Breaking it Down: Day 3

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 24 July 2016. 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.

In this broadcast the screen did not show who was speaking. A name marked BY VOICE was matched by machine against the voices in the broadcasts where the screen did show names. Tried on those broadcasts, where the screen gives the answer, it was right in nine speaking turns out of ten.

Prayas Abhinav · prayasabhinav.net/videos

00:02 SPEAKER 1 So this we're live now.

00:05 ADITYA Oh okay.

00:07 Welcome to the

00:07 Third day session of Breaking it Down. So we have tried to rant yesterday, even though we did not really end up ranting too much. We did discuss about rant. Today I we I thought we will build a little bit on what has just been discussed in the session yesterday, and also to take into other forms that we perhaps may discuss in the in line of ranting. So the first question for today is

00:41 ADITYA (?) Can heckling activate a conversation?

00:49 ROHINI (?) I think when I when I think

00:51 Of

00:52 Heckling.

00:53 And it sort of suggests there's an automatic interaction, right, between the person who's speaking and the person who's doing the calling out, if you like. So there is sort of implication of interaction between the speaker or the listener or sort of

01:08 ADITYA (?) Okay. Yes. And

01:11 PRAYAS But their interaction might not be cohesive, right? So the speaker and the listener might actually have a f very an interaction full of friction. They might actually be contesting each other.

01:28 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:31 ROHINI But it

01:35 ADITYA BY VOICE But do you think then do you see heckling as a as a potential to activate a conversation or do you think it has something more symbolic actually?

01:48 SATYA BY VOICE It shuts down no conversation on the other hand.

01:52 PRAYAS BY VOICE Sorry?

01:52 PRAYAS BY VOICE Yeah, because it takes very sporty hecklers to actually take heckling not as a position, but as a kind of sport. and that it's actually about sportiness because I can be very I can feel very disturbed about somebody raising an objection of some kind to a very something which I consider to be a very basic thing.

02:18 SATYA BY VOICE So the sportiness has to be coming from both the speaker as well as the heckler.

02:22 PRAYAS BY VOICE Yeah, sportiness has to kind of embody a kind of spirit which is like, ha, bohot sare perspectives hain, even if my perspective is this, I can't expect this from anyone.

02:38 ADITYA BY VOICE But I think that's sporty is the way to think about it. I'm not very sure, yes. But sorry Satya you were saying something.

02:45 ROHINI BY VOICE I think what it suggests is, you know, like when you look at like I don't know, politics or something and then you see parliament or people who are going back and forth, there is a certain sport in that as well, right? Who can get the who's get who gets the who's cleverer, who's able to use humour and maybe of course it's cutting as well, but there is that maybe I mean not s yeah, I think sport is not a bad thing.

03:06 PRAYAS BY VOICE The essence of sportiness is that the game is more important than winning. And that essence in a discussion that ha keeping the discussion healthy and alive rather than trying to win the discussion. I think sporty is a is a is an appropriate word for using there.

03:29 ADITYA Okay, sorry, Renan, were you saying something?

03:32 RENAN Yeah, just to connect it to what we've been feeling that this is something to do with sportiness and I think we do get this feeling precisely because heckling occurs during the conversation or it happens within the conversational sphere rather than as something that it starts a conversation. I mean it's there's this kind of reactionary position to begin with that enables heckling to begin with. So I don't think it's for instance similar with the rant that it can occur at its own space and its own time, but heckling actually is already occurring during the conversation. So that kind of lifeline of heckling appears or is present during the conversation rather than away from conversation. I don't know.

04:26 MALAVIKA BY VOICE I see heckling as being based on intrusion. So it actually it even the playfulness of heckling can is mostly based on intrusion. So you don't let the other person really finish what they are trying to say or you keep intruding and butting in and trying to and that is what ends up heckling the person who's speaking.

04:54 ROHINI BY VOICE Yeah, also it ends up becoming very much about power, right? So if the two parties are not e equal, if you like, then I think I mean I'm just thinking if we turn it around and not look at it in the abstract sense of, you know, heckling as a political maneuver. But for myself, for instance, if you're presenting or something, you kind of want almost want to make sure that you are completely your anti heckle proof. You know what I mean? Like you want to make sure that you have all the answers already so that there is no one who can come in and start. You know what I mean? Like you're sort of giving making sure you're protecting yourself. I mean, that's also because heckling is not pleasant certainly.

05:27 SATYA BY VOICE And there is also the artfulness of the speaker, of how they handle a heckler. you know, if you are able to take it in your stride and if you're able to, you know, make it funny or somehow engage the heckler, you might actually have something constructive there.

05:45 ROHINI Yeah.

05:47 ADITYA BY VOICE It's there's a very interesting th small I think four minute video of Obama handling hecklers and Donald Trump handling hecklers. It's quite fascinating. It's like he says, Yes, Obama says that, you know, I understand why you disagree with me, we can talk about it, etcetera. Whereas Donald Trump says, Oh, please get those people out of the out of the crowd, etcetera. It's a very no, that's when you said about the speak speaker's ability to deal with heckling in terms of how one picks heckling and gets back.

06:22 SATYA BY VOICE And to connect to that to what Rohini just said about power. It's in the case of Trump it is about establishing who's powerful. But in the case of Obama it's about power sharing. You're sharing your stage.

06:37 ADITYA BY VOICE It's more in i in a way at least the projection is more inclusive.

06:42 SPEAKER 1 Yes, exactly. Yeah.

06:46 ROHINI BY VOICE Well you know at one level, if you look at this level, if we're talking Obama, Trump, you know, that kind of political sort of stage, then I suppose the thing is that heckling then because it's also so disruptive, does maybe offer a possibility of where you can, you know, sort of push things in a different direction and disrupt, you know, sort of bring in you know, embarrassment, interruption, failure, discomfort which might otherwise never enter that plane.

07:13 SATYA BY VOICE Yeah, so true. And I'm reminded of one of those universities in UK where these FEMEN activists they went up on stage during a conservative Muslim seminar. And then these you know, these women are radical feminists and then they you know go topless and that's how they disab disrupt meetings to make a feminist statement. So yeah.

07:40 ADITYA BY VOICE So that's the point also then to think yes, heckling is understood as a disruptive kind of act. But at the same time when we say when we say heckling is act is activating a conversation, the point is whether the conversation is followed after the disruption is happened or whether heckling itself is a part of conversation. That's the I would say one of the questions that we can think about.

08:05 SATYA BY VOICE Interesting, because that would be a symbolic instead of using words, you're using symbols to communicate, right? So it's still a conversation.

08:12 ADITYA Yeah.

08:13 RENAN And I think yeah, and just to connect it with symbol, another interesting thing about the capacity to do heckling is you know the position of having a charm. You know, like I think this is something that's rarely talked about, this capacity of being charming and being able to inaugurate this form of heckling because not all individuals have this actually access to heckle just because of this certain appearance or this certain voice or certain performance of their speech for instance. So I think like for instance with Obama and Trump they're both operating on whatever level of charm or whatever form of charm they do have. And I think that's also interesting that this form of heckling is a is also communicates a level of charm or like charm or something like communicative agency.

09:09 SATYA BY VOICE Yeah, that's so true. The appearance of the speaker as well makes a difference i to the communication.

09:18 SPEAKER 1 And their demeanour, perhaps.

09:20 RENAN Exactly.

09:24 ADITYA That's why George Bush gets a shoe. That's what he's saying.

09:30 MALAVIKA BY VOICE The other thing I find is that unlike a rant, I think heckling has more space for it leaves more space for response in the conversation.

09:49 MALAVIKA BY VOICE It's I see it as something that is that has a shorter timing or duration and a rant can be much longer and it's more about a singular voice saying something.

10:03 ADITYA BY VOICE It's not it's not a monologue in that way. It's the everything is not a monologue.

10:07 SPEAKER 6 Yeah.

10:08 ADITYA And it does

10:08 SPEAKER 1 It's a goal.

10:11 ADITYA Right.

10:11 SPEAKER 1 Exactly. There's a goal to invoke a response.

10:14 ADITYA Yeah.

10:15 ROHINI BY VOICE Only thing is I find like there's something very makes me uncomfortable about a heckling versus a rant. At least a heckling suggests that you're really trying to, you know, make some pull someone down. And I'm I mean, only because then it becomes very much about who is able if you have the kind of personality or the strength or even or just the kind of personality really to be able to withstand that or deal with it and if you don't then it can be

very, you know, it can be horrifying. Whereas a rant at least has that kind of it's more it's not so explo it is explosive but in a different way. It's sort of you know it's

10:47 PRAYAS BY VOICE A heckler is not necessarily tr trying to pull someone down. A heckler might be just trying to make their own perspective register.

10:57 SPEAKER 6 Heckling is always targeted. There's a very clear target in heckling.

11:01 ROHINI BY VOICE Yeah. I understand heckling because then you could call it many other things. You wouldn't call it heckling. Heckling has a very clear sort of you know, you're build you're trying to

11:09 SPEAKER 4 Yeah, the that clear thing which it brings up is to me it's not that it's I mean I'm just direc it depends on where you see their energies being directed. Are the energies being directed towards bringing someone down or are they being directed towards putting someone up in the first place? So is it about presenting one's perspective or is it about dismissing someone else's perspective?

11:33 ROHINI But then you wouldn't heckle if you were trying to present your perspective, would you? Would you say that would be a

11:38 PRAYAS BY VOICE I think you would hack a [?] repressive environment or if it's such a dismissive environment where your perspective is not being acknowledged at all, I would imagine that yeah, you would heckle.

11:52 SATYA BY VOICE Yeah, because in for example in the case of the female activists, they would never have a s space in that stage. They would never be invited to such a so that's the only way they can

12:00 PRAYAS BY VOICE I can imagine s numerous sessions at the India Art Fair where I might be pushed to heckle

12:08 ADITYA BY VOICE Yeah. Certainly. Perhaps this time we should definitely do it.

12:13 SPEAKER 4 Yeah.

12:14 ADITYA Plant four people in the audience to heckle.

12:17 SPEAKER 4 Yeah.

12:17 RENAN And I think heckling has this kind of radial movement. I mean meaning to say on one hand yes there are certain occasions where it's targeted, but most of the time I think or I feel that heckling actually has this kind of radiality in which it's it stands in at this kind of assumed or presumed center of conversation and then try to radiate this kind of maybe it's aggression or maybe this kind of I don't know.

12:56 I don't know if it makes sense.

12:59 SPEAKER 1 Excellent.

13:00 SPEAKER 7 What begins to happen if the heckling is staged and if the heckler and the heckled know how d how does that change things? How does it change how the act of heckling is viewed?

13:16 ADITYA BY VOICE But then the audience will be surprised, no? That audience don't know it's changed.

13:20 RENAN Yeah.

13:21 SPEAKER 7 Yeah.

13:22 SATYA BY VOICE There is a tradition of having shills, right? There's a tradition of having shills who do encouragement. So it's they are planted there very consciously by the speaker.

13:33 SPEAKER 7 Or even hecklers are planted.

13:35 MALAVIKA BY VOICE I mean a heckle can also be orchestrated to literally, you know, test somebody's defenses or to unnerve somebody, especially if it's like political parties and oppositions.

13:47 PRAYAS BY VOICE Yeah.

13:47 PRAYAS BY VOICE Yeah, but as long as a certain establishment that is shaken up. As long as there is some amount of moving and shaking happening it there is heckling happening. So

14:02 SPEAKER 4 It doesn't matter if it is if it started off as being staged.

14:07 SPEAKER 7 Mm.

14:08 SATYA BY VOICE I mean it could matter in the sense because if you're trying to create a certain narrative. You know, it's like, you know, Shiv Sena activists or whoever coming and deliberately attacking their own you know what happened in the Hyderabad University thing where people came and incited they so they are the enemy but they pretend to be the friend.

14:29 ADITYA Yeah.

14:30 SPEAKER 1 You have to.

14:31 SPEAKER 4 Even JNU that happened, right?

14:32 SATYA BY VOICE Exactly. I think it was JNU or Hyderabad, I forgot, but you see people

14:36 ADITYA BY VOICE In [?] is a little different.

14:40 SATYA BY VOICE There was there was a riot, there was a campus riot happening and then it was being incited by people pretending to be the students. Yeah. So that's what I was talking about, you know.

14:54 ADITYA Shaunak?

14:54 SPEAKER 7 On a tangent this reminds us on a tangent this reminds me of the so in the Bolshoi Ballet there in actually in most old Russian theatres, they the theatre hires clappers and these clappers form a clique and of course their role is to clap at the right time so that the audience knows when to clap. But if they as a as a dancer or an artist, if they decide they hate you for some reason, they also begin to clap at the wrong time. And like to me that's actually a very organized form of heckling because that can change a lot. They're basically drowning you out at the wrong time. So

15:35 ADITYA Yeah, because even if you

15:36 SPEAKER 1 Paid them, it's not working 'cause they're doing the wrong thing.

15:39 ADITYA BY VOICE It's like the American television laughing for you.

15:42 SPEAKER 1 Right.

15:43 ADITYA Is that good?

15:46 ADITYA BY VOICE Okay, we are going to we soon have to move to the next question. Shaunak, can heckling activate a conversation?

15:54 SHAUNAK But there are two quick things that I actually find quite funny is that there is a thing called the International Hecklers Competition. Which is basically because heckling is just such a like enduring and a dominant part of American stand-up comedy that so I'll try and find the link right now and send it on the group. It's actually quite an amazing sort of for this thing where stand-up comedians are invited and are told that they're gonna be heckled, but they will not be the people who are either appreciated if or evaluated. It'll be the hecklers who would be evaluated, right?

16:31 ADITYA Whoa.

16:32 SHAUNAK BY VOICE It's in the framing of the questions that I mean the heckling is evaluated and so on. I'll try and send a link of it, but it's actually really interesting because it's a sort of model wherein almost administered into the delivery of a certain food or a certain content is the sort of anticipation of a kind of contagion of things that are meant to disrupt it. I can understand that's probably not how obviously how a general heckle is because it's works with the notion of the impulsive of the completely spontaneous and the impromptu. But it's interesting to see how these groups of people who refer to themselves as professional hecklers plan you know consolidate each other and then it's like a mass consolidated sort of an onslaught.

17:19 ADITYA Okay, institutionalized heckling almost.

17:22 SHAUNAK I mean yeah, I mean I it's i it's planned. I even if it's not institutionalized, but it's definitely pre planned and like in entirely anticipated.

17:35 ADITYA BY VOICE Any more additions before we move to the next question?

17:49 ADITYA BY VOICE Okay. Okay, the second question is would you process disagreement through an open letter?

17:58 ROHINI No.

17:59 SHAUNAK No.

18:02 SPEAKER 7 No.

18:03 ADITYA Okay, there's so many no's.

18:07 You also have to say why, you can't just say no.

18:11 ROHINI BY VOICE Well, I just feel like, you know, for one thing, I mean, given that you know, the way we're in this world of sort of social media, I think every Facebook post is like an open letter, right? Anything you post on a friend's wall is general yarn [?] for everybody else. And every time I mean I just feel like the open letter becomes this kind of it's a public announcement, it's posing as a private gesture and I don't I don't really for me at least I don't I mean, I suppose the only thing is that it's fun to read somebody else's mail, you know what I mean? That's the only thing that read to its advantage. But I don't know. It's slippery. I think it's rarely what it seems to be, which I find a bit un discomforting.

18:49 SHAUNAK BY VOICE Yeah. Actually, so my gag reflex most open letters is usually of revulsion. So I'm a s immediately

19:00 ROHINI Okay.

19:01 ADITYA You're cracking up Shaunak.

19:03 SHAUNAK Did you hear what I said now?

19:06 ADITYA It's still it's still mumbled.

19:09 SHAUNAK Okay, is it better now?

19:12 SPEAKER 6 Really?

19:13 SHAUNAK Is it better now?

19:14 MALAVIKA BY VOICE It's not so much to do with the volume, but maybe your bandwidth or something.

19:19 SATYA BY VOICE You could reduce your call into an audio call at the top from the controls.

19:25 SHAUNAK Okay. audible now?

19:28 ROHINI It's sort of breaking up, it's very distorted, that's giving me something.

19:31 SHAUNAK Okay you guys continue gonna try it in the other thing on your thing.

19:35 ROHINI You sound like a an you sound like a droid actually.

19:39 SPEAKER 6 Yeah.

19:40 SHAUNAK Are you

19:40 SPEAKER 4 You're droid.

19:46 Ah Shaunak, are you are you actually a droid?

19:48 SHAUNAK Yeah, I do sound like that in real life. But I'm gonna try and do make this into an audio call. You guys should continue your prophesy.

19:56 SPEAKER 1 Okay.

19:57 ADITYA BY VOICE Okay. Other perspectives. There are many no's that they said why they wouldn't want to process disagreements to open letters. So before Sean [?]. Sorry?

20:09 SPEAKER 7 That's I actually think of disagreements as very personal things. So somehow maybe I'm thinking of them in a different s at a different scale. So I'd rather yeah, disagree with

a person privately than do it on and I mean if it was open then it would become a rant, I guess. Or that's what I would call it.

20:34 ADITYA Que no pasa. [?]

20:35 SATYA BY VOICE Sometimes there is a way to disagree through an I mean I would think there would be situations where you could express yourself in an open letter in a very public manner to express disagreement without it being terribly negative or attacking or anything, you know. Because there are times you know you know how you have these letter exchanges between thinkers, for example, and his historical letter exchanges where the whole processing is happening during the writing process. You're writing and processing your thoughts.

21:07 SHAUNAK Yeah.

21:08 SATYA BY VOICE And then you at least for me, when I write it down, my emotion comes out, but then I'm able to temper it.

21:15 ROHINI Then you can send them a letter, right? Why would you I mean the open letter becomes

21:19 SATYA BY VOICE Yeah, no, but what I'm saying is if I want the world to know about it, because if there is a situation where for example if there's a character assassination kind of stuff going on or I'm suspecting somebody of, you know, trying to change a narrative that I'm you know, something else that I'm not, then maybe that's one way to process it out in the open.

21:41 SHAUNAK Am I am I audible now?

21:43 SPEAKER 1 Yes, you are much better.

21:44 SHAUNAK BY VOICE So basically what I was saying then was that generally my sort of gag reflex to any kind of open letter is usually of revulsion. as a as a medium it's never really worked for me. But I must also point out that I have I mean I always really have loved the letter form. I love reading letters like you know, the famous historical letters that people have written to each other and it becomes or I also otherwise love writing long email friends or personal relationships and so on. But the thing that I love the most in it is that it really holds I mean it the personal letter really holds intact the sovereignty of the person writing and the person receiving because you only have in mind me as a person, as a as a certain version of myself that I know the other person will see and the other person. the minute what we go into the open letter format is that gets dispersed ad infinitum into a strange thing which I just don't understand in terms of both the person writing it, like the subject position that person is another and the person like to whoever one is writing, you know, pure urban th [?]. I mean then you're not writing from like you inhabit the position of the citizen or the that kind of generalization I really it's like you know

22:54 SATYA BY VOICE It does serve a purpose, you know, because it's the s online space is all about narratives. There are battles of narratives going on and open letters serve that way to s tell a particular story, to sell a story. You know, and then this side is saying this story, this other side is saying I can understand being jaded with the form, yeah, it's become a bit too much and everybody writes open letters and it's become old. But in a way it's a way of creating history on your own terms, right? Like it's all documented online.

23:23 SHAUNAK BY VOICE Yeah, I no, I meant it more in the sort of personal relationship to letters and by the open letters and but also I do agree with Rohini when she said that the it's almost like all our forms of communication because so much of social media works on the logic of publishing oneself into the trying to make a dent into the world outside through publishing oneself, right? So I don't see the as a form i it's both its novelty and therefore the kind of indenture it can cause I think is much less increasingly by the day.

23:56 ADITYA You're

23:58 ADITYA BY VOICE Sorry.

23:58 ADITYA BY VOICE So you're saying that you would prefer the form of the letter than to open letter. That's what you're saying.

24:03 SHAUNAK BY VOICE No, I'm saying that what the open letter hope or aspires to achieve, I think a lot of other forms are entertaining like nothing [?] towards that. I don't think open letter distinctively as a form or as a subgenre holds unto itself any great value. I am I really enjoy letters in general, but an open letter in itself doesn't for me hold too much. I don't think it does much.

24:31 SATYA BY VOICE No, but you know, people who write an open letter, for example, it's almost like showing who they are. What are they thinking in a large you know, this is who I am, this is what I'm look at me, I'm writing an open letter. You know, so it's almost like a self advertisement in some ways, a at least on how you know, on social media.

24:48 SPEAKER 4 I don't agree that on each social media post on a you know, is like an open letter because you know, the mathematics of what which post is visible to whom determines that actually we are not visible to a very vast audience. And open letters are traditionally read in newspapers or something like that, which are giving the letter prefabricated public stage.

25:20 SATYA BY VOICE No, but aren't newspapers nowadays trawling for their material from social media? Like initially open letter appears on Facebook and then or something and then the newspapers start picking it up. Yeah.

25:32 PRAYAS BY VOICE But that works for individuals who have a large number of followers.

25:38 SPEAKER 1 That's true.

25:39 SPEAKER 4 Not for individuals who just have the individual networks.

25:43 SATYA BY VOICE That's true. And even if they make it public it doesn't matter. Somebody it has to go viral only then will it? Yeah.

25:49 SPEAKER 4 Yeah, so maybe a couple of thousand followers would do it.

25:53 SPEAKER 1 Yeah.

25:54 MALAVIKA BY VOICE I do feel that the open letter when it's actually the content that goes into an open letter is very different than what can put I think a personal letter when it's not open can be far more kind of precise and if it can have a greater impact from the reader, provided the reader knows you. If that personal component of knowing who's writing and knowing who's going to receive it is not there, then I think the open letter does serve it does become an easier m middle ground to express oneself.

26:36 SHAUNAK BY VOICE But I'm just wondering if this middle ground more often than not flattens out all possibility of nuance or because so much open letter fall [?]

26:45 MALAVIKA BY VOICE I agree that there's a lot that you cannot say in an open letter as compared to what you could say.

26:51 SHAUNAK BY VOICE I mean this in the not just in the in comparison to a personal letter, but also in fact that so much of the open letter format is couched in the vocabulary of a letter to so and so from an Indian soldier, a letter to so and so from an Indian father. That the it is a certain version of ourselves that becomes the chief sort of mouthpiece of for that letter. And I mean it seems to me a flattening out and a narrowing off I mean when I'm writing something to a close friend or to anybody, I mean there are various versions of myself that I'm then at that point triggering and channelizing, right? It's the open letter immediately like sort of like makes that myopic, like flattens you.

27:29 SATYA BY VOICE I think that is the c that is the idea. The idea is to create a narrative. When you write an open letter to the public in a social forum, that is you're cr trying to create an image or narrative.

27:42 SPEAKER 6 So that is the idea.

27:43 ROHINI BY VOICE A question of scale, right? Like who at what scale is are we talking when we say process disagreement through an open letter, what level of the disagreement are we talking with someone whom you could actually have a conversation with? Because in that case an open letter seems passive aggressive. If you're gonna if it's a much higher level you know what I mean? Like if it's something you're it's a political thing or it's something that you feel like you

cannot access where you're a very small player, then yeah, I suppose an open letter is one way at least that you can enter a conversation that maybe you wouldn't have.

28:14 ADITYA Access to

28:14 ROHINI Right.

28:15 SATYA BY VOICE And you could also start a conversation with it because a lot of like, you know, nowadays, you know, letters on social justice, for example. There are so many people who write that. It's just having that whole discussion thing that's the comments after that and everybody's, you know, responding to it and you know, somebody railing against patriarchy and all these MRA types representing the patriarchy are attacking it or something, right? So

28:39 ADITYA BY VOICE So I was just then thinking that so if we were to think about just to pedal back and think if for example people have not been not they're writing open letters instead of reviews, like you know, if I write a l if I write an open letter to a artist friend instead of reviewing about an exhibition that I saw. So do you think in that context also it is something some form that as an artist someone would not like because

29:11 SPEAKER 4 Yeah, 'cause it does it does sound passive.

29:14 SPEAKER 1 It's not a good thing.

29:15 ROHINI Mm- That sounds great.

29:17 PRAYAS BY VOICE Sounds like actually like [unclear] was saying, I think open letters should be banned if they being [?] to anyone except the Prime Minister. I mean

29:32 SPEAKER 1 Nahin par ham petriyaar [?] ke ghar kaise jaaen?

29:35 SPEAKER 4 No batan [?]

29:36 ROHINI Aditya, I have a question then. What does an open letter allow you as a curator, critic, whatever, writing about an artist friend's work that a review does not?

29:46 ADITYA BY VOICE No, but the point is that the idea of open letter is also as an idea of inviting response. And it's a it's a choice for you to respond or not respond. But the but the point is that a review is sometimes most of the time like single directional, you know?

30:05 ROHINI I think that's a good thing.

30:06 ADITYA BY VOICE I come I come and then I see the exhibition and I write a review and somewhere by the virtue of the history of how reviews are, we have s kind of an a kind of a particular kind of judgment about it. Where I'm not necessarily talking to you as a person, but I'm presuming exhibition as a condition or exhibition as a scenography that you have set up. Which you're also of course part of, but you don't become the point of interest always. Does that make sense?

30:33 ROHINI BY VOICE Yeah, and also it's interesting because then it sort of it plays a little bit also or it opens up this idea of also, you know, not established sort of modes of the way these things are done. So if you are writing a review, there's a part of that you're not going to piss off the person too much. You know, you might couch the language a little bit nicely.

30:51 SHAUNAK I'm thinking.

30:52 ROHINI Oh my name. [?]

30:53 ADITYA Yes. So did you say?

30:55 ROHINI Well that just to say that I think again it offers possibilities that maybe just to review definitely doesn't because

31:02 ADITYA BY VOICE Yeah, so that's what I'm saying. If I was look I watched a performance of a friend and I come back and I want to write something about it that is not a review. And I would like to at the same time have some kind of intensity of engagement with it. So then I would perhaps write an open letter to my friend which is talking about how the performance has transformed me. Of course, I don't think passive aggressive is the thing because you at least

personally for me I would only make an effort to write something if it moves me. Yeah. so if it's passive aggressive either on the band apparently [?].

31:35 ROHINI BY VOICE Because there's a certain scale to this, right? Because someone whom it is that's what I'm trying to say. I think here it functions a little bit differently because it's not an abstract. The you know what I mean? The conversation is not between two abstract entities. These are there's some kind of scalable relation thing.

31:51 SATYA BY VOICE No, but if you wrote if you wrote an open letter as in lieu of a review, would you mention that this was the performance that you went to?

32:01 ADITYA Not necessarily.

32:04 SATYA BY VOICE Okay, yeah, because that's what I felt where the passive aggressive element comes, you know, if it is being written about somebody specific and it's not being a directly addressed to them, you know, in terms of sending it personally, but or like a review. But if it's written like an open letter, it just seems like, Okay, why don't you just talk to me one on one?

32:26 ADITYA BY VOICE But the point is that's what I'm trying to say that one also the way especially in the context of review I brought it up because this is some practice that I'm personally doing at the moment. I'm actually writing about Mandeep's performance as a letter to him and the and the potential of him responding the one of the other thing is also the responsiveness angle of it, which is like if he thinks that there is something that he would like to respond to even though he's not obliged to then it bec what it becomes is that it's a two way conversation.

32:56 SPEAKER 1 True.

32:57 ROHINI BY VOICE And

32:57 ROHINI BY VOICE I'm wondering whether we shouldn't then use why are we using the word open letter? Why can't we say a conversation? Why can't we say a dialogue? Why can't we say a chain of letters? Why are we saying open letter?

33:07 SHAUNAK BY VOICE That people [?]. Like can you point out other sort of things that open letter form is bringing

33:15 ADITYA BY VOICE For example, there's this very nice letter. I would say that one of the best letters I have read which is written by Raksht [?] for with the along work called Time Capsule that they've done a few years ago. It's called actually a letter to Amalia Jaran [?]. it's beautifully written. It's an it's open, it's like it's published and everybody can read it. But what the what the reading of that letter and the accessing of their future through the through their writing to Amalia

33:43 SHAUNAK But yeah.

33:44 ADITYA Very exciting. Sorry.

33:46 SHAUNAK BY VOICE It is, but there the letter is going to be read by another person fifty years from now. When not ask how is that similar to you writing a review to Mandeep's piece?

33:58 ADITYA BY VOICE No I'm not saying it's in the law, but I'm saying I'm talking about the potential of there are some instances around and this is what I'm saying. I'm not saying perhaps yes, I'm not review reviewing your performance, I might actually end up writing something else. But I'm actually

34:15 SHAUNAK BY VOICE No, but I'm interested in what attracts you to the open letter form apart from the response thing, which I also think just calling it a conversation or a dialogue will allow will enable. So what are the other attractive components of the form for you?

34:30 ADITYA BY VOICE No, but it's just the because of the of the fact that it can be read by many.

34:34 ROHINI But so could a conversation if you s if you choose to make it so between the two of you can

34:39 ROHINI BY VOICE Yeah.

34:39 ROHINI BY VOICE Yeah, that this is no yeah. Or if you don't like interview because again it suggests I don't know a certain kind of power thing then you could say well no it's just a series of

conversations between Mandeep and myself. They it could still be open act I mean, you know, openly read by lots of people.

34:55 ADITYA BY VOICE No, that is true. The I'm not I'm not actually disagreeing with what you're saying, but I'm just it's as we are speaking, it's an experiment of whether this is a possibility that we can also because historically if you see that it has a very interesting that's why I put disagreement because it has a very critical value of dis disagreeing, you know, as a as a of course through letters but also sometimes through open letter. Like a taking a political position. Like if you if w one were

35:25 ROHINI BY VOICE I think someone wrote up this fact that, you know, we sort of saturated with them. I think I understand where you're coming from, like what it used to be, what the open letter used to be and what it is now. I think there's too much of a sort of it's carrying too much baggage. You know what I mean? And it's sort of

35:41 SPEAKER 1 Form has become a bit old now.

35:43 ADITYA Yeah.

35:44 MALAVIKA BY VOICE And it's diluted with the form of a letter itself in some ways that

35:51 MALAVIKA BY VOICE Just n not the open letter, but just a letter, the form format of a letter itself has a certain feeling to it, which I think an open letter being overused has completely destroyed.

36:08 ADITYA BY VOICE Also I would say that actually going back to someone's mention, it is true actually then the way in which the post economy works today, the idea of sharing everything also is a different way of address publishing that is something of course it is an open post, no, in a way that anybody can see it, like unless you're right, yes. Yes, there are limitations in some in terms of the controls that you have and the network that you can actually circulate in. But nevertheless a circle of five hundred people that you're in or a five thousand people can actually see it. So and at the same time have completely different perspectives of how one would like to look at it, no. whether it's too personal, too public, etcetera and things like that.

36:53 PRAYAS BY VOICE But contrary to the common understanding it doesn't work that way. So you don't actually have a public stage of that kind of which there is a certain number of static audience because things are being shuffled around at such a pace that you might only have a small accidental piece of audience and only the people who interact with you over the long term always see your stuff. Which is it's true.

37:25 SATYA BY VOICE Though, but that's very true and algorithms are a problem. But yet if you have this post up which is public, which you are trying to process disagreement, you actually can also do a collective disagreement, you know, you can process it collectively. So you might have more of your friends also offering their perspective of where you are being overcritical or maybe you need to think about this differently. So maybe there is a more community oriented processing of disagreement, perhaps.

37:51 MALAVIKA BY VOICE Why does it have to be in the form of a letter addressing somebody?

37:57 SATYA BY VOICE It's just yeah, that's true. I mean, why does it have yeah, it could also just be a post of how I felt.

38:02 ADITYA BY VOICE That's the question is then whether that's the point is whether that it is the it is a form that's useful and if it's not a form useful also because then why one thinks it is not

38:14 SATYA BY VOICE There is a directionality to it, right? Like you're addressing some specific person or entity or something. It's there is a directionality. So in that sense, it's not a post, it's a letter to somebody.

38:25 ADITYA Yeah.

38:26 SATYA BY VOICE And if you are specifically having a disagreement with that somebody, you have put it as a post, for example, and everybody is seeing it. And now because social media enables everybody to post, whoever sees it, they can offer their perspective too. I don't know,

maybe it might help to process. Or it might make it worse. There'll be people inciting it further. So

38:47 ADITYA BY VOICE Okay. Any more comments before we go to the next question? We're actually running a little late.

38:58 ADITYA BY VOICE Okay. So the last question, which is actually why very crucial to the breaking it down when it began, is that where does the generation of a language stand in a culture that is preoccupied with nomenclatures? Where does the generation of language stand in a culture that is preoccupied with nomenclatures? So personally for me it comes from a extremely academic perspective, but it is of course the true with a lot of us who work in the cultural industry. which is this condensation of a field of knowledge into particular nomenclatures, which is which seems to be the recurrent you know, theme or recurrent practice.

39:42 SATYA BY VOICE So what do you mean by generation of language? Is that the creation of codified words? is it is it ling lingo, jargon?

39:52 ADITYA BY VOICE Well, in the sense like how do you actually how do I produce if I'm an academic, for example, it becomes inevitable for me to use contemporary or like, you know, these nomenclatures that we operate. Yes, they're convenient, yes, they have a particular connotation to what they mean. But in the sense of at some point is also to the quest is also to find new nomenclatures. Like in terms of whether you know, the p colonial came, post colonial came and contemporary came tomorrow, post contemporary will come in terms of the a particular kind of method that looks towards producing these condensation, which is what Rohini we had this discussion about the Anthropocene.

40:35 If you're m so

40:38 ROHINI BY VOICE I think sometimes it can be generative too. I mean it's because with word I mean, o specifically if we're talking I mean, okay, so specifically if you look at the word Anthropocene it's interesting only because it allows access to

40:52 SPEAKER 4 Renovating to the [?]

40:56 ROHINI BY VOICE Like i th the word sometimes it can be generative, I think, because I feel like th the it allows access from many different points of view. as long as it doesn't become I suppose it hasn't yet come to that point where it's become this kind of thing. You know what I mean? It's still formative. It has not yet been really I mean, of course it's been defined, you know what I mean? But it's not entirely set yet. It's still it w it's why we're in one of those rare places I think where we're seeing it ha seeing it become, if you like. So it's still interesting. But I'm not sure if that will stay, you know. Yeah.

41:32 I don't know if that makes sense.

41:34 SATYA BY VOICE So but is the is the question that is there a need for or no, what is the value of having this kind of language being generated in such a culture which is preoccupied? Is that are we talking about the value of it?

41:48 ADITYA BY VOICE I'm not saying value of having nomenclatures, I'm trying I'm talking about how what other language can you actually speak in a in a in a kind of a context but is so preoccupied with nomenclatures.

41:58 SPEAKER 1 I see, okay.

41:59 ADITYA BY VOICE So because it's also kind of an unfreezing [?] language. So if I f if I'm an academic I am like obliged to speak a specific kind of language because you know, my whatever I work with they will say that this is not academic enough or like, you know, is this not

42:14 SATYA BY VOICE Say that just based on the terms that are used or the language that's

42:17 ADITYA BY VOICE In terms of I'm not saying that it's not the na it's not only based on the terms that are used, but that the particular kind of language that you need to use to be able to construct an argument. And also and also the co not the compulsion, but I'd say some kind of a drive to produce a synthesis that is condensing into particular I would say go and far and say categories and try to fit things into categories, which is which is a very common practice.

42:46 SATYA BY VOICE I mean it's a bit worrying if people if you know, if there is a preoccupation with language like that, it's a bit worrying, right? Because it takes away from the content but more about appearance.

42:56 ADITYA Yeah.

42:59 ADITYA BY VOICE Yeah. That is that is the also the that is also the thing and

43:03 ROHINI BY VOICE Also then it becomes sort of instrumentalized in a way that may not be the intent of whoever you know, in a sense that whoever's using the words, they can be used as part to bring something into the fold of an agenda that is not something that the I mean you know what I mean? Like whoever made if we're talking about within the art sphere. So let's say someone has made a work and then it's been brought into a various, you know, sort of different things just because it I yeah, that is one thing, I agree. Because also then it makes them very fixed.

43:33 SATYA BY VOICE Yeah, and also another thing is suppose I use a certain type of language, okay, and within my own industry there is another set of language being used by an opposing kind of

43:45 ROHINI Yeah.

43:46 SATYA BY VOICE People who are also working in the field. So if I speak using these terms, I fall automatically in this camp versus in that camp. There is I don't want to fall in any camp. So there's that labelling which arises from what words I use.

43:58 ADITYA Absolutely.

43:59 RANJANA And also that it makes it difficult for you to do anything else, you know, which becomes even more problematic.

44:09 ADITYA Others ran out [?].

44:11 MALAVIKA BY VOICE I think it depends on how one deviates also, like we were discussing yesterday or day before, that regardless of how much you deviate from your routine practice or your standard methodology of working if you're still going to be categorized and like if even if the deviant is being swallowed up by some larger category, then it becomes really hard to see h how really your language is evolving.

44:46 ADITYA That's the

44:47 RENAN Points.

44:47 ADITYA Sorry. Sorry, go ahead then.

44:50 RENAN On one hand I see the value of creating I mean I don't see I mean it's problematic to always be preoccupied with, you know having all these nomenclatures. But on the one hand it also like manifests a level of disagreement, a level of tension that needs to be sustained as we produce new ways of thinking and new forms of articulating. So I don't as much as it's problematic, I don't see that it's as urgent as say for instance, thinking through about discursive architecture and discursive sphere. You know, I think we can we can accommodate all this preoccupations and all this busyness in into this project by actually thinking through discursive architecture rather than just battling each other against the notion of what which nomenclature could actually arise and be prioritized. So it's more of like the sphere and the architecture where we could actually not it's not about equivalence or it's not about equal footing, but really rather having this kind of productive antagonism where there's this kind of you know war between linguistic devices because there's there will always be a production of these linguistic devices. But can this be accommodated in certain in existing discursive spheres, for instance art. And art right now, for instance with the notion of international art is not really hospitable to certain linguistic devices. So that's one thing that I think we have to talk about.

46:21 ADITYA BY VOICE And that's why I actually agree with you, Renan, on that. And also the idea is that actually then yes the I agree with the point of the discursive architecture that you're talking about. And I'm afraid whether that discursive architecture is being produced in terms of

systematizing and also and it's also like, you know, I would go far a little bit and to say institutionalizing certain forms of knowledge that comes I'm not necessarily as a deviation, but as j as something generative which being i is being then absorbed into a particular

46:57 PRAYAS BY VOICE You know, but when you're talking about nomenclature today and when you were talking about jargon on the first day, what occurs to me is also the fact that, you know, the more specialised you're going to become in terms of understanding things in a particular way.

47:14 PRAYAS BY VOICE Mm.

47:14 PRAYAS BY VOICE The more specialized your vocabulary is going to become and the more it's going to seem like jargon.

47:20 SATYA BY VOICE Yeah, and it's an unfortunate by product because if you're studying quantum physics you have to talk about a boson. You can't do anything.

47:29 PRAYAS BY VOICE Words that he used capture the specific meaning which cannot be captured by other words.

47:34 SPEAKER 1 Correct. Yeah.

47:35 SHAUNAK BY VOICE Also Mopi, I was thinking that you know, it seems I understood the question during the discussion that it seems to me that your sort of the question is rooted against a presupposition where jargon and nomenclature and certain kind of canonization of language seem to be interchangeable, you know? And I can see that of course I mean when you say that a certain kind of institutionalization of language comes in, it gets homogenized, it gets meanings get scrunched on an arrow [?], of course, of course. But for no nomenclature usually means naming things. And I for one, for example, I really enjoy and I think it's generally like the act of naming things is productive this thing. So the fact that if I mean you were talking about the anthropocene, the fact that the period post say the ninety ones. Mm. I keep coming across books where some somebody's called the last ten years say the age of transparency, you know, with RTI coming in and so on so and all the various different social political sort of things that have happened. Somebody else calling it the age of surveillance, somebody else calling it the age of insecurity, somebody else calling it the age of insomnia, somebody else and I instead of seeing this as a kind of a colliding hostile ecosystem, I think the fact of like this sort of a polymorphism is a good thing because it what it means is that it's sort of taking claim. It means sort of taking claim in different kinds of interpretations and different kind different versions of how one experiences our contemporary moment. And

49:02 SPEAKER 4 I think the problem is that when we are not comfortable with a certain vocabulary or jargon in the first when we say that we are not comfortable with the jargon, what we actually mean is that we're not comfortable with that perspective and we would rather like that voice to be not there in the landscape. And that is a much more you know, that is a harsher thing to actually accept oneself because it's easy to you know, get over the fact that yes I have my biases, but to also get over the fact that I have my biases which are very absolute in terms of I can't stand the other you know other position. So it might actually be about yeah, it might be reflecting on some discomfort and distaste that we have.

50:02 RENAN And I think I just have to caution I think the use of the word or the description of institu is institutionalization of knowledge, for instance, or this production. Because on one hand, yes, it always gets institutionalized, but the process of institutionalization of these the way we see and relate to institutions as a w you know, like a Western civil manifestation takes time. So I mean so there's this process of that's why I'm more interested into this notion of discursive architecture, because the when the process of forming takes time for institutions, that's the way I think other forms of discursivity and other forms of linguistic devices could actually enter into this kind of process because it takes time. I mean it doesn't happen like in ten years or like, you know. I mean so I don't think we have to think through this idea that institutionalization doesn't really happen like quickly. It happens with the

51:03 ADITYA BY VOICE Intention is not for the institutionalized happen too quickly, or it is to say I think what few points actually is very I really like the idea of the discursive architecture that you're proposing Renan, because I think somewhere we are actually on this on the same page what we are discussing was on the same page. And also I like the point that Shaunak raised about the naming of the things and the value of naming something because that gives you a kind of a perspective. then what I'm trying to so when I actually was thinking about it and also in terms of the there are two kinds of things. Of course, there is a certain kind of naming as a practice which we involved in as practitioners almost every day in various ways in various formats and in various platforms. the second is the is the practice where how do you how can I put it? It's like the forced culmination of completely different kinds of practices into one whole. Like it's like the it's like the way, you know, the challenge that somebody ha has faces about the framing of the contemporary, for instance, and which, you know, some people have been doing and some people have given up. So I'm not saying that we have to abandon or not engage because I think we are engaging with these questions. But also it either in the kind of the discursive architecture that you are proposing, whether we have to be cautioned or careful in terms of what the knowledge structure what forms of knowledge are we producing for the future, even for ourselves if not for the future for someone else.

52:47 RENAN No, yeah, I mean I get that. But my problem with the invocation of institution is that it remains to be one of those lone standing or one of those concrete you know, you we always refer back to this notion of referencing the institution as a form of a monolithic, you know what I mean? Like as a something like as a referencing point in terms of producing or in terms of how we constitute and sort of move around. So I mean so for me it's important to put it in a larger discourse of things, for instance, thinking about infrastructures, for instance, infrastructures of knowledge that would involve institutions coming from, say for instance the global south. I mean my point is like for Southeast Asia you have different ways of you have a totally different notions of institutions that begin with the notion of sick institutions rather than, you know, a welfare state institution. So that kind of expanding the notion of institutionalization as something that, you know, that's not just in a way, yeah.

53:52 SATYA BY VOICE So th that hints to me about the elitism and things like accessibility hierarchies, you know, like if you're using this if you're not using jargon or if you're not able to produce jargon, then you're not worth hearing. You know, you're too simplistic or something. So

54:09 SPEAKER 7 Mm.

54:10 MALAVIKA BY VOICE I'm not so sure about that because like somebody else was mentioning that jargon I think Prayas was saying that. it the words that I use that we like to generalize as jargon is sometimes very specific to that p particular person. I understand that.

54:28 SPEAKER 1 No, I understand that button [?].

54:31 MALAVIKA BY VOICE The resistance to jargon comes from the inability to access that piece of information.

54:37 SATYA BY VOICE Precisely. So the thing is if I'm not within those structures because I've not been given entry, because I don't speak in a particular way, I already am kept out of that knowledge structure. Even though I'm able to produce something which may have been of you know, add addition to it.

54:55 MALAVIKA BY VOICE Right. So are you saying that's that's the nomenclature that's being generated, falsely generated?

55:04 SATYA BY VOICE You know, 'cause I Renan just talked about the global south, right? Like I mean, there are these hierarchies of what becomes into war [?], right?

55:12 SPEAKER 6 Right.

55:15 ADITYA BY VOICE So but the point is that yes that the distinctions of hierarchies are very important but and also the idea of then how discursivity as such, how discursive architecture that Renan was interestingly pointing to reorients itself. And it's not to say that you know what

Shaunak's talked about, the question of the naming is important, but it's also the consciousness of how this practice of naming is unfolding is also important. how one is actually generating a particular kind of meaning to these everyday otherwise casually used like if I can say nomenclatures that are there. So my point is then to Yeah, it's not definitely to say that the name the question of the naming is not important, but the question of whether we are conscious to this process of making knowledge is what I was actually trying to head at.

56:23 SPEAKER 1 Conscious of the process and also conscious of other people's processes, are we able to accommodate that? Yeah.

56:45 Hello?

56:47 SPEAKER 6 Yeah.

56:50 SPEAKER 1 I thought I dropped off.

56:56 SHAUNAK Do we have time? Can I just say a small thing?

56:58 SPEAKER 6 Yeah.

56:58 SPEAKER 1 Yeah.

56:59 SHAUNAK BY VOICE Okay. So no, I'm just I'm getting a little confused and a bit uncomfortable with again this interchangeability between nomenclature and the world of jargon, etcetera. Nomenclature means the act of naming, right? I can understand that there is a durational experience through which over time nomenclature leads to jargonization, etcetera. Now the thing is that the friend [?] of theory or the main drive of theory is always towards naming experiences, sensations, etc. Right, or processes. Theoretical thought more often than not is to be able to pin down in language historical processes, social conditions, experiences, how like the you know, the raw material of everyday life. So

57:40 SATYA BY VOICE But the thing is who is doing the naming and who gets to you know, who's naming gets the bigger prior priority, that sort of thing.

57:49 SHAUNAK Yeah, no I'm ex

57:51 SPEAKER 1 Yeah.

57:53 ADITYA BY VOICE But that's an important okay, I agree in the distinction between the nomenclature and the jargon. It's also about the question of who is naming and whose naming is taken as naming. That's the important question. And it's also linking to what Renan was talking about the diversity of like where you are actually talking from and what infrastructure, for example, could mean somewhere to the west, to the global south. It's a completely different method of approach.

58:22 MALAVIKA BY VOICE Doesn't the naming always follow the process of you know knowledge production or the experience? The naming is always coming later.

58:33 SPEAKER 1 Hm, yeah.

58:34 MALAVIKA BY VOICE I see it as something that follows the what Renan was calling the discursive architecture.

58:41 ADITYA BY VOICE But did w you were expanding something, Shaunak? Do you want to say before we wind up? We have three minutes.

58:48 SHAUNAK BY VOICE Yeah, I mean see for me the more interesting part of now obviously of course this is an old question at who is doing the naming and of course this has to do with questions of power of access of elitism etc. But that's I mean that's all of us will have certain things to say about that and that's fairly I mean we know the like there are structures in place. I was very interested when you said Mopi that for example the anthropocene, for example like the sort of almost convulsive tendency to want to name, you know, to want to pin words to and there within that there is a kind of conceptual and theoretical overproduction and overdetermination which I'm quite interested in and I thought the question was veered towards whether today th like there is a definitive push towards the like for example I was reading that Today all of like millennials in general read much more than anybody of that age denomination has in

the past, even though they're not reading books, right? So the text, like written word as an interface has really staggeringly grown. So when you were pointing towards the desire to name, the desire to put bring experience into the fold of language I thought that's I think sort of like to me it sounds like a more interesting thing too and a more uncharted

01:00:02 ADITYA BY VOICE Yeah, it's also it's also exactly the Anthropocene example is what that's what we are actually arriving at because the difficulty of actually having that emphasis to name and also at over attribute as you said. Is that what you said?

01:00:16 SHAUNAK Oh yeah, I said o over produce and over determine.

01:00:18 ADITYA BY VOICE Overdetermine, yeah. Oh something that to overdetermine and which is something that you face with a lot of these things that emerge and that's also the continuous challenge of whether you're like at the end you're confused what ac what actually it means, no? Since it seem it mean to be it seem to be meaning so many things simultaneously. And whether that is something that is productive to Sorry, go ahead.

01:00:42 RENAN And just one last note about the naming. I think we should just de escalate the this process of naming as something that is just, you know, a access point. So for instance in the case of their Anthropocene, for instance, when it is when it gets talked about in the context of say Southeast Asia or South Asia for instance, this allows actually a possibility to actually revive or it's a point of disjuncture. It allows to apprehend this juncture and to actually appoint and assert new conjunctures that are not necessarily about the Anthropocene or that might be actually connected with the Anthropocene. So this for me with it all its problematics are just merely, you know, like points of continuity or even like points of entry. So I mean we have to de escalate this process of like

01:01:36 SHAUNAK That's actually good.

01:01:37 RENAN I think it's a good thing.

01:01:38 ADITYA It makes it

01:01:39 Us end in

01:01:40 ADITYA BY VOICE Up in a rather positive note. So it's also the question of where you are asking a question from and where you're actually speaking. And it's also good in terms of thinking about the construction of what Renan was saying about the discursive architecture and also rethinking about what Shaunak was saying about in terms of the re the process of naming and how it is different from a jargon. Okay, I think we are done. Thank you everyone.

01:02:07 ROHINI Thank you.

01:02:08 ADITYA BY VOICE I hope you enjoyed and yeah. so hopefully in other another forum on another topic very soon. Okay.

01:02:19 SPEAKER 6 All right. Thanks.

01:02:20 SPEAKER 1 That sounds great. Thanks everyone. Bye.

01:02:22 SPEAKER 6 Fine.

01:02:22 RENAN Right.

01:02:23 SHAUNAK I said.

01:02:24 RENAN Thank you.