

FILE NAME: habit-affect-rountable-audio**Speaker Key:**

V1/V2/V3/V4/V5/V6/V7/V8/V9/V10/V11/V12/V13/V14/V15/V16/V17

- V1 Just to reintroduce myself, I'm Leone Ridsdale. I was very delighted and surprised to be brought into this collaboration by Max. I'm a neurologist. I have worked in general practice. And before I did medicine, I did social science. So I'm very interested in seeing how different areas are progressing because I think that medicine started off with case studies, and then it moved to randomised controlled trials, but it's now also bringing in qualitative research. And some of the postdocs and PhD students yesterday talked about what they're doing in the social media project, which is looking at how people with epilepsy make sense of their own sometimes stigmatised identities, and get some sharing, using social media. And Becky's been particularly working on that. And there's a PhD student who's doing a project on how people share their data about exercise, which we don't know whether this is authentic, or narcissistic, or what it is. But we're interested now in people sharing their ideas about routine quantification, habit, affect and health. And I'll throw open the table there. And we've got Helena* who's going to take around the mic, if necessary. I'm hoping that you won't be speaking to people's backs by moving the tables in. But start anywhere you like.
- V2 This is not particularly serious, but I used an app on my phone for the first time, the last month, which was to... Google Fit I think it's called... and it's to track what I do and how active I've been and congratulate me with messages. And I was really pleased to see one day that it told me that I'd been cycling for three hours [laughter]. And that was great, except that I'd just got off the train and I'd been sitting working on my laptop all the time, [laughter] so after that, I don't know whether to trust it at all. And in fact, I think I might even be able to trick it now, and I don't know if that's good or bad, but...
- V3 I think I was trying to yesterday say that there was maybe some positive sides to digital life in thinking about the relationship between everyday habits and digital repetition. As in that everyday life has a certain kind of enduring, even though it has an imprisoning quality, it endures, it sustains. The repetition, the boringness is also part of what I think of as a mystical dailyness that we've thought about for a long time in relation to diary writing particularly as the epitome of the genre of the day. But I also wonder if digital repetition is really like human repetition, or I'm wondering... I feel I need to learn more about repetition, basically. And I wanted to throw in two conceptual terms that again, I need to know more about, so I'm really hoping that someone else can tell me. One is singularity, and Fredric Jameson's recent essay in New Left Review on his... This is his update to his famous essay about late capitalism, which you may remember was a long time ago and was all about, actually, for him also the bad things of reproducible cultures and how you lose not just an aura, but a human relationship. And I don't really know what he's trying to say about singularity, but I think he's saying we need more of it, but I'm not sure. The other term is Henri Lefebvre's notion of rhythm analysis, which is also old, but was, I think part of him trying to say we could track our movements around the city as part of repeated sustaining acts, even though they're also often commuting, or going to somewhere that you didn't want to go to and coming back every day the same, but somehow humanising repetition. So anyone can help there?
- V4 One of the original people who did self-tracking was Benjamin Franklin. And so one of the things I like to think about is that this isn't actually a new tendency. So I really liked the

00:04:51

things you said yesterday Margareta* about that we have to pay attention to the ordinariness of the internet because that's mostly who uses it. And not to say too much about Online Lives 2.0, but one thing I like in there that I just read this morning... because I was jet lagged I got up early... was Dana Boyse*' essay about the users of the internet. And that originally, she says internet was run by freaks, geeks, queers, and that now everyone does it and so that changed the quality of what's happening online. And so she said we have to understand that and understand what that means. And I actually think she's right. And I think you could put it together with what you're thinking about. To me repetition has two connectors. One is Nietzsche and return, and I wonder if self-tracking isn't part of that desire for fullness that you can't repeat, so you just do the repetition. Judith Butler, obviously, is the person who's talked about that with sexuality, but there's other ways of thinking about it. And to my mind, the pleasure that Paul articulates even in cheating the system is something we don't talk about much when we think about online identity, how pleasurable some of it is, or that it's secret pleasure, or it's something like that, where you're not... it's hard to articulate that something's fun when it's not supposed to be. And so to my mind, I think it's worth investigating, in line with other ways of thinking about ordinariness.

- V5 Okay, I do share the conceptual worries, up to the point, I mean, I'll say something about that first. I think in terms of concepts something that might be a useful point... it's always very productive I think to look at what, not just media studies analysts have done, obviously Dana Boyse* is up there with her work, but also what social media platforms, engineering and design features have been done, and what the rationale for this has been. And something that people who actually design digital media environments use quite a lot is the concept of iteration, which really allows us to see the kind of partly familiar, partly emergent character of the architecture even, because repetition is also part of an architecture. So that's one thing about concepts. I think where I'm coming from, I'm really very interested in documenting empirically what actual people do with other people interactionally, and I think a lot of these things... well everything is jointly drafted, really.

So when we talk about building routines and habits, there is an irreducible inter subjective element, and it really has to do with specific social media platforms. And I'll give you an example. I've been working on selfies, as I said yesterday, part of what I've been doing, and there is... and we tend to talk about selfies and posting selfies as a very solitary activity. And we tend to say, oh, those narcissistic teenagers. We... there's some discourses, again, there's some discourses, sometimes academic discourses as well, psychiatrists, who've actually said that, oh my God, there's something wrong with those people who post selfies compulsively. And when you look at specific environments, specific communities, peer groups on Facebook, and on Instagram, you'll see that selfies, their routines of posting selfies, are so irreducibly linked with the responses that selfies get, so that there's something that I'm calling now, again drawing on earlier work, ritual appreciation. So there's a lot of ritual that goes into the uptake of selfies. And I think looking at interactional processes around building routines and habits may be one way. It doesn't solve and I do empathise, it doesn't sort out all the conceptual problems, but it's a point of departure, I think.

- V6 So if I look at the thematic discussion title, about routine quantification, habit, affect and health, and I think about the data driven self and the claims that are made on behalf of that programme by the people who do it, it's that you, I believe, through better, through fuller monitoring, you could learn to live forever. So it's a sort of immortalisation project. If I lower my calorie intake, if I take this many steps, and so on. So it's an optimisation model for health. But how one uses that information sits within a number of different kinds of networks in which one is compelled to tell one's life story. One of those interfaces is to the physician.

00:10:26

So when you can then offer your physician the account that you have on your tracker, that puts something else other than story into the mix. And so all the ways in which these kinds of devices enable other kinds of relationships around one's health seem to be an interesting thing for future inspection. And I would just say that the easy slide from life storage to life story marks the worst spot in a cocktail party to be stuck. Somebody wants to tell you their Fitbit out... Am I right? Like the worst thing is if somebody on Facebook is posting their run, or their, yes, it's... right? I just want to see if... isn't that the worst? Or is that the worst? Or is that just me?

- V1 Well, thinking of their response, I should say the government has an interesting role in all this because in this country, at least, they're very wedded now to self-education. We're running several self-education trials with qualitative interviewing, and I guess they see it as an economy. They think if we all work on improving our health, then we'll cause less cost to them. So it's what you were talking about earlier on with this neologism of responsibilisation, isn't it, but it could be quite a pain. And also if you're a doctor, everyone wants to tell you about their symptoms, so I can very well empathise with that.
- V7 Yes, I think when you're kind of thinking about the habitual nature of these technologies, the discourses that surround a lot of them are operating on nudges and foreclosing choice options, as I touched on yesterday, and I think that they operate on this discourse of guilt and shame if you're not entering your data on a regular basis, and if you don't maintain that repetition, and you see people within your community that are, it might prompt you to enter information that... enter exercise that you haven't done or omit certain food intake or alcohol intake that you haven't consumed. So I think there's an element of self-censorship, whereby users are... the repetition... the stress factor behind the repetition there is making people actually self-censor the information they're actually putting on these devices. And I think that if people are using that as a complete data representation of their health, that's very problematic because it's not actually a true reflection of their body. And also the human form can't be completely quantified on a device anyway. So I think that when it comes to health care, and in terms of sharing that information with our GPs for example, these devices, a lot of them aren't actually rooted in any kind of scientific rationality anyway. And they're not necessarily very accurate. So I think it's problematic in terms of people looking at these devices and seeing that as a representation of being healthy or unhealthy. I think it's quite problematic.
- V8 This is maybe to go slightly off topic, but by way of kind of tying these discussions of habit and affect to the talk we just had about representation and politics, I was very struck by Lee*'s use of the term offsetting to describe the practice of Black Lives Matters, highlighting, but also challenging conventions of representation, by posting more positive images to try and undo some of the associative work that creates this effective climate of suspicion around black youth, and how that's enabled by the ease of retreating and representation... and repetition. And it almost gives a sense of kind of semiotic CBT in a way of, we can automate ways of representing things that hopefully try and change an affective climate or an association that's never quite at the level of consciousness. And I wonder in that respect, whether things that are being developed at the level of health and wellbeing might also have ethical or political versions in potential...
- V1 Just to answer that, and other people may have other thoughts, [Dipec s.l. 00:14:39] and we had two people who know a lot about it, who came yesterday, but unfortunately not today, was produced in Oxford precisely in this way. So you can look up any illness and

00:14:49

you can look up any demographic, in other words, age, sex, colour, da, da, da, and you can see people who had that condition and how they managed it, and they've done similarly in North America... I'm interested obviously in epilepsy... Colin [Delorio s.l. 00:15:08] produced a programme and you can.... so you can choose a black lady if you are black or... and that they've got them all on the internet, and it's particularly useful for stigmatised conditions where you might be quite isolated. So you can see what they... how they said they would manage their illness. And it's very ripe for qualitative research. In fact, we advertised it as part of this programme, but no one said they wanted to do it.

- V9 So as I said, yesterday, I've been interviewing people with epilepsy about their use of social media, but also apps, and one of the things that I've been particularly struck with is that the discussions that we have about quantification of self become... I'm really struggling with this... sorry, to be inarticulate today... I'm really struggling with the fact that when people keep, for example, diaries of their... online diaries, or they use their phone to record their symptoms, it's this curious instance of a sort of shock, when they see quantified what their illness looks like, the number of symptoms, or if they... often they have memory loss, so in keeping a day to day symptoms diary, they often get to the end of the month, or take it into their... to see their specialist, and they're confronted with this really shocking realisation of how many seizures they've had.

And I think that poses a really fascinating ethical quandary, which is this is an ethics of a relationship with a machine or a machine produced... I know that you're self inputting, so it's not... you are having to input things or your family's having to input, so it's not just capturing from the body, but this curious relationship where this device can help you self manage or, get good control is the term in epilepsy, which I find really problematic, because it's positing the body as a machine that needs to be controlled, but then on the other hand that is quality of life for them. And so this really curious, ethical relationship, I think that's going on between the machine and the human patient, which I still don't quite know how to articulate in the sense of, is that machine life writing? Is that [sous s.l. 00:17:48] surveillance? How do you theorise that?

- V10 Thank you. Just to add in support of that, I'm quite struck by the number of apps and so on, there are for analysing your sleep. So it's the bit where you're not awake, and you're not conscious. And it's the bit of you, you don't know and can't possibly monitor without the machine. And perhaps... I struggle with it too... but some sense that there's a kind of utopian pattern that you might aspire to of eight hours solid with enough REM or whatever it is to... so the popularity of those apps seems really eloquent of... and often people post comments to say that it's given them a self knowledge, which seems puzzling to me because it's not a conscious self. So how does that relate to your conscious sense of self? But they really like it. The affect around it is oh, look this is what I'm doing when I'm asleep. Very puzzling.

- V9 The point at which you're lacking consciousness, the thing that is supposedly designed to capture that lack of consciousness, that moment of lack of consciousness is the way that you are defined socially, that's where the stigma comes from, is someone having a tonic clonic seizure and losing consciousness, that's what they're stigmatised, that's where the stigma comes from. That's the thing that's also absence. So I like the parallel with the sleep, but it's a very different kind of self-knowledge.

- V11 I've had a question lingering in my mind for a while in these discussions around the issue of methodology. And maybe this is a moment to raise the question of what new

00:19:46

methodologies are called for in working with online based... what we might think of as texts, again, something that I think has to be problematised. For example, much of this discussion has centred on ethnographic projects that I take it are interview based with subjects, who present about themselves, but who of course are also observed and mediated through the interviewer. And that brings up for me a number of questions around issues of collaboration, of complicity, of the double mediation of technologies here. And it also brings up for me a notion of how many of us still work with a concept of texts that of course becomes in this kind of work multi sided for diverse and not necessarily predefined audiences, circulating in unpredictable ways, used and then perhaps reused, through Tumblr sites, where it's reorganised, so I wonder if we can bring some of these comments together around some issues of what in methodologies do we find changing? For example, for people such as Gillian, [Orlier s.l. 00:21:04], Alfred, who this morning were working with the after lives of texts, and were working with online circulations of other senses of life narrative. What can we say about methodologies?

V12 Could I add something to that? Because I think somebody said something about e-mental health yesterday, was that right? I can't remember. But I know that within clinical psychology, people are working a lot with therapy through the internet. So you just get questions, etcetera. That would be another part of what you're referring to. I don't know if anybody's doing any research on this. I find this very fascinating, but...

V9 Sorry, not to dominate the discussion here, but I mentioned very briefly yesterday, but trying to write an ethics application for our website, brought up a lot of these issues because I'm a literary scholar by training, and so I treat things as texts. And, while we might want to expand the notion of text to include image on the internet, for example, there's a real divergence between treating internet discussion as... do we treat things on more texts or discourse on the internet as human subjects, which is what the social sciences and medicine tend to do, which brings up a whole different set of questions too, if we treat them as text. Because if we treat what's on the internet as text based, we're concerned with questions about authorship and authority and copyright. And we probably want to acknowledge where we got our sources from.

I'm not saying they're necessarily completely different questions. But if we're treating it as a human subject who put this on the internet, it becomes very different questions about well can you track... historically, we want to anonymise subjects so that they can't be harmed by the processes of this research. Well, that creates all sorts of conflicting problems for certainly literary scholars because should you cite or should you not cite where you got your source from if it could damage... should we consider this as a published text? Because we've got very different concepts of what privacy and publicity and publication are on the internet, so... I don't have any answers. I just pointing out that in interdisciplinary work, it's brought up a whole different set of questions for me.

V5 Well, I'm really glad that the methodology question has come up. Okay, I would say that I have ended up following Annette Markham's... It's not a doctrine. It's really a suggestion. It's a sensitising suggestion and she very eloquently, I think, talks about remix methods, which is a fancy way of talking about mixing and matching. My background is in qualitative, contextualist, ethnographic, socio-linguistic work, but I have found that that poses some serious limitations, when, for instance, you try to track discourse activities, whether you call them texts, discourse activities or users, the problem is still to manage and track circulation, with some kind as well of representativeness. So there I have used all sorts of things from what people call adaptive ethnography to keeping a line of research open, so that I would end up doing what we call diachronic analysis of YouTube comments if I'm interested in

00:25:15

how specific videos become spoofs or whatever or they circulate. So that I would do time sampling, for instance, and go back every three months, so that my research would be incident based, rather than say from the outset that I'm doing YouTube.

That's why I tend to refuse to answer what do you do. I don't say Facebook. I've looked at Facebook. I started with selfies, for instance, on Facebook, and soon enough, with some ethnography and some tracking, I realised that I should really look at Instagram as well, if I wanted to document some processes. So it's a matter of... it's much more of... it's not neat. It's not neat at all, actually, but it's an eclectic... when people call it eclectic, I think it's almost a euphemism for a daily struggle, and your point Margareta* about big data, so there's the thing. I didn't really set out with any of the work that I have done to do big data, then again, it's so easy to, for instance, for the sorts of things I'm interested in, to do some keyword searches. That can be very revealing. And you can do a little bit of a corpus analysis on those. So that the big data, small data combination sometimes is something that arises, let's say, organically as part of a study, rather than, you say from the outset, I need to combine x with y.

- V4 I'd really like to support what you said about mixed methods. You're welcome. And I know Margareta* said the same thing. I think, because we're sometimes working with texts... I actually designed the human subjects protocol for the internet for my university... so something like ten years ago, we had this debate, and we didn't resolve it [laughter]. Yay, we didn't resolve it. But I think you have to use more than one methodology. And I think that humanists have to become more aware of what they can bring to the table around that because sociologists in particular, let's say, are very good at talking about methods, sometimes to the exclusion of other things. Humanists are notoriously poor at talking about method. Our methods feel naturalised and organic, but they are methods and we need to bring them into view because there are things that can be missed.

The tendency to interview first of all, does create its own problems, as you have articulated because you have problems of sample; you've problems of scale; you have problems of language. The internet is not in English, primarily [laughs], so you have all sorts of problems with your specific kinds of sample. So to me, always working in groups makes more sense for this kind of research. But I would also say always being aware that you should use more than one way to solve a problem is important. Julie, your comments about circulation make sense to me because print, for example, remains live inside of this formation. It was predicted it wouldn't, but actually the existence of digital text has reanimated paper texts in ways that we didn't predict. And because we're looking at questions of circulation, we have to retain traditional methods of looking at texts. I don't think we should lose them. So that's my two cents from the world of media studies meets the other ways of doing things.

- V10 Thank you. One of the things that troubles me a bit about the proliferation of health apps in particular, and Fitbits and tracking and so on, is that they deal in numbers, rather than words. And I find that quite challenging as a literary critic. I know there are still lots of words around them, but it seems to me that one of the things the Internet has done has sort of promoted quantification, and a kind of numeracy rather than literacy, which I find methodologically quite challenging because I'm not... I'm more literate than numerate. So all these people reading their data, for instance, have a comfort with quantifying things in numbers in a way that they might previously have reached for words, and different levels of comfort perhaps with that, and I don't have a methodology for dealing with that if anyone [inaudible 00:30:03].

00:30:05

- V12 I think it's not just a question of methods that is on the table. It's a question of how humanists are going to have to go about doing their work, and the increasing collaborative nature of the whole arena of scholarly inquiry, so it's not that those of us who have been trained so long ago now, in a certain way of doing a methodology that's engaged in the concept of deep reading. It's not only that we have to adjust to this whole set of kinds of reading that are now in the air, surface reading, deep reading, middle states reading, global... going from deep all the way up to the huge mining of large corpuses but it's that we have to engage people who are designers, who are coders, who are project managers. And it's a reorientation of work away from the singularity of the scholar in the study. That's not going to be everybody. It's not all projects, but it's a methodological question and it's a scholarly dispositional question.
- V13 Yes, I think we heard from you last night about the change of methodologies connected to the posthuman, humanities scholar. So the question is to what extent older methods are still valid or not. If I go back to what you say about sociology, which places a lot of value on empirical research, where you collect data, the interviewing technique, and so on, whether this is completely out of date, or whether it's still has a value. I know that, for example, the British sociologist Maggie O'Neill, she does research on the homeless in Vancouver, by walking with the homeless in Vancouver, who have nothing, who are also not on the internet, who have no mobile phones. So the assumption that everybody's on a mobile phone is wrong, I think, because there are areas in which this kind of technology does not exist. That does not exist in downtown East Vancouver, where she walks with these people, homeless people who tell their stories, what kind of road they take every day, in order to make their daily living. The same thing could be said about sound productions where people walk in cities, like in the German City of Munster, a Canadian couple, and then they go by the steps and acoustic sounds they make as a form of taking account of the city, and of the history of the city, and so on. So these are all forms of an old technology, an old methodology, which I think are, after all, still valuable. And I wonder to what extent the methods that are connected to discussing the internet and all aspects of online, are actually compatible with these old methodologies. The value for me, I think still exists.
- V14 I think one important thing that humanists need to bring to the table or reclaim is a certain vigilance in relation to the digital. I'm not saying that it doesn't entail a lot of desirable things, or positive dimensions, but I think we need to keep in mind, what is the quantification reflecting back on me? What is it telling me about me? And why? Is there any raw data? What will raw data reveal if it ever exists? And I'm also thinking that in terms of collaborative projects that is one of the key questions for a group like mine, to think about what is actually revealed? What kind of view of the human is revealed to us? And we are the best people to question that.
- V15 Thanks. Yes, I just wanted to sort of follow up some of these really interesting comments about methodology and humanist scholarship and what it can bring to the discussion. But also to return to the question of what we call the thing it is we're studying. It seems to me that one of the things humanists scholarship really can attend to is not just ways of reading, important though that is, but the readers themselves or the audiences or the listeners, and one of the problems we have, I think, is that we don't know what to call them. There isn't a term that covers the different kinds of ways people are responding to, or receiving or consuming the new media. So we need a vocabulary that extends automediality to cover the recipients as well. And what that might then help us to focus on is the extraordinary disparity and even fragmentation of the different kinds of responses, whether people are actually reading a text or whether they're just sharing something or liking it, or ritually appreciating it, or whatever it is. I think all of these are very helpful and constructive terms,

00:36:13

but they're also all very different terms aren't they? And they are beginning to enrich a sense of what participation means for the audiences or whatever it is we want to call them. I'm assuming Julie doesn't yet have a term for...

V4 [Inaudible 00:36:30].

V15 For the recipients of auto media, not just the people writing it, or filming or producing it, but...

V4 In new media we just say user, but it's not...

V15 Yes.

V4 But sometimes Henry Jenkins uses better terms because he's [interested s.l. 00:36:46] in youth production for culture. So sometimes those ideas like prosumer... it's an awkward word, but it does get at what it means to make content and not just receive content.

V15 Yes.

V4 And I think some of those low stakes, high support communities that he talks about, that's the word that gets used the most, so that's the only one I know about so far, that works with it.

V5 And there's also work that is somehow creatively adopting Goffmans' participation frameworks and I find that useful as well. And what we find there... and any work that tries to tap into this and you're actually very right Max and... how we see, we view, we research users, which is too unbroken a category, as we know, has all kinds of implications for our methods as well, for where we begin to define something as text or as a communicative practice or whatever. But we do find that participation frameworks tend to be multi layered, which is another challenge so that the reader may become a commenter or a sharer at the same time. So that there is a whole untractable category of what Goffman would call, I don't know, bystanders, eavesdroppers, but in interactional contexts, you tend to be able to see those, for instance. So yes, I think participation frameworks and that work is at the moment something that can be useful, yes.

V16 I haven't really thought this out, but it's just acknowledging a resonance. It's tied into what Julie was talking about yesterday, but it seems to me it extends out over in this discussion, a lot of the kind of considerations were coming up in terms of method or intentional, or action and whatever, the people who have talked most about that over the years are people who are trying to assess or evaluate the nature of play, right back to the mediaeval, [Lutus s.l. 00:39:18], the notion of the entire universe, in fact, being God's a programmer, that, in fact, it's highly formalised conventional, repetitive non purposive activity, which can have profoundly confining and constraining conventions, and yet at the same time, can then be remade or changed into other modes. So I think a lot of what's been said about game theory in language and various other areas actually gets closer because we certainly do

00:39:45

talk about people playing on the internet. And the whole game metaphor certainly takes you in that direction. So that's a thought.

V13 That does not really follow, but since we are going to talk about online courses next I thought that a comment on routine quantification might be valid, referring to the Bologna process in Europe. Since the Bologna process, which introduced the bachelor and master studies in all of the European universities, led actually to a quantification of students, not only in the sense of multiplying them, at least in Germany to such an extent that universities overflow and actually come to a post-human kind of academy, where the students are not treated as human people anymore, but as objects, as quantifying objects, and they think of themselves in the same terms since all of their work is translated into figures. The workloads that you need to have for how many degrees, what kind of modules to take, it's all quantified. And what has happened, of course, that this led automatically to reduction of educational values, or the interest in knowledge, the acquisition of knowledge in the universities. So in that sense, this routine quantification of the Bologna process has led to post-human academies.

V16 Well... and just because it's my favourite refuge, I always move toward historicising these things and it seems to me that one location for looking at sustained engagement with trying to understand the consequences of this kind of self scrutiny and quantification... Julie was already pointing there to Ben Franklin... but we're sitting at the home of it. The engagement with utilitarianism in the first half of the 19th century, and dealing with, for example, the absolute quantification that went into establishing the secular University of London. And Dickens engaging specifically with that notion of the fact quantitative based notion of trying to, in fact, establish numerical values for affect and whatever. That debate went on intensely and meticulously for a very long period of time. And we're sitting right at ground zero of that discussion.

V17 I suppose I'd just like to say something about the posthuman, given that I have some responsibility for releasing Posthuman [laughter] Lives amongst us and Sid and I've been talking about how that... and Julie... has been a really interesting journey. The biography seminar where we gathered in Hawaii to talk about Posthuman Lives was difficult. We were just beginning to ask some questions, and the people who turned up there were brave [laughs] because we were exploring what that means. And I think in the introduction to Posthuman Lives, that special issue, I say something like, it's time to question the bio that autobiography gave itself. And I did mean that as a questioning, but I would have to say that I only asked that question because I began to work on asylum seekers. So beginning to work on the topic of these people who are dehumanised and rendered objects, has led me to think about the testimony of things. And I don't see that as a non-humanist project. It's not a humanitarian project and I've been exploring, trying to sort out the differences there, but it's looking at different kinds of humanism that come into play around and through life narratives broadly conceived across different platforms and forums, but I don't see it as necessarily a non-humanist practice. But I deliberately use the form of exploration there. I'm still on this journey and I think many of us in the room feel that we are, but I find it fascinating to see amongst my colleagues how this is percolating around, most recently in Sid's post [laughs] not post...

V4 [Inaudible 00:44:14]

00:44:15

V17 ... posthuman scholar. And this is a work in progress and we need to be open to it, I think.

V1 As a good timekeeper, I think that is a good place to stop. Good work in progress. Thank you.

00:44:39