Mapping Fragments, Day 1

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 8 May 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.

Prayas Abhinav · prayasabhinav.net/videos

00:08 PRAYAS Hi.
00:10 Hello?
00:11 Yeah, welcome everyone for the first day of Mapping Fragments.
00:17 ADITYA (?) But I'm just trying to switch off my video so that it's clear. Can you hear me?
00:22 PRAYAS Yeah. Yeah, we can hear you.
00:23 MALAVIKA (?) Your video's off.
00:26 ADITYA (?) No we do though [?].
00:31 MALAVIKA Yes.
00:35 PRAYAS Yeah.
00:37 ADITYA Okay. Can you hear me?
00:39 PRAYAS Yeah, we can hear you. So the first question that we are so across the three sessions of Mapping Fragments, what we'll be doing is relating the fragmentation of the self to the
00:55 Fragmentation of locality in a sense. The fragmentation of a sense of s sense of place.
01:02 Okay.
01:03 So the first question towards that is how do we get fragmented?
01:10 ADITYA Being means self or the self and the place.
01:14 PRAYAS So the self and the place we are considering we are going we are going across traversing the two terms in a very in a parallel way.
01:27 PRAYAS (?) Okay.
01:27 PRAYAS (?) So sometimes we are de deliberately not specifying in which context we mean the to apply the word.
01:39 So be because it can yeah be applied in both.
01:43 SATYA I think we can discuss both or either or whichever way we'd like to take the discussion.
01:50 SATYA (?) Okay.
01:53 So
01:53 What does it feel like to us at this group at the moment? What is what is being fragmented?
02:01 PRAYAS Yeah. I think we could just we could go cl get closer to the to the issue at hand once we can talk about it more openly.
02:13 So how do we get fragmented? What do we feel about getting fragmented, f about being fragmented?

02:21 MALAVIKA The first thing that comes to me in a generic way is when you think of say community or a group of people and how

02:38 The group itself is made of different they can be get seen as fragments. So if you start backwards and think of a set of people as a as a unit, then you will have to then fragment the unit to look at what it's made up of. I mean it can be even the way we look at any anything in the way matter is divided into molecules and so forth. the other thing that occurs to me in a kind of instinctive way is to think of the self and how there are many parts of the self that one is constantly trying to deal with or confront and embrace everything at the same time.

03:33 PRAYAS So wha what is that what does that make you feel in the immediacy of when you feel fragmented in th in that moment, do you feel like enjoying the fragmentation or do you feel like something you feel like resisting that moment?

03:53 MALAVIKA I think it's neither. There is there w what is most important for me is to recognize. It's for me to recognize the fragmentation is far more important than either resisting or enjoying it.

04:19 ADITYA But the question then is w do we know that the fragmentation is happening or it's something that you only perceive it is in retrospect?

04:31 That's the important question because to be able to perceive something as fragments is also the ability to be able to look at different points of reference simultaneously. yeah, and the crucial question then I would ask because then fundamentally we are always trying to put fragments together in the in the speculation of producing a whole or making sense and so on. Whether it's the fragmentation of the speech to be able to bring into a structure, whether it's fragmentation of fragmented experiences trying to pull together to make sense of a new place. because it's only the confrontation or the experience of a new thing that will guide you to be able to pull together fragments to make sense of things that is at hand. So that is one of the w one of the things that I can think of in conversation through what you were saying.

05:38 PRAYAS So you mean to say the a specific moment when the fragmentation occurs is what we should zoom into.

05:48 ADITYA No, I mean to

05:48 Say that the I mean to say that the a moment of an experience

05:55 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

05:56 ADITYA (?) Is itself is not augmented necessarily.

06:00 MALAVIKA Yeah.

06:01 ADITYA But somewhere the it tries to bring together a set of fragments of our experiential realm.

06:11 ADITYA (?) Into in s ining [?] to make sense of what you just see or what you just heard.

06:20 PRAYAS Right. But it's not clear to me whether you're pointing us towards the I mean should we look into the actual performance of fragmentation or should we look at the post of that event? The moment the event you can do is already offered [?].

06:40 ADITYA No, you can actually do because when even when the experience occurs, it's I think both fold. Even if you think about the post of what think about fragmentation as a structure, the idea of experiencing anything in a fragmented not necessarily in any equity [?]. But the idea of only finding some points of reference through which you can make sense of a space, which doesn't mean that you're already bringing things from the past necessarily. This might just be the a conversation that we were having in terms of pulling fragments together to be able to articulate maybe another set of fragmentation process, which may or may not occur into a whole. There is no necessity or a compulsion.

07:29 PRAYAS So you wouldn't necessarily hold fragment a fragment as a binary opposite of a of an integrated whole.

07:39 ADITYA No.

07:40 SATYA That makes sense because how do we know which fragment belongs to the whole? Like how do I know if I have a bunch of pieces, I don't know what the whole is necessarily. And then how would I know that something be belongs to?

07:55 ADITYA Sorry, go ahead.

07:56 SATYA What I'm saying is if I have a bunch of jumbled jigsaw pieces, I don't know and I don't have a picture of the final picture what the m whole thing is, like what the map is, then I don't know really if this piece even belongs to the whole or if it's just a fragment lying around, like an impurity.

08:17 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, we might not know the whole, but

08:20 ADITYA But I mean

08:27 PRAYAS Yeah.

08:28 SATYA (?) I guess the point is like there is we only have the fragments. We don't know what the whole is like necessarily.

08:39 SPEAKER 1 So are you saying all experiences?

08:41 ADITYA (?) It will be fragmented.

08:43 SATYA (?) I would think so, yes. I mean we ourselves try to make a picture, for example.

08:51 SATYA (?) Okay.

08:52 SATYA (?) And first I need to have an awareness first of all that this fragment exists and then I have to connect it with something else. And then eventually after collecting many fragments, maybe some experience emerges eventually in hindsight.

09:10 ADITYA Which is may or may not possible is what you're saying. It's like unpredictable in a way.

09:15 SATYA (?) In a yeah, something like that.

09:17 ADITYA (?) But fragmentation is that way a process that we almost engage on an everyday basis.

09:24 SATYA (?) True, that yes, I do agree with that, yeah.

09:28 SATYA (?) The what I would like to do is also

09:31 MALAVIKA Tendency well there's also this tendency to a group, you know, if you look at the way basic animal tendencies are that there is a territorial and grouping tendency. So th there will be a herd, there will be a group of animals that will always try

10:00 MALAVIKA (?) Get trickten [?] as humans, so we cannot resist

10:06 Yeah.

10:08 Tendency to build a community either. And within that there is the recognition of the different fragments that are trying to coexist.

10:19 So

10:20 MALAVIKA (?) The journey is towards the whole. I don't think we can

10:23 Quite

10:27 Yeah.

10:29 ADITYA Are you saying that the journey is towards a whole and what we are trying to do in that process is basically trying to make sense of the fragments that we gather and trying to construct a structure that gives us more sense of thinking about the world? Is that what you're saying?

10:46 MALAVIKA (?) Perhaps and all also this whole is not very definite because the Yeah I mean wholes are keeping on changing.

10:54 PRAYAS (?) What I would like to a ask at this point is, even if the whole is not known or is not clear in some way

11:03 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

11:05 PRAYAS That doesn't mean doesn't exist.

11:09 PRAYAS (?) Maybe it does.
11:10 Yeah, so I think the ambiguity of the whole is not it does not pr produce a necessary set of circumstances to kind of negate the whole.
11:27 SATYA No, we don't know that. We don't know that. The fact that I have a few pieces of a bangle doesn't mean that the complete bangle didn't exist.
11:35 Right.
11:36 I don't know what it is part of, that's what I'm saying.
11:39 ADITYA But it's also the whole is also for example something like the subject, no?
11:46 Like as if the there is always the subject is trying to reach its a point of becoming a whole subject but it's always in the context of becoming. Which is something like the whole as well, because the com not the compulsion, the journey is always towards heading towards a whole but you're not necessarily sure whether when you are at the whole you recognise that you're actually part of the whole, no? That
12:14 SATYA (?) True.
12:15 ADITYA (?) Benefit of doubt.
12:16 SATYA Yeah.
12:17 ADITYA (?) Which in retrospect you might think that maybe I was there, I did not realise at that moment.
12:22 ADITYA (?) Yeah. And then it broke up again and
12:26 ADITYA (?) Yeah.
12:26 ADITYA (?) Yeah.
12:28 PRAYAS But why are we which are all the reasons why we are concerned about the whole? for one that is obvious to me is that in fragmentation one is one is in a way feeling a dissipation of the entire corpus of energy.
12:51 So in a fragment one would feel that there is not as much or yeah, as much resonance. there's not as much energy as the whole might ha might have. And that's the only reason why we are even calling it a fragment and not a whole.
13:11 ADITYA (?) But it might also be a necessary methodology to be able to
13:16 MALAVIKA That is why there is the tendency to try to unify or to connect or group. Because of the dissipation of this energy you feel you know that there's something missing and you wanna get more of it.
13:33 SATYA (?) As well as you said earlier, Malavika, this inherent desire, not desire, but inherent physical push towards collection. Like you talked about herds, right? Yeah. There is some kind of a tendency for things to come together for some reason. Something is pulling them together and we don't necessarily know what.
13:53 AJAY I think I've like to add something interesting to the mix because I hope I'm being heard clearly.
14:00 PRAYAS Yeah, we can hear you.
14:01 AJAY Yeah, because I mean th this whole idea of the coherent whole of the experience. I think there's also there's a beauty in sort of recognizing these fragments because piecing I mean understanding this fragmentation can allow to us being you know, articulating a different story and sort of shifting the whole or creating a new coherent whole. And I think I think that's what we try to do in a lot of you know, the different practices that we are in. So this idea of fragmentation and making it whole actually is very relevant and it's actually critical.
14:42 ADITYA (?) -huh.
14:44 PRAYAS Yeah, but the reality of the situation is that we are fragmented and we might never be whole. And
14:53 Living.

14:54 Yeah, so we might as well form a relationship with our fragments and develop a sense of coherence around being fragmented rather than lie in wait till the moment we are in you know really complete in that sense.

15:16 SATYA Yeah, because we don't even know if we can be or if it if it is even a possibility or a probability even. Because there's too many pieces.

15:26 ADITYA But isn't all also the sense of our time that we would like to be participants of the fragmentation rather than or the visionaries of the whole?

15:36 SATYA Yeah, true. It's a sign of our times, yes. Distraction.

15:39 ADITYA Distraction and also the idea of compartmentalizing, which of course product of a lot of forces around, which I'm not saying necessarily is a negative formation, but something that is a like a quality of a present which thinks of fragmentation as more productive exercise rather than a whole, which is like something I would say something like mod the modern time was trying to go towards this experiential realm, which is like kind of a whole experience, no.

16:11 Maybe.

16:12 PRAYAS But the real problem that occurs is the pr along with the fragmentation of the self, and our desire itself is fragmented.

16:23 Yeah.

16:24 That is the problem because then we are conflicted and we are conflicted in a way that we are actually working at cross purposes with the with our own with the satisfaction of our own desire in that sense. Because

16:40 SATYA The thing is should desire sh what's wrong with we don't know if desire should be a whole or if it's supposed to be fragmented. Maybe we are like Aditya just said, maybe we are in a new place now where we have to embrace the fragmentation. Maybe desire is meant to be fragmented.

17:01 ADITYA It's same in the context of the place because the whole of for example, even if you talk in pure political terms, the whole of the nation is always imagined whereas always the regions which are fragments try to articulate themselves as a whole, which a in reality never happens because they're just so diverse.

17:21 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

17:22 SATYA Okay, it's a

17:23 MALAVIKA And the identity sometimes goes beyond the definition of what the nation is.

17:29 ADITYA (?) And some relate to the whole at least pretend to relate to the whole men mo other than the than the others. So there's always this inherent inconsistent yeah, tension within the fragments of whether we are participating in the whole in the same way, which is the typical example of it is India in a way, no?

17:49 SATYA (?) Exactly. Yeah.

17:51 PRAYAS Yeah, so in the parallel text chat there is a there is a kind of attempt to map what we mean by the whole.

18:03 So

18:04 Yeah.

18:04 How would you like to consider that? So before we move on to the next question which is in a way related to being whole in the sense of being together, before that how would we consider what does that mean to be whole?

18:26 PRAYAS (?) Is that the second question? [?]

18:28 PRAYAS (?) No part of the first question. Yeah.

18:33 SATYA Because Da Don is saying that whole does not mean necessarily a loss of individuation.

18:41 ADITYA Yeah. So we agree with that.

18:44 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

18:46 ADITYA (?) But it does mean that synthesizing of individuation in some form, even though individuation exists.

18:52 MALAVIKA Yeah, and that's what Nu has said. He says the whole is a is perhaps are individual fragments quivering simultaneously.

19:00 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

19:02 SATYA But is it, is it? I mean, is that whole something just that we just put together for some reason we don't know what? wha I'm not able to see what a whole is in an absolute thing.

19:12 MALAVIKA That's what I actually said a little while ago on the text chat that I don't think we should use the word whole because whole ends up giving this connotation of something being very perfect or not really perfect, but a completeness and that it's not in flux and I think what I would suggest that we refer to it as is more like a group.

19:37 MALAVIKA (?) Can we do it?

19:39 Like there are i it grows and shrinks according to

19:46 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah what did we say? What can we think of?

19:49 ADITYA It an event rather than like it's more like tangential, can we think of it as event because group also

19:55 ADITYA (?) That makes more sense.

19:56 SATYA (?) Because it's la it's like coordinates of that time and place and experience.

20:01 ADITYA Whereas the event produces the fiction of the whole in a way, no?

20:05 ADITYA (?) Right. Yeah. Yeah.

20:07 Whereas the whole is always a fiction that needs to be regenerated all the time. But in fact what it is just the event where all these fragments come together.

20:17 That's right.

20:18 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

20:18 PRAYAS (?) The fragment [?] is the entirety of all the fragments.

20:22 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, exactly.

20:23 ADITYA (?) At that given moment.

20:24 ADITYA (?) Yeah. It might dissipate immediately also. There is no necessary duration to what is being produced.

20:30 SATYA And I think the duration is the duration of awareness of it.

20:33 ADITYA Yeah, exactly. Which might happen immediately and like maybe ten years later. That benefit of doubt always exists.

20:41 SATYA (?) Yeah.

20:43 ADITYA So maybe

20:43 Events is one of the ways of thinking about it, than actually the whole as we were discussing.

20:49 ADITYA (?) But that makes sense actually.

20:51 PRAYAS So the second question is actu is e exactly that. So what is being together? What where how does the idea of coming together arise? And if we take the your event thread, which was here, so the what is the event of being together? We can just restate the questions. And how does the event how would you restate that question? How does the idea of coming together arise? How would you restate that?

21:28 ADITYA (?) How does the event of coming together?

21:29 AJAY (?) Yeah.

21:30 SATYA I would personally tie it to awareness. Like first of all you have to be aware that you are fragmented, then you have to be aware of having a desire of coming together. If none of that is there, then there is nothing. I mean there is no fragment, there is no whole, there is no desire.

21:46 ADITYA But it's also the that's what going back to what I was saying, it's also the context in which we are in, where we think that there is no mono monographic or like the singular way

of approaching a problem or a question, where it's some it's supposed to be a almost like a discursive compulsion to be able to produce this fragment so that event can unfold. Okay. The interest in the unpredictability of the outcome rather than the predictability is something very important in terms of discussion today. Which for many institutional structures, the predictability is the goal that they would like to achieve. You would like to know what the outcome is. Whereas the whereas the this fragmented unfolding of an event is more about the unpredictability of what just the coming together can produce. And that's something interesting to think about, no unpredictability as a as a form.

22:46 SATYA That's true because a lot of calcification happens because of this desire to have the structure and the in which you end up negating things and negating variables that need to be taken into consideration and perspectives that should be in there but they don't find a place because somebody has built the structure because they need a sort of stability to be able to extrapolate into the future in order to plan whatever it needs.

23:09 ADITYA Absolutely. Yeah.

23:11 PRAYAS Yeah, but if we if we don't look at the situation as a subject, i if we don't look at the situation as someone who is being negated or who is not being acknowledged.

23:23 Mm-

23:24 Yeah if one looks at the at it from the perspective of the event actually, like Aditya suggested to us as something which is happening on the external side of being the subject. So not the not the not this side, not we're not feeling the emotion of being excluded, but we are feeling the ex we are actually feeling the entire experience. So what is lost? What is lost in the lack of acknowledgement and what is lost in the no, so I mean I'm not trying to say that acknowled denying an e a lack of acknowledgement is fine, but I'm saying that the pain felt and the distress realized is only on one side in that process.

24:20 SATYA Not necessarily because i if you have fragments that want to be part of a structure, they are finding distress. The structure not having the benefit of those fragments being part of it is not seeing it right away, but eventually it will see the problem of not having those fragments in it.

24:37 ADITYA Yeah, absolutely. It's also it's also the idea of the fact that the when I go back to unpredictability, the unpredictability is actually not to valorize the lack of having a structure. It is just having a structure that is not looking towards a definitive goal. At the same time not saying that I am the valorizing of the now and whatever is predictable is bad. It's just that it is not the question that I would like to engage with. Because I would like to s succumb to a different kind of purpose, which is I would like to go back to say that it's the purpose of our time where that necessity is somewhere made into like the most important method or of engaging with each other, which are fragment fragments, even if you would talk about us as subjects, us as fragments.

25:35 PRAYAS But I think the subject and the event are two opposing perspectives actually. They are from they are looking at the fragment from two opposing perspectives.

25:49 PRAYAS (?) Oh.

25:51 Because the subject is experiencing the fragmentation and in the event we discuss that all the fragments at that moment are unifying into rendering the experience. So

26:05 ADITYA But I don't think events necessarily produce subjects. They produce a perception of a subject. Okay?

26:12 Yeah.

26:13 Subject I would say I would argue of course, borrowing from Deleuze that there is always the act of becoming and then there will be a moment where there is perhaps a perception that there is a whole of a subject that's produced or subjectivity has achieved its synthesis etcetera.

26:32 But

26:33 In fact it is only the fiction that's created by the event.

26:37 SATYA Yeah, true, because what is the subject even? Is the subject whole? I mean the subject is only part of the subject that's part of the event.

26:45 MALAVIKA I am looking at the event as the subject.

26:49 SATYA I was looking at the fragments as subject.

26:52 SATYA (?) Yeah.

26:53 PRAYAS Yeah.

26:54 So Malavika, why looking at the event as a subject?

27:03 MALAVIKA Because that is the coming together and that is what is defining what is the fragment and what is coming together.

27:15 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

27:16 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

27:18 ADITYA (?) I thought that the subject is the experiencer.

27:21 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. So it's the it's the sub subject is aware of in that sense the emotion of the moment.

27:33 SATYA Yeah. Yeah, that's how I was looking at it. And then also and that too, the subject is only that part of the experiencer which is perceiving whatever it is. So it's only a section of me that is perceiving something. You know, like if I'm in a dangerous situation, it's my lizard brain that's perceiving the situation. My frontal lobes are not there at the moment. So I'm only part of me is present, not the entirety of me. So there's fragmentation at every level.

28:04 PRAYAS Nu Paradox offers in chat subjects are coordinates and the event is the mapping process.

28:12 SATYA Okay. Subjects are s are coordinates. Right. subjects are part of a group of coordinates. I would agree that the event is a mapping process. Yes, I would agree with that.

28:25 AJAY Wouldn't it be the opposite? Won' won't the event hold like you know unlimited potential and possibilities? And isn't the subject a lens that we're using to map our experience of that event?

28:37 SATYA Either ways, yeah. I see that as an intersection actually, this between the subject and the event. It's that cross section.

28:44 SATYA (?) But isn't the event the context for the subject to become

28:49 Even for when made sense of that part of the subject has to be there.

28:55 Okay.

28:56 AJAY Well, even when you're talking about the event causing extreme fear which

29:02 Well

29:03 To access the lizard brain aspect of the subject. The same event could be like interpreted differently if you had access to another part of the subject. So it could lead to new forms of thought or new experience altogether based on the subject. So I don't think the event per se can be can be so can be distilled into like one emotion or one set one meaning.

29:29 ADITYA It's not a it's not a structure, definitive structure, that's for sure.

29:32 PRAYAS The event is fragmented as well, is it?

29:37 SATYA It's like how is the event

29:40 SATYA (?) Personally happy [?] maybe what was perceiving it.

29:43 MALAVIKA You're being looking at it from and I think this idea of what is the subject and what is the I think what is clear in our discussion is that we know we have some idea of what the fragments are and we have some idea of what an event is. But whether what the subject is a little I'm still finding it a little vague because anything can become a the subject. It depends on where you're looking at it from.

30:13 PRAYAS Right. So depending on whose perspective it is.

30:16 Yeah.

30:17 SATYA That's what I was saying, like it depends on who's perceiving and part of me is perceiving. There is even that. Because there is within me fragmentation of within the cell everybody [?] depends on which part of this is activated at a moment.

30:34 MALAVIKA It's also to do with the f event is caused by the fragments. So one is feeding the other and the event is also feeding the fragments.

30:47 It's

30:48 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

30:48 PRAYAS (?) So how do you say that the event is caused by the fragments?

30:52 MALAVIKA Because the fragments are coming together and that becomes an event.

30:58 SATYA It's if like some part of the fragment is activated in one context, but another it depends on you know, it's like two people feeding into an argument. Yeah. The event of the argument would not have happened if one person had backed off.

31:14 ADITYA Absolutely.

31:15 ADITYA (?) Yeah, very true.

31:17 But what comes out of the events, then the third layer that comes out of the event or whatever, the different unfolding that happens through the very act of event doesn't necessarily condition the subjects that fragments try to project, or do you think that there's a transformative moment of them becoming something else?

31:40 SATYA I feel it's a constant transformation. I feel it's like a feedback loop that's constantly feeding into itself and it really depends on the previous moment.

31:49 ADITYA (?) Yeah. It's also rearranging, constant rearranging, as you said.

31:53 SATYA (?) Yeah.

31:57 PRAYAS But how would we be able to consider the fragmentation of the event? Because I'm still confounded with that, because a while ago we were talking about the event as a as a map of the fragments.

32:13 Yeah.

32:14 And then if we are also considering the fragmented event, that means the map is never complete.

32:22 MALAVIKA (?) The map is never complete. I d I don't think the map is a completion of anything at all.

32:26 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

32:28 ADITYA As precisions [?] in between for example, when the fragments become an event, that there is a common cause through which these fragments want to interact with each other.

32:37 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

32:37 ADITYA (?) At the same time go onto that fragmented path. Sometimes they're crooked, sometimes they can be a different fragmented path than on.

32:44 But

32:45 Then the event is the moment of the interruption of some kind, and I am not meaning interruption in a negative way here.

32:51 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

32:52 Which will let the fragments to a different journey. It's not necessarily trying to put pull on all the fragments together. That way the event is just bringing together the fragments as much as it's fragmenting the fragments again into a different level.

33:07 MALAVIKA The map is a perspective. And that's why I think you can have many maps and what the event does is create these many maps and the man many maps can have different combination of fragments in each one.

33:24 PRAYAS Does the map does each event create space for multiple maps and or

33:35 ADITYA It's a it's a map that doesn't have a cartography as its fundamental base. It's a map that has much more multi vocal structural ways of engaging with it. It's a map that is imaginary in

a way. It's just like maybe set of colours, like lines and routes and jigsaw puzzles, etcetera. To be

33:57 ADITYA (?) Some ways you're creating patterns.

33:59 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah. It's a pattern. It's a pattern that has some density.

34:02 PRAYAS So like Don is resting [?] on chat that each bird signals to its nearby fellows the whole is a movement chain across many feedback loops.

34:13 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

34:15 SATYA Yeah, I think it's a very good analogy, the murmuration. That's actually how you worked out exactly how you would represent it in a given moment from one s one cross section. It's not three dimension I mean, it's not multi dimensional, but the murmuration is a representation of one cross section of an event and the perspective of it in that moment.

34:36 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

34:38 PRAYAS But does the but does using the word perspective already imagine an individual in that sense? Because do perspectives belong only to individuals?

34:52 SATYA No, they don't. Perspectives are i are independent of anything.

34:58 Perspectives can belong to individuals but they are bigger than that. They can be perspectives without individuals.

35:03 MALAVIKA You can also yeah, and you can also have a collective perspective where a perspective might be shared or parts of a perspective might be shared.

35:10 Murmuration of perspectives, yeah.

35:12 PRAYAS So then no I was just I was just trying to relate the idea the perspective idea to the map. And when Malavika said that maps are perspectives.

35:27 You know and perspectives are in that sense collectives can be collectives. Then maps are collectives of f fragments as well, right? So in this sense m maps are never complete, that might be true, but then they hold within themselves the potential to be complete, right?

35:53 PRAYAS (?) Momentarily.

35:56 ADITYA (?) Fiction.

35:58 Fiction to be complete.

36:01 AJAY I think the map cannot be complete at any point. It's I mean it is it is a reduction. Yeah. which by a sense it's a reduction. A map is a reduction and it's and that's how so it is it is reality reduced into a form that can be acted upon and can bring people and fragments together.

36:25 PRAYAS (?) So Ajay how would you how are you calling a map reduction? Would you like to expand on that?

36:33 AJAY It's an again going back to the idea of the event and I think what we're talking about is the this sort of a tension between reality and language the structure of our experience. And that structure is essentially a reduction of all the all the possi possibilities that exist in reality, that the unknowable reality, right? And so in that sense a map is a tool. It's sort of it probably relaxes the you know the tension caused in interfacing with this reality but necessarily has to be fragmented again, otherwise I think the individual dissolves into that map.

37:22 ADITYA It's a way of avoiding disorientation of a bigger kind in a way. to and also to in some ways of course historically to exercise control.

37:32 Yeah.

37:32 Or pretend to exercise control, that I can have the ability to be able to exercise control.

37:38 Yeah.

37:38 Just because I can have this method of the map or mapping.

37:43 PRAYAS But the map now you know now f just turning towards the third question which is where do fragments unite? So where maps come together is territory, the idea of territory. So and if maps are I mean going by what you are saying, if and if we add maps as territory to the mix, then where do we go where do we arrive?

38:16 SATYA I think maps are metastable states. And sometimes these states last for a while. So if you have a map that is territorial, a at a given moment for a certain number of centuries, a certain map, for example, to be very concrete is in vogue and then something changes, then that map is redrawn. So a map also has a duration if we look at it from a geographical perspective in terms of polit not a land map, or even land maps. I mean any the kind of maps that we use as in our day to day you know concreteness. I feel it's like metastable state.

38:53 PRAYAS No, but I am interested, let's say for some time in talking about how i how the idea of maps when applied to the self was such a porous entity. But the same map when we apply it to space, it becomes a very fixed reality in the form of territory. Because it

39:14 MALAVIKA Necessarily no I think it works in a very similar way the whole idea of identity and self is in some ways this mapping and when you look at the negative I think what map also maps also do is to create the negative space and we are perhaps accustomed to look at what is being defined in the positive space as what is it what we are mapping and what we are mapping either as a self identity or a nationhood or whatever but we're not focusing so much on the negative space of what we are not mapping. And

39:53 SATYA I'm sorry, I actually don't see a difference between this mapping the self and mapping territories. Both are metastable states. We have figured out that

40:00 Yes I agree.

40:02 Come in together and if it stays for a while, then some new information comes in, it changes things up again.

40:08 ADITYA And it's also as Malavika saying, it's a question of what you would like to you would like to map and what you would not, no?

40:14 Yeah.

40:15 It's also the question of the what do you say, the precision of what you would like to project as what a place is and what you would like to hide as what the place is not or

40:27 SATYA Exactly. Yeah.

40:28 It's the that's where it's a

40:30 MALAVIKA Our idea of how Yeah. And how we're relating to what we think is the other and we invariably end up identifying with the other because there are parts of ourselves and the other.

40:41 SATYA (?) Yeah, and when we project ourselves, we are projecting those parts that we want to be shown which we think we need to be shown and that's in relation to the other.

40:51 ADITYA Actually projection is then a good idea because both within the self with the self and with the territory it's always a projection.

41:00 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

41:01 It's a projection of what you would like to think of an event or an event should be. It's a basically a projection of a projection of an event for a set of fragments or i it's a projection of a self and a projection of course we territory or what you would like to perceive within the territory and what you would like to know.

41:24 SATYA Yeah, it's like where are the lines drawn and that depends on what we want to project.

41:33 ADITYA And perception is quite passive as in relation to for something like projection because projection is more like a informed act that you're maybe we should not call it so loosely, but politically aware that what you are trying to achieve.

41:51 SATYA Projection does come from a sort of deliberateness, but it the ultimate image that emerges may be out of the projector's control. Because if they are projecting a candle but then it's bright sunlight, there's it does it's not seen.

42:09 ADITYA Even there the unpredictable. So it's not necessarily the we can only project but we cannot control the outcome of the projection is what you're saying, right?

42:16 SATYA Yeah, something like that, yeah. Like I might say ki, this is the boundary of my a colony or something, but the m municipality may have decided something else altogether. So they'll draw it something.

42:30 PRAYAS So we cannot ca we cannot control the projection the outcome of the projection, but in the in the currentness of the moment.
42:38 PRAYAS (?) Okay.
42:40 Our projection, whatever it may be, is taken as reality.
42:45 PRAYAS (?) Reality.
42:46 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, it's taken as a function of reality, as in this is the way things are.
42:50 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
42:52 SATYA (?) If it serves our purpose, maybe.
42:56 If we want to have a semblance of reality and if that is of importance then maybe, yeah.
43:03 MALAVIKA But that's again related to a goal of what we want out of the projection.
43:10 ADITYA (?) Yeah.
43:15 PRAYAS So but so are you saying that projections are conscious?
43:19 SATYA (?) Projections are conscious to a certain extent, but the eventual image that happens it may not be in the control of the projector.
43:31 PRAYAS Because that is that is that depends on experience, on the actual reception.
43:40 ADITYA So project projections that way are the way in which you would like to channelise your perceptions.
43:47 Of what you would like to re revisit and project something onto it and what you would like to sideline and not engage with. So what there is a perception of like of maybe hundred and fifty things, but they would like to only look at five things and project a kind of an idea of engaging with it's a place, it's a person, it's a context, anything.
44:08 SATYA (?) Right. So it's actually like a narrative that suits your purpose. Yeah.
44:12 PRAYAS So if we look at our current question which of if we which is trying to figure where do fragments unite.
44:21 SATYA (?) So how is how is that related to this projection thread?
44:28 I suppose fragments can be consciously brought together sorry, fragments are consciously brought together as projections.
44:38 MALAVIKA Don's just added something in the chat window saying projection is equal to hope, desire, which work as organizing principles for things perceived, things being engaged, etcetera.
44:51 SATYA (?) Yeah.
44:54 ADITYA But I think
44:55 MALAVIKA In that sense when he says yeah, organizing principles is again relating to something where things come together.
45:02 SATYA Yeah.
45:05 SATYA (?) Okay, I forgot what I was saying.
45:08 ADITYA (?) Sorry.
45:09 Uhhuh. No problem. No, I was just thinking that whether the where does the projection happen? Was the is the event the moment where the projection is happening? Does where the fragments not necessarily in the singular way try to project onto something?
45:30 SATYA So the event is one place where a projection is happening, but there is also a m a map that exists within the desire to project. So there is a desire to project a certain way of appearing and that's the map.
45:46 SATYA (?) Yes.
45:47 SATYA (?) There is a map within the event, but yet that map is only a narrative.
45:52 Yeah.
45:56 ADITYA (?) Which does not have the control of what the map would be after the event is over.
46:00 Yeah.

46:01 PRAYAS But h how does this happen that the projection is thought to be as a conscious construction in that sense it's a conscious construction partly and the event is an entirely unconscious rendering. So how does the projection in that sense render itself to become an event and I mean how does it transform?

46:27 ADITYA Unconscious at all. I think the event is actually when fragments the perceptions of the fragments get real in terms of get like conscious in a way. Because the it's only in the context

46:44 PRAYAS Is the event is more than the sum of the projections happening

46:48 ADITYA Yes, certainly. But it is it is certainly what I'm trying to say is that for a perception to translate into something like a projection, even though so there is two levels of it. One is that you yourself looking at something and projecting onto something. and b and second layer is that you trying to have a conversation with a set of other projections. and maybe contradicting, maybe s simultaneously like so like overlapping with what you're saying or similar, etcetera. Which is to say that whether

47:28 The un the not conscious part of the event that you're trying to speak about. I am not very sure whether it's like extremely conscious or extremely not conscious. It's a very tricky things to say because I don't think it's not non conscious because it is something that is being unfolded with a win [?].

47:48 PRAYAS There is a component of the event that is not rendered by us.

47:54 That's the outcome.

47:55 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, that's right.

47:56 SPEAKER 1 Yeah. So how where does that in that sense come from?

48:00 MALAVIKA I think it comes from the a cumul cumulative projection. I mean when all these projections are coming together you don't know what the outcome's gonna be when things get mixed.

48:13 ADITYA Yeah, it's the friction that exists in the context of the events and I'm not saying friction in

48:22 Necessarily produces a different way of judging their own projections and judging the event itself. Like why what are the routes that these projections will take just because they are complemented, they've been tested, they are contradict whatever the kind of the ways in which they're engaged in the context of their event, and what would be the reconfiguring forms of projections that will then on just because they have just experienced the event.

48:53 MALAVIKA I'm also wondering whether these projections are habitual and where ex except for the time when you're conscious of what you wanted to do. So at other times is it some sort of a habitual pattern at work?

49:10 SATYA (?) Like a compulsion. And you're not even it's just part of your nature or something.

49:15 MALAVIKA (?) Ah, yeah.

49:17 MALAVIKA (?) Hm. Yeah, that makes sense.

49:19 AJAY I think Don has an interesting point to make. I think I mean in his last comment where he was talking about hope, desire as organizing principles. I feel yeah, when we think of you know, what is the purpose of these projections, at some level at least one set of emotions and drives internal drives sort of requires resonance with our experience of the event. And that seems that's also a sort of a driving force to achieve this coherence and this whole the sense of the whole within the event. The sort of you know the sense of actually seeing the map or the internal projection played out in the event itself.

50:07 AJAY (?) Although I'm sure there are also other conflicting emotions which work which go more towards the you know the idea of the fragment. And which yeah it's sort of

50:18 SATYA (?) Yamcha [?] is a dominant fragment at that moment of the self.

50:26 MALAVIKA So it's in it seems to be hinged on this projection of hope and desire. Of where hope and desire is not really overt, it's it's an inherent thing and depending on how the projection works, it's either you know, things come together or they get fragmented.

50:48 SATYA And also hope and desire might drive the creation of that drives the creation
50:57 Projection.
50:59 So the hope leads the hope for something makes you plan for something.

51:05 ADITYA And it's also actually I think to necessary perhaps to also think that fragmentation as a condition rather than fragmentation as a state that you would like to head towards or exist in.

51:23 AJAY Why would he say that?

51:26 ADITYA Sorry, I'm saying that fragmentation as a condition. It is not I don't think it's like pre existing, like it is the way of being working as fragments. But fragmentation is also a condition where you are aware that you are actually existing in this condition. Whereas not necessarily always the drive is towards being a fragment in a way, no. It's not what I'm trying to say is that it's not valorizing the fragment. So somewhere we'll have to think about whether we are pre-supposing a fragment too much, but or looking at fragmentation as a condition that has its own set of internal consequences.

52:12 PRAYAS Yeah, because if we do that it would be looking at fragments in the in an in an entirely contrarian way from how a fragment is otherwise looked at. A fragment is otherwise looked at as a discontinuity of a kind of expanse of energy or it's looked at as an island of energy in that sense.

52:34 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
52:35 And it's not looked at as a as a long as a sustainable way of being.

52:47 SATYA So I feel like fragments are aware are what you are aware of. Like there is a continuity but the things that you become aware of are the fragments.

53:01 ADITYA It's like joining the dots union [?].

53:04 SATYA You talked about a condition, right? I it's like frag you said fragments are a condition. is that what you said, yeah?

53:11 ADITYA Yeah.

53:12 SATYA And I feel like fragments are not a condition but being aware of fragments. Like it's like when you it the quantum physics things, right? Like a particle gets manifested if it is observed. Something I mean I'm not in I don't have any authority on it, but I'm just sort of quoting. but it's like it the reality only exists when you are aware of it.

53:40 ADITYA No, actually that makes sense. Yeah. Sorry, go ahead.

53:43 SATYA No, but hey [?].

53:45 ADITYA No, I was just saying that makes sense that one is that being in a fragmenting state, two is being aware of the fragments.
53:55 One is that you are in, not always your when you're in it, you are aware about it. There will be a moment where you will be aware about these states, which are not necessarily your present, it might be your past.

54:07 SATYA I'm just wondering if the fragmentation is a condition or wholeness is a condition. Continuum and the moment fragment the moment a the moment of awareness is when a fragment becomes manifest.

54:31 PRAYAS (?) The moment of awareness is when a fragment becomes a part of the map.

54:36 SATYA (?) Of awareness is when a fragment gets manimated [?].

54:41 PRAYAS So it becomes a part of the map in that sense. It becomes a part of the event.
54:46 PRAYAS (?) The map is David [?].

54:48 AJAY (?) I think I think it's two staged. I mean there is awareness and then there has to be a conscious effort to bring it into the map. Otherwise it's experience and it's lost instantly.

54:59 ADITYA Yeah.

54:59 Yeah. It's just like the moment of recognition and the idea that this recognition is going to change the way I'm going to look at the map. Or trying to make that effort as he's saying. To make it reconstruct into something into the map of thinking that you otherwise have.

55:20 MALAVIKA Don's just brought up another question. how about the anticipation of projection? That is, when one person can ad adopt anticipate the point of view projection of another or to relate to Nu's notes above and current conversation about awareness, the sharing of a map.

55:45 So can you anticipate the projection?

55:48 SATYA Yes, I think we have maps which are anticipations. We hope for something, we desire something, we anticipate something, so we make a map for it, we extrapolate somehow from the past or whatever it is. And that drives into something which I forgot what I was saying.

56:07 MALAVIKA Is the anticipation again a manifestation of this hope or desire?

56:16 SATYA (?) Yes. Certainly.

56:18 ADITYA The anticipation is the way you would like to channel your desires of looking at a place, for instance.

56:23 SATYA (?) Right, yeah.

56:24 ADITYA The anticipation is the process through which you would like to make sense of the place through map in a way.

56:31 ADITYA (?) Yeah, which like you were saying the matter of the

56:33 MALAVIKA Yeah.

56:37 ADITYA (?) Yeah, certainly. Because it's always an anticipation of what the s real self is. and the ab and the process of achieving or t going closer to that real self or trying to address or articulate to that real self is the constant kind of question that you're internally trying to raise.

56:59 And so in the context of the place, whether the experience of the place is what I am anticipating it to be. Or

57:06 MALAVIKA In that moment of anticipation is there some sort of a compilation of the fragments and that is going into the projection or

57:16 Yeah.

57:17 I'm afraid to think of the mechanism of

57:20 ADITYA Certainly, because I think the anticipation is a composition produced with the different fragments that we have accumulated. That's certainly the possibility of can t we can think about it that way. Maybe some fragments are coming together to produce this anticipation about something. Whether it's the self or whether it's the place.

57:45 SATYA Right.

57:46 So Nu was saying mapping forms fragments.

57:52 Oh.

57:52 So I and I can relate to that because if we are drawing a map we have to name parts of it just by the mechanism of drawing the map.

58:02 And so we have to give identities to pieces.

58:07 ADITYA So mapping is the process of fragmentation then.

58:10 SATYA Yes.

58:13 PRAYAS But so it is not the process of unification.

58:17 MALAVIKA (?) I think it is both.

58:20 SATYA Yeah, innovate [?], yeah.

58:21 PRAYAS (?) So the math on the [?]... Simultaneous.

58:23 PRAYAS (?) We can say.

58:24 MALAVIKA Mapping creates patterns. So whether it's a patterns of the fragments or the or the commonalities within amongst the fragments that you're trying to trace and put together. It depends on how you're looking at it. I and which is why I think of mapping as something that

does both positive and negative things. When you bring things together you're also dividing things. You're leaving out something else.

58:54 PRAYAS Yeah. So considering that yeah, we are in the last minute and tomorrow we are actually going to be looking at the precursor to maps actually. We're going to be talking more about patterns tomorrow. so we'll share the link for link with you for tomorrow's discussion in a bit in the text chat here. Okay. but I guess it's a good point to conclude for today and then to reassemble tomorrow and focus more on the pattern.

59:31 ADITYA (?) Okay.

59:33 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

59:34 MALAVIKA Yeah.

59:37 PRAYAS For tomorrow and if you if you click that then you'll be in the discussion here as today. Yeah so I hope as many of you can join in tomorrow as well.

59:52 Yeah. Okay, thanks. Thanks.

59:54 Okay. Thank you.

59:56 PRAYAS (?) Thanks everyone.

59:57 MALAVIKA (?) Express [?].

59:58 SATYA (?) Okay.

59:59 NU PARADOX Thank you, bye.