

Plenary discussion

Discussant: Tim Ingold

Tim Ingold (TI): Okay, this is a bit challenging, there are so many thoughts flying around which I'm very grateful for, it's been a great day. I noted a list of things and they're not in a very logical order but I wanted to start with consciousness because I was recently reading William James and he has this lovely view of concepts or experiences as sort of chunky things with very frayed edges, with lines that go off in all sorts of directions and there's one article in which he draws an example, he'd been to a museum, an ethnographic museum and had seen a shrunken head from the Dyak people, I think somewhere in South East Asia and this shrunken head had lots of appendages coming out of it, sort of charms and bits of string and things flying out in all directions and he said, "That's what experience is like", it's like a Dyak shrunken head with some sort of a nucleus, a lump, a rather lumpy thing and then with lots and lots of strands coming off, and these strands can be much, much longer than the nucleus and they get all tangled up with one another, in some sort of space that we inhabit and that maybe one should call that space consciousness.

And so when people are talking about the flow of consciousness, I'm not at all sure about this idea of flow and I'm almost thinking that we need to maybe make what sounds like a hair splitting distinction, between flow and flux and the reason I say that is because standard mechanics and physics talks about the solid, the fluid and the gaseous as simply alternative states of matter, but that classification which we're all very familiar with, starts from an assumption that matter basically consists of particles suspended in space and whether it's a solid, a fluid or a gas, depends on the tightness of the chemical bonds between these particles.

The opposite would be to say that's not how matter is constituted, the opposite is to say we live in a continuous matter world, that's to say that the world we inhabit is itself a plenum and the things that we recognise in it including, because we don't want to make a distinction between mind and matter here, things like thoughts and people and minds and so on, are folds or crumples, spaces of crumple in this continuum and if we thought like that, then we would have to say that consciousness is a word for this plenum and that our thoughts, our cells, our minds are rather like I think, clouds in the sky and you think of a cloud, it's not an object hanging in the sky, unless you're a stage director on a set, "put a cloud here" and you hang it up but in the real world, clouds are not hanging in the sky, they're actually folds, crumpled folds in this mass of air which happen to be full of moisture and so they look a bit grey compared with the blue sky, so that you imagine the sky as this plenum, this plenum of air which is then flowing and getting crumpled and sometimes there are walls in it, as glider pilots know, if you happen to hit a rising thing, it's like hitting a brick wall and quite dangerous, so it's a very structured kind of space.

And I wondered what if I were to think about consciousness like that, it wouldn't be a flow exactly but it would be thinking of consciousness as something that is in flux, and in a sense as the ocean in which we swim and I felt that there was a tension during our discussions today, between one way of thinking about consciousness which was sort of like that, that we inhabit a world of consciousness, just as much we inhabit the earth and the sky, versus the idea that consciousness is this thing we have, that it's somehow inside us.

Those positions give rise to very different, maybe it has to be both, maybe we switch between the two rather than having to say it's one or the other but I did notice that we were going backwards and forwards.

One corollary of thinking about consciousness in the it's something inside us

way, is that we end up with this idea that it exists as a kind of vertical column, with consciousness or maybe even a super consciousness at the top and unconsciousness or sub consciousness at the bottom, as though in our mental life, we go up and we go down.

I'm pretty much convinced myself that this is a very bad metaphor and for that reason, I really don't like all this talk about the unconscious, I don't think that there's some kind of deep down sediment that comes up, I don't think that when we dream, this sediment is sort of erupting through the surface of our waking life, I don't think that's the right, I mean you can argue about it but I feel that somehow, this metaphor has been derailing us for some time.

And actually, I think we got some of the reason why because when you start talking about columns like that, with things being above and below and this sort of architectonic image, then you can't help bringing in the notion of foundations. There are foundations on which this column stands and we heard this morning that we should stop thinking in terms of foundations, if we're going to get at the sorts of things we're trying to get at, then the first thing we have to do is to at least complicate, disrupt or even remove these foundations all together and think of ourselves not as standing on some solid base, but as somehow desperately hanging onto one another in order to find some kind of stability, so a better image might be sea ocean creatures, trying to hold on against the force of the waves and the tides in order to stay put, maybe some rock dwelling shelf fish or something, that in order to keep going, you have to hang on, either to one another or to elements of the sub-strait because we're in this tidal flow of conscious existence.

And in that case too, I wonder about liminality, we sometimes talk about this reverie as some kind of liminal state and I'm always bothered about the concept of liminality because it always makes it sound as though we're half way across from A to B, we're going through a rite of passage, so I was a boy, I'm going to be a man and I'm in this funny stage in between being initiated or whatever's happening to me.

When we think of liminality, it's almost as though you're going across from here to there, so there's a big broad river with a firm bank on this side and a firm bank on that side but you've got to get across, but what if we said that really what we're talking about is life in the river, not going across but staying afloat within the river itself?

There's this wonderful image that I got from, others have got from Michel Serres when he's talking about, there's one perspective on a river, you could be standing on the bank on one side or the other but if you're a swimmer in the middle, that is almost unimaginable for people who haven't been swimming and standing on the bank, the fact that you have no foothold and the only way to keep afloat is to keep on swimming and you have to swim by, it's very hard to swim against the current, you're probably swimming along or at least diagonally, so for the swimmer, you hardly can see, you've lost sight of one bank, you've lost sight of the other bank and you're swimming along in a direction orthogonal to the direction of the line between the banks, and so I'm not sure when we're talking about reverie, whether we're thinking about it as a liminal stage half way between A and B or whether we're thinking about it as the experience of the swimmer who's actually going along.

But it does seem, I very much got the impression from what everybody is saying, that the condition we're talking about is one where, to a large extent, the rug is pulled out from under our feet and we are in a situation where in some sense, you have to keep afloat and to keep afloat, you can't stop, you can't stay put, again like the swimmer, if you just stop you'll sink so one has a necessary movement as to keeping going.

And that led to a question about, we had a discussion at some stage during the day about autonomy and what autonomy means, which was very interesting and it was very much tangled up in the discussion with the question of agency, which kept popping up or not, if you're autonomous, does that mean you have agency? If you weren't autonomous, you wouldn't have agency and so on?

There was a bit of a, not a disagreement actually but there were people who were saying, "I think autonomy means almost solitude, I'm on my own here and wrapped up in my bubble", and other people saying, "no, you can only be autonomous within a field of social relations of some kind, autonomy is really fundamentally relational, it's like having a position somewhere within a wider field".

I can't help feeling that there's probably no real opposition here in the sense that no being could ever be isolated in the sense of completely cut off, how could one exist except in a world of some kind, to exist as an autonomous being, one has to construct, create, grow a sense of identity, of singularity and you can only do that I think, through relations with others, so probably the two are mutually entailed but I do think that there's an issue about agency, people know that I hate the concept of agency and are tired of hearing me bang on about it.

But I think that if we are going to talk about agency then it can't be taken as an apriori state, it is something that is itself continually generated within the flow of action, it's not something that can come, you can put in advance of action, it's got to be something that one is, if one is maybe discovering, creating, generating autonomy within a flow of action, then it means that one is always, I hate this phrase always already but anyway, one is always already inside the action and many people spoke about this sense of losing oneself in the activity, of becoming, of what you'd normally call absorption, like the rock climber or the musician or the painter, completely absorbed in what they are doing and losing any kind of sense of who they are but because they're actually, but at the same time they're extremely concentrated so they're finding themselves in the midst of activity and I think this is really quite important, that theorists anyway up till now, have found it very hard to understand how it is possible to be extremely aware of oneself and totally committed to things, the activities and the surroundings one's doing at the same time, and that is because they've tended to think of consciousness always as reflexive self-consciousness rather than thinking of it in concentration, and concentration is quite different because to concentrate on something, your loop of perception and action is necessarily going outside, getting involved in the painting and coming back into it, so it's very sort of Batesonian in that sense, that one is talking about these loops that go out with concentration, loops that go out into the world and come back in again and yet you can be very concentrated and very aware.

Losing oneself in the activity, you're not actually, well you're losing maybe some sort of self-conscious, reflexive self-consciousness but you're certainly not losing concentration and those two things are different and I'm not sure whether we would have such a strong notion of reflexive self-consciousness if we didn't live in a mirror saturated world, I mean that Peter Sloterdijk has made this point, that for most of human history, when the only time you'd ever see your reflection is if you just happened to see yourself in the pond, which isn't very often, then this idea that self-consciousness is something that, where you reflect in on yourself would be quite, almost inconceivable and yet it's become foundational to the way in which we think about many of these things.

I've been hugely inspired, again as others know, by Erin Manning's writings on autism and where she's talking about how, the difference between an autistic person and the rest of us, accepting that actually we're all autistic to a degree, so not talking about people with autism and people without but people with different degrees of this, that for most of us, we slip very quickly into an understanding of what we see in the world around us, so okay, this is a table, we've got it straightaway, no problem, that's another person, this is a cup, we are perceiving the world visually, orally and so on but we very quickly slip into a recognition of what the things are that we're seeing and hearing and once we've got that, we then interact with others and with the world on that basis.

Most cognitive psychologists take that as the default assumption, that of course that's how we interact with the world, end of story but what autistic people are showing us is that that moment, that for us seems so short that we hardly notice it, is extended,

it's extended so far that maybe they never actually reach the sense of a settled sense of what that is, it's always edging into form, it's always on the verge of becoming something and so it's as though one is living in that sense of uncertainty that you never know exactly what something is, and Manning's point is that this is not some peculiar difficulty of autism, it's something we all live with to a degree but we tend to rather readily, most of us, rather readily suppress it.

But what if it's in that space that we find the true source of artistic creativity? What if it's in that space where things have not yet edged into form, where things are not yet conceptualised? Where you can move on from the joined up concepts, it's like going back to James, following those lines, those trails which haven't yet got settled into any sort of nucleus, if that's where ... is that actually what we've been talking about here?

And it raised in my mind another question that came up rather interestingly in discussion, through a contrast between two presentations, whether reverie is distal or proximal. We had one view that says that the thing about reverie is that it's dealing with memory and imagination, with what you might call longing, with things that are not yet or long ago or not yet but sort of that far away that we can't quite grasp them, but then the other view would be that actually it's all about bringing the world into a vivid presence, to a degree that would be denied as soon as we start fixing it in terms of concepts, that once we conceptualise everything up there, all sorted out but up to the point at which it's conceptualised, it is in our face, really coming at us and again maybe the answer is both, that we're talking about a world that is sort of coming in and out all the time.

It's terribly close, uncomfortably close and too far away to catch at the same time and I think many artists have written about this, about how the real terror of painting or whatever art form it is, is this sense that it's so close to you and yet so far away at the same time, how on earth can you then get it on canvas and maybe the answer is actually you can't and therefore that's why painters are full of angst because they never manage to succeed because they're doing something that if you think about it, is actually impossible to do.

And then we came to this question about surface and depth, I have to say since he's not here, that I found myself in profound disagreement with Professor Irving!

Amanda Ravetz (AR): That's not a surprise.

TI: Maybe that's predictable! But anyway, the issue was whether thought is beneath the surface or on the surface, whether people engage in a kind of interior dialogue with themselves that we, the rest of us can never know so he shows this picture of a few people walking a street, what the hell are they thinking? Of course, we don't know what they're thinking because we're not on the street and they're in a photograph, but probably if we were there and hearing them, we'd probably know about as much of what they're thinking as they do because most people haven't the faintest idea what they're thinking until somebody comes along and asks them what they're thinking, and then they're challenged to make up a story on the spot or they're told that they have to carry a microphone and tell what they're thinking all the time, it's quite hard work presumably to do that and most of us are not feeling that all the time.

And I do think that if we're going to say of paintings, that we should not think of a painting as a figure against a background, if we should think of a painting as something where maybe what looks, what immediately attracts us as the focus, a painting of some coloured shapes on a grey background, we're not supposed to think of those as shapes on a background, we're supposed to say, think that the painting is in the surface, not on it, well then if that's how we think about paintings, why do we then go and talk about the mind as though it had surface bits and deep bits and back into the column of consciousness? We should be thinking about the mind in exactly the same way too and recognising that it's actually, that surfaces themselves are not divisions between inner and outer, but places where the inside and the outside

come together in wonderfully rich and textured ways and when we interact with one another face to face, why it's the fact that we see and the face is a surface of a kind of and it's an extraordinarily rich and expressive surface precisely because it is not a barrier, a boundary between the atmosphere or whatever out there and the mind in here but because it's a place where these two things, what is inside and outside, actually come together.

Some of us here have been reading the work of Lars on surfaces and this is particularly inspiring in this regard because he's talking about John Ruskin and John Ruskin's idea about the earth veil and how he's saying that the surface of the earth is not something that divides, you know, the sky up here from the earth down there but rather, the earth is coming up and the sky in geological processes, the sky is coming down in weathering and erosion and it's where the earth's [inaudible 00:09:25] is pushed out and the sky is pushing in and you get a texture where the two are not divided but come together and I think too, that would be the right way to think about a painting.

I've just got two more things which we talked about, one is about words and again, there was a tension between a view of the word, a rather academic view of the word I think, as something that will never ever be able to catch the richness of experience, there's a lot in academia, there's a lot of frustration with words because we feel that the way we use words in academia, just don't get it and we have to introduce other sorts of ways of trying to get, as people say, beneath the words because the words just give an explicit veneer on what is really embodied experience.

Another view would say that actually no, words at least in speech or in handwriting, are performed when I speak, I'm breathing too, I wouldn't be able to speak if I wasn't breathing and these are coming up through my vocal cords and out through my lips and I can feel the word, the word is something that is animated by my own being, as a living creature, just as much as animals' vocal sounds are animated by their lives and so we don't have to draw some kind of line between the verbal arts and any other kind of arts at all, if we treat words as fundamentally performative rather than representational or propositional perhaps, I would say.

Which leads to the final point I wanted to make, which is that we've often been talking about reverie as a state, maybe a mental state, possibly a bodily state, possibly a mental bodily state. That I find a little bit worrying, I suppose it's within everybody's experience that you might, if you've been reading too much psychologist, you might talk about your state of mind but you might otherwise say that you had a great day or a rotten day or what kind of mood you had or you might use all sorts of words to talk about what it felt like, but the trouble with state is that it makes it actually sound far too static and it cuts it off from the rest of life and in doing so, sets up a barrier that has to be crossed to get into this state or out of it, which might not actually be there at all, I mean we might be imagining this barrier or we might think of it more in terms of transitions or transformations, or some sort of more flexible concept than state of mind.

That's what I was thinking of today, whilst I was listening to all your wonderful presentations.

AR: We have a bit of time for discussion after that? I'm glad I asked you to be the discussant Tim, thank you.

TI: We've got 15 minutes, yes.

Paul Stenner (PS): I think there was a wonderful set of comments on the presentations and I find myself agreeing with practically everything you've said, although strangely, you know, for example I don't think liminality is the view from the bank, liminality is precisely ...

TI: The one in the river, yeah, mmmm.

PS: ... the view of the swimmer and permanent liminality is precisely the predicament of life

TI: Yes.

PS: That you have to deal with. There's a political dimension to that which is we're being enjoined from all quarters to volatilise our life ...

TI: Yes.

PS: To live lives of permanent liminality with insecure employment prospects, with migrations that never end, with wars that no longer ever end, with no retirement age to be seen, with no clear distinc- there's a de-differentiation of all that is part of the logic of a meltdown that capital is producing, and I think we have to be aware of that political dimension when we undertake a sort of, a way of thinking with liminality concepts, so it's not just that we need to celebrate being forever in the [inaudible 00:14:46] , that can be hell, that can be a hell to work out a way of living a liveable life in relation to and there for me, that's where the questions of, I'm not so quick to do away with depth.

P: I think the column of consciousness, you're absolutely right, is deeply problematic and I completely agree that the talk of a sort of an inside chatter and an outside reality is taking us in the wrong direction, if we start to think of consciousness as something inside a little box, we are lost.

S: Doomed.

P: Psychology has been doomed to that despite a very good start with people like William James, who precisely asked the question, what is consciousness? Does consciousness exist? And precisely got us away from the idea of an inner/outer dichotomy, there is not an inner or outer, there's a flow of consciousness but a flow of consciousness is something in the midst of depth, there he talks about the stream of consciousness, he could have talked about the river of consciousness and he can certainly talk about the relationship between those things and the sea and the rain and so on, and there are different depths of consciousness in James but they're different flows if you like, and the concept that I would like to just introduce that I think can be quite fruitful for thinking about depth without retreat to an inner/outer, is the concept of canalisation which is introduced by Bergson, when he talks about for example, the locking of durations that happen when you're watching the sugar dissolve in a liquid, so he makes this beautiful point that you have got to just go along with the time of the sugar, so we're locked into a duration with the sugar when we're absorbed in watching it melt or when, I live in Brighton and Hove and you always get these fantastic starling displays on the pier and you lock yourself in with the duration of those starlings as they move from, in their fluctuating pattern, so it's not an inside and an outside, it's durations that are in some sort of resonance and that we can abstract ourselves out of so when we go into the distal experiences of imagination or of memory, we take ourselves outside of the duration of the other things that are with us in the, if you like, what we would call the outside world but it's not the outside world, so canalisation for Bergson is precisely this idea that experience can be made to go along, to flow along canals if you like, flow along creos and so we're not talking about something like an inside or an outside, but about experiences which sort of parasite other experiences or pre-suppose the existence of other experiences whose contrasts can then be felt and I think this sort of, this imagery of canalisation that Bergson introduced and then picked up by Whitehead straightforwardly, then taken into biology by people like Conrad Waddington, who basically epigenetics and the genetic landscape is all about canalisation.

This gives us a way of thinking about these relations that doesn't immediately lock us into an inner/outer duality which I agree is the wrong way forward.

P: Just a [inaudible 00:03:14] response at the beginning, I cannot, liminality and parity are not the same thing, so liminality is the state of movement, cohesion and something happening but not quite either side, the clarity means it's volatile and when we have a movement of course precarity comes into being, people don't want to be particularly ...

S: Locked in.

P: Locked in, so I actually think precarity is another thing from the [inaudible 00:03:47].

S: Clearly we have to distinguish them otherwise you can't address that political point and that's important.

P: Because you can feel that quite secure in a liminal state, as Alan was saying, you can feel the state and feel the joy and stability and you really know who you are, even though it's hard [inaudible 00:04:08].

P: But all states that are liminal aren't safe.

P: I was just saying it's not precarity, I'm not sure, one could be in a space of liminality but not necessarily precarious.

P: Right, but there's lots of different states of [inaudible 00:04:32].

TI: Maybe if you thought about a river flowing along and then little tributaries and capillaries coming off and it's all right if you're in a good, a flow that's not been blocked or interrupted or split, but it can be, you'd have little tributaries that get very weak or that are unable to keep going and that's maybe where the problem comes, it's okay so long as you can keep going but if you're, the precarity is like a little tributary that is in danger of being blocked or drying up, or something like that.

P: And it's a question of to what extent are, to tease the problematic concept of agency, to what extent are we active in our own assemblages, in our own flows and to what extent are they imposed upon us? We all want to flow and transform ...

S: Yes, so there's a power ...

P: ... it's a question of increasing our powers in a way that we retain some sense of involvement and investment, rather than having it simply imposed upon us.

P: Tim, when you mentioned [inaudible 00:05:58] and Ruskin and so on and surface and how we know from the face and this problematic of people's interior lives that ... this question came up when I was working with Clare who's a dancer and we were talking about how we know what people are feeling whilst they're also expressing something and how do we read that, so I'm completely with you in that kind of aversion to a distinction between inside and outside in that sense, in terms of feeling and the expression of feeling, but there is always remains for me that kind of almost ethical question of difference and presumption and so on, so yes I can read something of your face and yes, we have meeting points, boundaries or surfaces, things which are shared, things which relate to each other but isn't there still this kind of ethical or presumptuous question about how can I make a claim to really know what it is that there's something going on for you, that I do know or don't know, that requires an expressive communication and it also brings me back to that point about inter-subjectivities as often presumed a shared understanding, a mutuality is already there but actually it's not, it's the conditions of possibility for something that could be shared. So in these meeting points, what happens to difference and other-

S: Because I think the answer is that difference is emerging all the time through the process of our coming together. Cutting together apart, that's Karen Barrard's phrase, that in other words it is by going along together, that difference is ever emergent so we might say colloquially, "I read you", "I know what you feel" that's really horrible, that's the worst one, "I know how you feel" but at least that we can respond to the other but it's exactly, it's at that point where instead of being aware of attentive to and responsive to the presence of the other, who is becoming whoever they are just as we are, we presume to know "I know how you feel", that's the bit where the ethical problem arises but we don't have to do that, we can go along together, read each other, if you think of reading not as a claim to knowledge but as what you were just talking about, a canalisation, a going along together, a sharing of a duration so we can spend time with people, with a work of art, with music and each of us come out at the end different than we were before, but we don't at any stage have to say that "Righto, I've got that person sussed", that's not what it's about surely?

AR: Can I ask that the people who have a commitment to psychoanalysis in the room, can I put them on the spot or try and encourage them to say something about how this, what would it mean to get rid of this idea of surface and depth or conscious and unconscious? Is that something that's problematic? What's your stake in that?

Eystein Våpenstad (EV): It's like being a freemason, I'm obliged to believe in the ... [laughter] ... [inaudible 00:09:55] also the story of psychoanalysis has been where you still to come, discuss this vividly.

Let me start with your river, if you swim in a river, in this river the water is what we call grimy, not clear and it's quite deep and somewhere on your swimming trip, you will maybe start to think, "oh my God, what's deep down here? Is it a crocodile? Is it something that is dangerous to me? Do I really be as good as I thought I was swimming?" and where do these thoughts come from?

Another example, [inaudible 00:10:58] is why is it so that I who have so high thoughts of myself, who think I am this kind father taking care of my children, always being polite and nice and understanding, sometimes seemingly out of the blue, say things that I regret? And repeat things from my own childhood, which my parents did to me? Where does it come from? Where have I stored these kind of things? But of course, I will not fight very hard for the [inaudible 00:11:37] if you have a better way to process, please come forward. [laughter]

For me at least, I think it is important, I started my career in clinical psychology writing a thesis about Jean-Paul Sartre who is very critical against the Freudian unconscious, Freud saying something like there is a God standing on the limit of conscious and unconscious and telling, "Okay, you can come from the unconscious into conscious."

S: We'll let you in!

P: Then Sartre of course says the obvious thing is God, is he conscious or unconscious? Someone has to know what's in different consciousness if it is going through the Gods? Of course he [inaudible 00:12:37].

S: Maybe it's a bit like remember the marathon runner, the Scottish guy who fell during the marathon because his legs gave way, he was on the television and he managed to get up and he ran a little way and then he fell again, and interestingly in an interview afterwards he said that he had absolutely no memory of getting himself up and running that further bit before collapsing again, all he could remember was waking up in the hospital after the ambulance had taken him. But you might say then that the legs are the sort of the analogue of this, I mean they are actually lower down in the body physically but if the legs give way, you're stuck so far as running a marathon is concerned and so maybe it's something like that, I don't know, but anyway, I just came to think of it. Eleanor?

Eleanor Peers (EP): Yes, I just wanted to, I mean I suppose, to be honest I feel a little bit nervous about doing [inaudible 00:13:43] because I am in, I don't, I can't sort of represent or articulate the sort of Sakha point of view that I am now going to try and articulate and present because you know, I'm not Sakha, I'm not [inaudible 00:14:06] very, very different but I would suggest that, I mean my sort of sense, having the various ethnographies and texts like the [inaudible 00:14:18] text that I left on the Dropbox folder, is that you're living, well basically you're living in a completely relational sort of environment where, I mean, you know every, there are no people as far as we know it, as far as we can sort of perhaps imagine it, instead there's just a sort of constant flowing backwards and forwards of sort of ... creative beings and destructive beings.

And of course, all of these beings have personalities but because they're not sort of humans in the way that we understand them, they're constantly flowing into each other so they're constantly changing, which you can never, ever a priori, ever categorise any person or entity and so you have these nasty things called abahi [sounds like 00:00:22] and abahi are always talked about as being sort of incomplete people, so you know, abahi with one eye and one leg and I think this is a sort of figure

that comes up in quite a lot of different cultures, but you know, and abahi, they're always complaining, they're always dissatisfied, they're very cunning, they lie a lot but in their cunning, there's a particular significant kind of stupidity and so you know, the sort of nasty motivations in your unconscious, I think can be very sort of, are experienced actually still as abahi, as things you, you know, it's not that something comes into you necessarily, it's that you become that thing for a little while and then it goes away again, and in the various horrible voices that you heard Anatoli speaking in, those were, I mean as he describes, those are evil spirits, unclean spirits that are sort of flowing from you through to him and out and back again, so I don't know whether it's possible to sort of, for that sort of perspective on things to help us get to a point where we can describe psychic experience without using the terms.

P: It sounds like, I'm just visualising it, it's like a crowd of people and multiple personalities, you know, [inaudible 00:01:56] but it's suddenly making me see instead of the conscious and the subconscious, I'm just seeing how they're just all present.

P: Yes, all present, all at the same time and in multiple dimensions, interacting in [inaudible 00:02:11].

P: [inaudible 00:02:12] a big party and just weaving in and out rather than coming up from the cellar.

P: It means you can't actually count people can you, that's certainly the case with innuik, that the plural of Inuuk which is the soul is innuik but it doesn't mean lots of people, it means soul life going on and around, so it's like it's lots of [inaudible 00:02:33] that are being formed or clouds or whatever but you can't say where one ends and the other begins, so you can't actually count them in the population sense, demographically.

S: So on that note, thank you so much everybody for coming and contributing and being part of what I think's been a fantastic day and yes, it'll take time to digest, if it's even possible to digest it.

So I think there's some notices but I can't really remember what they are, you wanted to say something?

P: Just for anybody who's still around on Monday and Tuesday, then we're organising a workshop, one of the last KFIs to [inaudible 00:03:31] words and sounds and very much looking at how these different ways of language being used [inaudible 00:03:41] musicians and anthropologists and [inaudible 00:03:50] all exploring the different practices in which these acoustic and various forms of [inaudible 00:03:57] at the same time and it's not going to be held in here, it's going to be held in Dunbar Hall which is just up the road, anybody who's here is very welcome to join, that's it.

S: And we also have on Wednesday, a workshop with ...

P: I don't have the posters with me.

S: We don't have posters but anyway, that will be another one with Rachel and Zoe.

AR: So thank you to KFI for having us and some of us are meeting later on, I think Tilo's already asked people who want to exchange email addresses and so on, so we will keep in touch, make a transcript of the recording and things will roll on forward in some way, maybe not forwards, maybe that's not right!

[laughter]

[WRAPS UP]

[END]