Perspective Studies, Day 13

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 13 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

00:03 PRAYAS Hi all, welcome to day thirteen.
00:08 Is everyone here? we can start the broadcast.
00:13 UTTAM Right.
00:15 PRAYAS Hi. So you know yesterday we got very caught up actually in these ideas of you know memory being infinite and perception being infinite and instinct having a voice and we being bewildered by all these voices which are speaking to us.
00:35 UTTAM -huh.
00:36 PRAYAS But you know, if we really move on from there, as you know, today is the s is third last day of this study group of Perspective Studies. And if we are hoping to conclude this study group with some kind of
00:57 Thing something that we can take back and work on, right? So if you are to do that then we need to also keep in mind the horizon.
01:11 You know, so what i what is it that we are building these ideas for?
01:21 UTTAM (?) Okay.
01:23 PRAYAS Right. So the idea of the s the self that what do we make of all this?
01:31 Right. So there are all these things happening, there is instinct and there is there are all these voices.
01:44 But what do we make of it?
01:50 What's the what's the essence? And that essence being the idea of our voice.
02:00 You know, our self. So that essence being the idea of who we identify with, what our self is. As distinct from the voice. I mean, I'm not using the words self and voice interchangeably here.
02:18 [unclear]
02:20 ADITYA No.
02:20 Okay.
02:23 PRAYAS Hi Shanghima [?], we can hear you.
02:25 ADITYA Hi. Sorry, I j I just logged in.
02:28 PRAYAS Hi, were you able to hear some of our recordings? Or yeah.
02:34 ADITYA Not so much the previous ones.
02:37 PRAYAS Yeah. No, so I mean I'm just trying to figure if we should we can be abr abrupt with you or not.
02:48 ADITYA You can be abrupt with me, I don't have any problems.

02:51 PRAYAS (?) Right, so we don't need to build up the backstory.

02:53 ADITYA No, not so much because just tell me l little bit of what's up in terms of the structure so I can just follow up. We don't really have to tell so much.

03:02 PRAYAS Right. So you know, we have been talking yesterday about these all these things about instinct, about our voice, about memory, perception, all these things in terms of at different scales. At instinct and voice at the scale of the very primary, you right? So they being the units of our very elementary construction. So we hear the voices and we also hear the instincts and

03:34 ADITYA Okay.

03:35 PRAYAS And you know, and then we remember first we perceive things and then we remember those things, right?

03:41 ADITYA Yeah.

03:42 PRAYAS So you might remember a lot or you might remember only some things.

03:49 ADITYA Okay.

03:50 PRAYAS (?) That's as far as we got yesterday. And today we are trying to get past that.

03:58 ADITYA -huh.

03:58 PRAYAS Keeping in mind that we conclude in another three days.

04:02 ADITYA -huh.

04:03 PRAYAS And we're trying to figure what do we make of all this. So you know memory being infinite or not or you know and

04:17 PRAYAS (?) What is the idea of self that emerges from all of this? In the sense of as being distinct from the voice, right? So we are not using the words voice and self interchangeably here.

04:34 ADITYA Okay.

04:36 PRAYAS So the voice is what you know, the continuity of narrative that you hear.

04:42 ADITYA -huh.

04:42 PRAYAS How you heard. And the self being something larger than that. I mean I don't know what the idea what our idea of the self is because we are we are using the word first time today, right?

04:53 ADITYA Okay. So but so the idea is basically to think about how certain things exist in the memory and so only how certain things do not exist.

05:07 PRAYAS Right?

05:07 So I mean the memory r registers only those things which are uttered by the voice, right?

05:16 ADITYA Yes. Yes.

05:18 PRAYAS And what is beyond that we figured that okay, instinct is beyond that. And we also talked about how instinct is not part of memory unless it is mediated by voice, right?

05:31 ADITYA Okay. Okay.

05:33 PRAYAS But then now we are bring we are bringing in the word self and I don't know where the self stands in terms of in context of the voice and the instincts.

05:44 ADITYA Okay. But isn't the voice and the instinct is more responsive than necessary like reflection to self?

05:55 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I don't know. I mean I'm saying that we are just bringing the word in.

05:59 ADITYA (?) Okay.

06:01 PRAYAS (?) So I'm asking I'm putting this question to all of us. So do we keep the word self

06:15 Do we need it at all or we don't?

06:21 I mean are we able to model everything with the word instinct and voice and we don't need the word self at all or do we need the word?

06:35 ADITYA Okay. Can I say some I think the instinct and voice are more like because the self always tries to produce like expand itself as you said more than what it is, no, like you can't really reach the boundary not the boundaries but the reach of the wide reach of what it could be, no? And it's also I think since in itself like it's used in so many different kinds of contexts, maybe instinct and voice have more a multiple kind of possibility of talking about different kinds of things rather than self, because self immediately becomes very subjective to a person or something really personal.

07:22 PRAYAS So you are saying that the self the word self represents the subjective.

07:28 ADITYA Yeah, this a kind of a subjectivity that is at least anticipated if not a attributed when you talk about self as like a word in terms of course in reference to something, but there is already kind of a kind of a subjective definition or subjective approach that one is trying to think about. Right? So

07:51 PRAYAS (?) Do we all agree with this or shall we take this?

07:55 SATYA I find the self to be objective actually, not so much subjective. I find the s the self to be the most concrete thing in the physical sense of all the things we've talked about talked about, sorry.

08:10 ADITYA Can you just expand on it? I would like to like really interested to know more about it. You mean in the sense like objective in as in? I'm

08:20 SATYA (?) So the self is like an object, it is a concretization.

08:25 ADITYA Yeah.

08:25 SATYA (?) A it is a distillation of all these things that we have talked about into a limited space.

08:33 ADITYA Yeah.

08:34 SATYA (?) So it's like it's like how it is the sum total but beyond everything that comes into one shape.

08:46 ADITYA Okay.

08:47 SATYA All the influences of all the whatever it is that it is flowing in, the flux, all of that comes together into itself.

08:59 Does that make any sense?

09:01 ADITYA Makes sense because it's kind of interesting because my perception of the self and maybe it comes from being someone who has this biggest disagreement with the artistic self as an idea. So it comes, it's a it's a kind of a qualification of a group of like let's say a group of attitudes that are put together to be a constitutive of a self of or a person or of an artist. Like it somewhere the self becomes one of the benchmarks through which certain things are like both conceptualized, sometimes even historicized, and so on. So I was coming from that subjective from that perspective, and it's kind of interesting that you say it's the idea that everything concrete or a different kinds of things gets concrete in a moment, and that's why it's an objective. It's a very like I would say polar, but a very interesting way of looking at it.

10:00 SATYA And for me it is interesting to look at it as you're talking. And the other thing that I wanted to say about objective is that every perspective looks at every other perspective trying to understand if sorry, if a perspective looks at another perspective to try to understand it, the easiest way for it to do would be to concretise it, to grasp it, and therefore the other becomes an object.

10:29 ADITYA Okay.

10:30 SATYA Th and the other becomes an object because we look at ourselves as objects.

10:35 ADITYA Okay.

10:36 PRAYAS No but this word subjective, right? So in the sense if the subjective is our frame of vision, right? And it's our perspective and the objective is someone else's frame of vision or it is

an attempt to mimic the universal frame of vision, that this is what it would be like, right? You know, I mean irrespective of who looks at it.

11:09 Do we do we really are we I mean can really accept these words in the sense

11:18 ADITYA Yeah, well that's what I was just trying to say is that having said that subjective and objective distinction, it's kind of a little difficult to where do you draw the line between the both in the sense like certain forms of subjectivity produce certain forms of objectivity for it to make sense of the world, right? Like where the where the subjectivity not necessarily may be the foregrounding agent. But there is an implicated sense of subject that is that runs through all these activities, whereas the framing of it could be like the objective self. So in that way it's very in thinking aloud in that way, perhaps it's kind of a little complicated kind of relationship between the subjective and the objective, in the way it produces the whole idea of self. Yeah, maybe that can be something that we can think about.

12:08 SATYA When you say subjective, when you first use the word subjective, the f the thing that came to my mind was a grammar, sentence of grammar where there is a subject. Mm- And that's also another way for me I started looking at it like that, but it seems to not be that. But maybe that's one way to look at it.

12:26 ADITYA No, I was more in terms of like a def a defined like persona of subject, like a subject that has reached signification moment. not a definitive signific signification, but maybe sometimes a fleeting kind of signification. or a flexible, sorry, not fleeting is not the word I was doing. So that's what I'm saying, like even though there is a possibility for perhaps an objective exploration of or an objective framing of the self as an idea, but there are certain kind of subjective personal I don't know, seepages is the word or like oh inflows that also constitute to it, if at all one could think like that.

13:15 PRAYAS No, but what does that mean? I mean you know, are we someone or are we not? Right? So in the sense are we just sum of our voices and our instincts or is there something more than that? Is the idea of self which is either a product of our experience or largely attached, whatever it may be does it is there is it necessary for our model or not?

13:57 You know, our model that you know, so far we have just sp spoken about our instincts and our voices, but do we need to expand that? Does that miss someone?

14:12 Someone, right.

14:15 ADITYA (?) Yeah, survived [?] sorry.

14:18 UTTAM No, I like it.

14:20 ADITYA No, but the thing is like I was just thinking for example the self could be as one can think about it, is a series of a series of I would not say textures, but maybe let's imagine a series of layers that are constituted in con in not in conversation but in the context of a multiple experiences, right? So the thing is like i yeah and you always perceive the self only in retrospect. It's not that there is a continual like y you will try to like produce a continuity in it, etc. etcetera but it's also about m then going back to the question of memory, is that what is it that the experience of you with something else that you remember that you would like to align in certain partic in a particular line, which you would like to like define as yourself. Like for example, if I have to write a self motivating proposal to something, that is the moment where I'm actually assessing in retrospect what is it that the self that I have tried to constitute for myself at the same time looking at objectively as was pointed out. So this is kind of maybe that way

15:34 PRAYAS The word self means simulation of a periscopic way of looking at oneself, is it? So you're trying to look at yourself from outside in.

15:48 ADITYA Yeah. Yeah. So you're basically referring to a context that has passed and trying to reassess your particular participation in that context and how it has altered your definitions of self in some regard.

16:06 SATYA (?) So it's a series of selves, right? Like there are you look at the past and you're also assessing your present self based on the past.

16:14 ADITYA Exactly. And that's why it's like multiple definitions of what you consider and that's worth its layers [?] because it's not one la thick layer that is being constituted, but it's actually multiple layers that are coexisting. Maybe sometimes working together, sometimes not working together. Depends upon the
16:32 Yeah.
16:32 Yeah.

16:33 SATYA Right. And then some people have a very strong self sense of self, which means that they don't see necessarily see the layers. They're able to function with the solid self, which has always the same thing here.

16:53 PRAYAS No, so I would say that so the self i is it is this idea of self an envelope?

17:03 SATYA Mm.
17:06 Yeah.

17:08 PRAYAS Gonna an envelope within which there are instincts, voices, everything.

17:14 UTTAM Yeah.

17:15 PRAYAS Is it an envelope or is it a camera?
17:19 Is it the listener? The listener.

17:22 SATYA It's all of these, yeah? I mean to me I can see all of them in one.
17:27 It's like this envelope which is having a vision, which has a hole through which the outside world is coming in.
17:37 And then it's making some calculations and projecting outward, so it is also a projector.

17:43 ADITYA Yeah.

17:44 PRAYAS Right. So it's

17:47 UTTAM I feel like a conduit or a channel.
17:52 Rather than an envelope I see it like a flow of voices, a flow of emotions, flow of experiences which are flowing through this conduit. Which might go and merge with something else later.

18:06 ADITYA (?) Yeah.
18:08 ADITYA (?) I don't know.

18:10 SATYA I guess when I say envelope it's again coming back to that resultant wave of waveforms. You have all these waves which are coming together which have one res resultant wave and that's the wave envelope.
18:24 SATYA (?) Okay.

18:25 UTTAM (?) Exactly.
18:28 UTTAM (?) Yeah, I but

18:30 PRAYAS But you're calling it a c a conduit which I understand a pipeline or a channel, right?

18:38 UTTAM Right.

18:39 PRAYAS Between what and what?
18:45 PRAYAS (?) I mean it's the channel between which two points.

18:52 UTTAM I think it depends on the clipping plane where you like based on the camera, if you in a three D program camera has a certain visibility. Those are called as clipping planes, like boundaries. So it can't see beyond that. So it depends on which camera you're looking through.

19:16 SATYA Which lens?

19:17 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, which lens, yeah.
19:24 No, but a pipeline is between two points.
19:30 PRAYAS (?) It's A and B points. They are the origin and a destination, right?

19:34 ADITYA Right.
19:34 That's it.
19:35 They haven't caused it. [?]

19:36 UTTAM Like birth and death.

19:40 I don't see that as like a definitive answer because they might be rebirths or like they might be as we s talked the other day about possessions, right? Someone can possess someone. So that way I don't see this as like a definitive answer if I say the start point of the conduit is birth and ending point is death.

20:05 PRAYAS No so is this pipe a ring?

20:09 So which means that it a ring, like you know something which it lacks a it lacks a beginning and an end.

20:21 UTTAM (?) Yeah, something like a Mobius strip, but maybe like a donut, you can say.

20:26 PRAYAS Right, like a donut.

20:28 UTTAM Yeah.

20:29 PRAYAS So you are saying that the idea of the self is a ring

20:34 UTTAM (?) Mm-

20:36 PRAYAS (?) That's what you're saying. The idea of self is a ring. That's what you're saying.

20:42 SATYA (?) Actually that reminds me of what Sam said yesterday about the black hole, you know, where you see the back of your head.

20:50 UTTAM Yeah.

20:51 Yeah.

20:52 PRAYAS Right. The photon sphere.

20:54 UTTAM Yeah, photon.

20:57 UTTAM (?) Yeah.

20:59 ADITYA But there is a this interesting one of the historians has this interesting distinction between that he talks in talk in reference to political field, but it's kind of interesting to think about it in multiple perspectives, which is the distinction between the destination and the horizon. So basically the idea is that if you a destination is a fixed place that you have to like, for example, I might have a fixed idea of self that I would like to reach at some point, like maybe when I'm sixty or seventy or whatever, or fifty. So there is a perception of the self, like for example, that for an actress there should be a perception of like, you know, I might have to win the Oscar or whatever, that might be the completion of the self that would I would like to achieve. No, it's a destination that you're working towards a specific destination. So on the other hand, like there is this interesting thing about the horizon which continuously f makes you to const continuously re-articulate your own strategies and think questions as you move on. Like basically it's not you have a it's not a destination that you are looking towards in that way it's a it's a different it's a it's a different kind of logic of movement that you are m that you are actually multiply moving towards where you have to constantly re-articulate your strategies of your journey and things like that. Maybe in some way thinking about it in terms of how you constantly rearticulate yourself depending upon the context within which one is situated or thrown into. Maybe that could be one of the

22:34 PRAYAS But you know, you mentioned that this perspective is from a political in a political context. And you know, that makes sense to me in the sense that you know the need to constantly rearticulate your positions makes sense to me on a political landscape. But you know the political landscape is a very base layer as far as what we are talking about you know, the idea of the self or you know, because the person and the political is very far apart, right? So

23:11 SATYA (?) No, but is it far? I mean, everything that a person does is political. I mean, in relation to other people, no?

23:17 SATYA (?) Yes.

23:18 PRAYAS Right. But as far as you are concerned, as far as your interior is concerned, it's insulated in a very opaque, impenetrable way from the outside, right?

23:32 SATYA But do the but are the voices amongst themselves having politics?

23:36 ADITYA No, I don't know, no, I don't I disagree with you because the thing is like I think more often than anything, I would say even then the political sphere, the constitution of self becomes a very reconstitution of self or I would say even rearrangement of the self becomes a very important way with which you interact with the world, no. So the internal insularity in some ways, I don't know whether one can think about it in that way because you're constantly navigating with an outside that is changing so rapidly, no. So what k whether it can be the web space, whether it can be the art world that you work or whether it can be an academic space lecture.

24:18 PRAYAS So what does what do what does your voice, for example, have to do with your changing environment, right? So I mean what does the inside of your head have to do with what's what environment you're in?

24:34 SATYA But you may have conflicting voices within your head. For example, if you have grown up in a particular environment which gave you a certain voice, but then you are now in a new place which a different voice is speaking to you because of experience. Now an you know, these two might have a serious conflict with each other because of the change in the environment.

24:55 PRAYAS Right. But I mean I totally agree. I mean I can understand what you're pointing us towards. The politics of the of m the multiple voices in our own head. And you know, th that might actually be there. But that politics doesn't require the reassessing of your position. Which I mean, how does it? Right? So in the sense the horizon

25:24 Doesn't exist in the as far as the interior is concerned.

25:31 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but

25:32 SATYA (?) Possibly

25:35 The two defining of a position is again a struggle, right? Like what is the position that I'm gonna take?

25:43 SATYA (?) So

25:44 PRAYAS That position becomes less relevant when you're talking about your inside. I mean when you're talking about an amorphous an am amorphous space that is in which you know you are floating free from anyway, you know, which you can't see the entirety of. You understand? I mean you know like you know, we have grown up with images of the earth as a planet. But you know, im if you are living on this planet and we have never been able to see this planet as a sphere.

26:17 ADITYA (?) Right, but now we have

26:19 PRAYAS Self. No, I mean we haven't seen ourselves as a planet. We have only seen the Earth as a planet, but we haven't seen our self as a planet. So I mean I would extend what Uttam was saying that our self is a ring to saying that us our self is an ellipse, right? So I mean why do you need the hole in the middle?

26:42 I don't know that.

26:43 SATYA In today's in today's scenario though, I feel like a lot of people are seeing themselves. In fact everybody is so self conscious and they are constructing these selves.

26:53 ADITYA (?) Let's put it in quotation self obsessed also some of the

26:57 SATYA Yeah, no, absolutely.

26:58 ADITYA (?) Exactly.

26:59 PRAYAS Right. But y you might try to look at yourself and you might think that you have a good picture of yourself, but in you're never able to self pivot away to be able to give yourself enough of a distance from yourself to be able to see yourself as a planet.

27:19 SATYA Okay, I agree with that. I mean it's that objectivity which is needed is really difficult and that is a stuff of a lot of discipline and whatever, yeah.

27:28 PRAYAS So we are only modeling what we might be looking at as through how others look at us or you know, through some self critical discipline that we have developed or whatever. So I'm saying basically this that right? So if you haven't been able to look at yourself as a planet, if you if you don't know what is the size of your world, you don't know what is yourself, you don't know the coordinate system of yourself, then how can you define your position in this world?

28:05 SATYA No, we define our positions no matter what. Or not everybody, but yeah, it's a it's like a general human tendency to define a position mainly because you have to approximate in order to deal with your circumstances. I mean I wish I wish there could be a space where I did not have to take a label or a position. I mean, but that doesn't work that way. I think you have to withdraw from that or you know, or

28:30 PRAYAS Right, because everything casts a shadow, right? So if you're casting a shadow, you need to which means that you're on the landscape. If you're on the landscape you should know where you are on the landscape.

28:42 SATYA I mean at least if you want to participate then yes. I mean it's difficult not to I wish there was a space where I didn't have to participate.

28:52 PRAYAS (?) Right.

28:54 ADITYA But the but thing is like it's also interesting in terms of like how taking these positions also are moments where that you're exploring something about you those yourself but you yourself are not aware.

29:08 But it.

29:08 Right? So the position in that way becomes the in that way the going back to the conduit becomes the conduit through which you explore certain sides of yourself that you are not available about. So the recognition happens in a moment where a particular aspect of your own engagement comes in conversation with something else, which may be a political mobilization, which can be a very domestic kind of problem, which can be work problem, whatever it is. It's not necessarily a problem, anything. Right?

29:41 PRAYAS So let's say we agree with what you were saying earlier about your the difference between the horizon and the what was the other

29:52 ADITYA Destiny. Destiny.

29:54 PRAYAS The horizon and the destination.

29:56 ADITYA Right.

29:56 PRAYAS So, you know, I got into the technicality of it in the sense that is it possible to even un know your position in the context of the self? But you know what Satya said makes sense that you know you are trying to approximate your position all the time anyway. So and if you're putting any set of coordinates on your you know, on your position on the on the on the grid even if it's an approximation it holds. So can you please continue? Yeah, what were you seeing with two entities?

30:33 ADITYA Which one? Sorry, who was saying

30:35 PRAYAS When you was when you were offering the difference between destination and the horizon.

30:41 ADITYA No, I was just trying to say that the it's especially the whole idea of approximating, because the thing is like when there is a there will be a moment, at least in certain like professions of this world, where the self has to be more often reconstituted in terms of its frame, okay. So for whatever reason, for personal reasons, for professional reasons, for whatever kind of reasons. Okay, so there is a moment where you have to in certain way both rearrange and re-evaluate the self in context of something else that is outside. Because you're speaking to that outside through yourself, right? So what I'm trying to say is in some way you're constantly approximating the linkages that has happened in your past. In some way, you're trying to expand your own perception of thinking about how is it that the self of you have both traveled and is

traveling towards, okay? So where you're not necessarily thinking that there is a There is a specific singular destination that one would like to reach where you're thinking that okay, there are multiple this is one of the context, so there are multiple contexts through which like we are going to transform in A, B, C, D, EFG ways. So then that's going to be the expansive logic with which so basically the perception, the horizon of your understanding of y what is it that yourself is constitutive of, is constantly expanding.

32:09 SATYA Right, yeah.

32:10 ADITYA Yeah. So you're not basically coming to a precision at the end, but basically you're coming to a precision of an understanding that there is a horizon that you're trying to explore, right?

32:19 SATYA (?) Absolutely. I think the nature of understanding itself is that it opens up more and more horizons.

32:25 ADITYA (?) Exactly. And the fact that what opens up what horizon is something that's purely contextual. You can't really but

32:33 PRAYAS But you know, but if you're if you're essentially saying that horizon, the word horizon is a more realistic and practical word to use than destination. but you know I'm not s I'm not sure we were referring to destination at all. I mean, you know, the fluid amorphous space that we were situated in already was working with the idea of the horizon, or do you think we were getting into finite scope?

33:07 ADITYA No. I'm just talking about I'm just talking about in the general usage. I'm not meaning to say that you were using in that particular way. But I'm talking about in the general usage of thinking, like you know, with the with the way that we deal with the world itself, it's not there's no single destination that anyone has. Destinations change like every half a second. So in terms of thinking about it, maybe in terms of the usage and thinking conceptually with it, perhaps to just to produce this distinction, I thought we maybe something good to think about. And this is something that

33:40 PRAYAS You know we had in our hands the idea of the self as this ellipse. So Uttam we can we can make the we can make the doughnut we can make that a an ellipse or do you need the hole?

33:57 UTTAM (?) I need the hole

33:59 PRAYAS You need the hole, so why do you need the hole?

34:02 UTTAM I need the hole because

34:07 SATYA W or no? The hole with H.

34:10 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so you're not saying that it's a donut with a hole in the middle.

34:15 SATYA (?) Yeah.

34:21 UTTAM It's like I mean, I feel if s each self like universe consists of a lot of selves, right? So universe has like perceivable universe and unperceivable universe, like coming to the point of black holes. So it has some something which is which exists and something which we don't know whether it exists or not.

34:47 PRAYAS Right.

34:47 UTTAM In that sense I feel like universe is filled with all these donuts which are selves and the holes in the middle are the ones which you can't perceive. And those constitute for the black holes, I don't know.

35:02 SATYA No, actually that's a very interesting point because we don't know what lies on inside a black hole, for example. We don't know what is there.

35:09 UTTAM Right.

35:10 SATYA As ourselves, as ourselves, we don't know we don't have a full picture of ourselves and there are certain blind spots within ourselves.

35:19 UTTAM Right.

35:23 SATYA Like to perceive ourself as whole is probably not a possibility.

35:29 UTTAM Right.

35:30 Yeah.

35:31 OBTUSE (?) Get away. [?]

35:33 ADITYA It's more fractured. It's more fractured also in the sense like on the one hand that's on one way one way, like one counterposition of the doughnut metaphor could be that there is always this understanding that there is a okay, let's imagine there is an outer circle and there is an inner circle, no? So in some ways this also comes with an understanding that there is a there is certain thing that is outside. so other either there is something that's inside that we can't perceive, and there is something that's an outside that we are trying to navigate through, right? So but in terms of a distributive logic of this I don't know, I'm just thinking about how one can understand the self also as fractured, and by which I mean that it's only in response to certain circumstances, certain points of this fractured self is being communicating with the world. So in that way basically there is no clear what I'm trying to say is that there's no clear distinction that way between the central circ the middle circle and the big circle.

36:45 PRAYAS But you know what Uttam is suggesting that the hole need not be a it need not be a void, right? It might just be the dark what's in the dark, right? So what we don't know.

36:59 ADITYA (?) Okay. Which we can't access, no?

37:01 PRAYAS Yeah, what we can't access like the future. The Uttam is restring [?] is like the future. Obtuse is agreeing with that. So in the sense

37:09 UTTAM (?) No. Actually Obtuse is saying is the future and I'm saying future doesn't exist.

37:14 PRAYAS Okay.

37:15 SATYA You know, I'm not able to see how we can have a concrete ring of w one ring and another ring. I can't see only one hole. I feel like it's like a shadow play. It's like a it's like a dappled sunlight that, you know, clouds coming through. And with clouds are holes sometimes and it's like it's much more diffused than having a specific shape like that.

37:42 PRAYAS Right. I mean what so Uttam bot [?] allows this the form of the self, the shape of the self to be a c a coherent donut, right? So why would it not be a very crazy, weird, 3D shape with holes all over? That's what you're suggesting, right Satya? I mean you're saying that not one hole, many holes.

38:08 SATYA Yeah, many patches. You know, it's patches of light and dark. You know, sometimes you don't see the dark. Sometimes when you see the dark it becomes light, but you lost sight of the light. So it's like you know, it's a n ever morphing kind of thing.

38:24 UTTAM Right. actually I was kind of like I mean if I'm allowed to approximate like some shape with so many holes, I would rather prefer like a I'm not saying a symmetric donut, but it can have like surface irregularities or the cross sections might be different. But if I'm just able to like approximate it like a geometric shape, I would prefer modeling self as a donut with a hole in the center. Because that way when we say like a periscopic view onto ourselves, it aligns more closely with that idea of being able to look towards yourself or the photon sphere that we spoke about.

39:16 SATYA (?) I'm unable to reduce it that much.

39:21 I'm unable to reduce it to just one hole.

39:25 PRAYAS You know yeah, so Ut Utt Uttam it if it's the earlier idea of the envelope.

39:32 UTTAM Mm-

39:33 PRAYAS You know the envelope so you will put yourself in an envelope that you are that you identify with, right?

39:42 UTTAM Mm. Right.

39:43 PRAYAS So if you're in the shopping if you're in the shop for envelopes, you'll pick an envelope that you identify with and then you'll place yourself in that.

39:52 UTTAM Right.

39:53 PRAYAS So that has more emergent qualities from you know, the voices and the instincts and you know the just the experience of being yourself. You know, it seems appropriate that you would colour your own envelope in that sense you would customize your own envelope, right? So whereas for you might place yourself in the envelope which is like a donut. Satya might place herself in that in an envelope that has lots of holes in it.

40:28 UTTAM N the re another reason why I thought of like a donut is because I said like voices are like these currents which flow through the channel, right?

40:38 So

40:38 So when you speak of like electricity and magnetism, when there is like a flow of current of something like say for example there is flow of current you will see magnetic lines, right? Magnetic field lines. Like when you pass through current through a ring, you get magnetic field lines which pass through the ring. So that way I feel like we our voices

41:01 PRAYAS Because magnetic rings are not like a donut, they are like shaped like a rugby ball.

41:08 UTTAM No. What I'm saying is if there is a simple ring and you pass electricity through it in a loop, so the magnetic field lines like I don't know, I'll just show you a picture or maybe I can find it online, but you can think of the donut lying on a plane and the currents are passing through the donut in the same plane. So what happens is the magnetic field lines emerge perpendicular to the plane through the center. Like you know, like a flux.

41:40 PRAYAS (?) Passi [?].

41:42 UTTAM So that way now the flux can have the possibility of being influenced by other fluxes or might be like influencing other currents or other donuts.

41:51 PRAYAS (?) Right. So Satya would we like to Yeah.

41:55 SATYA Yeah, sorry. I want to respond to that by saying that is one aspect of the self. Like one of those rings is one aspect of the self. Like there are many f I would look at the self as a interaction between many such rings.

42:15 UTTAM (?) Okay.

42:17 SATYA So I you know, like when I see the thing that you sent and I feel like these waves that are going away from the see, you have the south and the north pole and then you have all these other waves which are going away. There's one for example, there's one i image here which has two magnets next to each other and they are interacting with each other.

42:39 UTTAM (?) Okay. I mean I'm talking something like this, I'm just going to share.

42:43 SATYA Sure. but in that image

42:46 UTTAM Sorry, please continue.

42:49 SATYA I feel like there's a whole bunch of such rings which are all connecting with each other.

42:55 UTTAM Right. I totally agree to that. But the thing is right now, like when we say self it need not be like an individual, you know, like you're saying a lot of these rings become a part of oneself. But what I'm saying is I'm not d what making a distinction between like oneself and the others, you know, like if I if myself has like I don't know like say ten rings

43:25 SATYA Yeah.

43:25 UTTAM I so I'm identifying myself with ten rings. And say for example you have like I don't know like five rings. You're identifying yourself with five rings. But if you just whatever remove that idea of like m myself as a container and just look at o only these rings, then each ring can be a self. But it need not be identified as a whole. You know what I mean? But

43:48 PRAYAS You are saying that some selves are subsidiary selves of other selves. Now that is one layer above the scale of the selves that we are talking about. And I mean we were talking about

the self as the outer envelope, right? And you are saying that you know we don't need an envelope at all. They can

44:12 UTTAM Well that's right.

44:13 PRAYAS Right, so you are saying that it's like the solar system, right? So

44:18 ADITYA We need the we need the envelope for the precise reason that I think the recognition of a self, like let's imagine a situation where okay there are five rings and there are some subservient selves and there are different perceptions, like different ways of like how the self is produced collaboratively. So envelope in some way maybe not exactly envelope some kind of that form that brings together is needed because the envelope is the one that is recognizing this difference of how some selves are foregrounded and some selves are not. Because the other selves are basically helping the ones that needs to be foregrounded to get the to be framed in some way. So in some way the envelope is needed because you have to periodically in some way put things together, new things together in the envelope so that the perception of what the self is and the transformation of on the s from what the self was before is recognized. So in that way you need periodically not a new envelope necessarily, but maybe a same envelope. It's a re Yeah, it's a recalibration of an envelope that discards certain aspects that you think were relevant at some point, whereas like shares comrade with some other points that you think have become more relevant in the in the in between this duration of the whole.

45:48 PRAYAS You are saying that there is d there always is definitely an outermost layer.

45:56 ADITYA Yeah. Right? Yeah.

45:57 PRAYAS (?) So you are thinking that

45:59 ADITYA Where the recognition of the self even with oneself happens.

46:03 ADITYA (?) Yes.

46:04 PRAYAS Right. So you are basically saying there always is an inside and an outside thereby, right?

46:10 ADITYA Yeah.

46:11 PRAYAS (?) So Uttam, are you agreeing with that? so shall we take this and go ahead?

46:17 UTTAM Actually, instead of I mean, for me I'm getting like whatever like different views because when we say envelope I'm seeing it like a frame. Envelope is just a frame.

46:27 ADITYA Exactly

46:29 SATYA Frame. It's the largest frame that is a congregation of all the other frames.

46:34 ADITYA Yeah.

46:35 SATYA Most dominant frame.

46:36 ADITYA Exactly. And also the fact that certain everything has its own kind of what do you say like relevance in terms of how it participates with other things. So maybe in that way it can be seen like it's a framing agent that recalibrates as Satya was pointing out.

46:57 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so you don't

46:59 Like we are going to talk about on the fifteenth. when you look at the others as the negative space of yourself.

47:11 UTTAM Mm-

47:12 ADITYA Yeah.

47:12 PRAYAS You know, so if you ask who am I? at one level you can answer it very simply, I am who you are not.

47:21 ADITYA Mm-

47:22 UTTAM Yeah.

47:23 PRAYAS (?) Right. So at that where at that position where you can see that's the outermost envelope.

47:34 UTTAM Okay.
47:35 Yeah.
47:36 PRAYAS Right? So where you can absolutely convincingly say ki you know after this point it's not me. Right.
47:45 Okay.
47:46 So you know the positive identification of the self might be very difficult, but
47:52 The negative identification of the self might be possible in that sense, right? So when you think that you're talking to the world.
48:02 It's simpler than talking to a stranger.
48:08 OBTUSE (?) Yeah, that's true.
48:11 PRAYAS So you can speak into the air, okay, I'm talking to the whole world and you can imagine a world, but because that is you're imagining the world at that point as a negative space of yourself, right? But you can't track [?] from that negative space and say that this is the stranger whom I'm speaking to. So you know it that's what I'm saying. So if that helps you accept this idea of the envelope you know, the self as the envelope.
48:42 UTTAM (?) Okay. Yeah.
48:44 Yeah, envelope sounds fine like after hearing to this, but I'm not really convinced with like how you are something that you are not because you can be anything because based on the previous like talks we came to like whatever one conclusion that being is random, right?
49:06 SATYA The way I understood was that not you are something that you are not, but you find yourself by looking at what you are not. That's how I understood.
49:17 ADITYA No, it's kind of interesting. I was reading this transcript of a conversation that filmmaker R. V. Ramani did recently in Delhi. So it was actually a conversation about the death of an image, actually. So he was talking about how he was preoccupied, how he sees any photograph as a death of an image. Like he says he sees death in a photograph because he thinks that the moment in some ways dies in the image. So we also he looked at like he did this film called Tsunami My Camera in Tsunami. So where he lost his camera which he was shooting the tsunami wave in tsunami, so he fortunately survived. So he has this thing when he talks about one of the one of his friend in Calcutta, when he talks about this guy was a drunkard and then he died. Okay. So his idea was that his the perception of who you are. Is only constituted by how others relate to you. Okay. So the outside is basically producing certain forms of impulses through which a certain configuration of what yourself is constituted. So basically who you are in some way, at least to a significant portion, is constituted by others' perception of you all your life.
50:37 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, but by the negative space
50:39 ADITYA And no, and the and the let me complete. And the and then he says that the death is the moment where this perception is basically lost in some form. That's what he was answering.
50:52 SATYA So even if you're physically present, if no one else is perceiving your presence, you don't exist anymore.
50:58 ADITYA I mean the thing is like your existence in a very conceptual sense is defined by the outside as we were discussing in some bundle [?] outside.
51:08 PRAYAS I was not referring to the outside in the sense of the social. I was actually referring to a very specific outside and that is when you're part of a conversation, right?
51:19 ADITYA Oh so
51:20 PRAYAS Everything that you have contributed to a conversation is you can see as yourself and the negative space of that you can s see as collectively as a world. I mean so which means that there might be there might not be fixed boundaries of yourself in relation to your body or something like that. so y you know something that we're talking about yesterday, I think,

which we couldn't figure out how to resolve, but what if parts of me are inside you and what if parts of you are inside me?

52:02 SATYA Right.

52:03 PRAYAS (?) And we couldn't take that anywhere but I was thinking today that, you know, that was a very you know, very strong kind of a picture that

52:18 SATYA Yeah, I'd agree with that.

52:19 SATYA (?) Yeah.

52:21 OBTUSE (?) Which one? Sorry, can you say that again?

52:23 PRAYAS You know the idea of parts of me being inside you and parts of you being inside me, you know? So the idea of the self not having f fixed boundaries as far as your body is concerned.

52:36 ADITYA Mm-

52:38 Okay. Mm.

52:40 PRAYAS Which then you know goes on to I think add weight to what Satya was saying in as in the plane with multiple holes. But you know how do the multiple holes and the envelope sit well together?

53:03 SATYA So for me it's like a shapeshifter where at any given time I am a aggregation of various concepts and of those because of various reasons I am unable to see certain sides of myself which maybe you can see but I can't see them. And that's how I see both of them coming together.

53:26 ADITYA Really?

53:27 SATYA And part of those the congregation or the aggregate of whatever that envelope is, it c it also comes from what I think that you are seeing of me.

53:40 ADITYA Mm.

53:41 SATYA And maybe I think in my head what you are what I think you are thinking and I shape myself according to that.

53:53 PRAYAS But am I interested in how you see me at all?

54:01 ADITYA Sometimes it's it i it is. Sometimes it depends, like you know if I if you think the I has the set

54:08 PRAYAS Yeah.

54:09 ADITYA Look if you think the I as the self, okay, a self that is has its own internal logic. And if you pose the question am I interested in how you see me? Because I think I'm only interested in how you see me, because I think the consolidation of me as I is only produced in order to pr perform certain kind of activities. Like you know it's

54:39 PRAYAS I would say the idea the idea of the c of myself forms

54:47 You know, much before the idea of the social of the society of the world even breaks in, right?

54:54 ADITYA Okay.

54:55 UTTAM Right.

54:55 PRAYAS (?) That's

54:56 SATYA One self though, that is one self.

54:58 SATYA (?) One self, maybe, yeah.

55:00 I don't know if that's the dominant self or not. It is always there perhaps. It's like the instinct.

55:06 ADITYA No, but the thing is like one question which maybe we should ask is also like where is it that the self is validating itself? No, what is the space that the self produces a validation? Because for the self of any kind to sustain itself, it has to produce constantly tell itself that okay, you're validated, you're relevant, you have certain kind of internal, concrete, comprehensive focused logic to yourself.

55:32 PRAYAS The validation in question of the self is always a mirror. So the validation surface is always a mirror. So in the sense that you know if you are alone in a forest

55:46 ADITYA Yeah.

55:47 PRAYAS Even then you know who you are. You don't think start thinking that you are a tree.

55:53 ADITYA Okay. So there's a conscious but isn't that the only as Satya was telling the one aspect of that?

56:03 PRAYAS I don't know. I think the we could put that slice of the self or t that layer of the self as being I mean I think I could safely say that's the idea of the self that I was talking about, right? So you can always put the layers of s the social self about that and of course the social self exists. You know, we can't deny that it doesn't exist.

56:31 SATYA But do you tell me one thing, like maybe a self had formed and crystallized when I was before when I was pre social, but as I went through social, when I went through society like Siddhartha did, and then I rejected all that society, did I come back to the original self that I formed or did I find a new self? Which is probably before now. Maybe that's

56:55 PRAYAS If it's a crystalline structure, if it's a crystal, if it if the idea of myself as crystallized actually, then there is no other. Right? I mean there is no other self to find. If it's not crystal

57:10 SATYA I might crack that crystal. I might find that I don't agree with this. I mean, I don't think it's useful anymore because I may be a cris I may be a piece of coal that now has or carbon that has now out of pressure become a diamond or something or I might have cracked.

57:25 PRAYAS Yeah, that's th that's right. I mean that might happen and even if it's even if you come back to a different self, right? So that's what how would that change? How would that make a difference?

57:42 SATYA Yeah, it doesn't make a difference, that's true. In the present moment, what difference does it make? Yeah.

57:48 PRAYAS So I mean I'm saying that if you what you if what to come back to is always this y it's some self, right? So we don't care which self. So that means that the social is at one level redundant, right? So we can just discard it because that's not really so intertwined with this with this self which is there.

58:17 SATYA Does the new self we have arrived at can it have happened without the social transforming the original self?

58:26 OBTUSE (?) That's okay.

58:27 ADITYA Also, does the self then find its relevance within the social? What is it that the self is finding? Like, you know, if there is an in coherent internal self even before the social moment has happened. So what is it that the what is the moment that the internal self is going to find its relevance of being in the world? So there should be some moment that one has to find the relevance of okay, I have this I have recognized that there is an internal structure of self that I have. But what is it that and that's why I'm actually it's a very corny example, but I was just thinking about the movie Tarzan. and how in some way you can also read this kind of transitions. On the one hand, you can say that one is in a forest. of course inhabiting a certain sense of sociality but also exploring other facets of other not necessarily civilizational but other facets of sociality gradually where in some way he's track he's continuously reinventing the possibilities that his self can constitute to right. So I that's why I'm saying in the equation.

59:37 PRAYAS I mean we can accept I mean let's say we accept that the social self is very important in the in let's say in the almost the alchemy that happens when you take the crystallized self and the world and then something happens and then you're true that the then the self is actually formed, the self that you identify with and hold on to. So let's say we take that.

01:00:10 So

01:00:14 So what were what were you saying earlier that we went into understanding why the social is important at all.

01:00:27 ADITYA (?) Yeah.

01:00:31 OBTUSE (?) You mean Aditya, or?

01:00:33 PRAYAS No, I think right. I mean you were I think talking about the self as being aware of how others think about us and it being ourself in a way responding or reacting to that to that

01:00:54 ADITYA Exactly.

01:00:56 PRAYAS That's

01:00:57 ADITYA Exactly.

01:00:58 SATYA Like creativity, for example.

01:00:59 I feel like there are things sometimes creation doesn't happen without the presence of the other.

01:01:08 PRAYAS (?) Right. No, so yeah, exactly. So we let's say we take that and we can you know ca we can build forward. So

01:01:20 Let's say we can look at the negative space of ourselves.

01:01:25 As the stranger as well, right? So when I was saying that it's the world and not the stranger, you are saying that because of sociality being in a way

01:01:42 Very binding, you know very bindingly there. you are saying that it's never the world. We can never escape awareness of other people to abstract away enough to think of the world.

01:01:57 ADITYA Okay. But can you just elaborate the stranger and the negative aspect because it's a little confusing?

01:02:03 PRAYAS You know, I was saying earlier that you know it's easier to think of s of the world ra of talking to the world rather than talking to a stranger. Because you can talk to the world as in you're talking to a negative space of yourself. So you can project that, right? But when it's a stranger, it's a stranger, so you don't know who it is at all. So you cannot perform the calculation of negative space of myself minus everyone else and leaving the stranger and so I know who it is. You know, we can't do that because we don't know all the other people, so we don't know what to minus, right? So in the sense we still have to try and know people. You can't deduce what they must be, right?

01:02:54 ADITYA Yeah. But there's always a possibility and I'm this is just like a long possibility, but there is always a p possibility of stranger becoming a friend, no? In the sense like a stranger who will not have any subjective influence on us because he's just passing by or he's just like con like came to us untimely.

01:03:14 PRAYAS Yeah, but are friends not part of the social? So are you not self conscious with friends? So t so as to say that you are actually as you are with friends, so the so the social disappears.

01:03:29 ADITYA Not necessarily, that's not what I said. I think what I was trying to say is that if you think that the I think I've lost the thread somewhere. Okay, I'm going to come back to it. Go ahead.

01:03:41 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, no, you were I mean I thought that you were saying that strangers become friends. So

01:03:46 ADITYA (?) Mind I'm saying about what is the situation of thinking in this line of like you know, for example, there's this concept that is called the untimely, you know, the untimely where and Dan [?] is stranger if you think about something as untimely, which is something that you didn't expect to happen, but it happens, and that happening has a certain kind of not necessarily not necessarily always certain kind of implication of what your self is, right? So you're basically put in an untimely situation which is changing you in the per in the way that how you're looking at your interior of the self.

01:04:33 ADITYA (?) And such situations might happen more often.

01:04:38 PRAYAS No, but I didn't really understand the relationship between the idea of the untimely that you were just suggesting and

01:04:49 ADITYA No, not just the untime. I'm just saying the like the for example like the stranger is somebody who's an untimely. Like it's something an interaction with the stranger is something that we didn't anticipate, right?

01:05:03 PRAYAS Right.

01:05:04 ADITYA So in the what I'm trying to say is that the expansion of the self or even the even the rearrangement of the self could be in certain way be understood as a process that takes a lot of these untimely moments into consideration of because these are also surprises of some kind. It's like a it comes to you as a surprise. Some stay with you in the in the process of reinventing yourself or reinv reinventing.

01:05:34 PRAYAS What are you suggesting? Are you suggesting that the idea of the self is not just in relation to the social and so at some level the stranger is not always the stranger, so at some level you're not self conscious and looking at yourself as how the world looks at you.

01:06:03 ADITYA But no that's not what I'm saying. I'm not saying of course these people are implicated within the fabric of the social. It's not I'm just thinking about in a very specific terms rather than thinking about the social as the larger landscape. In very specific terms, I also brought this up because the whole question of friends came up. I mean, I just thought about like how we said that like you know there is this perception that you can really be true of yourself when you're with friends. So it's also thinking about how valid that statement such as that be, because what happens to yourself, even though you have produced certain form of a collectivity in terms of mutual understanding. And also going back to what I was saying before, your definitions of the self, like what other people think of you. The other people are usually friends, no, it's not that everybody around you, right?

01:06:59 PRAYAS But I don't really understand the value of going into these the strangers versus friends kind of No

01:07:09 ADITYA Not no I'm not making a binary there I'm just trying to understand that where does the what is the agency so let's put it this way what is the agency that

01:07:22 ADITYA (?) And

01:07:22 ADITYA (?) That's

01:07:23 SATYA Can we instead of thinking about friends and strangers, because in my case I find myself being myself more with strangers, can we put it as where does the self realize where d where is the self free to be itself?

01:07:38 SATYA (?) What does it mean to be yourself?

01:07:43 OBTUSE (?) What do you say Prayas? It's meta? [?]

01:07:46 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I think that is at least taking us away from you know the technical almost technical you know nitpicking over words because yeah I would say we have we have chiseled away at the idea of a self that you know is has is responding to a certain social and now you know we are dealing with this question of you know how can we be ourselves, right? Satya, that's what you said.

01:08:22 SATYA Yeah.

01:08:22 PRAYAS That makes sense to me a also because I was thinking that you know, the other day we were talking about how all the noise in the world makes us inhibit it.

01:08:38 Yeah.

01:08:38 'cause we don't want to add to it. Now if you think about and then we later spoke about it as also making us angry

01:08:49 SATYA (?) Yeah.

01:08:51 PRAYAS Now how does ourself so what Srinivas was talking about the agency, right? So what kind of agency does this idea of ourself have to talk back and you know talk back to the world in terms of calibrating its own attitude, right? So

01:09:17 If you're saying that you know, you're angry or you're inhibited or whatever, right? How do you talk that back to the world in the sense

01:09:26 OBTUSE Yeah.

01:09:29 OBTUSE (?) Yeah.

01:09:30 OBTUSE (?) Is the self is the idea of the self exclusive? I really doubt it because you're pretty much a collective.

01:09:41 Multiple selves over.

01:09:43 SATYA (?) It feels fluid to me.

01:09:46 UTTAM (?) No, it's

01:09:47 PRAYAS We ha we again left that thought somewhere in the middle today, the idea of you know, parts of me being in you and parts of you being in me. Mm- That got left away again somewhere. But I'm saying yeah, so that would mean that it's fragmented and not so unitary.

01:10:06 OBTUSE So when you say what is the real self that you go back to or sleep with, who is the i who is the real self? Your identity? I don't know, I don't understand the question because

01:10:17 PRAYAS So you know even exclusive. Yeah, so even if it's a real self and even if that real self is fragmented across multiple bodies and or multiple how does that make a difference?

01:10:31 OBTUSE (?) No, it doesn't make a difference. it's merely to identify who is it that we really are and what makes us.

01:10:39 PRAYAS Yeah, but the if the who is fragmented across vast distances

01:10:47 PRAYAS (?) How does it affect the who?

01:10:51 SATYA (?) Yeah, it's still the who.

01:10:53 PRAYAS Yeah, so you know, if parts of me are really thousands of kilometers away, it's still part of me.

01:11:00 OBTUSE It's merely understanding tendencies, inclinations or certain characteristics which would be particular to a set of things. So

01:11:11 Just for mere understanding, I don't know if it's changes anything.

01:11:14 PRAYAS Right. Yeah. Okay. So and then you know, we were at this question that how do we when can we be ourselves?

01:11:26 PRAYAS (?) Right. You asked that.

01:11:29 I mean that's what Satya kind of brought us to and we have that question and I don't know, I it feels like a very big question in the sense that some in a sense that we might need to dedicate enough time to this. So do you think Satya does it sit well in relation to our question for tomorrow, which is knowing ourselves as the negative space of the other.

01:12:04 SATYA Yeah, definitely. I think it ties in it's the to me it's the same question.

01:12:09 PRAYAS Right. So we can actually just open it up more, you know, extensively tomorrow. So, you know the word for tomorrow is other and the question is what is a negative space of ourselves? So that might be yeah, so we I mean just to register the question is I mean I'll post it. But it's when can we be ourselves or how can we be ourselves and

01:12:38 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

01:12:39 ADITYA I'm just I'm just regarding the mirror question, it's kind of interesting that the I'm just reminded of this video which I'll just post in the chat thing by an artist who basically has this in a video addressed. May not be completely useful, but something interesting to think about why one thinks that one will be completely themselves in a bathroom mirror, not even in a mirror, inside a mirror inside a bathroom. Because that you're devoid of all your connections with the world on some form. So you're put in this kind of laboratory where you're conscious that you're not in no way connected with the outside world. And it's an interesting space. Yeah, I mean something interesting to think about if at all we can discuss that.

01:13:31 OBTUSE (?) Transferred. [?]

01:13:32 PRAYAS (?) Yeah. Thanks everyone for being here. So we'll stop the broadcast here.

01:13:37 OBTUSE (?) Thank you.

01:13:38 ADITYA (?) Thanks, bye.