# Mapping Fragments, Day 3

*A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 10 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

00:02 SATYA Say good evening everyone. Welcome. Hi.

00:07 Okay.

00:08 Hi Prayas and Malavika. Welcome to Mapping Fragments Day 3. This is a study group that has been organized as part of Srinagar Biennale's web mode, and it's brought to you by Surfatial. So in the past couple days, we talked about fragments and maps, obviously. We talked of fragments being acted upon by organizing forces in particular yesterday. And we talked about fragments forming patterns. Then also we also went into some discussion around concrete ideas of administration and governance and power structures. We discussed mapping as a survey and mapping as a lens or a filter applied on topographies. We also went into discussion on maps as distancing agents. And then the big question we also discussed yesterday was about mapping conflicts.

01:10 And maybe we can see how things go today, but maybe we can go into some concrete directions today as well. but the first let's go with the first question and start there, which is how is fragmentation perceived?

01:30 So

01:33 SATYA (?) How is fragmentation perceived and

01:37 For me the first question that arises when I think of this is who is the perceiver?

01:44 SATYA (?) Right.

01:45 PRAYAS Yeah, so the internal and the external view of fragment of fragmented being is different, right? Because internal the internal experience of fragment of a fragmented being is scattered.

02:06 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

02:07 Whereas the external experience of a fragment fragmented being might never know that this is a fragment.

02:21 SATYA So the projection of a fragment doesn't necessarily know that it's a fragment, is that what you're saying?

02:29 PRAYAS Yeah, so the from the outside you can never you can never assess whether it's a fragment or it's a it's a pattern, it's a map or whatever.

02:39 Right.

02:40 But I think f internally you know that this is not you know a unification of many different islands of energy in that sense.

02:59 SATYA (?) Yeah.

03:00 MALAVIKA The first and at the first level of perception I think you we I can think of this you know in terms of how we perceive people. So we perceive one another as individuals but when we start relating to different people we also relate to I guess fragments of them that we can identify with within ourselves and that's when we begin to perceive the fragmented nature of every being.

03:35 SATYA Right. So what you're saying is what I'm hearing is there is an element of time and an element of degrees. So when

03:45 MALAVIKA Think the identification and the building the relation is w when a fragment is perceived. Right. When there is no connection it is a like an individual soul entity. It's only when there are connections made that the connections forge some sort of

04:11 Idea of a bond.

04:15 Yeah.

04:15 Even in terms of chemicals and molecules coming together, there's something that bonds them together.

04:21 SATYA Right, but then w to go back to what you just said about perceiving a person, for example, an individual over you know, when we first meet them they appear in a particular way, but you know, after getting to know them there are other facets that appear. And

04:37 SATYA (?) Right.

04:38 That sounds like so in the how is fragmentation perceived, so there are degrees to it, you might perceive the e from external view there might be a perception or even internal I mean even when we know ourselves, for example, when we sit with ourselves, we are aware of certain things, but as conditions change, as time inputs change and in the things that get projected or the things that get perceived of that individual are different. And so there are different fragments that are at view. And as time goes by or whatever, as more and more of these pieces are visible, maybe there is this organizing tendency that makes us perceive that there is some sort of a coming together.

05:30 SATYA (?) Yes.

05:31 So then we map that individual or are we mapping our perception of that individual perhaps?

05:39 MALAVIKA I think both are done. A little bit of both I would say.

05:45 SATYA Right. So it's both happening at the same time. We are

05:48 Yeah.

05:48 Things, yeah.

05:49 MALAVIKA (?) I think the perception in it i in itself is a kind of mapping.

05:53 SATYA Exactly right. Yeah. That's what I was gonna say. Yeah.

05:59 Perception is not

06:00 PRAYAS Experience, perception of experience is a kind of mapping that's what you're saying Malavika, because so yeah in the sense that our sensory information feeds us fragments which we assemble in the form of the perception of experience.

06:22 MALAVIKA Say that again. I kinda lost that.

06:25 PRAYAS Our sensory in the sensory information from multiple sources is compiled together into this

06:36 Right.

06:37 With which is the perception.

06:39 SATYA Right, and it's interesting because even the sensory the sensors themselves are fragmented. The sensors are located at various places and they are taking in fragments of the what they are perceiving. And that also is coming together into some kind of a map.

06:58 MALAVIKA Yeah, it's true.

07:00 SATYA Hm. And now if you now if we switch to the internal, like Prayas you were talking about the external and the internal perceptions. So if we switch to the internal

07:18 Are we talking about perceiving the fragments internally? Then are we talking about perceiving experience or what are we talking about from the internal perspective?

07:32 PRAYAS From the internal perspective is actually from the beginning of the study group has been more of has been my interest actually. Because irrespective of how we consider a fragmented being to be from the outside, the actual trauma of fragmentation is experienced on the inside.

08:00 So I actually think it's

08:06 It's something that y your experience is getting fragmented, right?

08:11 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

08:11 PRAYAS (?) Your experience gets fragmented when you

08:15 Are fragmented and that is painful. Fragmenting your experience is so there is a cost you're paying for

08:27 SATYA Yeah.

08:28 PRAYAS Being fragmented.

08:30 SATYA (?) Yeah. And something

08:32 MALAVIKA No is [?] just saying that experience itself is fragmented, and I'm not quite understanding that because my understanding of experience is something that is of the moment. You don't do you can experience fragmentation, but can you also know that very experience is fragmented? I'm not sure because you're just experiencing it, and at the moment of experiencing something, how do you know what it is? The knowing comes after, right?

09:04 SATYA Yeah, I guess in the moment it is like whatever's happening is it. And it's that's it. We don't know whether it's full or half or I mean if we apply our if we apply some kind of a logic to it later on, as you said, like then yes, I mean obviously I'm not going to know the entirety of it, but in the moment it does seem like it is all it is.

09:26 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, that's how I need [?] experience.

09:29 MALAVIKA (?) Price you see? [?]

09:31 PRAYAS In the moment you would know that the that your experience is fragmented by your concurrent experience of contradictory things. I mean your concurrent experience of two contradictory perspectives of the same experience actually.

09:52 SATYA (?) So you're talking about a higher level of awareness in the moment.

09:57 PRAYAS (?) I mean, when you come across contradictions within yourself

10:02 MALAVIKA Does fragmentation always have to be contradictory?

10:10 PRAYAS A fragmented experience might not might not be consisting of only frag only contradictory things, but when you when the contradiction arises, then you know for sure that there is some fragmentation that has taken place.

10:30 SATYA But then that awareness that a fragmentation has occurred, th does that happen while you're experiencing it or can it happen? I mean I would think it would happen if you have a higher level of awareness of the situation.

10:43 PRAYAS It's in any conflict for example, like we were talking yesterday. In any c and in psychology let's say it l let's say desires are in of i of interest because what you how you what you express a desire towards actually c is encoded form of communicating a lot of things. So if for example you dislike somebody you might be extra polite to them or whatever, you know, I'm just putting standard textbook kind of descriptions of actually of being in of being in a conflicted

11:34 SATYA So you're saying that there is what you're talking about is being aware ki okay, I don't like this person but I have to be polite to them. So there is a sort of cognitive dissonance kind of thing going on. But you're doing it with full awareness. So you're saying that sort of contradiction.

11:50 PRAYAS Yeah, you might not be doing it in full awareness, but the thing is you are experiencing the contradiction within yourself. You're experiencing that

12:00 Yeah.

12:01 This is someone I don't like, but this is someone I want to be very I sh also feel like being very polite to.

12:09 SATYA Correct. But then the experience of that the experience of that contradiction is still very whole. I mean it what does it mean to say experiencing fragmentation or is experience itself fragmented? I'm not phrasing it right, like what does it mean to perceive fragmentation?

12:32 MALAVIKA You see, I the what Prayas is talking about for me is still like you said Satya is a larger awareness of something. Like if I know he's going to speak a sentence now because I know there's a complete sentence coming up, I will expect more words. But my experience of every word as he narrates them is still a complete thing. So for me that experience of every word is not fragmented. Precise. See [?] because I know that there is a larger story coming up that I will look at it as a fragment. But the experience of every moment for me is not fragmented.

13:14 SATYA Yeah, and which is very difficult to define as such. Like how ex the only as biological beings or whatever, we in the moment when we are going through something, it's not possi I mean, it's very d difficult to define it very clearly to be able to express what that fragmentation is really. I'm struggling a lot. I can I can only see it as a whole, every moment as a whole.

13:39 Yeah, I see that way too.

13:42 PRAYAS But when you but the conflicts that you experience in the in your experience of the whole are signs of something being amiss actually. So they are signs of things having fragmented without your without your specific without your awareness.

14:02 SATYA No, but the fact is that everything is fragmented. Like we don't have a complete awareness, yet we do have a complete awareness. So at the same time everything is, but at the same time what I consciously perceive is not going to be everything. It just cannot be because of my limitations as a biological being.

14:21 PRAYAS But that is a matter of degrees, right? So the degree to which I can perceive

14:29 The is actually. The degree to which I can do that will depend on how you know how I am fragmented. So in the sense what is which are the which are which are the segments through which I am experiencing the whole.

14:49 SATYA Correct, that's true, but then do you have any control on that? And how much degree of control do you have on which fragment you're using to sense the fragments?

14:59 PRAYAS No, it's not about control, but it's about

15:03 SATYA I by control I mean like having a choice. Like do you have a choice really of how you perceive?

15:09 PRAYAS (?) No. I mean you don't have a choice but even then you might be aware of the fact that

15:17 SATYA Yeah, that's true. Yeah.

15:18 PRAYAS You know, there are contradictory, conflicting sources of information that I'm you know, bearing witness to.

15:26 SATYA Definitely. So they what I'm hearing is in perception of fragmentation there are layers. There are fragments already. There are various layers of perception of the fragmentation because as you said, I could be aware that there is a contradiction but in the moment I'm not necessarily aware of it. So there's various levels of it.

15:48 MALAVIKA Yeah, I think this also relates to this idea of distance we spoke about yesterday.

15:54 Yeah.

15:54 Because when we're talking of degrees we're also thinking of removing ourselves from that moment.

16:01 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

16:01 MALAVIKA (?) Another space or time to examine what that moment is. And if we're in fact able to do that simultaneously while experiencing the moment, then yes, I think I get what Prayas is saying, that you can recognise the fragment there.

16:20 SATYA And yeah, and also distancing can f function at various levels. It could be that distancing depends again on the sen the sensor. Like do you need to be really far away from it in time and place? Or can you actually be in the moment and still be able to distance yourself? So in the perception in that sense, yeah. And is that something that can be you know, developed or some is that something that can be sharpened, for example, that perception?

16:48 MALAVIKA I think so.

16:50 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

16:54 SATYA (?) Yeah.

16:55 MALAVIKA Funnily I think cynicism is can be a good example of that happening when you see something happening and your mind's also telling you that what's happening is of no consequence or

17:15 Yeah.

17:15 Yeah, question it at the same time.

17:18 SATYA (?) Yeah.

17:20 PRAYAS I mean I think what we should be looking at is the conflicts that emerge within us which give us evidence of the fact that we are we are in fact fragmented.

17:35 Yeah.

17:36 Mm that conflict what does that conflict do? That conflict also fragments the nature of our the scope of our desire actually. Right? So we want multiple things, some of which might not be might not even sit well together.

17:59 SATYA Yeah, that's true. That's true. We th and that's very na that's perfectly natural, that's exactly how everyone is. And I so Don is saying some a question here which is maybe perceiving fragmentation may only occur from a state of non fragmentation. And this is the opposite of what you're saying, right, Prayas? You were talking about everyone being in a state of conflict.

18:24 PRAYAS (?) I'm saying that you might be in a state of conflict and I'm and I might not be and so in that sense what Don is saying holds you know it makes sense that if you are conflicted and I'm not, then I might be able to notice that you are conflicted.

18:43 SATYA That's true, that's true. But then the thing is to say that you are not conflicted, to me that's questionable. I think every everything is conflicted. But there are moments of clarity or whatever it is where that othering when I have a distance from you and I'm able to see parts of you which are not visible to you and in that sense I'm not conflicted. And I'm able to see the conflict in you.

19:12 But

19:13 SATYA (?) Yeah.

19:14 PRAYAS Also I might not be conflicted in the sense that I'm aware of the conflicts, so how I am propagating my perception of things is with the awareness of the conflicts. So

19:30 PRAYAS (?) Yes, you know.

19:31 So it doesn't betray a kind of sh you know a kind of irrational

19:41 PRAYAS (?) Kind of perception of which is conflicted and not even aware of its own conflict.

19:49 SATYA I mean see aga again, to me everything is degrees. Like everything is degrees. degrees of conflict, degrees of awareness of conflict, dealing with conflict in while experiencing things. So it's like everything is fragmented, everything everywhere I see everything is fragmented.

20:10 MALAVIKA (?) Your perspective.

20:12 MALAVIKA (?) Precisely.

20:13 PRAYAS No, in the in the sense that you feel your p in within your perspective you are able to hold multiple contradictions together.

20:25 SATYA And what I'm saying is every there are degrees to it. Like there are degrees of holding which might be in me, in you, in everyone. Like there's degrees to everything.

20:38 And if it's my perspective then, you know, I am sort of distanced from you and I'm not necessarily able to see what you are seeing and so I'm kind of alienated from you. And as Don had earlier also said, fragmentation is a kind of alienation. So the perception of fragmentation is a sort of alienation because everyone is within their own fragment as t you know, as it were.

21:06 I love it.

21:07 MALAVIKA Brings up something interesting here. She's she asks is conflict the same thing as fragmentation?

21:15 SATYA And that's not like the thing is for me, I'm just saying that conflict is a division. There's a there's a division of sorts, it's a loss of the wholeness. So if I define it that way, then I can say that it's a fragmentation.

21:30 So she says I am I experience conflicts in myself, but not necessarily that these are fragments. And yeah, and i it the way I'm defining conflict is that I'm not having a coherent sense of the moment or of some event or occurrence, and I'm saying that I'm conflicted here and I'm calling that as a fragmentation of my whole understanding of whatever it is.

21:57 That

22:01 CATHY Fragments sound like something that's broken or that you know, that there's a there's a shattering there, whereas a conflict you can have a conflict that feels like the things belong together in some way or

22:16 SATYA Yeah, there is a

22:17 CATHY Relation between them that's a necessary relation, whereas a fragment seems like it is sort of self contained in a sense.

22:28 PRAYAS (?) So I guess you're saying that not all conflicts are fragments, but some but some fragments might be conflicted.

22:38 CATHY (?) Yes. Yes, exactly, yes.

22:42 SATYA So not all conflicts are fragments, but fragments can be conflicted.

22:48 MALAVIKA Yes.

22:48 I s I see conflict as something that is a result of the interaction between fragments or the conflict can be as a result of a mapping that may, you know, cause the conflict or

23:05 SATYA Yeah, like a un uncalled for mapping, for example, where some people just don't want to be together in that map. Those fragments don't even want to be there together. They are conflicted.

23:18 Okay.

23:18 It's also terminology. Like I'm using the word fragment the way I'm perceiving it. and I'm looking at conflict as a shattering, as you said, Cathy.

23:27 PRAYAS (?) But the we need to have a have certain amount of a common ground, right? In the sense because we are sharing a vocabulary, so

23:38 SATYA But do we necessarily need to? Because that would it would be interesting to also have conflicting you know, views on the same term, for example. I mean does every fragment have to have

23:52 PRAYAS Kind of resolves away into the into the somewhat pointless excuse of being subjective selves.

24:01 SATYA Not necessarily. It's if we are talking about fragmentation and we engage in fragmentation of meaning, that would be interesting also at a meta level.

24:12 So I mean do why does a fragment have to have an identity? Like why do we have to define it? Big [?] which is the next question. What does it mean for a fragment to lose its identity?

24:27 So what is identity? Like if you are trying to come to a very specific meaning for what the word fragment means.

24:37 SATYA (?) Yeah, we cannot do that.

24:39 SATYA (?) Is I mean, what does that even mean? Does it have an identity? What does it mean for it to lose it?

24:49 PRAYAS So we are we are saying that all kind of communication itself is impossible because the multiplicity of meanings actually defeats language.

25:05 SATYA In a way, yes, but it isn't it I think it's amazing that we are all able to communicate despite all that. At a fundamental level to me, I don't see how anything communicates with anything, honestly. Like everything has its own perception, everything is coming f perspective, everything is coming from its own place, everything has its own meaning based on the individual. E and identities are based on individuals.

25:29 PRAYAS So there are correspondences that are happening without our knowledge, like in that sense they're without our specific intending those correspondences to happen.

25:43 SATYA (?) Yes. Yes.

25:45 And we may intend for the correspondence to happen also. Whether it will happen how we want it or not, I don't know. But

25:53 MALAVIKA I think communication often is only one component of that. Yeah. Or wait, I don't know how to put it, but the correspondence is one c component of the communication. But basically what I do think is happening is what we perceive is not necessarily entirely communicated.

26:18 Yeah.

26:20 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, but we use it at least I mean yeah.

26:25 SATYA And to me again I see the word fragment there. We are not entirely communicating, which means we are only communicating on fragment.

26:33 MALAVIKA Yes, and in rela with when it comes to this idea of identity, I am wondering I have a question whether it has any relation with the idea of belonging.

26:48 Right.

26:49 Looking at identity because if you're looking at the identity of fragments I would think of where the fragment belongs strangely.

27:04 Right, I understand it.

27:05 Something in complete isolation. Why would identity matter in complete isolation?

27:12 SATYA Right. And Cathy, I was wondering if you had any thoughts on what is identity?

27:20 CATHY I don't I don't know. In relation to a fragment I'm struggling. It's so abstract.

27:26 SATYA Yeah, I guess we kind of go into these abstract realms. Because the word fragment itself, and what is it what is a fragment like? And I you know what is a fragment? What do you what does it represent to you, for example?

27:45 CATHY It depends on the context. You know, if I'm talking about within myself, that's one thing. If it's you know, if it's spatial, that's a different thing.

27:54 Right.

27:55 PRAYAS So we are I mean across the last two days we have been actually superimposing both together. So the fragmentation of the self and fragmentation of the of the place and of the locality in that sense.

28:08 CATHY (?) Okay, I missed yesterday. I listened on Sunday, but you [?] missed yesterday.

28:13 PRAYAS We've been mashing them up and in that sense because the mashing up produces a kind of a meaning which can be you know, shared in both contexts.

28:26 SATYA And the other thing is we are sp very s we're very much focused on the individual experience. So whatever there are so many definitions and the idea here is to have everyone's perspective. So, you know, even if there wasn't a thread from the past, like what does a fragment represent to you for like you just said, there's the internal and there's the external.

28:47 CATHY Well, I guess I mean this is partly where my question came from because I slightly struggle with it because I feel like I don't probably I don't think about my experience as fragmented so much as in negotiation. So I can think about it's not it's not coherent in a sort of static sense but it's it I don't feel it's as fragmented as in

29:17 These parts are not talking to each other. It might be someone used the example the image on Sunday of a murmuration of Right

29:25 CATHY (?) Right.

29:25 CATHY (?) That resonates with me, that sense of there are patterns that are emerging, disappearing, emerging again.

29:34 CATHY (?) Exactly.

29:34 CATHY (?) And that could be spatial or within the self.

29:38 SATYA Exactly, yeah. I think that was Don that had brought that up. Yeah. And I think that's such a beautiful representation of the mapping as well as patterns as well as the consist con constituents of the patterns.

29:56 Yeah.

29:57 Yeah. But then if we focus down, if we zoom in to one of those starlings and we say, What is the ident what is the what does it mean for the starling to lose its identity?

30:08 CATHY (?) Mm.

30:10 SATYA Is it then going to go its own way? Will it get out of that pack? That's wrong?

30:16 CATHY And I mean the loss of relationship. I th I think yeah, that you if you take it away from any relationship, how would it be?

30:27 SATYA Yeah.

30:27 Have an identity, yes.

30:29 PRAYAS Yeah, the identity itself is a fragmented notion because we are only we identify as something

30:38 Only after we are aware of it. So we don't identify with the fragments that we are not aware of within us, right? So we don't actually do a very good job of representing ourselves because we are only representing ourselves in terms of what we are conscious of.

30:57 SATYA But you're talking about conscious representation. Like what if I'm a I'm a child and I don't have any awareness, but I know that I am a child. I don't know what that means, but I know that I am. So the identity came before the identification. Yeah.

31:15 CATHY Yes. Oh well I do.

31:22 SATYA (?) How does that work?

31:23 MALAVIKA I don't I don't know how you

31:30 The identification is again contextual. So I can't look at identity without a context. Like you said with the starlings. Now if the starlings is out of its group, you I would still see it as a bird. But if I see it outside of being a creature with wings, then so you keep r you know, removing every possible identity what are you left with?

31:59 SATYA Right. And then you're and what occurs to me is every time it is removed from its context, it finds itself in a new context. So the ident the context defines its identity as Cathy also mentioned earlier. So it doesn't mean that there is a loss. There is always an identity of some sort which can be imposed on it, perhaps. That's what you was also saying.

32:23 PRAYAS Yeah, but as Nu is saying that identity is not static and as multiple we have h we've had that being expressed here, but the fact is that even if identity is not static, our identification of the identity, our articulation of the identity is more or less a static narrative that e either loses or grasps th the different kinds of detail at different times. But then the narrative is I mean so the narrative is more or less static.

33:10 PRAYAS (?) The narrative for that identity.

33:12 MALAVIKA From a desire. Yeah. I feel that may come from this desire for some sort of stability which we were talking of yesterday and you want s some sort of a continuation from one mo-

ment to the next. So you keep a narrative that is static so that it becomes a point of reference to what your identity is or what your identity is.

33:35 Is it map in that sense?

33:39 SATYA (?) Identity is a map. It is yes. It's a map of the cur of the coordinates of that experience.

33:47 PRAYAS Yeah, it's a map of the different how differently I know my different fragments.

33:57 SATYA How differently you know your different fragments depending on the context.

34:03 Yeah.

34:04 Hm. So wha does it ev I mean, does this question even make any sense then? Wha what does it mean for a fragment to lose its identity? I mean to me this question is not making sense because an identity can never be lost. There or there's always going to be a map of those coordinates.

34:20 PRAYAS (?) No, identity can easily be lost if a frag i if what I for example, if what I had perceiv what I have been perceiving as being me being myself in a very central way, and then I realize that it's just a fragment of who I am and not really it doesn't really occupy any centrality.

34:47 SATYA But we just said that identity is dependent on the context. So even if that context is gone, there is a new context. So there is a another identity. I mean

35:00 MALAVIKA I think in the moments when there is complete loss of identity I think it could be a momentary experience or it could be temporary or short lived, but it I think it's possible, right? And I was thinking of the experience of say when someone is ostracized, what happens at that moment of alienation? How does one look at identity in those moments of sudden alienation?

35:37 SATYA The do does that mean for example, does that mean they have a new identity or i or are we a multiplicity of identities all at the same time and one is taken away, there is another one still there?

35:52 MALAVIKA But I think it takes time for that for that reckoning to happen where you come to terms with one identity.

36:03 Lost, you know, th that moment of loss is still a moment that you have to reckon with.

36:15 SATYA But then isn't there a base identity?

36:22 Like no matter what, there is a baseline.

36:26 There is, there is.

36:27 PRAYAS (?) There might be a base identity in terms of what I am externally perceived as. But internally I might really be really vacuous. I might really be

36:39 Yeah.

36:40 SATYA (?) But what is external? Even within the internal there is an external. When I am self perceiving, I'm still othering myself and looking at myself, am I not?

36:49 CATHY (?) If you lost that you would you would get ill, wouldn't you? I mean no I'm serious, you know, w that is mental illness, isn't it? Where is it

36:59 SATYA Is it an awareness? Is it is it a higher state?

37:02 CATHY Well there is that in mental and this maybe

37:05 CATHY (?) Yeah.

37:07 I don't know, but you know, how would one live with that degree of fragmentation as a

37:17 'Cause I think it's true that if you if you lose if you lose all your bearings, all your coordinates, there is a loss of identity. But to avoid a complete breakdown at that moment probably something is sustained. There is there are some patterns that are recognizable still. Yeah. And if there aren't then you're in crisis and

37:43 SATYA Unless you're in such a state where you have deliberately lost you've deliberately shed those layers and you brought yourself to a sort of a base place.

37:55 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. I mean I think it's possible to be in crisis as Cathy said and to accept that one is one is in crisis so and that is one's identity, that I am at this point in crisis and

38:10 Right.

38:11 A and I don't really have anything to hold on to. I don't really have any definitive in my identity. And that itself can form a part of
38:24 Another identity.
38:25 PRAYAS (?) Of a at least an a basis for an identity that allows me to continue to operate as I did before.

38:34 SATYA Yeah.
38:35 SATYA (?) It just

38:36 PRAYAS I'm going to do it.
38:37 Yeah, just with a weaker commitment that in the sense that
38:41 Yeah.
38:42 I'll go on doing what I'm doing, but I'm not really sure if I should if I really want to do this.

38:48 SATYA Yeah, and there's an acceptance that I don't know but I'm gonna do this just because it's the base place where I have reached and I'm just gonna keep carrying on. Maybe some other something might dawn upon me and I might have some new information that I might create a new narrative.
39:07 I just I'm just money [?].
39:08 You know, I'm just trying to s I'm talking when I see lose its ide when what does it mean for a fragment to lose its identity? the i it doesn't always have to be crisis is what I'm trying to say. It's like yes, crisis is absolutely yeah, it's there, but there is also the situation where losing identity could be a good thing in the sense of, you know, uncovering
39:31 SATYA (?) Position.
39:32 SATYA (?) Yeah. And it could be like an uncovering of new layers which may not have been accessible.
39:40 SATYA (?) Yeah.
39:40 SATYA (?) Yeah, it doesn't okay.

39:41 CATHY (?) Always have to be a crisis.

39:43 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
39:45 PRAYAS (?) It's always a crisis actually if you are going to hold yourself up against any normative idea of what should be and what should not be. but I think if you don't do that you're free to accept anything that you might be experiencing and be okay with that.

40:08 SATYA Yeah. Yeah, and be okay with that. That's the thing. I mean you are taking yourself out of boxes and expectations and you're found yourself in a new place. I mean, maybe it doesn't even matter that do I have an identity, am I able to articulate it? It doesn't even matter anymore.

40:29 PRAYAS I mean the fact is that y you do have an identity right, you're not a blank wall.

40:35 SATYA You might have an identity but it doesn't matter. Exactly. That's what I'm saying. There is always a base state. Whatever it is, you change the con context of the state.

40:48 MALAVIKA Well wait, I think Nu pointed out that identity is momentary, there's only awareness and I think I'd agree there that it's an awareness of the identity that can sometimes you lose that awareness of your identity, even your base identity. Yeah, you may just about think you're human at some point of crisis, even if everything else is gone. but that awareness sometimes Yeah, but I think the understanding of what one's identity is and that sense of belonging when it's taken away, that moment where you feel that loss can sometimes be a state where m you do feel like you don't know who you are anymore or you don't know what to do.
41:43 Yeah.

41:44 SATYA (?) Yeah.
41:46 SATYA (?) Yeah.

41:48 MALAVIKA So

41:49 SATYA (?) And then as you said there it's a transit transition point because that global crisis
41:57 Yeah.

41:57 Is bringing you to a new place where you are getting new information.
42:04 Yeah.
42:05 PRAYAS Yeah, but as I think it's being what we're talking about is also slightly going off the you know, the terrain of what we have been talking about so far because wha as what as what Cathy is saying that it's about that la a loss of identity can also seem to mean a loss of memory, which is which I don't think is what we are we what we
42:37 Were pointing towards because a loss a loss of memory is an a is an ailment and we're not really talking about a loss of memory, are we?
42:50 CATHY (?) I was responding to the point in the in the discussion, people don't cease to exist post total memory loss, life goes on.
42:59 Mm- Mm-
43:00 SATYA (?) In the in the comments.
43:02 SATYA (?) Yeah.
43:03 CATHY Right. Okay.
43:05 SATYA (?) But then what is myself, right? Like I see that's the thing. I mean, does it matter if the memory is lost? Does it doesn't matter, like? Does it there is still an identity of some sort?
43:20 Johnny [?], I personally I think I might have come up with this question, but I don't agree with it anymore.
43:29 So then because of that let's move on to the next question, which is how do you map yourself?
43:40 How do you and I guess this is coming you know, it sort of flows from the earlier place where we are talking about looking at ourselves, right?
43:49 SATYA (?) Right.
43:51 PRAYAS But to map oneself one would need to be aware of all the paths one is trying to map.
43:58 MALAVIKA (?) Not all. I mean at different points of time you're putting t together different pieces. like Satya was talking of with jigsaw that day.
44:11 MALAVIKA (?) There are different pictures that emerge at different points of time.
44:19 SATYA Depending on which fragments you're mapping.
44:26 Again it's the contexts and the perspectives of what sliver of our data are we looking at and one type of map. And we also talked about how there are different types of types of today [?]. We talked about how mapping can be just a survey of the topography and at the same time it can also be an imposition of a political viewpoint over a geographical area, for example. And
44:53 MALAVIKA And I think we ended at an interesting point yesterday where we were looking at the whole process of mapping going beyond something that is geographical.
45:04 SATYA Right, exactly.
45:05 MALAVIKA No whether parallel maps could coexist alongside the geographical
45:12 SATYA (?) Exactly. And if we directly apply that to the mapping of the self.
45:17 SATYA (?) Yeah.
45:18 Like so if we if I'm just say stating that this is what I am externally, for example, I have this colour skin and I have this features or whatever, that's sort of like a survey.
45:31 SATYA (?) Yeah.
45:32 I mean this is very like crass and basic way of saying this is how I map myself. but
45:42 How do we how do we look how do we think of which rationale to go with when we map ourselves?
45:54 MALAVIKA I think we can connect this too little bit to this what we what we were talking of previously in terms of identity. That's one way of mapping because you're
46:08 Trying to
46:09 PRAYAS (?) It also depends on our need of the moment, right? So in the sense
46:13 PRAYAS (?) Right.

46:14 PRAYAS (?) Our desires will actually map our ourselves in the in the in the s in the in the context that we need it to. So w what we want, as in what our desire is going to map ourselves in that map ourselves in that context.

46:36 SATYA So you're saying that depending on my desires at the moment, I'm going to have a certain way of mapping myself.

46:43 SATYA (?) Yeah.

46:46 SATYA (?) Mm-

46:48 PRAYAS (?) And when these desires are conflicted, as we if you can just go back to that for a moment, then we are m mapping ourselves in a very complex way which might not be entirely aligned in the same set of coordinates. So you know you can end up making a map that is discordant in itself, which doesn't s which doesn't have any coherence.

47:25 SATYA Right. And there's always the danger of holding on to such a map and then basing that as the you know, basis for future action or placing oneself into circumstances in the future. So if there is a flaw in that mapping

47:46 Because of that one.

47:47 MALAVIKA Problem lies in making maps static. The moment maps become static then you know you've got a lot to deal with.

47:59 SATYA That's true, that's true. And yeah, and that's the problem. Like we might stick with our comfort zone, which is a sort of a map in a way.

48:08 And if that becomes static, it's like, you know, I have solidified my conditions and I don't want to get out of this.

48:19 What Don is saying is sometimes we don't need a clear rationale or something not in conflict with it. A process of mapping can just be something enough for

48:34 Huh.

48:34 Process of mapping is what

48:39 Helps to get to the next level, perhaps.

48:46 PRAYAS But the moment we think about levels

48:50 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

48:51 We kind of invalidate the f fact that you know, we don't necessarily all of us want to be aligned to the same logic of levels.

49:05 SATYA Which is true, yes. Yeah.

49:08 CATHY I think I think of it almost like on any given day I might have like a little sketch map for myself that's kind of provisional for that day on the back of an envelope and the next day I might cross it all out and it'll be different. I mean, you know, not a literal map of a street but you know, that it could be a provisional scrawled thing just for now to get me through the day.

49:37 SATYA (?) Yeah.

49:38 Yeah, and that's actually an interesting thing. What's occurring to me is what if we go in the direction of how would we specifically map ourselves? Like what very concretely, like you said, Cathy, you might have a map for yourself for a day. What would that involve what does it look like? I mean would it involve what one wears that day or how one is going to project oneself that day, or how what is that map? What does it have in it?

50:03 CATHY Oh for sure it starts with getting dressed. Yeah.

50:09 SATYA (?) Yeah

50:12 SATYA (?) That's interesting 'cause wearing a dressing oneself, 'cause that's how do we want to be perceived?

50:22 Right. So how can the word mapping, how can we look at how can we look at the w concept of mapping to the projection ourselves?

50:34 PRAYAS The concept of mapping seems to also betray a kind of strategic mindedness. And

50:43 Yeah.

50:43 Actually when you're in conflict you might not have any strategy.

50:50 SATYA Yeah.
50:50 It depends, it depends, right? Like if your strategy could be I have a gun and I'm gonna shoot but you can't necessarily control what happens.
50:59 SATYA (?) Yeah.
51:00 PRAYAS (?) Strategy would be to survive and resolve the conflict.
51:07 MALAVIKA (?) You will find it. I mean I mean so for me dressing could be like I dress myself with the schedule for the day.
51:14 MALAVIKA (?) Right. It's gonna rain or it's gonna be cold, so I have to wear the sweater.
51:20 No or I plan my day with XYZ activities to give even myself a projection that this is who I am for today and th because I will be defined by what I do.
51:35 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.
51:39 SATYA (?) And so that's a sort of a mapping.
51:44 PRAYAS No, but our map and what Malavika said actually betrays a lot of hope and b it betrays so in the in the sense when you are when you s when you experience yourself as a set of conflicted fragments, then you might actually be not you might not be motivated enough to do anything but resign yourself to the fragments.
52:16 PRAYAS (?) Okay.
52:16 PRAYAS (?) Resignation.
52:17 Yeah, and that doesn't leave you in a place where you're going to actually do any kind of mapping at all. You're just going to be a disarray.
52:29 MALAVIKA No, I think it depends on the degree of conflict because if e even in the most conflicted situations you have to do something and you can accept your fragments and say, Okay, I'm gonna take fragment B, X and Y today and B that and do these things. And you I may convince myself that I'll deal with the other fragments tomorrow. But th there is still a strategy and that's where I think what you were asking about having a strategy to approach the whole mapping process is also important.
53:12 PRAYAS Yeah, I'm just not sure if that choice of X, Y, and Z and you know, of whatever strategy is something that happens all the time because I don't think once
53:28 Conflicted nature allows oneself to make any sort of choices sometimes. It's just paralysis. It's a paralysis of sorts which I mean your fragments have cancelled each other out or whatever, but you are you are a at that moment paralyzed and a paralyzed identity is what you what you map then.
53:54 SATYA True and you could be making the choice also of that moment to remain in paralysis by not doing anything. That is that is a sort of a choice. It might be a conscious choice, it could be an unconscious choice, but you might say you might just be that there in that state of paralysis.
54:13 MALAVIKA How long would you do that?
54:15 SATYA Right, until something happens. So I'm saying ki it is it could be a strategy, it is still a strategy to remain in that paralysis, consciously or unconsciously.
54:26 PRAYAS Yeah, 'cause it might be getting you something.
54:29 SATYA Yeah. In that moment you are okay that's the only thing that's making sense to be in that paralysis. Or it's not making sense at all but you don't know what to do and that's the only thing that can be done.
54:44 CATHY Sometimes you might be mapped by other people too.
54:47 Huh, yeah.
54:48 So, you know, there are times when you feel yourself to be put in a set of coordinates that you don't recognise. Yeah. And then you can either go with that or literally move out of that sometimes just sometimes just by simply m moving to a different position, e literally spatially, that can change that.
55:18 CATHY (?) Yeah.

55:21 SATYA And if one were to directly apply this to a geographical situation to larger bodies, I mean I can see a direct parallel where, you know, a nation state being defined in a particular way. Of course a nation state cannot move geographically, but you know, conceptually it can move and the way it is construed or the way it its identity is constructed or the way it's mapped, it changes.

55:57 PRAYAS W what Cathy was saying about being mapped by someone else. Actually that is being mapped by someone else also gives us the an opportunity to actually manipulate that mapping. And so because it's someone else who is mapping us, we can manipulate that person or that situation to be seem like something we are not.

56:27 SATYA Yeah.

56:33 So we are talking about manipulation of one's presence.

56:38 PRAYAS (?) Of others other how someone else might cost might construe our presence.

56:46 SATYA Yeah. So we are mapping ourselves in a way that manipulates how we appear.

56:56 PRAYAS Yeah, and that is I think simpler to do than doing anything with our own self mapping actually, because that is not something which we can ex we that's not something which we can manipulate.

57:14 Like we can't manipulate our own truth, but we can manipulate someone else's version of our truth.

57:22 SATYA Wait. We cannot manipulate we ca we can manipulate someone else's version of our truth.

57:28 PRAYAS Yeah, we can manipulate someone else's version of our truth, but not our own version of our truth.

57:36 PRAYAS (?) You don't think that we can manipulate that?

57:39 SATYA (?) No, I don't think so. I don't think we can actually manipulate ourselves.

57:47 SATYA (?) But are we fully aware of how we manipulate ourselves?

57:51 SATYA (?) I don't think we can

57:53 MALAVIKA (?) Why the word manipulate? I'm a little confused.

57:58 PRAYAS (?) No, it's in the sense that when we get into the identification of others of us, right?

58:08 PRAYAS (?) Then I was just commenting, yeah, so that identification is something which we can toy with.

58:19 SATYA (?) Yeah, y I mean you can you can

58:24 MALAVIKA You can contribute to that narrative, I think. but I don't think

58:35 I don't see how the manipulation of the self comes in there.

58:43 Yeah, it's a matter of

58:44 SATYA Mapul but manipulation is it a parallel word for mapping?

58:49 Is manipulating the self? Yes.

58:53 SATYA (?) Yeah.

59:06 There's a parallel discussion going on in the chat window which is distracting me at the moment. But and it's a pretty intense discussion on you know, how one is perceived, how which is sort of if we were to use the word

59:21 It helps to work with it.

59:23 Pretty much, yeah. but we are almost at the end of our time now and I think we have mostly discussed today, you know, on how the self is. Yesterday we were more concrete on geographies and conflict and governance, etcetera, but today we really focused a lot on the self. and I guess we had a whole bunch of different ideas coming through.

59:56 I guess we can end on this note of it's a slightly fragmented note, I guess. To me at least, the way I'm defining fragmentation.

01:00:10 CATHY Have a listen to yesterday's is it still going to be up yes it is

01:00:13 Yeah.

01:00:14 MALAVIKA Y you can access them on YouTube at any point of time.

01:00:18 SATYA (?) Yes, and I can send you a link if you like. but thanks everyone for joining. And as always, there's a lot to think about. And hope to catch you in another study group. Thanks all.

01:00:31 Thank you. Thank you.

01:00:32 But