA (?) Li I was just thinking if we r relate this to the question and if we for instance take a story, s the same story with I mean, okay, the story is said by two different people
09:37 MALAVIKA (?) And let's assume that to be the refraction that's happening.
09:42 MALAVIKA (?) Mm.
09:42 MALAVIKA (?) And there is a variation in the two stories.
09:45 Right.
09:46 SATYA (?) It's essentially the s a s the similar kind of story, but there's a variation in the narration.
09:54 MALAVIKA Yeah.
09:54 So if you talk of believability or credibility or whatever and you have these two stories being narrated
10:06 Right.
10:07 MALAVIKA (?) What happens?
10:11 SATYA It so depending on the audience who perceived those two refractions, those two stories, I think it depends a lot on the audience and
10:25 And you know, this presentation, the how the refraction is happening.

10:32 So it's an interaction between all these refractive surfaces.

10:38 PRAYAS Believability is

10:41 Even credibility is.

10:44 No but how I mean th I was looking at believability in the sense of a construction and in that sense as a good thing, in the sense if it's a construction and it can be constructed again, right? Whereas if it is something you believe in, we don't know what you're gonna believe in next.

11:08 SATYA That is true, yeah.

11:11 I mean we can't say one is better than the other, one is good, one is bad. I d I don't know if I can say that.

11:17 PRAYAS Yeah, I'm just saying it's more useful in the manner of the question I mean in relation to the question we were we ended with yet with yesterday which was how do you optimize the refractive quality of a surface?

11:38 So offering construction

11:44 SATYA I don't know why believability cannot be constructed either. I mean or you said that believability can be constructed.

11:52 PRAYAS Yeah, I'm I said that it can be constructed.

11:56 SATYA Yeah. Believability can be constructed, credibility also can be verified. So both have an element of construction.

12:06 PRAYAS (?) Credibility cannot be constructed so easily.

12:12 SATYA Yes, but credibility can be acted.

12:18 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean without needing to be believable.

12:21 SATYA Yes, that is true.

12:23 SATYA (?) Also get credibility through conviction. And that does not necessarily have to I mean and yeah, there you go back to, you know, believing it. You believe and so y it gains credibility.

12:38 Correct.

12:45 So I'm not sure how m how many surfaces care about verification. I think persuasion and believability is of higher value. Higher not good or bad, but it has it seems to be of a more of a

12:59 SATYA (?) Functional. It's more functional.

13:01 PRAYAS Yeah.

13:02 PRAYAS (?) More option. [?]

13:02 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

13:03 Yeah, if you are considering that it happens in a way in a physical kind of process without needing the intervention of the individual.

13:16 So

13:19 Because the because constructions can be

13:24 Can be altered in real time. and I mean I understand that's what acting is about.

13:33 SATYA (?) Right. And this is an interesting acting where you keep the audience in mind because it's like a feedback system where construction the act can happen based on how the refraction is progressing.

13:45 PRAYAS Yeah, and I think keeping track of both at least seeming to keep track because you don't really know what the refraction in somebody's somebody else's head is happening. You don't know that.

14:01 PRAYAS (?) Right.

14:02 MALAVIKA (?) But

14:04 SATYA But there are certain pointers that perhaps a good actor looks out for.

14:11 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean I think that's what we were trying to get at in the sense when we were talking about how does I mean what is the external manifestation of refraction?

14:25 Right.

14:26 So when we were talking about whether if something is happening with a chair as a witness and if something is happening with a person as a witness
14:38 Right.
14:39 What's the difference? So can we say that because there is a refraction happening in the person's experience
14:50 Right.
14:51 There's some external manifestation of it that is that can be felt by
14:58 Someone outside that person.
15:01 SATYA Yes, but I want to say that thing outside the person, the chair could actually be anthropomorphized and the person can actually be objectified. So but maybe the presence of an outside structure out may make a difference, yeah.
15:22 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I mean the chair can listen, but how do we hear that?
15:30 PRAYAS (?) We it's inside, we imagine it listening.
15:34 Yeah, so yeah, we have to imagine hearing as well.
15:39 SATYA (?) Hearing and but the point is that there is a there is a fac there is a new variable going into the refraction because of the presence of the chair.
15:49 PRAYAS Ah, okay. So you are saying that things have that external manifestation as well and it's not necessarily a person.
15:58 SATYA (?) Yeah.
16:00 I mean I could have like a fire in fr you know, or something you know, something traumat traumatic in front, which is an object which might affect.
16:11 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
16:16 And that's what you are seri pointing towards in this question.
16:25 I mean in a way
16:29 Of one of it of surfaces affecting each other as it being a chain and not
16:44 SATYA Like I didn't want to I felt like narrowing it down to the individual was being a bit selfish. I if I may even use a word strong enough as arrogant. I felt like there's much more to it than just the individual.
16:59 I mean much more before it.
17:02 SATYA (?) Before yeah a while or after.
17:04 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, okay.
17:06 SATYA (?) Yeah. Like it's a it's much bigger than that.
17:14 That's right.
17:15 PRAYAS Also but also a disinterested person kind of bored person.
17:23 Yeah.
17:24 Who would in that room with a chair, a person and an actor
17:33 Would feel nothing in that room.
17:36 Right. Right.
17:41 So
17:42 In that sense it's individual.
17:45 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I mean because it takes some kind of
17:50 I don't know, like learning or sensitivity or
17:55 And how do we characterize those things?
18:02 MALAVIKA I didn't understand what do you mean that something may not feel someone or something may not
18:12 Or be sensitive because if you take the example of what Satya gave, if there's a fire now that would affect
18:26 Different things differently. It would affect people in a different way, it would affect
18:31 PRAYAS (?) Not all people in the same way. Not all people in the same way.
18:36 MALAVIKA But also

18:36 I if you if you take material, you know, like even objects, it's gonna affect it differently.
18:46 Correct, yeah.
18:47 MALAVIKA (?) So
18:50 SATYA (?) I think
18:51 MALAVIKA There is a response, a reaction, if you don't want to say response.
19:02 PRAYAS And it doesn't require a kind of sensitive. Not necessarily
19:08 MALAVIKA Necessarily I think it depends on what it is subjected to.
19:13 SATYA But then yes, it does depend on what it's subjected to, but how it responds is dependent on itself, right?
19:24 MALAVIKA Yeah, the properties of the surface. Yeah.
19:27 And I think that's where the sensitivity perhaps comes into the picture.
19:33 Yeah.
19:42 Because we have to take into consideration things like weather and time and climate and these are equally
19:50 Yeah.
19:51 MALAVIKA (?) You know, causes
19:53 SATYA (?) Yeah, every it's like a soup. We are in the soup. Yeah, it's all there.
19:58 MALAVIKA (?) So then our next question is already I think being discussed in that sense. if re-fraction is a learned process.
20:15 PRAYAS Because yeah, I mean you're saying that we're already in the soup, but
20:24 I mean, just like we can actually go back to language for an easy example, we can say that this the same will not even be understood by someone who is not habituated to reading.
20:41 PRAYAS (?) Right.
20:43 So I mean because acting is a slightly more difficult example because you can never know what the impact was, you know, what the reaction was.
20:54 MOSES SAM (?) Right.
21:00 SATYA (?) Right, whereas reading or something more passive was that where you're going at?
21:04 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I mean I'm just saying that you don't understand if you don't understand the construct of language at all. I mean of specific kind of usage of language.
21:18 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
21:23 PRAYAS (?) So or are we thinking of text operating like a like a chant does that produces
21:34 Produces a kind of quality of readership just by being you know being experienced. So it's not de p it doesn't depend on being understood. So you can you can say a Sanskrit chant or some chant and supposedly it has everything
21:57 Embedded in the in that chanting and there's a
22:03 PRAYAS (?) In the chant there is a yeah.
22:08 SATYA Yeah, there's no processing required, but the it the effect already happens.
22:12 Yeah.
22:16 SATYA (?) I mean I was coming through a debate. [?]
22:19 MALAVIKA Well
22:20 I just said it's debatable.
22:22 Because there's just because learning itself is I think a result of the refractive process.
22:34 Yeah.
22:35 So I think things and people respond to its environment and surrounding and the ones who are capable of a sensitivity they adapt and change according to those and that you can term as a learning. Like even plants tend to change the way they grow or what they do according to what they're exposed to. They are they slowly evolve and adapt.
23:17 So it does not have to be a learnt process. I think learning is a process as that
23:27 PRAYAS Comes through.

23:29 Yeah.

23:31 SATYA But Malavika from what I heard w you say I interpret that as learning. So it's getting some inputs and it's adapting to that. So to me but maybe that's my interpretation of learning.

23:44 MALAVIKA (?) Refraction itself is not a learnt process.

23:48 MALAVIKA (?) Okay.

23:50 See the question is whether refraction is a learned process. I think it's not.

23:56 Okay.

23:57 PRAYAS So what would you say to I mean so would you say that a given experience will cause refraction in a similar way?

24:10 PRAYAS (?) Two similar two.

24:12 I mean across all possible e surfaces, ex individuals, whatever, the refraction is similar.

24:22 MALAVIKA Oh, why wouldn't it be?

24:24 PRAYAS (?) But you're saying that it's not a learned process, so that means it should occur in the same way.

24:28 MALAVIKA No, it does not imply that.

24:31 SATYA No, it doesn't imply that. Yeah, it's for each individual that refraction exists.

24:35 MALAVIKA (?) Surfaces are different and we just discuss the properties of each surface as we

24:40 MALAVIKA (?) No, but how does it exist?

24:43 SATYA (?) What the original construction is there and that is the refractive surface.

24:49 But I want to add to it that I believe there is also something meta in this. There are some layers that go on. The refractive surfaces become aware that refraction is happening and th that the refraction happening is not optimal for that individual surface, therefore it puts on a new layer.

25:08 Sure. Yeah, that is certainly there. That is

25:14 PRAYAS No, but I don't agree that it's entirely about the surface. that's what I would like to believe, but the way

25:30 Culture operates, for example, in a in a outside the frame context and it's it doesn't really

25:43 Assume a common shared readership.

25:49 Amongst the whole audience.

25:52 PRAYAS (?) That's true.

25:55 And it expects a kind of learning to enjoy its benefits.

26:03 Great.

26:03 And that and that expectation is rewarded. I mean

26:07 Yeah, it is.

26:08 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. So how would you connect these two ideas? I mean

26:13 SATYA But that's where the layer comes in between. Culture is what provides the crust, the new crust. There's layers and layers forming.

26:22 PRAYAS (?) Forming where?

26:24 SATYA On top of the base refractive surface there are other refractive surfaces that form.

26:30 SATYA (?) Okay.

26:32 And culture's one of the catalysts that causes that crusting to happen.

26:38 SATYA (?) You mean it

26:40 Culture a not like a f I mean it could be a filter, but it is also a thing, an agent, which it's there. It's like a soup and then you have to sort of put on a shield o over the individual, over the refractive surface to be able to function within that soup. So you become a submarine.

27:11 PRAYAS How do you become a submarine? you're saying that the layers accumulate on the surface and so it becomes a hybrid surface in that sense.

27:20 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

27:22 So Acha, you're calling that a submarine?

27:25 SATYA Yeah, kinda like the

27:27 SATYA (?) Okay.
27:31 SATYA (?) Exactly.
27:35 PRAYAS But then how is how is that related to the believability idea in the sense of the construction, right? So if
27:50 SATYA It will allow the crust to form if I believe in what is hitting me.
27:57 PRAYAS Yeah, but the c the layered crust, the layered surface can that be constructed or no matter what you do, it's going to either be there or not and that's an that's a that's a process and that can't be constructed.
28:20 SATYA (?) S I'm the s the image I'm getting now is scar tissue. I mean
28:26 Scar tissue forms, I mean, whether you want it or not, it'll be there. It's the debris of the conflict with the outside.
28:36 SATYA (?) But then if I become aware of it and I'm able to form another surface outside it.
28:50 PRAYAS Oh what do you say, Sam? Can you hear Sam?
28:57 MOSES SAM (?) No, you can't yeah.
29:05 SATYA (?) 'Cause I guess the question was is refraction a learned process?
29:09 SATYA (?) Yeah.
29:09 MOSES SAM Okay, yeah, okay. Can you guys hear me?
29:12 PRAYAS (?) Yes.
29:13 MOSES SAM Yes.
29:13 Okay. I mean I was listening to what Malavika was saying. and I accept that learning in itself is a process, but for us to make sense of, you know, we are using language, which again is something that we have learnt, right? Yeah. so in that context, if you're using words that we have learnt over all these years of survival, then refraction becomes a learned process, right? Like otherwise we won't be able to talk about these things. And I mean adding to that, you know, even the physics that we talk about, you know, refraction is a physic physical phenomenon. And that again is something that we have learned. We never really how to put it we experienced it but then we experience it because we see it through our physics glasses.
30:13 Right. So in that context I think refraction is a learned process, yeah.
30:20 SATYA (?) Sam, I want to go back to what you said about language. I mean language is learnt yes, but
30:25 SATYA (?) Yeah.
30:25 SATYA (?) That doesn't mean refraction is learned, right? I mean we are using language as a tool to describe refraction.
30:37 PRAYAS Or to communicate.
30:38 But the idea of refraction lives within that description.
30:45 MOSES SAM Correct. I mean the more we learn about something, the more we'll be able to appreciate it. Right?
30:54 MALAVIKA (?) Is are we talking about the idea of re refraction or refraction itself? So I think I think that the two differences
31:01 Thanks.
31:01 Yeah.
31:03 MOSES SAM That's why I missed that. What is that?
31:05 MALAVIKA (?) I said are we talking of the idea of refraction or refraction itself?
31:10 PRAYAS No, but they're not two different things in the sense we c we cannot distinguish between the idea of something and something because all we have is the idea of it. We don't really have it.
31:24 PRAYAS (?) And it's sort of feeding it.
31:25 MOSES SAM (?) Take experience.

31:28 MALAVIKA Idea of it versus I'm pitching it against experience. I mean if you go out and stand in the rain, you don't need to know what rain is to understand what is happening. You still get wet. Whether you call it rain or you call it anything else, it doesn't matter.

31:49 PRAYAS (?) But how do you know that was not my delirium?

31:55 SATYA What?

31:56 PRAYAS I mean that rain, how do you know that it's not the idea of the rain? It's not an idea.

32:05 SPEAKER 2 Because your clothes will be wet.

32:08 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so they can be very convincing they can be very convincing deliriums.

32:15 SPEAKER 2 Delete him see th then see this is this is the credibility. This is where like [?]

32:21 MALAVIKA Okay, so I can verify whether it is delirium or it's actual experience.

32:28 PRAYAS No, I

32:28 SATYA I think a delirious person can't do it.

32:34 PRAYAS Yeah so you know like Inception the movie

32:39 Yeah.

32:39 Really had this paradox in the sense how do you know if you're sleeping or you're awake or I mean sle in the sense dreaming or you're awake. And I'm not sure it's actually it's possible to distinguish.

33:00 PRAYAS (?) I agree.

33:02 SATYA Distinguish between idea and the

33:05 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. The idea of the thing and the thing itself.

33:10 MOSES SAM Right. I mean it's the same thing, yeah.

33:14 PRAYAS It's the same thing or is it's different things?

33:18 MOSES SAM No, it is the same thing. That's what you're saying, right? I accept that.

33:21 PRAYAS (?) No I'm saying that there are different things. That the idea of the thing

33:26 SATYA But we only know.

33:28 Yes.

33:29 SATYA (?) Huh?

33:30 MALAVIKA You started off by saying they are the same thing.

33:32 Yeah, that's when I left, yeah.

33:35 MOSES SAM (?) No.

33:35 MOSES SAM (?) How are you saying that does it?

33:37 PRAYAS No, I'm saying that the idea of something and the thing itself are different things in the sense that if we the idea of refraction

33:52 Is all that we know of refraction and we don't really know if outside the idea of refraction there is actually any refraction or not.

34:03 So basically

34:04 PRAYAS (?) And yeah.

34:06 SATYA So for the individual, the individual knows only the idea of the thing, but whereas outside the individual there are two separate things.

34:16 PRAYAS We don't know if there's an outside.

34:18 SATYA Right, we don't know that, yeah. So are they two separate things?

34:22 PRAYAS (?) I mean we don't yeah, I mean we can never know that.

34:26 PRAYAS (?) So then we only know the idea.

34:29 SATYA (?) Yeah, we have to make do with it. That's all we have.

34:34 MALAVIKA (?) I think this is useful as a tool.

34:38 With sort of

34:39 Contexts. I am not going to I don't feel comfortable agreeing with it universally.

34:53 SATYA (?) Or even essentially.

34:56 PRAYAS I mean it's actually counterproductive to actually even go down this road because

35:03 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

35:04 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, if you're if you're if you can't really say, then the idea is the thing for you. As far as you're concerned, then the yeah it's the same thing. Right, Sam, you're right.

35:19 MOSES SAM No, it is the same thing. Okay, so let me put it this way. So ideas are you know Jason Silva, this guy futurist, he said ideas are just as real as neurons are, you know, the neurons that inhibit these ideas. The ideas become the neurons and then they transmit from one brain to another. Essentially, you know, like what we are doing right now is we are talking about an idea. So it migrates from brain to brain and then you know it competes for the limited number of resources, everyone has a short attention span. So it lives in each of our brain cells for a few seconds or milliseconds or whatever time it is, but then they have this spreading power, they are infectious. So essentially this idea is what we experience at the end, even if it comes out as a product. So it is the same thing.

36:15 MALAVIKA Yes, f fr from a human being's perspective, yes. What f what about

36:24 I'm I'm really fascinated that Satya brought up this aspect of fire today. Because fire affects everything. So what would you say to wood that is exposed to fire?

36:39 MOSES SAM (?) Why do you have to say anything to the wood? Maybe the wood's purpose has to be doing

36:44 MALAVIKA (?) The word the you see a reaction.

36:47 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

36:49 PRAYAS (?) What could you say to the idea of w of wood?

36:56 It's the same thing, so you can replace them.

37:00 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, I mean I'm saying wood itself is an idea.

37:04 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

37:04 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

37:05 PRAYAS Right.

37:05 MALAVIKA You

37:06 Can talk of it an as an idea, but if we're talking of refraction as being a process even

37:15 Even if we just take the illustrative example of a prism and a ray of light passing through it.

37:23 Huh.

37:24 Yes you can talk of it as an idea, but you can also experience it as a thing.

37:31 MALAVIKA (?) Right. And I yeah.

37:34 So if we're talking of it as an idea then everything will fall under that

37:39 Aspect of I mean the world is itself an idea.

37:42 Everything is.

37:43 Yeah.

37:44 Because it because of our consciousness the everything becomes an idea. But outside

37:49 Of this, now that

37:51 That is obviously accepted.

37:53 It is a given.

37:54 Mm-

37:55 If we look at the actual process, the physical

37:58 Of whatever is happening that's what I'm

38:01 I'm interested in

38:04 See.

38:05 There is

38:09 Can you at that level say that it's a learned process?

38:13 MOSES SAM (?) Oh.

38:17 SATYA (?) So you're talking about how the neurons respond. I mean, just to take that as an example. So the physical are you saying is it a learnt process at that level of the physical.

38:28 MALAVIKA And I'm trying not to go back to a human

38:31 Example because you know it's very the two can get mixed up.

38:37 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah. I mean it helps to talk about the surface irrespective of subjectivity.

38:44 SATYA (?) Yeah.

38:44 SATYA (?) But that's the prop there's a problem here, right? I mean, in case of a human example, there is learning happening across time. Yes, you know, there is evolution happening. So the skin has evolved over a period of time or like the plant has evolved.

38:58 Yeah.

38:59 That you know, if there is no sunlight I become yellow. So the surface has adapted there's a learning that has happened through evolution. But for a inanimate surface so I mean unfortunately the surface does come into the picture.

39:18 MALAVIKA (?) There are active surfaces and static surfaces.

39:22 MALAVIKA (?) Yes.

39:26 PRAYAS So are you saying the surface does come into picture or the in individual does come into picture?

39:32 SATYA (?) The surface okay.

39:36 What?

39:37 I think yeah. I mean the surface is tied to the individual.

39:42 SATYA (?) Okay, but might have nothing to do with it in that I mean might not be specific.

39:47 If you take a piece of skin which is detached, then yeah, it does ch change colour, like if you expose it to heat, like on top of a tabla or something, it has a it has a different because of its constitution, but if it is attached to an individual or an animal, it will have a different response.

40:08 PRAYAS Yeah. So we m move to our third question for the day. If we accept that we cannot ever know anything.

40:19 Does that mean that refraction leads us to a state of unknowing?

40:28 I mean we don't know anything, we have accepted that.

40:31 Yeah. So does the refraction take us to is refraction the periodic refresh that takes us back to that point and prevents us from getting deluded that we do know something.

40:47 SATYA Okay, yeah. but again it depends on who's taking the input of the refraction. I mean it depends on the individual processing of the refraction.

40:59 PRAYAS Yeah, right. Because that is not the common mode of

41:04 PRAYAS (?) Operation. Yeah.

41:06 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, right. So it obviously must be getting perverted somewhere.

41:10 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

41:13 SATYA Like I keep coming back to this image of scar tissue. It's like

41:18 A surface which is like a coverage. It's like you built this armour.

41:24 SATYA (?) Mm.

41:27 PRAYAS (?) And that sort of is like a hubris sometimes.

41:32 Yeah, your defense c your defense mechanisms limit you.

41:36 SATYA (?) Right.

41:41 PRAYAS But for me it also seems like a clue towards the optimization that we were that was baffling us yesterday. So in the sense that to optimize the refractive potential of a surface

41:55 Yeah.

41:55 You the one thing that we might be able to do is construct a more believable unknowing like in the sense that construct a more believable reason to not know.

42:13 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

42:16 MALAVIKA (?) You have a feedback mechanism built into the system.

42:21 PRAYAS Yeah, of turning everything around constantly.
42:26 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
42:28 SATYA (?) To
42:31 PRAYAS You know, to constantly be left with the feeling that you don't know.
42:37 MALAVIKA Yeah, that makes sense because even when you're talking of defence mechanism, you know I'm thinking of how our immune system works sometimes. And if you take the condition of allergies, the immune system is actually hyperactive. So you have to either tell your immune system to sleep or train it to not recognise the things it knows or is believing to be harmful.
43:04 MALAVIKA (?) Right.
43:05 So I think that makes sense that you find that balance where it you don't sensitize yourself to an extent where you just believe everything or you take in everything at its acute, sharpest form.
43:25 PRAYAS (?) You are saying that a little bit of knowledge is essential in that sense.
43:30 MALAVIKA A little lack of knowledge is essential.
43:33 PRAYAS (?) No, but training your allergies is an act of knowing for your allergy. I mean
43:42 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
43:45 MALAVIKA (?) I mean from the immune system's point of view a lack of knowledge is essential then.
43:49 MOSES SAM Yeah.
43:50 Yeah.
43:51 MOSES SAM (?) That's true.
43:51 MOSES SAM (?) So how's that?
43:53 PRAYAS (?) No, it has to forget that, you know that
43:55 PRAYAS (?) Okay. But it has to know that it has to forget that.
44:01 PRAYAS (?) I think you have to do this.
44:04 MALAVIKA Th it has to be conscious that has to get away with its knowledge. It has to unlearn certain things.
44:11 PRAYAS (?) Acha so it's like an erasure, it's not like a me it's not like a memory to erase.
44:19 Yeah, it's conscious unlearning.
44:21 PRAYAS (?) Mm.
44:22 MOSES SAM Like a compensation.
44:23 MOSES SAM (?) [unclear]
44:24 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
44:27 SATYA Mean even if i'm feeling now li if you look at the corporate systems where
44:32 Yeah.
44:33 You take the temperature of your company and you see a cha something is going wrong so I have to make a change.
44:40 You know. So some knowledge is needed, but then getting used to that process itself is not a good idea. You have to shake up that process also. You have to keep on shaking up every process.
44:53 SATYA (?) So you can't ever make a textbook.
44:56 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
44:57 MALAVIKA And
44:57 I think that's essentially the problem.
44:59 Problem with institutions also, they're not taken up in enough.
45:02 Yeah.
45:03 Periodically.

45:04 SATYA Yeah. And it's always fun to go back to read textbooks from twenty years ago and you find it so hilarious.

45:14 MOSES SAM (?) Especially with organizations.

45:16 PRAYAS But then how do we grow?

45:19 SATYA That's how we grow.

45:21 MALAVIKA By breaking yourself again and again.

45:23 SATYA Exactly. And like Malavika said earlier about you know a little, you have a little knowledge, you apply it.

45:32 But shield yourself.

45:36 MOSES SAM No, get hurt and then do it again.

45:40 Yeah.

45:41 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, having a little knowledge is getting hurt. Like you have a controlled hurt.

45:45 SATYA (?) Yeah.

45:45 SATYA (?) You don't kill yourself.

45:47 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

45:50 PRAYAS But that's really expecting a lot in terms of

45:59 No. But that you have been hurt once and you want to be able to get hurt in the same way again.

46:10 In a different place.

46:11 Yeah, I know.

46:15 Yeah.

46:15 Yeah, don't pick at the scar tissue, let it heal.

46:18 Let me

46:19 PRAYAS (?) That's where Yeah, you're right, because that's I guess that's what is effective learning, that you see that you don't get hurt in the same place again. Right.

46:31 But then how is this how is this understanding of refraction as a state of unknowing? How do we keep it from becoming like a like a text actually, like a like a tenet, like a like a learning like yeah, like a learning. So how do we keep it from becoming like a

46:58 PRAYAS (?) You know, a syrupy thing that you can just pass on.

47:03 PRAYAS (?) Right. I was seeing recognition posts. [?]

47:06 Yeah.

47:12 SATYA But you know, sometimes I feel and I hate to admit this, but like cliches

47:18 Mm-

47:19 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, right.

47:21 Yeah.

47:22 PRAYAS (?) No, it's not the fault of the cliches actually. Most of them are more than I mean, they are very true. It's just that

47:30 PRAYAS (?) Yes.

47:31 Yeah, it's just that when you I mean if you just sell the spice separately packaged, then it's not as valuable as the cooked food.

47:44 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

47:47 So it's it I mean that's just it. So you know it's see if you constantly keep peddling the moral of the story, then the you know, then it then y you still want to read the story because you're not interested in the moral anymore.

48:05 So how do we do that? How do we keep it from becoming because it's a very natural thing actually that you tend to repeat to yourself what you think are golden words.

48:17 SATYA Correct. But actually what counts is the experience of that moral. You know, the process to get to that moral is more important than the moral itself.

48:28 PRAYAS Yeah, and it I and it can't be reverse fabricated in that sense and also you know, things get blunted just by getting repeated.

48:39 SATYA True. And we associate with the moral itself rather than the difficulty of getting there without having actually gone through it.

48:48 PRAYAS Yeah, and we will assume that it has it is blunted now, so it doesn't work in the same way, whereas it might if applied as a process and not the moral.

49:02 PRAYAS (?) Right.

49:03 MALAVIKA (?) Yes.

49:05 PRAYAS (?) So we need to have a tactic for preventing that from happening because we don't want to

49:13 MOSES SAM What's wrong in that happening, and that's again another process, right?

49:19 SATYA I mean nothing wrong but it's like the teaching a person to fish versus fish itself, giving a fish. I mean it's kinda like I would probably learn more and have a stronger moral in instilled within me if I went through the mistake.

49:34 MOSES SAM (?) And it's interesting that you brought it up, meaning I've been thinking about it. But what if everyone learns to fish, right? Then there is too much competition.

49:45 MALAVIKA (?) Then this one optimizing. [?]

49:48 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, then you filter.

49:50 No, then another guy tries to create a net. The whole problem with capitalism is that

49:56 SATYA I agree, I agree, but the key there was to actually share the fish.

50:01 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, but like human that's not human nature, right?

50:04 I know, unfortunately.

50:08 MOSES SAM (?) No, but we are not concerned about everyone.

50:11 PRAYAS (?) Mm- Okay.

50:13 MOSES SAM I mean we are just concerned about ourselves, right?

50:15 SATYA No, but we have to be concerned about everyone if we are concerned about ourselves because if we overfish everyone's gonna overfish.

50:24 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so I mean that is automatic. So concern for yourself and

50:30 MOSES SAM Prayas, when you say, you know, w what can we prevent, you know, what can we do to prevent this particular thing from happening, I'm wondering why should we prevent it and who are we preventing it from?

50:41 PRAYAS So I'll s I'll expand, I mean so I'll tell you where I'm coming from. You know, that periodic act of ceding ground of you know of essentially giving up your tension and of periodically landing up on a blunted at a blunted point. I mean which is not sharp in that sense.

51:05 -huh.

51:05 Is not is not desirable. I mean in a way in a way you'd like to evolve and constantly live with the sharpness and you don't we d actually don't know how.

51:23 MOSES SAM Hm. No I'm okay.

51:26 MALAVIKA I think the that state of sharpness or bluntness is variable. It cannot be static.

51:34 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, then that itself becomes blunt.

51:37 SATYA (?) I mean and what's wrong with being blunt? You know, hammers are supposed to be blunt, they're not supposed to be sharp.

51:44 PRAYAS So periodic bluntness is fine. I mean I'm not saying that you know we need to be knives because even knives get blunt and you have to sharpen them.

51:54 Exactly, after a while, yeah.

51:55 Yeah, it's fine, but it's like do you know that how to sharpen the bluntness again or not? I mean I'm just talking about that. And that's

52:05 SATYA (?) That's where the inflicting the controlled wound comes back.

52:10 MOSES SAM (?) Right, self sabotage.

52:12 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah, self-soluted. [?]

52:15 PRAYAS So you are saying Sam that we don't need to worry about this prevention at all.

52:21 MOSES SAM No, sir, no.

52:24 MALAVIKA (?) So it's okay.

52:27 MOSES SAM It is okay. Everything is okay.

52:29 PRAYAS (?) No, but then so y we just populate more and more cliches, that's it?

52:41 SATYA No, you know, I see.

52:43 MOSES SAM (?) Accept that everything is okay, let things be the way they are. There's no more arguments, there's no more discussions. So

52:53 PRAYAS (?) No, everything's okay. But it's still

52:58 Not restfully o okay. It's not restful. I mean you're still you still can't you're okay but you know you still can't rest. You're still restless.

53:13 SATYA (?) Yeah, that's true. That's the inherent nature.

53:15 Yeah, and

53:16 MOSES SAM Yeah, because some people are not okay with being okay. They want you know good, great, mm you know, those kind of things.

53:23 SATYA No, but that's like a that's like the comparative levels. That's I don't think when some people are not being okay, that's not always in a competitive manner. It is also just the inherent nature of wanting to do something different.

53:38 Yeah.

53:40 MOSES SAM But why does that person want to do something different? Where is that coming from?

53:45 SATYA That's just an inherent nature.

53:48 Maybe that's

53:49 MALAVIKA (?) Their way of unknowing.

53:51 Ha

53:52 SATYA (?) I mean not everybody I mean if you can say that it's okay

53:57 Mm-

53:58 At a foundation, but you might be restless. And I think that's like the Zen or whatever, like where you are.

54:05 MOSES SAM (?) If you actually say it from your foundation, then it's okay. But if you're saying it from a superficial level, then you know, then there's a problem there.

54:13 SATYA (?) Right, like whether th I'm doing it because I should be doing something or you know those words of should like that. Yeah.

54:21 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean of course we don't want to regress and talk about doership when we spoke at such length about you know the impossibility of doership last time in Perspective Studies and I'm not saying that we get into that mode of conscious action and I mean that's not what this optimization idea is about. But it's more it's more about you know focusing the lens. You do it once and you don't even know if you do it, right? You just do something and you think that's focusing the lens.

55:04 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, but I think that's what a lot of the creative processes do. I mean, when somebody is

55:13 PRAYAS Creative processes are mit almost you know, mythical. Like you know

55:19 MALAVIKA Wait, okay, let's not let me not use the word create. When a Sam was saying that somebody is doing something different or it's it you're changing your state to not be okay. It's

in some ways you are trying to push your own boundaries to see what else you can include in your frame.

55:43 SATYA (?) Right, you're acknowledging that you don't know.

55:48 SATYA (?) Mm.

55:49 MOSES SAM Yeah.

55:51 SATYA You're acknowledging that I know this much but I need to know more. I don't know that. So maybe I push there.

55:57 MALAVIKA Or either that or you're questioning.

55:59 What you know that is it really true?

56:01 Exactly.

56:02 MALAVIKA (?) You know, can there be something else? Am I missing out something?

56:08 PRAYAS So I'd like to conclude this season of the Refractive Surfaces.

56:15 PRAYAS (?) It's done.

56:17 And the next one is this idea of you know surrogate surfaces. And I mean in the sense that, you know, so the surrogate surface is basically it's it is a construction and it is outside you in that sense. But you know, like an actor does, like an actor constructs a surrogate surface like an identity which is not the actor's own, but it still belongs to the actor. So I think I mean that's a starting point for me because that feels like it will go beyond

56:57 The objective and the subjective position both because it's like a third thing.

57:05 SATYA I see. So you're not you're not thinking of it as a layer on the existing individual, but actually another third party thing outside.

57:14 PRAYAS Yeah, because it's a construction and like for example the same role constructed by different actors will be similar and dissimilar at the same time.

57:27 Right.

57:28 You know, so there is some surrogacy going on. There is something that is happening.

57:34 SATYA I'm sorry, can we I mean, would it also include something like the act an individual puts on themselves, like playing different personalities? Would that be considered as a surrogate surface?

57:46 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I mean we will look at all I mean degrees of it. And so I'm thinking of planning that in December. Is I mean are any set of dates particularly not good?

58:00 SATYA For me personally, December eighteenth to twenty eighth is not so good.

58:06 PRAYAS Okay. So across the new year might be good. Sam, how's that for you?

58:10 MOSES SAM I'm okay with anytime was.

58:12 MOSES SAM (?) Okay. So my value is different. [?]

58:14 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah possibly.

58:15 SATYA For me.

58:16 MALAVIKA (?) Early December?

58:18 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

58:19 PRAYAS Yeah, so maybe before ten.

58:22 SATYA (?) Before or yeah, like e until the fifteenth.

58:26 PRAYAS Yeah, sure. So we'll figure the dates, I guess we'll bounce some set of mails and but I'm thinking it for December, so we will figure the exact dates. So yeah, thanks everyone for being part of this study group and hope to hear your voices next time.

58:46 MALAVIKA (?) Thanks for using. [?]

58:48 MALAVIKA (?) Thank you.

58:49 MOSES SAM I guess that.

58:49 But

58:50 MOSES SAM (?) Nice talking to you.

58:51 MALAVIKA Yeah.
58:51 Yeah.