Perspective Studies, Day 10

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 10 July 2014. Watch on YouTube

---

I made this transcript by machine from the recording and corrected it against the recording's description and my own records. I have not checked the words by ear. I checked a sample of the speaker names by ear, and corrected those I heard differently. [?] marks a word still in doubt and [unclear] a passage that could not be made out. A speaker is named only where the broadcast's screen or the recording's own words say who is speaking. Fillers such as "uh" and "um" are left out. Times are from the start of the recording.

A name followed by (?) was read from the screen at a moment when it changed from one speaker to the next, so the turn may belong partly or wholly to the speaker before or after.

Prayas Abhinav · prayasabhinav.net/videos

00:07 PRAYAS Hello everyone. we're here starting at day ten.

00:17 SATYA Hi all.

00:18 PRAYAS Hi. today our st the question we start with is this the syntax. So wha which are the symbols that meaning is contained in?

00:36 PRAYAS (?) And yesterday we had a

00:41 We had a good session in terms of trying to understand the game that we play compulsively and then try to read its own meaning and where does that lead us?

00:57 And today I think it'll mean asking

01:04 The that meaning which is which is a habit to chase and which is in a way inherently geared to fail. Which symbols is those is those meaning contained in?

01:22 So for us when we're chasing it, what do we actually chase in its symbolic form?

01:35 SATYA (?) There's one thing before going into symbol I was thinking about were we looking at game as a sort of

01:48 Like a negative connotation to the game? Was that the feeling we had yesterday?

01:54 Like it's a game, something that we don't want to play, but we are forced to play.

02:02 PRAYAS So th the game can definitely mean that, but for me not necessarily in the sense that the game is also something that gives you pleasure. And I mean compulsion is something that holds you by rewarding you with pleasure. so if you're compulsive about let's say

02:30 You know, arranging a room in a certain way, then it also makes you feel good.

02:37 Okay.

02:41 SATYA I got that thought was like sometimes when we talk about work becoming play, enjoying your work so that it becomes play. Or like we even ch talked about children and how you know children are actually in a larger framework than we are and they have to come down to our level. I think Sam had mentioned this. And I was like, children at play, that game is not negative, it's more pure. So I was just thinking about that.

03:11 PRAYAS Yeah, and I mean I would say that also in the corporate HR department the way they appropriate games and you know, that try to make work enjoyable.

03:24 Yeah.

03:25 That's because it's so painful to begin with.

03:28 SATYA (?) Yeah.

03:33 PRAYAS And of course on the other side you have the gaming industry that's you know that has to offer this the joy of game as a product and as a necessary with a necessarily deliverable reward. Which is again I think all which is not possible. I mean

03:57 Yeah.

03:58 So I think between both those poles the I mean in common vocabulary the game has become a distorted field with very low in that sense you know affinity or we d we don't like I mean we don't like to think that everything could be a game.

04:27 SATYA Yeah. And like even the word game has sort of become twisted into something that's a manipulation.

04:37 PRAYAS Right. Instead of basically it's a self running narrative system, right? So it's a s narrative system that makes its o that has its own rules and by its own rules it generates its own future. So

04:55 It challenges of course

04:59 Every church there is because

05:04 It's doesn't seem to have a place for a referee in that sense like we were talking about yesterday or

05:09 SATYA Yeah.

05:16 But then now I'm trying to think how symbolism the words symbol and symbolism can be brought, which is today's question.

05:24 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

05:26 SATYA With this thread.

05:29 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, because I mean symbols have come in are coming in today because you know once you represent something symbolically it can become something that it's not.

05:43 PRAYAS (?) Right.

05:45 Right. So it becomes one l one level extra difficult in the sense

05:52 That the meaning can be there and the meaning cannot be there also.

05:59 PRAYAS (?) Right.

06:02 SATYA (?) And everyone has their own they could give their own interpretation of it. Everyone has their own interpretation.

06:09 SATYA (?) Right. So I mean Uttam did you were you asking how?

06:13 UTTAM (?) I was asking yeah, I was asking how. How can it not have meaning?

06:17 PRAYAS You know, like in language, right? So words don't always mean the same thing. So if somebody is using the word love for someone and someone else is using the same word, it doesn't necessarily need to represent any emotion.

06:33 UTTAM Okay. But the thing is the individual symbols themselves might whatever, like mean the same thing, right? Especially in one frame. If you say if you take a language English, so the symbols, the alphabets might mean the same thing throughout. Because we have framed a rule that they should mean the same thing.

06:59 UTTAM (?) You know what I mean? Like different languages might have similar symbols, but

07:04 PRAYAS No, what I'm saying is that symbols can be empty.

07:10 SIDDHARTH (?) Right?

07:10 SIDDHARTH (?) Is symbol [?]

07:13 PRAYAS So symbol is a I mean okay, f symbol is a container which is supposed to contain a standard

07:24 Intensity of emotion, right? So it's it can be taken for granted as and in that taking for granted it can sometimes also cheat you by being empty actually.

07:39 SIMRAT Why would you take it?

07:43 PRAYAS I mean like going back to the example, if you use if you for example, if you are writing poetry, the way to write poetry in a way that you can least communicate it, so that you know

it's basically it means nothing to no one, is to use a lot of adjectives. Right? So adjectives have in common language become blunted and have lost their lost the symbolism because of being overused and because of often not containing representing anything at all.

08:21 SIMRAT But you're saying that implies that at one point they had a fixed meaning or that they had a that they weren't empty at some point and they have become empty now.

08:32 PRAYAS Right. I mean that's a c that's something that I'm leading I'm going on to say because you can still sometimes encounter the same symbol with emotion. Like so I mean in the sense you can still you have we have not dismissed the word love from our vocabulary because some of us still love some people sometimes.

08:59 SIMRAT (?) Yeah.

09:04 SATYA (?) It's a function of various factors such as culture or overuse or it's like almost like an evolutionary thing.

09:15 SATYA (?) For a symbol to have a meaning at a given time and then it changes over time. It depends on who's saying it, who's using it, how it's being used.

09:24 SIMRAT So is it that a symbol has like a sort of accepted meaning, but to each individual it has a nuance, like their nuance differences to each individual? Is that what we're saying? Or we're saying it can be completely different for completely like from person to person or from situation to situation. Like when you say the word love, I mean I feel that everybody has like a standard accepted understanding of love and then how I choose to comprehend that emotion may be different, but there's still an underlying acceptance of what that might mean at some level, right? Like we know love is different from hate. Like I would never take the emotion of hate and ascribe that to love.

10:04 Do you do you understand what I'm saying?

10:05 PRAYAS Right, but the fact is that, you know, in the everyday experiences of love, hate is p a part of it.

10:12 SIMRAT Sure. But d but there's still some underlying acceptance of what that word or that symbol might mean. Like there is a commonality that we're all operating on. It's just

10:23 PRAYAS That is the taking for granted, right? I mean

10:26 Right, of course.

10:27 So when meanings get frozen in dictionaries then those words cannot possibly mean anything anymore, right? So that defines the constant need for writers to either use words in a new way or make up new words because otherwise there's just no you know f facility left in, you know, trying to communicate something.

10:58 SIMRAT (?) But that can be a good thing.

10:59 PRAYAS (?) D

11:01 SATYA Sorry, that commonality we are we are all saying that there is a commonality, but the way we experience that commonality may be different from person to person.

11:13 SIMRAT So

11:18 SATYA So the commonality is also a symbol.

11:24 SIMRAT Oh

11:34 SATYA It's like saying blue, right? I mean there is there's this thing about how certain cultures actually call green to be blue.

11:43 SATYA (?) Mm-

11:44 SIMRAT (?) Right.

11:45 SATYA So but then there is but still there is that commonality of blue.

11:52 PRAYAS So just to frame the you know this question about the commonality if I go back to the example we I mean to the model to the model of the problem that we had yesterday. So let's say so we are playing this game that we do not know why we are playing, so we're playing it com-

pulsively and we become aware of this, that we are playing this game. And then we try to f try to find why, right? Or why or so we try to access the meaning of that. What does it mean to be playing a game without want without knowing why you're playing it? And that accessing access of meaning is an access of a symbol. That's what we are adding to that model today. And how does that

12:42 SIMRAT Change the situation.

12:51 SATYA We're we are playing game we are playing games and we are trying to find the meaning of that game and we are trying to attribute a symbol to that meaning.

13:01 Right.

13:02 And we are trying and we're trying to understand what is that symbol.

13:07 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, we're trying to understand what that symbol is because that symbol being I mean w what that symbol is determines what that symbol makes us do. So, you know, if that symbol is

13:25 Is a religious symbol, for example. So the symbol is of religion.

13:30 Yeah.

13:31 PRAYAS (?) Then we do we respond to it in a certain way. If the symbol is of something else

13:44 SATYA (?) Yeah, it's evoking certain behaviours and s it's like a rule set. I it's like a representation of a rule set.

13:51 SIMRAT (?) Yeah, so that symbol is the relationship between us and the meaning.

13:59 Right.

14:09 PRAYAS (?) And now what the question is

14:11 SATYA (?) The Yeah.

14:13 Sorry, good [?].

14:15 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, no, please go ahead.

14:17 SATYA (?) Oh I'm just trying to think. We're talking about who comes up with the symbols or what are those terms?

14:24 UTTAM (?) Yeah, who like how are the symbols born? Like are they born when you try to form a narrative or when you try to communicate or when you try to decipher something? Who assigns like what a symbol is, like or who identifies what a symbol is?

14:45 PRAYAS So if we if we go to Malgorzata who is who's joining us today what did you say? why do symbols take form?

15:00 MALGORZATA Is it the question for me?

15:02 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean if you if you want to respond to that, if you want to take that question that Uttam has posted. So, you know, where do these symbols come from?

15:15 MALGORZATA Yeah I mean it's interesting subject for me because I am interested in archetypes and exactly like you know it comes from somewhere very ancient times I think the symbols. And how do we how do we know that

15:38 It's a mystery for me. How do we know that blue signifies something for us different than red and the fire and the sea, the water of different animals has different meaning. It's very interesting. But I don't know.

16:00 PRAYAS So are you saying the symbols come from a time before culture?

16:05 MALGORZATA (?) Yes. I think that is something very ancient.

16:13 SATYA Do we think that language has a similar if you know, it's sounding like even language is something like this, like the words are symbols for something, so it's like the evolution of language itself.

16:26 Exactly.

16:27 SIMRAT Words are symbols and alphabets are symbols and numbers can also be symbols and anything that has that I guess a graphic form is a symbol because we ascribe something to it.

So like the meaning of one means something to us and it might mean something different in a different culture. You know? but yes, I don't know where that origin comes from. I think I would have been on

16:54 UTTAM (?) Sorry.

16:55 SATYA Is it only graphical? Could it not be?

16:58 SIMRAT It could be sound, it could be also like taste could be a symbol. I mean I assume anything that's related to the senses, it's like anything that we experience can have a meaning, you know? it's just that usually optically and sonically, those are the things that we I mean, I feel like that's what we think of in terms of symbols. but largely I think we think, you know we operate on those terms but they're not limited to that.

17:29 PRAYAS You know, but concepts are beyond the senses, right? So concepts are I think one level one level more primary. It's before experience. Concepts are before experience.

17:41 SIMRAT But if you can't Okay. Could you elaborate a little bit on that?

17:45 Symbols.

17:47 PRAYAS You know, so in the sense that if you have a mental picture or a mental concept of a certain person being a certain way

17:58 Okay.

17:59 You know? So now that is something more primary than anything about the po about the person in a re in a real way, right? It's nothing that has anything to do with the person at all.

18:12 SIMRAT (?) Yes.

18:14 SIMRAT (?) So that is before experience.

18:18 SATYA Are the yeah, and symbols are not yeah, okay. Yeah.

18:21 UTTAM (?) I think symbols are the result of approximating an idea.

18:31 PRAYAS Right. So like words try to capture meaning.

18:37 Right.

18:38 So word words are links, right? So

18:41 Right.

18:42 Saying basically that symbols are links. The symbols are approximations and okay. Yeah. They're links to an approximation, I'll say.

18:51 UTTAM Mm.

18:51 Yeah, you're right. You're right. Links to an approximation. Right.

19:06 But how does that thicken the plot? You know? So

19:10 Yeah

19:10 And do symbols make it are they on our side or aren't they are they on the game side?

19:19 SATYA (?) Right. And why does a symbol become a symbol? Is it because of a certain group of people accepting it or why did that become the popular symbol?

19:34 PRAYAS Yeah, so if symbols have so much potency in the sense that they come from these ancient times and all I mean if you don't know where they come from basically. And if they have such power in the sense of changing the flow of narrative without any intention.

19:59 SATYA Okay.

20:02 PRAYAS You know, then we can actu what is the what is the role that symbols are actually playing? I mean what where do they because it makes it easier a lot more curious.

20:17 SIDDHARTH Do symbol provide ease in communication?

20:25 Do symbols.

20:26 SATYA Provide communication you're asking.

20:28 SIDDHARTH No, do symbol provide an ease in communication? Do they make communication easy?

20:36 SATYA (?) Okay.

20:37 PRAYAS Or maybe symbols can show something beyond the words.

20:41 SIDDHARTH The as we are saying that words are symbols.

20:45 And during communication we use words. So it words make to us to understand our feeling easily.

20:54 PRAYAS N I don't think so. You think it is easy because you learn how to interpret a symbol in a specific way and you keep encountering the same thing again and again and that's why it makes it easy. But if you

21:07 SIDDHARTH That's where the symbol came into existence.

21:11 PRAYAS I don't think so.

21:13 But can we actually say that words are symbols?

21:17 Yeah.

21:18 Are they symbols or are they just part of something that builds the language?

21:25 I don't know.

21:26 A word specifically.

21:27 I don't know if I could agree that words are symbols.

21:32 SIDDHARTH Words can be symbol. As you take a word, it specifies a certain thing. As ball a as a word you ball is a symbol. For a word ball is a symbol for a

21:54 SATYA Well, it just occurred to me that Prayas you said symbols are links to experience. Symbols are also links for communication, to link people.

22:12 PRAYAS Interesting. Yeah. Especially if you look at in a from a religious perspective. A lot of people whatever try to relate themselves to a specific symbol or a specific I don't know.

22:32 You know what I mean? Like

22:33 Yeah.

22:34 They relate themselves to a specific symbol, like maybe if it's Hindus, maybe Om or Cross for Christians. I don't know.

22:44 So it's medium for Go ahead.

22:48 SIMRAT Or to s look at it like how it connects people or it makes links between people.

22:56 SIMRAT (?) Yeah.

23:01 UTTAM Like you associate the sound of crying to someone in pain, maybe, that's one this thing, right?

23:11 PRAYAS (?) You I still say the sound of pain too.

23:15 Yeah.

23:16 Sound of kind of

23:20 UTTAM Yeah, sound of crying to pain. And

23:26 Yeah.

23:32 PRAYAS You know but between all the all the smaller questions, I would s I would call the question whether if words are symbols, I would I would call that a smaller question. And reg in regard to us actually trying to figure out what's the role the symbols are playing.

23:58 SATYA It's like a detail, okay.

24:01 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. I mean I don't know. It's that's a that's a feeling because you know, if s to figure out if any anything is something or not, it's a technical question, right? So in the sense that you know, we ca we are we'll get into trying to define it and

24:17 Right.

24:17 You know, I don't know. I think we can we can leave it ambiguous and you know tr try to more imagine the model and that symbol and that model and try to figure what is what is how does the flux change? How is it affecting the flux, you know, the symbol.

24:38 SATYA So what is the role of the symbol? That's what you had said.

24:41 PRAYAS (?) Right. I think I think that's interesting for me. We can all define our own interests, but you know, that is one thing of interest to me to help us take forward.

24:54 SIMRAT But you are also specifically interested not just in what is the role of the symbol, but what is the role of the symbol to the game is specifically what you're interested in and how does it change the game or complicate things.

25:04 PRAYAS (?) Right. So how does it affect the flux? Right. So I'm interested in this the role and what is the how is the role acting itself out?

25:22 SATYA You said flux and that's feeling to me like the symbol is what tries to bring in a certain amount of order to the chaos of the flux.

25:38 PRAYAS (?) I don't know. Why would you say that?

25:42 SATYA So suppose you have a whole bunch of actors who are acting randomly within a space, each one playing their own game within maybe a larger game, and then somebody introduces a symbol and that symbol starts resonating with some of the players within the game and they all start aligning themselves with that symbol. So that's kind of what I mean by ordering things within a noisy space.

26:15 SATYA (?) Yeah.

26:17 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I would I would agree. I mean, in the sense, you know, it gives it a gives it

26:25 Yeah, a direction in the sense it makes it

26:29 Possible for other actors to make a play, right? So you ca they can all make their move because this something has spoken.

26:38 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

26:41 SATYA (?) So it's a moment of clarity in our narrative.

26:46 Yeah. And then the other actors can be influenced by it. Like there are others who don't direct immediately resonate with the symbol, but like the Facebook experiment that just happened of the emotion contagion.

27:00 Right.

27:01 So you know.

27:06 PRAYAS (?) Right, but you know, at least it's in the game we can figure that the moment that the symbols emerge is the moment of play. You know, that's when the play is happening.

27:20 SATYA (?) But play is happening anyway, right?

27:24 PRAYAS I mean the deflection points. Like the you know, that's when the play is changing.

27:28 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, okay, yeah.

27:33 PRAYAS (?) The game changed.

27:35 PRAYAS (?) Right. But then you know what is causing these symbols to emerge?

27:42 UTTAM Right.

27:47 SATYA (?) Is it a need for the players to find a narrative?

27:54 PRAYAS But so that is the compulsion, right? So that's the compulsion which is making them play.

28:01 SATYA Right. But then they are playing and s right. And some of them feel like, Why am I playing? Why am I here? What am I doing?

28:09 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so that's the awareness of playing a game that you don't even know why you're playing.

28:14 SATYA (?) Correct. And in that effort there may be a few who are like there has to be a meaning to this. So maybe this is the meaning to this and that this is a symbol.

28:30 PRAYAS (?) When you say this you mean

28:34 SATYA The meaning. So y there are people who have become aware of the question that what am I doing? Why am I here?

28:40 SATYA (?) Right.

28:41 And to answer that question, to come up with a narrative, they hold on to something which becomes a symbol.

28:50 PRAYAS Right. So y you are saying that the symbol is an attempt to answer.

28:57 SATYA Okay, yeah. We I could look at it that way.

29:01 PRAYAS I mean is that what you were trying to express?

29:06 SATYA I think so, I think so. I mean it's like here's it's like okay I think it's very difficult for people to deal with randomness and with to have no to have no meaning, to have no purpose. I think that's a difficult thing to live with.

29:22 SIDDHARTH Do we use symbol to express?

29:27 SATYA Yeah.

29:30 PRAYAS And what's the Dhat [?] you're saying, that's that basically I think adds on to what we were saying in the sense that if symbols are approximations of an answer, then that is the that is the expression, right? So the symbols are approximations of an expression of an answer.

29:51 PRAYAS (?) Right.

29:52 SIDDHARTH And can words be expressions?

29:55 PRAYAS Can words be expressions?

29:59 Right. So I mean, I think symbols can be contained in words. Words might not be symbols, but you know, s words can contain symbols within them.

30:10 SIDDHARTH (?) Yeah, that can be a two point [?].

30:27 SIMRAT Hm okay.

30:29 PRAYAS (?) Right. So you know Siddharth i if words are attempts to answer

30:33 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

30:35 What does it make them?

30:38 UTTAM C can we l go back to symbols instead of words? Can we call words as symbols and try to whatever? Because I'm getting a little confused when you say words because symbols have a much broader meaning, right? We said

30:53 PRAYAS So I think I mean I'm still holding on to symbols, but I'm just saying that you know words can possibly contain symbols. So when you when you for example through a series of references in a poem, you create a mental picture in the person's mind who's reading the poem.

31:18 PRAYAS (?) Right.

31:19 UTTAM (?) That is a symbol.

31:21 SIMRAT Yeah, because I can also

31:23 Say the word love, just one word and create a mental picture without doing anything else.

31:29 PRAYAS But that would not be a symbol, that would be like what you were talking about earlier. The you know, it's not a specific symbol in the sense that if the word love pretends to be a symbol, then it doesn't work and symbols have a habit of working. So

31:48 You know, in that sense we could say that love is not a symbol

31:54 Only because it doesn't work all the time. And symbols do work.

32:00 SATYA So then you're saying not to use the word let's not use words. Let's talk about symbols

32:06 SIMRAT But you had mentioned right at the beginning that a symbol is a shell, right? So the shell can contain the shell can have any form.

32:17 SATYA (?) So I think we should distinguish because if we talk about the shell then let's talk about the shell because

32:23 SIMRAT I see the thing is this shell can be anything. It could be I mean it could be it could have a form, it could also not have a form as we sort of discussed earlier. So then perhaps the qu the we should move away from conversations about words and as Prayas had said earlier and just talk about symbols and shells instead. Maybe shell is a better word to use.

32:49 SIMRAT (?) Yeah.

32:50 PRAYAS So in that sense symbols are resting inside shells, right? So

32:56 SIMRAT Right. And the shell could take could be with form or without form as well, right? That's what we had sort of spoken about earlier.

33:02 PRAYAS So su I mean concepts can be shells.

33:06 SIMRAT (?) Right.

33:08 MALGORZATA How can shell be without form?

33:14 Is it pos how is it possible that shell has to have that form?

33:18 SIMRAT (?) Well

33:18 SIMRAT (?) But this

33:20 I was thinking that earlier when we talk about concept like I guess it's a little abstract. Can we speak about that a little bit perhaps? Like what do we mean when we say a concept could be a symbol?

33:33 PRAYAS So you know, a mental picture. So a symbol that has not that is not expressed yet maybe, but you know a symbol that maybe also doesn't need expression. A mental a mental picture, something that you're holding on to in abstraction, letting it be abstract.

33:55 SIMRAT (?) But do you not when you say mental picture, do you not create a form in your mind when you say that word?

34:01 SIMRAT (?) Yeah, exactly.

34:02 SATYA (?) But that's your each individual's perception of that concept. And that, if it belongs to each individual, then it's not common.

34:12 UTTAM Right.

34:13 MALGORZATA But that's

34:18 SIMRAT So that complicates the game? Is that what complicates the game?

34:24 SATYA To a certain extent I think it does, because e each one has their own interpretation then and then the commonality becomes a little blurred.

34:35 Communication becomes difficult.

34:45 But if there was a way to hold on to the symbols somehow, to communicate the symbol itself.

34:53 Then maybe we would have better communication.

34:56 PRAYAS (?) Right. So in the sense if we if language was true and if language worked, right? Yeah. In the sense yeah, if we if we had not managed to exhaust language.

35:13 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, correct.

35:16 SATYA Because there must have been a time at some point when it may have been more pure language.

35:25 PRAYAS (?) I mean we don't know that, but we do it matters.

35:29 SIMRAT Exhausted, Prayas. I'm not totally sure I'm on board with that.

35:33 SATYA I think like the example of the word love, right? Like love is now a tired word.

35:43 PRAYAS So exhausted in the sense of having been punctured. So you know, now we are n never sure if

35:52 A symbol has a meaning or not. So you know the original puzzle. So we don't really know and that not knowing is

36:04 You know, an exhaustion that you know so we can't really be sincere about language anymore.

36:12 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

36:14 SATYA Like there's meta to everything. There's sarcasm, irony. We don't even know if a word is sarcastic or ironic anymore.

36:22 PRAYAS (?) Right.

36:24 SIMRAT The language it in fact m multiplies its possibilities, no?

36:31 SATYA But then isn't it that word's become beaten to death? Like what do you do? Isn't it tiring then? Like which meaning should I take?

36:41 SIMRAT Well
36:46 But doesn't I mean for me that would make
36:51 The game more exciting and mean that I'm yeah, that you keep playing and you're playing and you're playing and you're playing and yes you could get tired but you could also get excited.
37:00 SATYA Agreed. Yeah.
37:01 SIMRAT (?) Right.
37:03 SATYA I mean it makes it more interesting in that sense. Yeah.
37:06 Mm-
37:07 SIMRAT There's more to play with.
37:13 SATYA But then are we communicating s you know?
37:18 SATYA (?) If that's the intent.
37:19 SIMRAT No, there I mean, I think that there could be the attempt to communicate, but m communication may or may not happen.
37:26 Yeah.
37:28 PRAYAS So doesn't that exhaust language for you?
37:35 SIMRAT I wouldn't I wouldn't necessarily I wouldn't necessarily say it exhausts all language. It may exhaust it in a psi particular situation, but
37:49 SATYA (?) But situational exhaustion is I mean what I'm saying is either something is absolute for you, it's always there or it's if it's sometimes not there, it's you know, not there basically.
38:06 SIMRAT But what is absolute for you? Like for example, what would be completely absolute in your life?
38:13 PRAYAS (?) So absolute is what I'm what actually I think what we are all talking about in terms of symbols. The symbols always work, right? So symbols
38:24 PRAYAS (?) Right.
38:25 Don't get exhausted. Whereas language does.
38:28 SATYA I would agree with that. Like maybe we move on from b like today's the state of today when there is so much noise, there is a proliferation of everything, maybe we will reach a place where we get exhausted and move beyond it and think that, you know what, I'm just gonna keep quiet. I don't want to use words anymore and just make the symbol communicate somehow.
38:54 Yeah, so again.
38:55 PRAYAS That is the effect on our first like the inhibition factor in a sense that you know if so many people are saying so many things that they obviously know, then you know, I won't bother anymore. That kind of inhibition that emerges from the system is exactly what you're describing, Navy [?].
39:16 SATYA Right. It is a sort of inhibition in the sense like there's so much noise, why should I add to it? Does it even make any sense anymore?
39:27 SATYA (?) But there is then also a sort of freedom. There is also freedom from the noise.
39:32 PRAYAS By not participating in it.
39:35 SATYA (?) Yes, by not participating and by trying to find maybe some by go by stepping back. You're stepping back from the game. You're saying, you know what, I don't want to add to this.
39:47 SIMRAT But I but what would what would like what kind of situation would that entail? Because this is I feel maybe the conversation is a little bit t geared towards language and I'm trying to think of other symbols that we have that are not necessarily words or language.
40:04 SATYA (?) So if I can give an example, it's like I'm being very much on the physical plane, but there's so much music.
40:12 UTTAM Yeah, it reaches a
40:14 SATYA (?) I mean there's so much. Like really is there any need to add to this?

40:23 UTTAM I mean

40:24 PRAYAS Parvez, would you like to jump in at this point in the sense, you know you've been here and I don't know.

40:35 PARVEZ I just logged in. There was some technical error at my end. But yeah, hi everyone. And interesting. I think this symbol thing, when you're talking about symbols the non verbal symbols. I mean words are the most common, but the others there is enough and in fact we wear our symbols all the time on ourselves. And the idea that there may be a time when we won't want to talk and use symbols instead which are non nonverbal or whatever, we are already doing that along with this. So the whole notion, for example, of having a certain kind of a car or wearing a certain t shirt or whatever we are wearing, yeah, everything is a symbol. Even the haircut is a symbol. So we are using all the nonverbal symbols all the time. You know the only thing is that I think words don't begin to dominate because Language probably was one of the most primitive what to say or the one of the oldest way to become an elite. You know, so language has always become been that part of the elitism, and the rest of them slowly started acquiring simple greater value, the other things which are silent and on the side. So symbols, I mean, we are always using symbols, and we think that the words are the most important thing. And another interesting point which occurred to me when I used to work in psychiatry, one of the most interesting sentences which I had learned was that the assumption in psychology is that language is equal to thought. And that is where you start understanding psychology is. So whatever the person says, you take that as his thought, which itself has so much you know, b you can't really express a thought in words. But if that is the assumption where psychology starts, then I don't know how much of psychology is of real use in this thing. So anyway, just I

42:33 SIMRAT You make sense of a thought if you don't express it in words, you can express it elsewhere.

42:40 PARVEZ No, I'm not saying that I were making sense. Words are probably one of the most what to say, the best thing or the nearest to the thought. So in psychology and psychiatry, the assumption that a word is equal to thought is the best possible thing probably they got started at the starting point.

42:59 PRAYAS Right, so you like you would diagnose a compulsion by hearing the description of the beh the compulsive behavior, you know, and the and rely on maybe other cues to figure out whether you should trust this expression or not.

43:18 PARVEZ Yeah. So now at least as in practice and I'm sure that's how it must have evolved, that you use the word to frame the f to create the frame and then you also look at the nonverbal symbols, which are equally important in both psychology and psychiatry. So you're always looking and watching and listening if to for other things.

43:38 PRAYAS You know, but in button [?] second I

43:42 SATYA I'm sorry, compulsive liars would be hard to diagnose then.

43:46 SATYA (?) Compulsive what? Liars.

43:48 PARVEZ (?) Yeah, it was.

43:48 PARVEZ (?) It's

43:50 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. huh. Sure.

43:55 Sorry, go ahead.

43:56 So in psychiatry an undue or I would say a lot of importance is placed on the ex expressed symbols. So in the sense that you know you're like your dreams or like analysing your writing or your poems or your points [?].

44:13 PRAYAS (?) Or something.

44:15 Yeah, like how you read symbols and how you write symbols. And so there is also there seems to be this tendency of wanting to go beyond language because language is noisy.

44:27 PARVEZ Right.

44:27 Yeah.

44:28 SATYA (?) And a lot of us have a tendency of using of not exactly expressing what we are thinking for various reasons.

44:35 SATYA (?) Yeah.

44:36 SIMRAT So is then language a tool that it's essentially a tool is what we're saying. It's not necessarily the symbol itself. It's just a tool we use to comprehend the symbol.

44:50 PARVEZ (?) Yeah.

44:52 PRAYAS Yeah. I mean it's a plastic. Language is a plastic entity in the sense that you know like the symbols that language can possibly contain doesn't really affect language itself. So in the sense, if you're lying in a poem

45:12 PRAYAS (?) The poem won't care that you're lying through it, you know?

45:17 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

45:17 PRAYAS (?) So language in that sense is I would say it's uncaring, right?

45:27 SATYA Sometimes language is even malicious, eh? That's how I see it.

45:31 PRAYAS Yeah, by allowing you to say things that you don't mean, it's yeah in a way siding with your malicious intent.

45:39 SATYA (?) Yeah. And like not having words for the things that you should be saying.

45:44 PRAYAS (?) Right. And so in that sense conspiring against you.

45:49 PRAYAS (?) Correct.

45:52 UTTAM (?) Yeah.

45:54 PRAYAS So in that sense if you're all in this sense okay with moving beyond language into talking about symbols which are non lingual

46:06 PRAYAS (?) Then what can we say about the role that symbols play?

46:15 SATYA For me again I go back to a shared just trying to survive, just trying to make sense of the all the inputs that come in and into my limited structure.

46:30 So that I can survive.

46:34 PRAYAS So but you don't need

46:35 PRAYAS (?) To survive.

46:37 SATYA No, you do in the sense of concepts, right? I ha I have a concept of hot. It when the sun comes out it's gonna be hot. I may not have a word for it, but

46:47 It's not good for me to be out in the heat, something like that.

46:52 PARVEZ See, I think again coming to the origin of symbols, it's probably the necessity for sharing which led to symbolicism. And the necessity for sharing again arises from the necessity to be together to survive against the odds that peep man [?] faced. So therefore symbols basically otherwise they have no meaning. The meaning was created and symbols were created so that people can start connecting more effectively, so to say, and perhaps against things that they were figuring finding difficult to handle or difficult to take. So the role Yeah sorry. No, go ahead.

47:35 SATYA (?) And so they're like organizing forces within a chaotic space.

47:40 UTTAM You know you know what, I think symbols play a role in procreation. You know, like say seasons they indicate the animals and the birds like when to I don't know, like breed. I mean lot of na nature is full of symbols, right? It whatever, like it communicates in many different ways and if you look at like birds or animals, they like their predominant I don't know, like they live, they eat and then they procreate. Other than that, I don't think they have any agenda as such.

48:24 UTTAM (?) Unlike humans.

48:26 PARVEZ Yeah, Uttam, two things. One is I think nature has signs, not symbols. And second about the birds and all, when you say that they do not have an agenda, that is what we think. And I have really no clue. Maybe they have an agenda, who knows? And one of the key agendas, if you even talk about procreation, then one of the things is why do what are we trying to

survive from? Because we know ultimately we as we as an individual will die. Right. Right? But the symbolicism comes from a sense of a survival of some sort. And what is that survival? Is it then as they there is that whole discussion that it is just that we are living for procreation and passing on the DNA. And it's the DNA which is the serv the key player, we are just a shell for the DNA.

49:14 Right.

49:15 On. So we come to a completely different idea and then is it the DNA which is deciding us, you know, giving us all these s si triggers to find symbols to do this, to do that and continue

49:29 PARVEZ (?) Yeah.

49:30 Survival. Or are we really an entity or i is it the mind which is an entity? Which of the three is the entity really who's governing?

49:41 UTTAM I mean this the way you just sorry, tr the way which you just said, it makes me think of symbols as cordyceps. You know? Cordyceps

49:52 -huh.

49:52 Which infect an insect's mind and they make it like zombies just so that the spores can whatever like for the spread of the spores. So maybe I think if you look at it in that way, like symbols are actually trying to control our minds and all it needs is a container for the DNA.

50:09 PRAYAS Yeah, but you know that takes us back to the to the earlier question of why. I mean, so why would symbols try to do that in the sense that I mean you know that point in the conversation where we were wondering about the emergence of symbols and how does I mean what causes these symbols to emerge in the first place, right? So I mean that is not the same quite that is not the same as asking what is the origin of symbols. But what is what is the in the narrative at that point at which symbols emerge. So which is the players efforts to answer the question of you know why engage in a compulsive thing? So I'm just saying in that attempt to answer when the symbols emerge, they don't actually they don't emerge in the player's mind, right? They emerge from somewhere else.

51:09 Right.

51:09 So what is it

51:13 PARVEZ Yeah, if we are saying that symbols emerge from some thing else or some other place, then that means the mind also emerges from somewhere else. So then we are already focusing on something else rather than the mind. So whether the mind creates the symbols or is it something else which leads to the mind and then triggers it to create the symbols?

51:34 PRAYAS So what would you say? Where do you think symbols come from?

51:39 PARVEZ Well by I mean what I said was probably this is the necessity of survival which has various mechanisms which man was trying to figure out and one of them was figuring out symbols so that they can start connecting and forming a larger force, huddling together. You know, to m to make

52:00 PRAYAS Are they cultural entities or are they precultural entities? What would you say? W how would you describe them?

52:07 PARVEZ (?) No, I think they were precultural. But now at this point of time I do not know what they are. They are everything. I mean we live today we are just living by symbols. We are talking by symbols, we are wearing symbols, we are we are just symbolic identities in fact. So even if you're not saying anything and you step out on the road, people will immediately place you in a certain way at least, even before they hear your name. And with the name of the game.

52:32 PARVEZ (?) I'm sorry.

52:36 SATYA Yeah, it's actually a very annoying thing when you don't want to be labelled but people want to put th identities on you, depending on their interpretation of what you're wearing or whatever it is.

52:48 UTTAM Yeah.

52:50 PRAYAS But I think cultural currents in their sense cultural symbols can be separated from the abstract symbols that we are talk o also talking about.
53:05 Just
53:06 They're not necessarily the same.
53:11 You're talking about pre cultural symbols, for example.
53:16 UTTAM I think Prayas is asking, are symbols part of the culture or are they pre culture?
53:21 PRAYAS No not in any cultural currency.
53:28 Could you repeat that?
53:32 Uttam, I think we already start we already agree if they're pre-cultural. Yeah. So I mean I'm saying if you are if you're if you're agreeing that one of the ways of looking at symbols is pre-cultural entities, then of course the precultural symbols don't have a cultural currency. They don't have a currency, right? So in the sense they don't have a
54:01 SATYA And so how do we look at that?
54:03 Them through the lens of culture so if we look at them if you look at pre cultural symbols through the lens of culture then they will have a currency. I'm saying remove the culture altogether, if we just go back to pre cultural.
54:17 Right.
54:20 Yeah.
54:22 PARVEZ Yeah, please go ahead.
54:24 SATYA No, please. I was just emphasizing what I heard. Please.
54:29 PARVEZ Okay, I am just saying that even if we don't look at it from cultural perspective, even then pre cultural symbols will have currency. Because the original survival mechanism, you know oh so that was their biggest currency at that point of time to survive. Which is true even today.
54:50 PRAYAS You know, so I mean in a way to in a way to find our way out of our of this maze I would say so you know, if we don't try
55:08 SATYA Hello, are you there?
55:12 Prayas's signal is bad, I guess. It's breaking. Yeah.
55:18 Yes, sir. Go ahead, whoever wants to say something.
55:22 I just wanted to I just felt like, you know, like we thought about not using language. Maybe we should not use the word culture also. And go before all of that.
55:34 Yeah, sure.
55:35 Okay, yeah.
55:38 Yeah.
55:38 So where do pre cultural symbols come from?
55:44 PARVEZ Where do they come from as in the necess they came see everything in life, if we were what we were talking yesterday, it's a necessity. So everything starts with a necessity and then we build it up and take it to the week [?].
56:01 SATYA So
56:02 Yeah.
56:03 And the necessity could be a an evolutionary necessity is where I in my thinking, unfortunately everything boils down to survival. And I'm unable to move forward from that.
56:14 Right.
56:19 PARVEZ Sorry.
56:19 SATYA Seven [?].
56:21 Do you think?
56:21 Yeah.
56:22 SIDDHARTH Do symbol can cause a coexistence?
56:26 SATYA Coexistence of

56:29 SIDDHARTH Is human or when

56:32 SATYA Oh, okay.

56:35 Due to coexistence of species, is that what you're saying?

56:39 SIDDHARTH When we started to live together, when we started to form so societies and all

56:47 SATYA Yeah.

56:51 I couldn't get your point. I mean I don't know if others got it. Can you please say the whole point again?

56:59 SIDDHARTH I thought that I was thinking that do symbol came cause of with the humans started to live collectively.

57:07 PARVEZ Yeah, we were just talking about that probe symbols probably started coming by because of the need of people to come together and to live c as a collective. And the need to be a collective was probably the s need for survival and fighting against the bigger things which man alone could not fight or survive from. And then we were Satya was bringing in the other point that she couldn't go bind beyond survival as the basic need. So I think that's where we were yesterday also, that the one of the key needs, the moment we figure out that we are born and now we are we are alive, then it becomes that now you have to stay alive. And that is where Prayas kept bringing the notion of compulsion of the game, that you're thrown in a game and now you have to play it and you have to survive. And we do not know why we are surviving, but we have an instinct to survive perhaps. And the answer why we don't survive might be the best answer would be w would come from those who had committed suicide because I thought that is one way of getting out of the game. That hey, I don't want to play this game, this is not my game, and you get out. And again, the other question was, we are thinking they get out by committing suicide, by dying, but do they really get out? I mean we don't know where and so

58:32 SATYA I want to address what Siddharth said, J though. I want to say that I don't know if symbols only came up because of the need for coming together into groups. I think there may be symbols even before that at an individual organism level.

58:49 Yeah.

58:49 Which may have arisen from, you know, DNA like you said, Parvez or you know, like you or something else, some other compulsion of life to perpetuate itself, to keep itself per for life to survive.

59:05 Yeah.

59:09 SATYA (?) Yeah, sure.

59:10 PARVEZ (?) But I was I got disconnected and then I was cut off in mid sentence. I'm sorry for that. But what I was tr trying to say was that the pre cultural symbols if we

59:27 PRAYAS If we you know try to learn material that each of us you know personally deals with in different ways, right? So it's not it's not necessary that we go by the textual by the textual understanding of how and what this precultural symbols are and how they're important to us. Because I think there is there is a kind of inhibition that I set in [?] in reference to what Satya was saying earlier. and that's inhibition is set in terms of being able to respond to these precultural symbols because they seem to be in that sense larger than life and larger than time, because you know, they are these mysterious entities that you know as a human we can know them in our lifetime and you know talk about them. But that dissuades us from being ab from talking about them at all. And

01:00:29 Yeah.

01:00:32 I would say yeah, it would help if you can just go past, you know what we hold the pre cultural symbols to be textually, and we can play with those with them in a certain way.

01:00:47 Mm-

01:00:58 Yeah.

01:00:59 Do we have a like a common agreement point like

01:01:03 Oh.

01:01:06 And what
01:01:07 And
01:01:08 Yeah.
01:01:12 Trying to think on that.
01:01:14 Okay.
01:01:20 What could be a pre cultural symbol?
01:01:37 UTTAM I think symbols are continuous and there isn't any
01:01:43 Pre culture as
01:01:46 C if when we think of in frame of continuity, like time is continuous. So I think symbols have been from I don't know, they've been throughout.
01:01:58 SATYA Right.
01:02:01 But there is a proliferation of symbols over time. Yes or no?
01:02:08 PARVEZ (?) Yes, of course. Yeah.
01:02:12 PRAYAS Specific symbols, the specific s you know, there are innumerable symbols and there has been a proliferation like you're saying, but you know, of the specific symbols that we are interested in are the symbols that emerge you know in the at the moment of play in the in the game when you are when you're on awareness of your compulsion is attempted to be answered. you're attempting an answer to that to that awareness.
01:02:46 PRAYAS (?) Okay.
01:02:48 So I mean I think that is those are some specific set of symbols which are not necess you know, so we can I think also choose to focus on just those symbols which you know which help the narrative move forward because like we like we said, those are the those are the moments when the when the players make their move, right? So
01:03:15 Right.
01:03:16 PRAYAS (?) Which are those symbols that we try to contain the answer in because those answers and those that containment of that answer in the in the symbols is what is what affects the flow of the game.
01:03:37 So if the game is in that sense you know, our frame from our earlier conversation, then
01:03:49 You know the those symbols are affecting the flux of the frame and in that sense constructing the perspective.
01:04:02 SATYA I'm having such a tough time moving past survival, really. Like anything that's coming it's like, okay, I have to do that because I have to survive.
01:04:12 -huh.
01:04:14 PRAYAS Right, so you are saying that the player offers th the answer to the question to survive. You're saying the f for the player to survive in the game is the most important thing.
01:04:28 UTTAM So or surviving long for the longest or as long as possible, something like that.
01:04:34 SATYA So the yeah. Yeah. I mean survival.
01:04:38 PRAYAS So f so it seems to me that we can focus just on the symbols of survival.
01:04:46 Okay.
01:04:46 Right? So in that sense the symbols that we offer as answers and the answers that work. So in the sense that the s the answers that actually help us survive.
01:04:59 Are in some sense
01:05:02 Significant in you know, in terms of trying to understand them and
01:05:09 That's where we are.
01:05:12 PARVEZ Yeah. Right. Yeah, I think mm just rephrasing your thing, symbols basically become these small chips in a puzzle, which we are thinking that there is a puzzle and we are fig figuring out it out more and more, and therefore we keep creating symbols and then modifying it and then taking them further. And we think that they are the answers. Right. That's our assumption that they are the answers. But then that is where again I come back to the point I raised yesterday about the theory of absurdism. That is there really a meaning to all this, to

life, to whatever? Or are we assuming and therefore assuming that symbols are the answers or the symbols will lead us to an answer. And th then it comes to the game also, that is this really a game or is this you know something else altogether? But because we have de defined a game and we understand a game. We are using that and we can't go beyond that to understand it.

01:06:18 PRAYAS But assumptions are all we have in the sense that if we just look at this environment that we're in

01:06:24 PRAYAS (?) Right.

01:06:25 The chance that the assumption that we're making is true is even if it's true, so what? Right? So in the sense a an assumption won't

01:06:39 Won't you know it won't it'll still remain an assumption even if it's true. It's a true assumption.

01:06:47 PARVEZ Right.

01:06:50 Yeah, but then I would like to throw this question that what if this is not a game?

01:06:58 And because game immediately gives us a framework, a strong framework that there are rules, there is something, there is a goal, there's something happening there which is which will be or which is decipherable. What if this is really something undecipherable and this is not a game, this is just existence which is which is just existence, let's say for example, just use the word existence and it exists and with time, you know, it comes and goes and comes and goes, or maybe it just comes once and goes.

01:07:30 PRAYAS So you are saying that the game is another symbol that we're attempting to offer as an answer?

01:07:35 PARVEZ Oh of course.

01:07:37 PARVEZ (?) Yeah.

01:07:38 Because remarkable. You see, game comes, I it's again that very interesting thing. The way we whatever knowledge we have gained or whatever things we can see or understand, we try to place whatever is beyond our realm within that perspective to keep looking at it. And the classic example is the concept of God. That everybody defines God, but the whole all the definitions, if you look at any religion, and sometimes I play this joke with children, and I ask them, okay, what are the different names for gods and what are the meanings? And it comes to all those meanings which people want a benevolent father a father figure or an employer to assume. And that is what God's definition actually comes to. Somebody who's benevolent, who's all powerful, who will take care of us, who'll give us food. But that is from our perspective of understanding a powerful person.

01:08:29 PRAYAS Right, but you know there was this beautiful it was this funny moment in a comedy show that I was watching recently, that if religion didn't exist, would you would you still make it up?

01:08:43 PARVEZ (?) Would you still

01:08:45 PARVEZ (?) No, just but is still constructed. So in the sense

01:08:49 SATYA Yeah, I totally think so. I think religion is about control. Again, it's about coherence, it is about order. And order for perpetuity. It's right.

01:09:03 It's I really feel like this meaning thing, I agree with Parvez. It's like I don't think there's any meaning and I think everything like the universe is indifferent, right? Somebody had said that, I forgot who. And it doesn't matter really.

01:09:16 SATYA (?) Yeah.

01:09:17 But we as limited beings who have to go from day to day, we have a need to make sense of it. And so we have to find some way to express it.

01:09:29 PRAYAS So we are living in the indifferent universe compulsively. You know, if we discard the framework of the game.

01:09:36 SATYA (?) Right. Right.

01:09:38 PRAYAS We are living in that sense compulsively and trying to come up with answers to the needling doubt that we are just living compulsively and we don't really know why we are living.

01:09:53 SATYA Yes. That's a difficult thing for a lot of people actually to not have meaning.

01:09:59 PARVEZ See if we d the wh the whole problem why people try to ascribe meaning is that the moment you take meaning out of the system of life at this point of time where we stand today, everything will fall apart.

01:10:14 PARVEZ (?) Yeah.

01:10:15 The culture, the countries, everything, all the notions will fall apart and people say, Hey, what the hell man? You know, we can I can live up by my own or live my way. So that is the problem because of which and that is what has been knotted throughout civilization slowly. So there may be a meaning. I'm not just saying that there may not be. I'm just wondering is it really a game with a meaning, or is could it be a game just an existence without a meaning? So both are possible. So I have no clue, but the game

01:10:46 PRAYAS Like you're saying the absence of hold I mean in the absence of holding on to a to a desire to find a meaning, yeah things do break down. In that sense the notion of the break of a person going through a breakdown for us is someone who has who is feeling meaningless, who feels that, you know why should I do these things that hold no meaning for me? And

01:11:14 So meaning getting used to life without a meaning.

01:11:20 SATYA (?) Yeah.

01:11:20 SATYA (?) Yes, exactly. And that's like post religion, right? Like that post not having those structures.

01:11:29 PARVEZ And then the question is that a problem? Getting used to life without a meaning? I mean do then we come back to what I think Uttam had pointed earlier about the birds that they don't have an agenda. So and I don't know if they have or they don't have, but let's assume that they don't have an agenda. Let's assume the bacteria don't have an agenda and still they're living and they're fine and they're surviving. So that means survival or living a life is possible, even if we don't search for meaning or even if there is no meaning to it. Even if it is just an existence, it's fine. And I mean

01:12:08 UTTAM (?) Yeah.

01:12:10 SATYA Yeah, I think what I feel like is human beings have this thing called self awareness which ended up causing them to ask these questions or whatever. I mean, e whether humans are around or not, every everything else will go on just fine. Like all the other organisms, you know, life, whatever it is, bacteria, it'll all just go on.

01:12:32 PARVEZ In fact it might go on better.

01:12:34 SATYA (?) Exactly. Exactly. I really think we are totally fucking up the place.

01:12:39 SATYA (?) Yeah.

01:12:41 PRAYAS So we are humans and noise. So we are noise.

01:12:45 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:12:46 SATYA Like that sometimes.

01:12:47 PARVEZ We I think we have become the biggest noise because we have become the mob, no. So mob in the sense of this whole again then I'll take it to another level that there is this concept of minority and majority which we accept very easily across the world, across cultures. And that I was just thinking the other day actually gets justified by the concept of democracy, which runs on the concept of majority and minority. Right? And because of that, in the world scenario if we put all the organisms together, even though together human race might be a minority when it comes if you put together all the other life forms, but perhaps alone and b you know, the way we have mastered it, we have become that ruling majority in a strange way, even if we are a minority. And that is where the whole problem probably arises from that we think we can take decisions on behalf of the others. And within that

01:13:43 PRAYAS Democratic system, the democratic system of majority rule, do you think that applies to our mind also? Like in the sense the one who is in control, the poll the sense you know, the voice which is in control in the mind. Do you think that voice represents a kind of majority control?

01:14:05 SATYA I feel like if you have a value system, then whatever is your m predominant values, those will be the things in control.

01:14:16 PARVEZ So th those values again if I were to put it bring it back to that example, now what is a majority in that case? A majority is a mob. Because if we d agree that the majority will decide what happens wherever, then we are talking about a mob will decide what will happen and whoever is the mob. And sometimes we see that the idea of majority and minority also changes to not necessarily numbers but to power. So who has a majority of power decides what the people with le or the other group with less power will do. And the same then when you're talking about values in your head, then again it is the dominant values, so to say, wherever they may come from, who become the mob and decide to rule over.

01:15:00 SATYA (?) But then there's a contradiction here, right? I mean if you say a dominant value or one is the mob really democratic, or is it that some people are stacked against the others and the other ones ruling? So it's actually an oligarch oligarchy, it's not a democracy.

01:15:18 PARVEZ (?) No, how sorry, I didn't get your point. How does it become an oligarchy?

01:15:23 SATYA I mean if we have a dominant value that's taking over in the mind and commanding the other values, that is not democracy.

01:15:31 PARVEZ Right, that is where I am taking the example of a majority to the concept of power that we also know in the same democracy a group with more power, not necessarily with more number, will still dictate. So the majority is one is in terms of numbers, the other is also in terms of power, who holds how much power.

01:15:52 PRAYAS Right.

01:15:52 But Parvez, from looking at this construction of power in the world outside, which you know you can you can you can understand. But if you try to apply that to the construction of power inside us, in the sense that who can take the mic which voice can take the mic in its hand and which becomes m which voice becomes my voice and at the cost of all the other voices that are trying to speak inside my head. is that also a kind of mob mechanism, what you say, or I mean so I'm saying what is the power play within a head that allows that kind of this individual voice to emerge at the cost of other voices?

01:16:43 PARVEZ Th that is precisely the your last sentence clinches it. So I am going to put it the other way around. That within the mob there are sometimes you find that one stands up against the mob, even at the cost of dying or fighting against or somehow managing to turn off the mob, whatever. So when you're talking about the voice inside your head and the dominant one, and if it is one which is dominating, then if you know where it is I mean so th that becomes I, that is the voice, that is the person against the rest of them, whatever it is. But then the interesting thing would be to figure out where is that voice originating from. Is it your real I or is it originating from all the other values around the mob values or the so called

01:17:25 PRAYAS I'll think more than more than you know, from where it is coming from, how is it coming, you know in the sense what is the power play that is helping you to identify yourself?

01:17:41 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:17:42 PARVEZ (?) I mean I think we should

01:17:44 SATYA To tie that I want to see how that can tie with democracy. I mean democracy is like everyone having a voice. And y we are saying now that one person or in the head, there are all these values that have voices, but one value has a voice more than the others and goes against the others.

01:18:01 PARVEZ (?) Mm-

01:18:04 UTTAM (?) Right. So

01:18:06 SATYA (?) Like democracy doesn't exist actually.

01:18:09 SATYA (?) In inside the head.

01:18:11 PRAYAS (?) Even outside.

01:18:13 Right. I mean the cynical the you know, the cynical reading of society will always say that's democracy is only a set of symbols that exist to placate everyone into thinking that it exists. Well actually you know

01:18:28 SATYA Maybe moving towards democracy in the sense like nowadays more people do have a voice. I mean I won't be completely cynical because we are moving evolving in such a way that more people do have a voice.

01:18:40 SATYA (?) No, but then what the

01:18:43 PRAYAS I mean having a voice so in the sense being able to express your opinion about some benign reality of your environment, is that equivalent to having a voice?

01:18:54 SATYA I agree, I agree.

01:18:56 PARVEZ But then my question to that is where is that voice coming from? Is that voice really your voice, which you are voicing? Is that how does that voice form in the first place?

01:19:09 PRAYAS So you know the obscurity looking at you know the presence of the obscure in society and at all given times we've always had obscurity amidst us. you know the obscu obscurity is the obscure voice is always standing up for something that we find very easy to dismiss. You know, so for example you can just as someone who challenges the entire structure that we live in.

01:19:40 Yeah.

01:19:40 Why would anyone ever listen to someone who's challenging the whole system? Right? So

01:19:46 SATYA Yeah. I mean unless that voice has its moment in the sun because of various factors.

01:19:53 PRAYAS Right.

01:19:54 PARVEZ (?) Yeah.

01:19:56 So Galileo had his moment in the sun and for a pretty long time. You know. I mean, just as an example. And that is the whole problem that by again coming back to how does that even that one voice forms, which we think when you're saying that most people have voice what are the formative influences on that voice to can it can it really be called one's own voice? Or is it coming from all that we start teaching a child right from the age of, you know, one month or even the first day, this is the nose, this is the head and this is the mind, this is

01:20:31 PRAYAS I mean then you can imagine all of this democracy and this whole world to be existing in somebody's head, right? So if we were all actually living in inside somebody's head it would be the same thing that person would be thinking of, right? In the sense that how does how do we emerge inside this guy's head into representing this voice or remaining part of the noise? And I mean this question r seems interesting for me and specific enough in the sense for us to conclude today, if we stop here and attempt to look at this tomorrow in the sense that what is the power play inside a head and is that similar to this democratic or is it more violent or is it you know organic power play which is not even something we're familiar with. What is it? I wouldn't know. And we can look at that at that tomorrow because we are looking at the buffer tomorrow and the buffer is whatever is filled into the container of the moment. So which I have approximated in a in a in a sentence which is not very good actually it in the sense of calling the buffer what is the duration of the moment but that is that is something we already looked at earlier and I think we can extend that into how does you know this power play occur and

01:22:05 Yeah.

01:22:05 Thanks everyone for coming in tonight.

01:22:07 PRAYAS (?) Oh, thanks.

01:22:09 SATYA Thank you so much.

01:22:09 UTTAM Thank you.