Surrogate Surfaces, Day 2

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

00:05 PRAYAS Hi, we start the day two of

00:13 MALAVIKA Yes.

00:15 PRAYAS And hi. Yeah, we s we'll start our day two our session on you know as part of the study group called Surrogate Surfaces. And we'll start with our first trigger for the day, which is where basically which is where we concluded yesterday.

00:43 Yes.

00:44 Are do acts transition or are they interrupted and replaced?

00:54 So yesterday we had Lawrence kind of s speak of this analogy of Arjun and Krishna talking to each other during the before the before the battle broke out and

01:18 Lawrence seemed to say that from the point where

01:27 Arjun

01:30 Stopped hesitating and agreed to wage war

01:37 At that point there was a break.

01:43 And I was not sure if that was a break or a transition point in the narrative. So if the if the act was continuous and but it basically transited, it had a deflection point.

02:03 So that's where we were yesterday and I thought that would be a good thing to revisit and start our day with because I was actually not really sure I had figured that out.

02:19 MALAVIKA What do you mean by break?

02:24 PRAYAS So the act breaking is where it stops being continuous with itself, right? So in the sense if a c if you ha if your if your character breaks, if you if your act breaks, then you do something which is atypical of you.

02:45 PRAYAS (?) Something which you might not have done.

02:48 MALAVIKA But then in that narrative the there is a transition. There is according to the story there is there is a an entire narrative which causes a transition. So I don't think it is an abrupt unexplained break in that sense.

03:08 PRAYAS Right. I mean that's what seemed like a simple that's what seemed obvious to me, but maybe I'm missing describing some maybe Satya you were there yesterday, maybe if you want to open it up like we were puzzled yesterday. So maybe

03:35 SATYA I was just thinking about it and I'm thinking of it in terms of a song. And sometimes in compositions you have a part which is called a break, at least in Western style, and sometimes there's transition, sometimes it's referred to as a transition. So within the context of a composition, which could be anything, it could be a script, a screenplay, whatever. Whatever it is, the

actors are not stepping out of the script. So in any case it's a change of some kind. So even if it's the way I'm looking at it, even a break is also a transition. It's an inflection point, which like Malavika said, there is a narrative going on and that narrative and it fits into the entire narrative. So I don't know if that's how we are looking at a break or if you mean by break as the art actor actually stepping out of the story, which was also like how Lawrence had given the example of the Doll's House where the character steps out of the story, but then again she doesn't. That is part of the story. Even though it is left hanging for the viewer to decide what happened, but still the n the script is still the script, right? I mean the composition is still the composition.

04:54 PRAYAS Right. I mean so how I saw what Lawrence described as a break and how he gave examples of what a narrative break would be. I saw it as a as a transition, like you're describing it. And so I was actually failing to understand yesterday how any construct any construct could tolerate a break because the break is in that sense the end of the construct. It's the it's where it ceases.

05:32 SATYA Right, which and then I'm thinking if you step out into the meta where the author of that script has decided this is going to end here and then starts a new story altogether different, is that a break?

05:52 MALAVIKA (?) Or are you looking at break as a pause? You know, like something that

06:00 L like a separator in a continuous sequence, whether it's a story or something. So you have a pause. So you have something that separates one scene from another.

06:14 MALAVIKA (?) But it's still within the same script, right?

06:18 MALAVIKA (?) Sorry?

06:19 I'm sorry, it is still within the same story. I mean, what I'm seeing you what you just said, what I'm seeing is volume one, volume two, volume three like that of the same story continuing.

06:31 Yes.

06:34 PRAYAS I mean I think we are all talking of a similar notion of a of break as a transition point today, but maybe yesterday what Lawrence was talking about was I mean I couldn't grasp it fully, but I'm making some assumptions here. What I believe he was talking about was maybe the tangents of potentiality which that exist in the transition points which

07:17 Which seem like they can go either way.

07:22 SATYA Right, which is yeah. And so you're leaving the question up to whoever it is that is not the actor to imagine those tangents, which way could it go? Is that where you're

07:34 PRAYAS So for the viewer, for the for someone who is essentially consuming the experience.

07:43 Yeah.

07:44 There would still be that anxiety. So in the sense if there's someone holding a gun up to someone and threatening to shoot, the audience is going to be anxious about whether with the sh the actor will really shoot or not.

08:10 I mean the author knows that oh this actor is okay, this actor won't shoot right now. But the viewer the audience doesn't know.

08:21 Yeah.

08:22 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

08:24 But how is this connected to

08:28 The side of this is

08:31 PRAYAS So

08:34 I mean the s surrogate surface we in Surrogate Surfaces one of the basic fundamental questions which we are trying to address is the relationship between the actor and the act. And all the I think the folds and details and all of that of this relationship which you know whatever that is. So one part of this relationship very for me is

09:06 Is understanding whether it...

09:11 It ever ends or it's continuous across different acts. So, you know, one actor can play different acts.

09:23 Now

09:24 MALAVIKA (?) Essentially at the same time.

09:28 PRAYAS No, but as a transition from one act to the other

09:31 MALAVIKA Oh.

09:33 PRAYAS Do I basically have a interruption? Do I have an interrupt or do I glide, do I transition into the into acts as I you know as I go along? So is the is the overall act in that sense continuous or is it with breaks? Is it punctuated by you know these kind of blackout moments?

10:03 SATYA See me, if we look at it from outside th then as the viewer, then maybe you can say, Okay, this I went to see this play, then I went to see another play another day, so there's a break in between. The actor was playing here, then he or she played in the next one. I can see that as a break, but I'm unable to see how break can happen I mean again, it's the definition of break, but I can't see how a break can happen within it so to me it seems like a transition. Like the actors just actually

10:33 PRAYAS Think if yeah as Lawrence is not there today I think we can we can leave the leave the point of the break within the same act. I mean I think at this point most all of us are maybe agreeing to see that break as a transition and leave it at that. But I would still

11:01 SATYA (?) If you go to the question, do acts transition or are they interrupted and replaced?

11:09 PRAYAS Yeah. So I mean I'm here I'm talking about the different acts that the same actor is playing. So the so I'm g because let's say we accept that within the same act the narrative points where the shifts happen, let's say we can s look at them as transitions, but

11:41 What happens when the acts themselves change? So if the if an actor is playing X today and playing Y tomorrow.

11:54 PRAYAS (?) Right.

12:00 So that's something like being interrupted and replaced.

12:03 And why o also? [?] Yeah. Yeah.

12:12 SATYA So I mean, it seems like both i if I just look at the question, it feels like both are possible.

12:21 So if I were to analyze transition, we spoke about transition. There is inflection points within one s screenplay or script or whatever and the actor is acting according to that script or else the other thing is also possible where they are playing one act but the grid changes or the circumstances change so now they have to put on a new role according to the change.

12:48 PRAYAS Yeah.

12:54 So in the in the second situation, I mean even when the acts change, so when X becomes Y

13:04 Yeah.

13:05 The actor is in a way being the continuous link between X and Y, right? I mean

13:13 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, correct.

13:15 So I don't know if it's possible to keep X and Y separate in a very distinct

13:26 Way in a very absolute way because

13:33 My memories as an actor, my memories of putting on the X Act are going to affect my the way I put on the Y Act.

13:45 SATYA Or if you're a really good actor then that won't affect. Like if you're playing a doctor one day and the next day you're a I don't know, I poor example but

13:56 MALAVIKA The it the a lot of it depends on skill. So I'm and sorry I'm looking at the question again it acts do transition because they are interrupted or replaced. So the interruption

14:17 Allows for the transition.

14:21 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

14:22 So whether it's a break or you know, a smooth smoother transition or you know, you morph one character that slowly changes through the script and turns into another, there is still a transition. And finally yeah, you do find that something is re is replaced. So you the replacing can't be avoided because you're also taking time.

14:49 SATYA Right, so you're saying everything is a transition, right?

14:53 MALAVIKA Yeah, anything that is factored by time will h have a transition. You can't have a constant in that sense. I don't see unless the

15:09 I don't know. I think you can't have that kind of a constant because even the time is changing.

15:16 SATYA Yeah, I tend to see that also like

15:21 PRAYAS I mean the vehicle the let's say the

15:25 The body, the vessel.

15:26 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, the body, the actor. The actor is in that sense

15:34 A continuous continuously carrying forward the ability. So I mean and I think what you were talking about skill of the skill of maybe being able to forget the acts that you have performed before.

15:53 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

15:55 SATYA (?) I'm not sure if

15:57 You don't have to forget though, right? I mean you have it's there, but you know that you have to you're playing something else, so that doesn't matter.

16:07 PRAYAS Yeah, it doesn't matter. So it might not percolate through the conscious you know through the performance of the attributes of Y, but you know it's like if I know something I can't unknow it, right? So

16:33 SATYA (?) If I have played

16:37 PRAYAS Yeah, so if I have performed a criminal before and if I'm now a let's say a law enforcement officer of some kind

16:50 Then at least the continuity that the audience will force through the knowledge that this is the same actor

17:02 I'm not sure will it whether it'll happen in the audience's frame or I don't know where it'll happen, but

17:13 SATYA So there are various perspectives, right? And I think I thought we were going to I don't know why I assumed that we'd be focusing on the actors' perspective.

17:26 But do if you if you

17:28 Looking at the act itself.

17:32 MALAVIKA Because I was just thinking that you can have an actor transition and w especially when you speak of memory. So an actor may have the memory, but the acts are independent of each other. So in that sense, if I think of the script of the script

17:57 You know, a character in a script does not necessarily know or need to know or the act of that character does not need to be aware of its channel, that is the actor or who is going to be playing it and so in that sense the memory doesn't come into play within the script. It only f the memory is only with the actor.

18:25 SATYA And the audience.

18:27 SATYA (?) Yes.

18:28 MALAVIKA (?) Yeah.

18:30 PRAYAS I mean so Satya I don't know if we can in the case of acting, I'm not sure if the we can limit it to the perspective of just the actor because the act is always for somebody's benefit.

18:47 SATYA Okay, I mean even the actor can be their own audience. I could see that. I mean, n for I'm I for some reason it I got stuck in the perspective of the actor and now I'm pulling myself out of it after hearing you both

19:00 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I'm trying to say that the actor is a is a reflec is a reflexive being who in the sense calibrates the act based on the perception of the audience which is in a way sensed in a very subtle or in a in an unarticulated way in a in a

19:30 SATYA I mean if you're a good actor, I mean not all actors necessarily take into account that feedback. But if you're a good actor you would do that, yeah.

19:40 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean at least you know when the gaze of attention, the attentive gaze is there on you and y and it and it's absent. She so you know the difference between the two. You know when the audience has slipped away and you know when it's there.

19:58 SATYA (?) Hopefully, yeah.

20:06 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

20:10 You want to move to the next question?

20:13 PRAYAS So the second trigger is that if we consider surrogacy as an extension of the self, so it's the self is one layer and a superimposed another, then which is the act, then the self is an and the and we consider the self to be an enactive routine as well. So which layer of the persona is the host and which is the guest?

20:45 MALAVIKA So why assume that the self is an enacted routine?

20:54 PRAYAS I mean you can disagree with that. I mean I'm just it's a trigger, yeah. It's something which I'm putting let's say here in our in our in our shared space and we can we can rip that statement apart if

21:17 PRAYAS (?) Yes.

21:21 SATYA I feel like the self is unknowable, the true self, therefore any self is a construct.

21:31 PRAYAS Right. I mean in the sense that's my understanding as well. So I mean if you if we if you can never know

21:42 Who you are except in the way that the story that you make up

21:48 [unclear]

21:49 SATYA Or we do know who we are but we cannot access it or articulate it. So

21:59 Because

22:00 PRAYAS Yeah and we know only that which we articulate and know, right? So in the sense so for practical purposes what is not accessible for articulation or f or for knowing is not there.

22:19 SATYA Yeah. But Malavika, do you have a different view of it, of the self?

22:28 MALAVIKA Wondering because

22:30 Was I think the awareness of the self is both knowing it and not knowing it. So it

22:41 Yeah.

22:41 We can't if because if we narrow it down to oh only what we know of ourselves because we are also aware of what we don't know about of ourselves. And that is also a kind of knowing to some extent. The degrees would of course vary. And so if I mean to get to the question of therefore which becomes the host or the guest or which part of the persona is highlighted at different points of time is it's really hard to kind of filter out and

23:23 SATYA So it's like the host can be the guest and the guest can be the host.

23:27 Yes.

23:27 Are feeding into each other.

23:30 MALAVIKA Yeah, and it they're actually nice words though the host and the guest because we can play both parts.

23:39 SATYA (?) Right.

23:43 PRAYAS You know, but our everyday experien our everyday experience is that we are able to distinguish between our different acts and what we come back to. You know, so

23:58 Yeah.

23:59 We fall back upon and what we

24:04 MOSES SAM (?) You know can play out.

24:06 SATYA (?) If we agree on that, like if we agree that what you just said, Prayas, about what we fall back upon, if we consider that as the self.

24:16 Okay.

24:16 You know, I'm home and you know, I'm in my pajamas or whatever, that's the self. And I step out and that's the host, the guest or whatever. Not the guest, sorry. The act.

24:29 PRAYAS Yeah. So the guest in that sense, yeah.

24:31 SATYA Right. So maybe if we I mean, maybe it would be useful to take that as the baseline and discuss from there, perhaps?

24:39 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean and what we fall back upon is of course is a construct like we were talking earlier. So it's not really that we fall back upon on some version of the truth or anything. It's if we fall back upon a set of habits or a set of set of comfortable attributes of you know doing stuff that we the way we do it.

25:07 Yeah.

25:08 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

25:09 MALAVIKA (?) So

25:12 MOSES SAM Can I add something?

25:13 PRAYAS Yeah, please.

25:15 MOSES SAM Alright. listening to what Malavika and Satya were saying so the self from how I see it's you know what we express out the subset of what we know about ourselves and that's the express. So which is again another subset of the subset that comes from the superset of what we know about ourselves, right? So let's you know like think about it this way. So let's say you are in a small co confined space, but then a small city, let's say Singapore, right? And then you are involved in a startup community over there. And so what you do over there, and since it's a very small you know forty kilometer thing, what you do over there becomes your reputation kind of thing, right? And if you fuck it up, then there's always you know there's India, there's other places in the world where you go. And then you create your own self again. And it depends on how you iterate or how you want others to perceive yourself, right? So if that's the case, then this host and guest thing, we can't really say if the self projects the guest or the surrogate surface or the surrogate surface controls itself, you know. I don't know which is stronger.

26:38 SATYA Let me interrupt there and say so suppose I'm a serial killer and I'm in Singapore and I move now elsewhere because people are after me. I'm still a serial killer because I still have those instincts psychopathic or whatever. So that self is still remaining, it's still constant, right?

26:55 MOSES SAM Okay, so then we are coming to the debate of nature versus nurture thing. So there are certain qualities that we get through nature which we really can't change, right? So if that's what you call a self, which I think is a very small part of how we behave in the real world.

27:13 SATYA No, but I'm not even saying nature nurture. I'm saying that there is this person who I come home, I let down my hair and I'm sitting. That person you know, in Singapore also it doesn't matter, like even if we remove the nature nurture, you know, there's one fallback that I fall back upon and call that as the comfortable self.

27:35 SATYA (?) Even if it changes a little bit if I change my environment.

27:39 MOSES SAM Right. But do you think that's constant? Don't you think that varies over time, you know, based on the knowledge you accumulate and stuff?

27:45 SATYA Agree. I do agree that it changes. Okay. But what I'm saying is maybe we should I mean this is my I'm just thinking aloud, maybe we shouldn't try to define what that self is, but then try to unders try to take it as a scheme that we

28:03 MOSES SAM Yeah, I'm not trying to define self, I'm trying to understand the relationship between the self and the surrogate surface or the projectile thing that we are you know showing out.

28:13 SATYA Right. Right. That's what I'm saying, yeah.

28:15 Okay.

28:17 MALAVIKA So what are we looking at as an act, especially when we're look if we're talking of the self because the way I see it, whatever one does is y I mean you do it as yourself, you know,

you're not assuming another persona unless you are really in an act. You're performing as another character.

28:41 PRAYAS No so the idea of the self is like Sam said not a consistent idea, right? In the sense even if you fall back upon a familiar and an and a known a known layer of our persona that we call our self, even if you fall back upon that layer, there is there are there are ruptures in that in that familiarity and those are the extensions of the self. And those extensions are in more elaborate forms you know, they become the surrogate surfaces.

29:31 NEHA You give birth to a new adult? Yes, I do. [?]

29:37 NEHA (?) I under

29:39 Oh deep. [?]

29:40 Hi.

29:42 PRAYAS Yes, yeah, we can switch camera off, yeah.

29:46 SPEAKER 6 Yeah, I don't know if it's

29:50 NEHA I'm listening, I'm listening, come.

29:54 PRAYAS Yeah it's the c okay, we'll right. So what we were talking about yeah, so the extension of that the f that familiar pattern becomes the surrogate surface. And that's what we're talking about, Malavika. So

30:15 MALAVIKA I'm asking you where that l boundary of extension lies. I mean, what when do you call it an extension? I mean, how do you define that extension?

30:25 MALAVIKA (?) I mean for me.

30:26 SATYA (?) Sorry. Sorry.

30:28 Go ahead, Sam.

30:29 MOSES SAM Right, okay. So when you fall back, the surface that you're falling back to isn't the same as the previous one, then it becomes a surrogate surface.

30:42 SATYA Okay. The way I'm looking at surrogate surface is if I put on an act, I am a psychopath but then I try to blend in with society by being this very polite person. So I'm putting on an act to me that's a surrogate surface.

30:58 MOSES SAM (?) Right. So then

31:02 NEHA (?) So you're saying any activity you put on then anything that you do it you know intent that is not you.

31:09 SATYA Yes, that's how I was looking at it, like and i it I don't want to use too ex to say even, you know, if you go if we go to a theatre, we as theatre goers or a to the opera and you know, I put on these clothes and I behave in a particular way, I t turn off my cell phone. Even this is a sort of an act which you know, that's how I'm looking at it.

31:36 MALAVIKA So are you looking at acts as being something that is kind of structured by a social expectation?

31:49 SATYA I either social expectation or me having an expectation of myself. You're right. I mean it is built by social as well as me thinking that if I am with that so and so person I want to behave in this manner. But yeah. It is feeding both ways.

32:09 PRAYAS Yeah, so I mean I would just like to clarify and then move on to so if we are

32:35 Okay. So if we are you know by ourselves and then we get talking to somebody then we are already constructing an idea of who we might be in that in the other person's

32:55 No.

32:56 Mind. And we get to know of those constructions through of course the

33:03 The response that we get from the other person might which might be through the through the behaviour or through the res you know the conversation that we have or how the other person chooses to continue what we you know start constructing.

33:32 PRAYAS (?) No?

33:34 So the moment we start talking to somebody else we are already mounting a surrogate surface because we are mounting a construction of ourselves in their in their mind in that sense.
33:46 Okay.
33:47 PRAYAS (?) Trying to do that.
33:48 MALAVIKA (?) Okay, so you're basically trying to say that the self and i the extension would most likely begin when you have another person, when there's an interaction or there's another in individual involved. And only when the self is alone or, you know, w without
34:10 PRAYAS Yeah, I'm giving that as an as a simple example. So just to put it out there s from a simple interaction, a social interaction
34:23 Right.
34:23 From there the surrogacy would start because we are already extending the idea of who we might be into the idea of who we can potentially be as far as what that person the other person thinks of thinks of us.
34:41 NEHA Right.
34:47 PRAYAS (?) So there is a social element.
34:52 Yeah because
34:56 If we are
34:59 If we are constructing the what we are holding on to, I mean the sense of the familiar layer of our persona, the our ourself or whatever. If we're doing that through our through our memory and our ability to recall. So as soon as we get another memory which is memory escape [?] which is distinct from that, which is you know like at this point we are having our shared you know our shared capacities to remember pool together here. And each of us will remember this conversation in a different way once it's over. But so there is the there itself starts you know, there is a potential of mounting a construction, of mounting a surrogacy, because it starts with the memory, in the sense if you if I'm going to remember something differently, then I can construct it differently.
36:08 MALAVIKA (?) Right.
36:12 PRAYAS So what determines the distance between the self and the surrogate surface?
36:21 MALAVIKA But did you say what defines the diff the distance?
36:25 MOSES SAM Yeah. What determines the distance? What defines?
36:33 PRAYAS So I maybe to begin with, it could be the memory that surface r resides in. You know, if so if
36:46 If dif if by default the idea of myself resides in my mind, in my memory
36:55 And the idea of who you know me as resides in your memory.
37:00 PRAYAS (?) Right.
37:01 MOSES SAM (?) So the distance between
37:05 PRAYAS The construct of th myself and my mind and the one in your mind is so there the distance between those two
37:17 Is the distance between us
37:22 MALAVIKA (?) But the presence of another memory or another person would be needed.
37:28 Right.
37:29 Unless you assume that see there that's where you can assume another presence, you know, like we were talking in the last sessions about thinking of another perspective. You don't necessarily need another person to show you y once sometimes experience offers you enough perspective so you know how to step aside and look at things from another point of view. So is that possible?
37:58 MALAVIKA (?) In this case as well.
38:01 PRAYAS Right. I mean I would think that we can assume the other because like we were talking earlier, the a each act is for the benefit of someone. So there is an audience and
38:21 And I think

38:22 SATYA Sam's question was what was the what determines the distance between the self and that construction for the audience?

38:31 SATYA (?) Right.

38:32 Which is interesting. And it feels like it the distance is determined by the self's construction of the audience's perception.

38:45 MOSES SAM Oh what this construction of

38:49 MOSES SAM (?) The self in the sense the ideal self.

38:55 SATYA The what self?

38:55 MOSES SAM (?) But the ideal self, you know, the theoretical idea everyone has their own notion of where you want to be, right? And that projection.

39:12 So that determines the distance and each act is taking us one step closer to that ideal self, I guess.

39:19 PRAYAS (?) No, how but how do the acts take us closer to the idea of the self? I miss that connection.

39:28 MALAVIKA (?) I don't think he's saying idea of the self, he's c tal talking of an ideal. An ideal self.

39:33 PRAYAS Yeah, but how do our acts take us closer to the ideal self?

39:39 SATYA Acts are ma access [?] and practice gives us new data points, so they could give us a new insight about our own ideal self. So in that sense it could be a way to take you towards the ideal self. But I don't know if that's what we are talking about here.

39:56 PRAYAS (?) No, right. So what Sam is s what Sam what you're saying Sam is that the host we c we get to know the host through the guest.

40:10 SATYA (?) I would imagine so.

40:12 SATYA (?) Yeah.

40:13 PRAYAS Oh that's the so that's I think that's something to hold on to.

40:21 And which all which is also leaving us at a point where we can move to our next trigger which is that if the actor has no insight, right? So and there is no subconscious to analyze.

40:39 All that there is the flat surface of the act.

40:47 SATYA Which is actually an interesting transition from the earlier point of determining the ideal self. So you're actually when you say a flat surface, it means that there is no knowledge of the ideal self or any that an ideal self exists even.

41:05 PRAYAS (?) Yeah, because we know of the act only what through o only through what is being enacted. We actually can't peer into the mind of the actor and assume attributes of the act because that would basically lay it open to all kinds of speculation.

41:43 MOSES SAM (?) I missed something. So did you guys conclude that the ideal self in itself is a surrogate surface? Is that what we're talking about?

41:51 PRAYAS No, so the third trigger is that okay, the actor has no inside and so there is no subconscious to analyze.

42:03 PRAYAS (?) Right.

42:04 And all that there exists is the flat surface of the act.

42:09 PRAYAS (?) Mm.

42:09 PRAYAS (?) So

42:10 MOSES SAM The thing is the projection, I don't think the projection is the surrogate, the projection is the self at that point in time. And the and the previous data point that you have left to come to this point, that's the surrogate surface. The that's how I see it. You know, it's the flip side of what we have been working out till now.

42:37 SATYA Interesting. So you're saying that whatever is interacting is the self. What was in the back? Yeah.

42:46 PRAYAS So you are saying that this moment

42:49 PRAYAS (?) Mm-

42:49 PRAYAS (?) But this the current the currentness of the moment defines the self

42:55 MOSES SAM (?) Right.

42:58 PRAYAS Okay.

43:01 SATYA Don't you have to be aware of it? Like you have to be very mindful of yourself to be in that kind of

43:11 MOSES SAM Yeah, I think we are doing that involuntarily. Like we are our mind convince ourselves that this is ourself at this point in time. Only then we can put on that act you know, convincingly.

43:23 MOSES SAM (?) Right.

43:25 SATYA So there is an act being put on but there is also the self there.

43:29 SATYA (?) Right.

43:32 MOSES SAM I mean so the distance between the act and the self is zero at that point, as in as in like some people understand okay, this is an act and this is something different. Whereas most people most people's mind tricks them into thinking that this is the self and the previous data point is the surrogate, you know, you're left that behind.

43:55 PRAYAS I mean I w I would actually like to agree with you.

43:58 MOSES SAM Mm. Okay. Good.

44:02 Finally. I think I can die now.

44:05 MOSES SAM (?) Company [?], Prayas.

44:08 PRAYAS No, because the my experience of acting in that sense and you know the intensity which one feels when one is acting

44:23 Actually remind is reminding me of what you are saying that you know so when one is acting one feels very close to what one might be.

44:36 PRAYAS (?) -huh.

44:37 SATYA (?) Oh, that's interesting.

44:39 SATYA (?) Yeah, it's true.

44:41 PRAYAS So the and that is not something that one can hold for very long. So that is tiring in that sense it drains you out. But I can relate to what you're saying that and I think that's a very for me that's a very no novel formulation of the you know the surrogate and the self because yeah it kind of shakes it shakes these ideas out of their kind of static positions and makes it a much more dynamic kind of

45:22 [unclear]

45:25 NEHA (?) Pulls them sets them into motion.

45:29 PRAYAS Yeah.

45:31 SATYA (?) Yeah.

45:33 MALAVIKA (?) No.

45:35 Cases where people depersonalize, you know, where they

45:44 I mean there is this idea of the body and what you body and the mind, but you know, you don't you dissociate yourself from your own body, you know, that kind of

45:59 MALAVIKA (?) Do you think a similar thing plays out?

46:06 SATYA (?) Feel like you're actually not really there but you're acting you're only an actor who's residing in this body.

46:15 MALAVIKA There's a complete disconnect, yes, between what is felt and what is perceived or thought or imagined.

46:28 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean the that again is something which I can verif that I can confirm that yeah, that happens to me at least, you know. So what I feel in my head and what I see in the mirror sometimes don't match up.

46:48 SATYA That's so true. And like you might make a plan that I'm going to act in this way, but when you start acting, it doesn't really go the way you were thinking. Something else only happens.

46:59 PRAYAS Yeah, the I mean the dissoci association between the body and the idea that you hold of yourself. I don't know what that is actually, but I don't know what this dissociation is.

47:21 PRAYAS (?) It's a disorder for some people, but

47:24 MOSES SAM (?) It's sanity. That's what keeps us sane.

47:29 PRAYAS I mean y you're saying that the ability to delink, the ability to get lost in our in our minds is what keeps us sane.

47:42 SATYA It could all but the other way is that actually you're detaching yours the observer. There is an observer inside who's observing. So the observer has detached. So you're actually able to make more objective sort of thoughts, like decisions maybe. Or observations of yourself.

48:02 PRAYAS I mean I would like to maybe think of this dissociation as a kind of dissatisfaction, you know, or as an act of a as a as an incompletion. So when

48:17 In a way I'm not fully happy with everything that is current.

48:25 PRAYAS (?) One way for me to

48:29 Come to terms with that is carve out from this currentness one you know one entity. Yeah, which I'm kind of okay with and

48:49 And letting whatever hangs out be some kind of

48:57 PRAYAS (?) Self alien alienating kind of entity.

49:05 SATYA I mean it could also be that it could also be that space that you've carved out is actually the awareness or i mean it's not negative but more positive too, where you're deliberately detaching yourself from your reality to observe it and to become more aware.

49:30 PRAYAS Awareness is a more is a more integrative

49:35 Yeah.

49:36 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

49:37 MALAVIKA That's how I understand it. And I see dissociation as something that's moving away from that awareness or where there is a lapse in awareness.

49:51 SATYA (?) I mean like J. Krishnamurti used to say something I can't quote very well, but he says something about the observer, you know, and so you actually we are observing ourselves all the time anyway, but then if you become aware of the observer and the observed, you get a better sense of what's happening. So in a way it's actually empowering rather than taking you away from and what is trying to be discovered.

50:25 So it's like yesterday Lawrence was saying about that little critic.

50:30 So if we don't take that critic as somebody who's blogging [?] me all the time, but that critic as somebody who's giving a running commentary of what is happening.

50:43 PRAYAS Yeah, but who is this observer? Who is this critic?

50:49 SATYA (?) Yeah. I don't know if that's the self or if it is some part of my self or

51:03 PRAYAS I mean I don't know if it's a necessary feature.

51:10 Of one's composition, you know, this observer. It's only you can observe it as a symptom sometimes. But

51:22 SATYA I mean I personally think of it as a interesting it's not necessary, but it is useful. I find it useful.

51:30 PRAYAS (?) But don't you think it adds to the noise?

51:34 SATYA Not always. I mean it's a matter of management.

51:38 You had enough voices, you manage which ones you want to hear.

51:44 PRAYAS (?) But wouldn't you be able to for example, you know, do m do more things which are inconsistent with the

51:57 Idea of yourself, if you didn't have this commentary, if you didn't have the observer.

52:02 SATYA (?) Not necessarily. I can make friends with the observer and we can tell each other, okay, do you want to do this today or do you want to do that?

52:14 SATYA (?) Yeah.

52:14 SATYA (?) I don't know if control is a good thing or not, but that's what Krishnamurti says. It's not about judgment, it is or control. It is just about observation. I don't know, again, I don't know if it's a useful discussion to go into, so

52:35 PRAYAS But we are we are talking about this disassociation and the commentary or the critic. we are talking about all of these things as parallels, right? As similar notions, right? Or are they different things?

52:55 MALAVIKA (?) No, because of this thing of the trigger which says the actor has no insight and so when there's no subconscious

53:06 So we had

53:09 Okay.

53:09 Well, something

53:11 That is singular without a dependence on another to function.

53:19 MALAVIKA (?) Right.

53:20 So and I looked at it in terms of a body mind connect and where you know if you if the mind had to just function without the body, so articulates the act.

53:40 PRAYAS (?) What is what contains the act?

53:45 PRAYAS (?) The enactment.

53:47 MALAVIKA (?) So the actor has to enact. So how will the actor enact?

53:52 PRAYAS No the act is enacted by the actor

54:02 But then the I mean the enactment is the only final surface of experience. So there which has doesn't have any

54:14 Any insight, so to say.

54:18 SATYA So are we saying that there has to be an insight?

54:22 PRAYAS (?) No, the trigger says that the actor has no insight.

54:26 PRAYAS (?) Yeah.

54:27 PRAYAS (?) Because

54:29 Mm-

54:30 I'm not able to visualize the actor as having two layers to the to the act, one which is

54:40 NEHA Yeah.

54:41 PRAYAS One which is being sh revealed as and one which is being hidden.

54:48 PRAYAS (?) Right. So

54:48 SATYA And which is kind of what Sam was also saying where

54:53 NEHA Okay.

54:54 SATYA The seven. [?]

54:55 SATYA (?) Yeah.

54:56 Separate things.

54:59 NEHA (?) Mm-

55:01 SATYA I'm not misquoting him very badly.

55:09 NEHA Probably.

55:13 MALAVIKA Actually what I understood from what Sam said was that the point of enactment becomes the self. Is it's what holds the self.

55:22 SATYA Right. And which is kind of Prayas what Prayas was saying just now about the enactment being the act. Okay, so the enactment is the act, not the self.

55:39 PRAYAS Yeah, I mean I what I could appreciate in what Sam said was how he juxtaposed in a way and made it functionally you know distinguished the sur the surrogate and the self by set-

ting by putting both these in one in the currentness and one which is which has passed. Or one which is yeah, so

56:12 So that does sound like a trend.

56:14 The self.

56:15 Right. I'm sorry. That so that does sound like there is no insight. Whatever is here, the actor has no insight. Whatever is here is here. That's the currentness.

56:26 Right. So if the if the actor has no inside, then there is no

56:36 Point in actually in thinking about the critic's voice or the

56:43 SATYA Yeah, exactly. That's right.

56:44 PRAYAS Commentary because that's not revealed, right? And so what is not revealed is not known.

56:53 SATYA Yes, that's right. Which is why I was thinking like this is a useless point to go to.

56:59 PRAYAS I mean for me I ca actually I can't relate to that so much also because sometimes I'm able to float out of you know the presence of the commentary or the or the observer, right? So sometimes it's just very silent and it's very blank where there is no the critic is really absent in the sense

57:35 PRAYAS (?) Okay.

57:36 That I feel free.

57:39 SATYA I feel like I feel like I think I must have I feel like I misinter misrepresented observer. The observer is not a critic. now that I think about it, the observer is just there. It's not doing anything. It's just see it's just watching. So if I floated above everything, I'm just watching.

58:03 PRAYAS (?) It's not judgmental, it's just there.

58:07 SATYA (?) But again, it's probably not useful in this context.

58:11 PRAYAS No, it's I think the observer in a in a very in a in a common thinking of it as a in a very common framework, I could maybe put the observer and the audience on a similar kind of platform as in

58:38 Because we are not thinking we are trying we are trying to think of the actor as not having an inside anyway. So it doesn't matter if you place the observer I mean where else can it be? Because if there is no insight

58:58 Yeah.

58:58 Where else could it be if not looking at us, right? So

59:07 SATYA (?) So it's not inside, it's outside. And that's how what Malavika's saying about detachment, the two dissociation.

59:15 SATYA (?) Metric, [?] that's how the image is coming to me now.

59:22 PRAYAS (?) Right. Okay. I had misinterpreted what Malavika had said had said earlier. Okay, now I get it.

59:36 So I we conclude the day two of Surrogate Surfaces here and we'll be live again tomorrow at nine PM Indian time. Thanks everyone for joining in.

59:55 MALAVIKA (?) Thank you.

59:55 MALAVIKA (?) Thank you, bye.

59:56 PRAYAS Thank you. Bye.