Someday we shall talk - Day 3

A broadcast by Surfatial, the collective of Satya Gummuluri, Malavika Rajnarayan and me, 22 June 2015. 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

00:23 PRAYAS (?) Hi the event is live.

00:27 MALAVIKA (?) All right.

00:29 PRAYAS (?) And Satya is not here, she'll be coming here soon.

00:33 Okay.

00:33 So we'll just wait.

00:36 MALAVIKA All right.

01:05 SATYA All right then. So fish will be back. [?] Thanks Prayas, for starting the session.

01:14 Sorry about the delay and thanks everyone for joining again. I'll just jump in.

01:19 Awesome.

01:20 Welcome to day three of Someday We Shall Talk. The questions we have considered on Someday We Shall Talk so far have been about pre-communication and what happens before channels of communication open between the one and the other. On day one, we talked about wanting to speak how one sees oneself, what one perceives of oneself when one wants to speak, and what is in the mirror. On day two, we talked of attempting to speak. so we spoke of attempting to speak over the noise over and above the noise. So and we spoke of noise. So after wanting and attempting to speak, today we'll consider questions on actually speaking, on the doing, on the act of speaking. And so the first question I have for today is. How do you know what to say and when to say it?

02:30 PRAYAS So it's only if you have a script in hand do you know, right? I mean otherwise you don't know and you are hit shooting in the dark.

02:40 MALAVIKA I thought yesterday we came to the point where we said that we're not going to speak unless we really have something to say.

02:53 SATYA Right.

02:53 That's right.

02:54 SATYA (?) Yeah.

02:55 PRAYAS (?) I mean as in life or

02:58 SATYA I that I mean that came up with the perspective from a creative point of view, from a musician's point of view. But if we apply that to the

03:07 MALAVIKA To the noise, with reference to the noise, that w how do we deal with the noise? Finally we came to this point where we said that in order to deal with both the noise and find the

silence and you know see where that edge is. We're not going to say anything till we actually have something to say, till then we will stay silent.

03:31 SATYA (?) So now my question is how do you survive? How do you get by? If that if we all started adopting not all, if one of us started adopting over the noise, how is it possible to survive?

03:46 MALAVIKA I think it is because you in that point when you don't say something, i you are generating material. I it's not that you're n you're not going to be generating any material and there is gonna be a point where you will want to communicate. That we have I think already established that one way or another we have this need and desire to communicate.

04:13 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

04:14 VEERANGANA And also like you said, Malavika, I mean in that silence it could be something that you're creating. I mean we look at suppression in some way, it would in some way connect with the idea of language about how you say it. So you may decide to say it at a time where you may not be able to say it verbally, but you actually say it through another medium, which is where again this whole thing of when you say it would depend on the situations around you and how much you can actually say it aloud or whether you can say it through another medium. And what to say would again be a reflection of the situation you're in.

04:52 SATYA Exactly. And I also feel like it is also reflecting who you are because there are those who

04:58 His first instinct is to say it.

05:01 And then do what I'm doing. [?]

05:02 SATYA (?) Whatever processing comes afterwards.

05:06 So if that is who you are and in for me, if I if we just leave behind this question of waiting to say something until the right moment and if we come down to a very I don't want to say down, if we come to a more practical and a more superficial level of interaction, then how does anyone know what to say?

05:25 PRAYAS No, but why does one need to happen before the other? Why can't they happen simultaneously? So you can you can think of what to say while you're saying it.

05:35 SATYA Correct, it's generating itself because as it's like a feedback loop. Whatever is coming in is generating the next stuff.

05:41 MALAVIKA (?) Is that actually possible? I find that very hard to do.

05:45 SATYA (?) I mean

05:46 PRAYAS Like that's the essence of for live performance. I mean I'm I mean a lot of people are essentially doing that all the time. That is they don't they

05:57 SATYA Presentation, like if you're presenting and you're getting the pulse of the audience and you're gauging the temperature and you're changing your modulation accordingly.

06:04 PRAYAS Yeah.

06:08 SATYA So that's another so one way is to wait, one way is to be in the moment.

06:16 MALAVIKA I think it also depends on the content of what you're trying to say because when it comes to mundane things like everyday your r routine chores, this that, you're having a conversation with your family and you just say come let's have dinner you're not going to be thinking about what to say. But let's say you're having a slightly more demanding conversation that requires you to think that y you can't just keep speaking without kind of playing in your head how you want to put it.

06:54 PRAYAS If the intention is to create material and to c create content, do something, then you could do that. But if you're sitting with a CA, of course, I mean you might have a very predetermined, you know, okay, this is exactly what I'm going to say.

07:09 SATYA Right.

07:10 SATYA (?) But I think that's a good thing.

07:13 VEERANGANA Sorry, go ahead. No, I was saying I suppose I mean if you're in a situation where it doesn't matter whether when you say something that's gonna make a difference or not. So you may decide not to say anything, but there could be instances where you feel compelled to say it even if it doesn't make a difference.

07:31 MALAVIKA Right. The consequences would matter, you're saying. Yeah, that's true.

07:37 SATYA (?) And then if the consequences matter, then do you stop to think?

07:44 MALAVIKA (?) Of course.

07:45 PRAYAS Also the act of speaking makes you something. So if for example if you speak and if you don't speak, then you are two different people.

07:56 SATYA Right. That is true. The perception of what that what I am is different.

08:00 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

08:01 SATYA So coming back to mundane situations, even within that I sometimes feel like there are situations where you can't necessarily say what is expected in that moment.

08:18 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, we've got

08:19 VEERANGANA Mundane situation could be heightened into another situation if what you've said triggers something else off.

08:25 SATYA Exactly. So the context and the surroundings and

08:32 But then how do we do we really spend a lot of time thinking about what we are saying? Do we just say it?

08:41 VEERANGANA It will again depend upon the situation and whom you're with or whom you're saying it to.

08:48 SATYA So we do have a s different way of approaching obviously every interaction.

08:56 VEERANGANA Yeah, I think so.

09:00 SATYA (?) Do we have formulae for them?

09:06 KRITTIKA [echo]

09:08 [echo] But then how do we do we really spend a lot of time thinking about what we're saying? Do we just say it?

09:17 [echo] It'll again depend upon the situation and whom you're with whom you're saying it to.

09:24 [echo] We are we live in the have a different kind of approaching obviously every interaction. [?]

09:32 [echo] Yeah, I think so.

09:36 [echo] Do we have formulas for them?

09:51 MALAVIKA We actually I mean the f I don't know if we have formulae. we I think experience feeds us with

10:04 VEERANGANA (?) What we need to say and when we need to say it.

10:12 PRAYAS No, I mean you can also sense if a sense if a conversation is going strong or if it's going to die and you might see your role as a as a emergency healthcare professional for conversations and

10:33 PRAYAS (?) I mean

10:33 PRAYAS (?) In what sense?

10:34 MALAVIKA (?) The talk doctor.

10:35 PRAYAS Then you'll come in and do something.

10:41 SATYA That could be an

10:42 Interesting business proposition. I mean

10:46 Yeah.

10:46 Yeah.

10:52 PRAYAS (?) See Doctor the talk.

10:54 SATYA Right.
10:55 Yeah.
10:57 Yeah, you pump in things to it.
11:00 PRAYAS No, so I mean I think that correlates to with w what Veerangana was saying, that sometimes you say things I mean sometimes you don't say things if you think it won't register. But sometimes you know that it won't register but you still say it. And I think this will be the third leg that you will only say when it'll register sometimes.
11:26 SATYA Do you know what I mean?
11:29 PRAYAS (?) If you know that you can bring a conversation back to life, you know that it has registered.
11:37 SATYA Okay. The registering is in one it's some form. Like it has registered some way or the other. It may not have registered in the way that you wanted it to.
11:46 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, I mean it has had some impact. So the conversation has come back to life.
11:51 PRAYAS (?) Correct.
11:51 PRAYAS (?) Essentially you have performed your role as a doctor.
11:55 SATYA Okay. then coming to communication because you may or may not have communicated what you wanted to.
12:06 Something there is a conversation going, but that's about it.
12:09 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.
12:11 SATYA And you don't know w you may or may not know your own intent, you have your own d structure, but then you're trying to get that across to someone else. Have you done all this pre processing or are you doing it later? How does it work?
12:28 PRAYAS I mean I think you know what Malavika or I don't know, I actually I don't remember who, but we were speaking before that one of the choices of you know one of the choices we can make is really just being there, you know, in a conversation, just be available fully in terms of okay, so whatever falls on my plate I'll respond to it. And I think that is that is sufficiently
13:00 Th I think that is that is enough. If you just commit to responding to whatever falls on your plate.
13:07 SATYA (?) Mm-
13:09 PRAYAS We don't need anything else for conversation to remain somewhere
13:17 MALAVIKA Moving towards something.
13:20 I mean everybody has ambition. You have ambition to take it somewhere. You want it to progress. That don't we all have a tendency to give
13:30 PRAYAS Yeah but conversations are conversations are very bad vehicles for ambition. If you if any one of a conversation is has a has a personal agenda for the conversation
13:43 SATYA (?) Yeah.
13:44 PRAYAS (?) So
13:46 SATYA No, but th I would say the opposite. If you don't have a clear if you haven't figured out your agenda, then and if you're not a good conversationalist, both have to happen. You could be a good conversationalist but you don't know what your ambition it's not going anywhere.
14:03 MALAVIKA See, Prayas, if you have an idea in your head and you say you immediately think, Okay, I wanna say this to this person and you start saying it to that person. So you're already approaching that conversation with a very clear picture of what you're gonna say and why you're gonna say it.
14:20 PRAYAS That is that is functional. you perform that function. Let's say I say that okay, can you give me the password of your Facebook account? So I'm saying this. And you give me a password and then it's done.
14:34 PRAYAS (?) And then what else do we talk about?

14:36 SATYA But do we is but the thing is this a conversation or is it I mean, I don't even know if I'm talking about conversations. I'm just talking about how do you know what to say at all? Yeah. And

14:50 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, okay. Because okay. So I mean

14:54 MALAVIKA Example you gave. What you said if I say no I'm not gonna give you the password. That's gonna continue the conversation. You may imagine that see th you're never gonna be able to predict how the conversation's gonna go. So you have to have an agenda.

15:10 PRAYAS I'm just saying that transactional conversations don't really become really vibrant communications in I mean conversations which in the sense are which is which are which are equally alive for everyone participating.

15:30 SATYA Surely that is true. Trans yeah.

15:32 MALAVIKA All conversations are transactional. They're all y if you're not transacting s y you will have you're transacting ideas.

15:40 SATYA But it's not

15:41 SATYA (?) Good.

15:41 SATYA (?) There would be intent of transacting ideas or just

15:46 MALAVIKA (?) You can't I assume. [?]

15:48 SATYA You just I mean, there is some transaction at some level. I mean I might commun I might converse just for conversing's sake.

15:57 MALAVIKA (?) What does that conversing sake exactly?

16:00 SATYA Like I'm getting something out of it no matter what.

16:04 MALAVIKA Exactly.

16:05 SATYA (?) Yeah. There is a c transaction no matter what.

16:10 PRAYAS (?) No, why? Why is that?

16:12 SATYA So see so suppose my I just need to talk. I don't need anything. I just want to talk. And the thing that I'm g i the transaction that's happening is if there's somebody there, I'm talking and I'm thinking that person is listening.

16:28 And that because the other person is there, I'm getting to talk. So I am getting to talk.

16:34 MALAVIKA Just the audience itself is a transaction.

16:37 PRAYAS No, why? I mean you're saying the audience is transacting I mean you're saying both the conversation partners are transacting with each other in terms of attention.

16:49 SATYA Yeah, then

16:49 Yes, that's a good point. Yeah, it's a t it could be attention and also my need of wanting to express is coming out. Whether the other person wants it or not is beside the point, but at least my

17:00 PRAYAS No, I don't agree actually. I don't agree that it's the transaction of attention which is the currency of conversation.

17:10 SATYA But don't we have Okay?

17:13 PRAYAS I mean then the people who have high attention, right? People who are able to let's say catalyze or large amounts of attention, let's say celebrities or people on television or whatever.

17:27 SATYA (?) Yeah.

17:28 PRAYAS And if that were to be true then we would all be logged in to conversations with them on the phone. That's it.

17:34 MALAVIKA No, conversation does not necessarily have to mean only through word or speech. It can be the attention itself is a conversation, which is why now you have social media and people are in touch with the rest of the world.

17:51 PRAYAS Attention is a very base kind of human desire. It's not I mean, I don't think attention drives every desire to converse.

18:03 MALAVIKA To communicate, yes.

18:06 PRAYAS (?) But not to converse, I mean.

18:08 SATYA Yeah, I guess we are confusing communication and conversation. I mean t I'm looking purely at communication or even before that, like we talked about transaction. I mean, even before the communication happens, there is a sort of a need for something. And the need is a tran could lead to a transaction.

18:27 PRAYAS (?) Right. No that's right. I mean ca in the in the frame of communication of course, yeah.

18:32 SATYA Yeah. I wanna move to the next question which is when one is speaking to the other, who is speaking to whom?

18:42 And the reason I ask this question is when I see okay, if we limit this to two players, one is speaking to the other. So is the there is a true self, there is a true self on the other side, there is a perception of one, there is a perception of the other, and who's talking to whom? Is the true self talking to the self image which is then talking to the other's image or there's so many constructions. So when you speak to someone, the other, who are you who is speaking to whom?

19:15 VEERANGANA It depends on who is listening. Because at the end of it, I mean, you could be

19:18 Speaking to yourself and it could just be wanting to vent or wanting to say something whether you're being heard or not.

19:27 VEERANGANA (?) And whether if you're speaking to someone, it would depend whom you're speaking to and the intent you're speaking with. But then who

19:35 SATYA Who is speaking? Is it me? And who is me?

19:41 VEERANGANA The situation probably.

19:45 MALAVIKA That's an interesting one.

19:48 SATYA (?) The situation will construct a form of me.

19:55 VEERANGANA (?) In a way. Because the situation you are in is what will also construct your conversation or your communication. The situation we are trying to speak with.

20:06 SATYA Right.

20:10 So the content

20:11 Intent of

20:11 The conversation or the communication is constructed by the situation. But then when I am speaking, when I say something, who am I speaking to? I mean who do I address?

20:29 MALAVIKA Could be your other selves.

20:33 MALAVIKA (?) Which you may identify with other people at different points of time.

20:38 SATYA So it's a very shifting and very dynamic sort of di situational sort of construction.

20:44 VEERANGANA It's also about whom you, I mean, you could be

20:47 Confronting or reasoning in various manners, whether it's with yourself or whether it's with the person you're communicating with.

20:59 SATYA Who am I speaking to?

21:01 Might think that I'm reaching I might be constructing my communication

21:05 Communication based upon an image of who I think the other is. But that communication is completely wrong because the other person might not be sincere and might be presenting a face, right?

21:23 I find this very confusing

21:24 Actually even coming down to a very personal level. It's like how do you know?

21:31 MOSES SAM I think you talk to your true self but through the other person in the sense you are actually talking to the construct of the person who is standing in front of you, but the construct itself is a reflection of your true self.

21:48 PRAYAS Yeah true or not, but reflection of some part of yourself, right? I mean

21:54 MOSES SAM (?) Yeah.

21:55 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, because I mean true would just mean to absolutes.

22:00 SATYA And what is true? Because true also depends on the situation, does it? Or is there something true beh behind all of this?

22:09 MOSES SAM (?) No, I just use that word because you constructed that question that way. You said there is a true self and there is a image of the Yeah. So there are

22:21 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean so what you are saying is actually something which we that makes a lot of sense to me, that we are always just talking to ourselves.

22:31 SATYA We are talking to ourselves, yeah.

22:35 PRAYAS That's all we are doing and i if that is so then actually I'm confused again about the transactional nature of the of communication then. Because then how do you transact with yourself actually?

22:52 VEERANGANA I think that in some way also brings up the idea of validation which we spoke about yesterday.

22:58 SATYA (?) Right.

23:00 SATYA (?) Yeah.

23:04 PRAYAS No, so when you're talk when you're speaking to yourself do you still need validation? is there is there still a play of validation in that conversation with yourself?

23:18 MALAVIKA I think like Sam mentioned this idea of the self is not necessarily s singular. It could be you're looking at different parts of yourself. So when you're talking it's only one part that is talking and there are other dimensions to yourself that you may want to connect with.

23:42 SATYA And that depends on whom you are talking with and that makes you connect with different parts of s yourself.

23:47 MALAVIKA Yes. Yes. And so the transaction still exists.

23:52 MOSES SAM Yeah, and Prayas I think the ultimate form of validation is something that comes from within. So

24:00 PRAYAS Yeah.

24:01 MOSES SAM (?) I think people are looking for that through other people.

24:04 VEERANGANA Yeah.

24:04 Even if you're in a situation where y you need to decide something, you're constantly placing those pros and cons in your head about which idea to discuss and trying to validate which one would be a better option to choose from.

24:19 SATYA Exactly. And then that also depends on your self con your construct of what the other is and the that choosing of those concepts and ideas that you want to bring forth. You may not want to bring forth everything, depending on who you think the other is.

24:38 Which is again which is again a reflection of who you think the other is based on yourself.

24:49 So I actually did this exercise where I put two like I was saying earlier, two figures in a room and I constructed how many selves could be there and I found ten selves.

25:03 MALAVIKA (?) Only ten.

25:05 SATYA At a basic minimum level. Like I just found ten.

25:07 PRAYAS (?) How? How do we find

25:09 SPEAKER 6 What are those?

25:11 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah, what is this ten? How did you come up with ten?

25:13 SATYA Okay, so on one side there's ba the true self, which we don't know what the true self is. There is a self image, there is an image of the other.

25:24 MOSES SAM (?) Okay.

25:25 SATYA Okay. There is an image that I want to project to the other.
25:34 So there's two, there's A and B.
25:36 Okay.
25:37 SATYA (?) Okay.
25:38 PRAYAS (?) Okay. So there's A one, A two, A three, four, five and B one, B two, B three, two, four, five.
25:45 SATYA Actually there's actually ten people in the room. I have it written down, I can't remember which
25:49 MALAVIKA That ev exponentially go to the power of ten each one because with each you will have this will you'll have to do the same process.
26:02 SATYA It that's right. And then that's the thing where it's like it's like a reflection. It's like goes on reflecting on each other like that.
26:09 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.
26:10 SATYA And at a basic minimum there were a few suppose we suppose that gets too complicated. Suppose let's remove the ad infinitum part and if we just take very basic. If I'm in a room with somebody else and if I do this experiment of observing myself, who's talking to whom? You know, I don't know if I'm reaching you. Who am I reaching when I talk to you?
26:34 SATYA (?) Why does it matter?
26:36 To me it's very confusing because it's like, What do I say to you? I don't want to you know, how do I know what to say to you?
26:44 MOSES SAM (?) You say what you want to say to yourself.
26:47 SATYA (?) Sorry, please what do you say, Sam?
26:49 MOSES SAM I said like if you don't know your audience then you don't know what you're gonna say as well.
26:55 SATYA And isn't that debilitating?
26:58 MOSES SAM It depends. So there's one way to look at it is that there's no validation, like you just there you don't put any filter, right? So you just say whatever you want, irrespective of who is standing on the other side. That's one way. The other thing is a very corporate slash transactional thing where you restrict slash filter whatever is coming out, right? And for that, if you are looking at it th in that perspective, then the audience matters a lot, right?
27:31 SATYA Right. And that's highly annoying I think, but
27:40 And to me that's a bit debilitating because it's like I'm constructing all the time.
27:46 MOSES SAM Right. So in that case understanding the receiver becomes a lot more important.
27:53 PRAYAS This understanding not be some s arrived at through some robust process. It can be very ad hoc. So I mean it's open to it's to open to misreading very easily. So you might so I can just assume that I'm talking to this person and this person wants to hear this. Now if they don't want to hear it, they'll just ask me to shut up. So you know that's it's already a built in safety mechanism.
28:24 SATYA Should be hearing it. I mean you're telling them stop drinking. They should be hearing it. They'll tell you to shut up.
28:33 PRAYAS Yeah, that's but that's okay. But le I mean I don't know let's say we are not rehabilitation
28:41 You know, we're not engaged in rehabilitating people with alcohol alcoholism, right? So
28:49 MOSES SAM (?) No, but I mean if you're trying to
28:50 SATYA Trying to d draw somebody out, for example, into a conversation I mean I think conversation is different from communication. There are two these are two separate things.
29:00 PRAYAS (?) So how are they different actually? I mean I would like
29:04 SATYA I feel like c conversation is a sport.

29:07 MOSES SAM Is that what?

29:08 SATYA Is a sport.

29:09 MOSES SAM Okay. Ah yeah. I was gonna say it's like flirting, so you just like make up things, right?

29:17 SATYA And communication is there is an I mean, you know, conversation could m mean that it is being coming from a place for a need for communication, but communication seems more like a more transactional than a conversation to me.

29:33 MOSES SAM (?) Right.

29:37 PRAYAS (?) But how in terms of what you're trying to address

29:41 SATYA Yeah.

29:42 PRAYAS How is communication more of a useful model than conversation?

29:49 SATYA Yeah, I mean that's true. In what I'm trying to address, perhaps communication it's worth sticking with communication and

29:56 PRAYAS I mean I've just if you if you can distinguish the two in terms of what where you're what you're trying to address actually.

30:06 SATYA What I'm trying to address is first of all there are two people in the room and they want to get along, for example. They want to communicate or even if forget getting along. Some agendas are there and they need to get these across to each other. I mean and by agenda I don't mean negative, it's just it's just an objective. So how do they even know what to say? Because I don't know who I'm talking to.

30:34 MALAVIKA Then it would be communication. You're trying to communicate to initiate conversation. I think in conversation there is an understanding that both are more or less equal participants. In communication it doesn't matter. There's no agreement from the people around whether like a lecture can be a communication. It's not you never call a lecture a conversation.

30:55 SATYA (?) Right.

30:57 PRAYAS (?) They should be

31:00 PRAYAS (?) That's a first communication. [?]

31:04 SATYA Wait, Prayas, you said there's no communication there?

31:07 PRAYAS No I was just saying then we should replace all communication with conversation. I mean why have any anything which is not peer to peer?

31:19 MALAVIKA Because everybody may not agree

31:20 Agree to converse all the time.

31:23 PRAYAS (?) So then there is not nothing th then no not then nothing happens.

31:30 MALAVIKA You catch the ones that are re agreeing to converse. I mean that's what we were talking about the noise yesterday, so

31:37 PRAYAS Right. No, but I'm saying as opposed to communication, let's say the milkman the milkman comes to my door and if I don't say give me milk, then he won't give me milk. That's fine.

31:48 MALAVIKA (?) We'll still give you the milk because that c that's already been communicated.

31:52 SATYA Mean you're looking like this guy at the door who needs milk. So it the image of you is communicating to him already.

32:00 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, so if we take that away and we just and we make it a game that the milkman comes to my doorstep and if I tell him a good story about milk, then he'll give me milk.

32:13 MALAVIKA But the very fact that you call him the milkman means that he is somebody who delivers milk and the very fact that you know that he's coming to your house means there may be a transaction of milk there. Not necessarily conversation.

32:27 PRAYAS But a narrative conversation will decide whether the transaction will happen or not. I'm saying that is a more that is a more that is a fairer model for you to assess whether a transaction needs to take place or not. So I mean

32:42 MALAVIKA Agree to converse with you.

32:44 PRAYAS (?) So then we don't exchange milk. I mean we don't

32:48 MOSES SAM (?) Right.

32:52 SPEAKER 2 Go stop. Go and look for words.

32:58 PRAYAS No, because isn't that what we do in every other thing we do in life? For example, you're trying to you're joining a company, you meet the people and you converse with them and then you decide whether a conversation is going to whether a transaction is going to happen and whether you'll join them.

33:18 Yeah, and you're trying to maybe you have been hitched with somebody, you are going to get married to them and you of course you meet them and talk to them, okay, so are we going to survive each other? But I mean every transaction is somehow even trade.

33:37 MALAVIKA Agreement in all these transactions. So if you go to a company and the company doesn't have any vacancies, they're very quickly going to say we don't have any vacancies, we cannot have this conversation.

33:52 PRAYAS And then you read about people who design ways for companies to be in a conversation with them. Like you know, something they'll do on social media or they create a website which does something. I mean what I'm saying is we also know that only the transactions that succeed are the ones that come through conversation. Otherwise they don't succeed.

34:15 SATYA So if we are looking at successful conversations a successful transaction, sorry the next question is the one is the best communicator the best actor? Is the best actor one who can look unflinchingly into a highly polished mirror? So the first part is the best communicator the best actor? So if I want to have a successful transaction, should I be a really good actor?

34:42 SPEAKER 6 Yeah. You should be an improv artist, not just an actor.

34:49 SATYA It that's true. That's true. There is that feedback reflection going through and you shift yourself according. I mean you if you just go by the script then

34:59 VEERANGANA (?) And everything. [?]

35:02 SATYA I'm sorry, Veerangana, you don't

35:04 VEERANGANA (?) Rehearsed communications.

35:07 SATYA (?) Yeah, it's improv every time.

35:10 VEERANGANA (?) Yeah.

35:11 MALAVIKA (?) Oh, you rehearse so well

35:12 MOSES SAM (?) That you can improvise at any point of time.

35:16 SATYA (?) Yeah, all right. [?]

35:19 PRAYAS (?) So that's w that's what manipulation is. It's a rehearsed material that is made to look like improv.

35:26 SATYA Exactly. Exact and we know we have we are seeing examples of it all around us at this moment.

35:33 MALAVIKA (?) Like yeah, what we're doing.

35:38 SPEAKER 2 Yeah, that was my first question too.

35:41 SPEAKER 6 You guys rehearse without me, I'm the only one who is improving.

35:47 SATYA (?) I think.

35:48 PRAYAS I guess.

35:51 SATYA Exactly, that's exactly it. But I mean should we be rehearsing? I mean should we be putting up these facades? Like sometimes I feel for good communication, if I really spoke how I

spoke, I mean no normally people don't talk to me anyway, but if I really spoke they'll just get rid of me.

36:14 MALAVIKA Oh, but so what's stopping you? I mean

36:18 So you say y people anyhow don't talk to you. So you might as well speak how you speak.

36:25 SATYA (?) But then the transaction doesn't happen.

36:30 MALAVIKA (?) Anyhow not happening. Are you all of the transactions happening?

36:35 SATYA There's two things, there's a one need for a transaction and there is a need to be true to the self.

36:43 PRAYAS (?) So which is which is priority?

36:45 Yeah, no, I think we should discard the second one for good.

36:50 SATYA (?) The need to be true to the self because the true self doesn't exist.

36:54 PRAYAS No, yeah, I mean it's too much pain and trouble.

36:59 SATYA It suppose you relate this exactly to the conversation on artists and artist statement.

37:05 MALAVIKA Yeah.

37:06 SATYA Then it's only the artist statement that stands.

37:09 MALAVIKA No, it will be both. Both are equally valid because you're discarding this idea of the true self. So there's not one thing that is going to be valid. It can be any form of

37:21 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, you can put a whole you can put a whole encyclopedia of artist statements and say you can that choose the one you like and you know, and have all these ways of being read and you can choose either one.

37:34 SATYA Now to do that very well, should you if you have the ability to look at yourself in the mirror and look at yourself and say that I am a manipulator, this is who I am, maybe that might give me the ability to make a very good range of selves, right, to project.

37:55 MALAVIKA Why would that become manipulation?

37:58 SATYA Okay, manipulation is probably a negative word, but

38:01 PRAYAS (?) No, I don't think manipulation is a negative word at all. I think it's a very basic thing that we have to do all the time. So if we don't manipulate our parents, we don't get to leave home.

38:18 SATYA Yeah. Like the dog doesn't get his treats.

38:21 PRAYAS Yeah. Dogs manipulate us and we manipulate the parents.

38:32 SATYA It helps to

38:34 It helps to look in the mirror and be aware of who this person is and that helps to create these selves.

38:45 PRAYAS Yeah I mean So yeah, so it's like what you were actually going at with the whole communication model. That you understand that you to speak in different tongues to different figures because they'll understand different tongues. So then for each of those tongues you construct different fake figures who are going to speak naturally in that altered tongue.

39:14 SATYA (?) Right.

39:15 VEERANGANA So I mean the case of manipulation when

39:18 You speak about say with parents or with dogs, that would become more I'd say emotional manipulation. But if you look at other forms of it, you could look at blackmail and corruption also as kinds of manipulation.

39:30 SATYA (?) Right.

39:31 PRAYAS Yeah, which are like based on coercion and that's why they become kind of unethical or let's say they become problematic or negative because of the of the coercion involved.

39:44 SATYA And then it then depends on the actor. I mean, is this what they really want? Is that what they are attempting to do?

39:53 MALAVIKA But that way even your parents do not really want you to leave.

39:59 PRAYAS No, but you are you are putting up a convincing argument of why it would be the best for everyone if you just leave.

40:09 PRAYAS (?) Be the best thing in the world if you leave.

40:11 MALAVIKA So you're saying that as long as there is an agreement kind of consensus.

40:19 MALAVIKA (?) You can force that agreement. Yeah.

40:22 And yeah, so if the agreement is not coerced, you're saying it's fine, it's not unethical. Yeah.

40:30 PRAYAS (?) Is just a problem because then you can then of course you'll go into power politics and you know

40:35 SPEAKER 2 Yeah, I agree. Yeah.

40:37 PRAYAS (?) And people who don't have problems in being criminal, they'll just put out the guns and

40:46 SATYA So, I mean overall I guess to wrap up yeah, there are all these selves, there are all these images, there are all these situations and there are all these interactions that are happening all around. And we sort of are not moving away from this construct of a true self, so to speak, because that's not possible to construct or to really express or to understand what the true self is. You could only move towards it but not exactly know what it is.

41:21 It's to me it's like a soup. I mean it's like I'm swimming in this and there's i if I to actually have effective communication, there's two things. Either I'm completely aware of this soup and I'm managing to construct all these different selves depending on the situations, or I just totally ignore and just be who I am and just say, Fuck it, just talk to me, this is who I am.

41:43 MALAVIKA Yeah.

41:44 SATYA (?) Yeah, I think that's better.

41:47 MOSES SAM Satya, can you do me a favor? Can you send me those or send everyone those ten constructions of two people?

41:55 SATYA Okay, sounds good, I will do that.

41:57 VEERANGANA (?) You said you have written it somewhere, right?

41:58 SATYA Yes, I have, yeah.

42:00 MOSES SAM (?) Okay, good.

42:01 SATYA Yeah, that's yeah. Yeah. okay, well thank you everyone for joining. I really learnt a lot and it's always fun hearing perspectives outside my head, so it's fun talking to all of you. Thanks for joining and

42:16 VEERANGANA Thank you.

42:16 SATYA The next session is in fifteen minutes. Thanks, bye.