

Desiring Otherwise: Reading Asexual Counter Narratives in *Desire?*

¹Anila Anandan, Research Scholar, Dept. of Humanities & Management, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar (Punjab), India. anilaa.hm.21@nitj.ac.in

²Dr Shyamkiran Kaur, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Humanities & Management, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar National Institute of Technology, Jalandhar (Punjab), India. kaurask@nitj.ac.in

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59136/lv.2026.26.1.40>

Abstract

Desire? is a 30-minute Indian documentary directed by Garima Kaul that has been screened at several international festivals, including the Scottish Queer International Film Festival and the Glasgow Short Film Festival. This performance-based documentary focuses on asexuality- an often-overlooked identity in both mainstream and queer discussions. It challenges the dominant idea that sexuality must always involve desire or attraction by bringing forward the real-life experiences of asexual individuals in India. Through personal stories, visual performances, and reflective narration, the film questions how society defines desire and normalises sexual behaviour. This paper uses queer theory to analyze how *Desire?* opens up space for thinking differently about sexuality in Indian culture. It argues that the film helps to reimagine desire as something that does not have to fit into fixed or conventional categories. By doing so, it gives visibility to asexual voices and highlights the need to broaden our understanding of sexual identities.

Keywords: Asexuality, Queer Theory, Indian Documentary, Desire, Sexual Norms, Representation

Introduction

Garima Kaul's *Desire?* offers a critical examination of asexuality through the form of performative documentary. The film centres the voices and lived experiences of individuals who identify as asexual—an identity frequently overlooked or misrepresented in both medical discourse and mainstream culture. Through a blend of personal testimony, visual symbolism, and reflective narration, *Desire?* explores the emotional, psychological, and social realities of those who exist outside dominant frameworks of desire and sexuality. The documentary challenges normative and often pathologising definitions of desire, exposing how institutional and cultural narratives frequently erase the complexity of individual experience. By interrogating the ways in which medical and social systems construct meaning around bodies and relationships, *Desire?* invites viewers to reconsider prevailing ideas of intimacy, normalcy, and fulfilment. The film's emphasis on ambiguity, silence, and non-linear storytelling functions as an act of

reclaiming narrative space for marginalised identities. As such, *Desire?* serves as a significant intervention in queer and documentary studies, contributing to a more nuanced and inclusive discourse on identity, embodiment, and care.

Materials and Methods

This study adopts a qualitative approach and takes the form of descriptive research. The primary material for analysis is *Desire?* a documentary directed by Garima Kaul. The film is examined in detail to understand its narrative structure, visual strategies, and thematic exploration of asexuality and identity. To support this analysis, the study draws on secondary sources, including scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and academic research in the fields of asexuality studies, queer theory, and documentary film theory. These sources provide the theoretical and contextual foundation for interpreting the documentary's representational strategies and sociocultural implications.

Asexuality and Documentary Filmmaking in India

Asexuality is defined as “a sexual orientation characterised by a persistent lack of sexual attraction to others” (Bogaert 280), yet it continues to be marginalised and misunderstood, even within queer discourses. Mainstream media often either ignores asexuality or misrepresents it, reinforcing heteronormative and amatonormative ideals that position sexual and romantic relationships as universally desirable. The influence of Freud-Lacanian theories, which centre libido as essential to human identity, has further entrenched the notion that sexual desire is a fundamental aspect of the self (Markiewicz 2021). This has led to the systemic erasure of asexual and aromantic identities, not because of their absence in lived experience, but due to dominant cultural frameworks that assume sexual attraction as a given (Gupta 2015).

Documentaries have long served as a vital medium for making marginalised experiences visible. As Bill Nichols argues, documentaries function as “discourses of sobriety,” offering a sense of seriousness and authenticity that grants them the power to question dominant narratives (Nichols 2001). While queer documentary filmmaking has expanded in India in recent years, the focus has predominantly been on homosexuality and transgender identities, with asexuality receiving minimal attention. While Western productions such as Angela Tucker's *A(Sexual)* (2011) have begun to explore the subject of asexuality, Indian documentary cinema has yet to offer substantial engagement with the theme. Films like *And You Thought You Knew Me* (2014), *Purple Skies* (2014), *Breaking Free* (2015), *Is It Too Much to Ask?* (2017), and *Please Mind the Gap* (2018) address broader queer concerns, but their focus tends to remain primarily on lesbian, gay, and transgender experiences. As a result, explicit representations or critical discussions of asexuality within Indian documentary narratives remain notably scarce, pointing to a persistent gap in the spectrum of queer visibility.

Desire? intervenes in the representational lacuna around asexuality through a decisively performative mode of documentary practice. In Nichols's taxonomy, the performative mode privileges “subjective, affective and embodied knowledge” over didactic exposition (Nichols 131), a stance the film embraces by refusing the traditional scaffolding of talkinghead interviews and omniscient narration. Instead, Kaul orchestrates handheld takes that allow mundane gestures (pride rallies, household conversations, cooking) to accumulate affective weight. The camera's restless yet intimate proximity collapses the distance between spectator

and subject, echoing Stella Bruzzi's contention that performative documentaries "stage reality so that the act of recording becomes an event in itself" (Bruzzi 186). Ambient sound is left largely unprocessed; *footfalls*, ceilingfan hum and traffic din are held at nearlive levels, cultivating what Aufderheide calls a "space of unmediated experience" (Aufderheide 2007). Occasional flashes of direct address, a glance into the lens, a subject's wry halfsmile remind viewers of both the camera's presence and the co-authorship of meaning in the filmed moment, a hallmark of performativity's self-reflexive contract.

Visually, *Desire?* deploys shallowfocus framings that isolate bodies from background, insisting on the *felt* textures of everyday life rather than on sociological context. These choices enact what Laura Marks terms "haptic visuality," inviting viewers to touch rather than simply *see* the screen (Marks 163). By foregrounding sensation, the documentary dislodges sexuality from the domain of clinical definition and relocates it within personal, often ineffable experience. Kaul's montage strategy is equally pointed: sequences linger in temporal suspension before cutting to black, where intertitles quoting social pathologising of asexuality appear simultaneously. This oscillation between sensorial immersion and textual intervention dramatises the tension between lived asexual subjectivity and the "compulsory sexuality" imposed by biomedical and cultural discourses, thus operating as counterstorytelling in Delgado's sense (Delgado 1989). Crucially, the film's performative stance is not an aesthetic flourish but a mode of activist knowledge production. By refusing explanatory voice-overs, *Desire?* denies audiences a voyeuristic or pseudo-scientific distance; instead, it asks them to share the temporal rhythms and affective textures of the protagonists' worlds. In doing so, it reframes asexuality from absenceofdesire to an alternative way of desiring, thereby expanding the epistemic boundaries of queer representation in Indian cinema. This paper argues *Desire?* not only fills a representational void but also recalibrates the terms through which sexuality and identity can be publicly imagined and felt.

Discussion

Affective and Relational Diversity in Asexual Lives

Asexuality is frequently misunderstood due to its deviation from the dominant conception of sexual orientation, which is commonly imagined along a binary or linear spectrum between heterosexuality and homosexuality. This binary framework often results in a reductive view of asexuality as a singular, monolithic identity defined solely by the absence of sexual attraction. However, this simplification erases the lived complexity and variation among asexual individuals. While the commonly accepted definition- "a lack of sexual attraction"- serves as a useful entry point, it risks flattening the multifaceted experiences of asexual people. As Bogaert (2004, 645) argues, conceptualising sexual orientation only through sexual attraction- the so-called "psychological core" of sexuality- obscures the nuances of desire, identity, and intimacy. Garima Kaul's documentary *Desire?* addresses this conceptual flattening by offering a textured portrayal of the diverse experiences that fall under the asexual umbrella. The documentary's approach is both effective and analytical, allowing the viewer to see how personal narratives challenge prevailing clinical and cultural assumptions. A brief yet significant montage (0:11–0:24) juxtaposes historical and contemporary visual representations-from erotic sculptures to sexualized media snippets-demonstrating how deeply embedded sexual expectation is within Indian cultural discourse. This visual framing presents asexuality as a resistant positionality

that challenges normative structures of desire, rather than merely depicting it as a lack. One of the film's most important interventions is its insistence on the internal diversity of the asexual spectrum. Participants such as Shambavi and Mallika directly question rigid medical definitions. For example, Dr. Prakash Kothari's clinical claim that desire is an "instinctual inclination towards sensual gratification" and that asexual people experience "no desire" (5:16–5:27) is juxtaposed with Mallika's assertion that desire, for her, is deeply emotional and spiritual- "heart to heart" rather than physical (11:54). This difference in framing illustrates Diamond's (2003, 175) argument that sexual attraction and romantic desire are not necessarily linked, and their conflation often leads to the erasure of non-normative orientations.

The documentary foregrounds a spectrum of asexual identities: heteroromantic, homoromantic, aromantic, demisexual, and greysexual-each with distinct relationships to desire and intimacy. Mallika identifies as a heteroromantic asexual, describing a capacity for romantic attraction without sexual desire. Despite being open about her identity for over a decade, she continues to veil her face in public settings, revealing the persistent stigma around asexuality. Omkar, Sadanand, and Shambavi speak of homoromantic asexuality, where emotional and romantic bonds form without sexual inclination (17:21), aligning with Carrigan's (2011) and Bogaert's (2012) observations about the range of relational forms in asexual lives. Meghna, a student at Delhi University, introduces yet another positionality by describing her disinterest in both romantic and sexual relationships. Her narrative challenges the presumption that everyone must be oriented toward coupling and sex, and further destabilises the normative script of adulthood. Nevish contributes an aromantic asexual perspective, sharing his discomfort with physical touch and lack of interest in romantic or sexual engagement (10:01). This complexity speaks to Decker's (2015, 85) claim that aromanticism, though distinct from asexuality, is often wrongly conflated with it and misunderstood in public discourse. The inclusion of terms like demisexuality and greysexuality adds further granularity. Mallika explains that demisexuals experience sexual attraction only after forming deep emotional bonds, while greysexuals may experience sexual attraction rarely or under specific circumstances (11:40-11:50). These identities resist rigid categorisation and underscore the argument that desire can be conditional and fluid. Asexuality, as presented in *Desire?* is not a void but a field of nuanced relations to desire, intimacy, and social expectation.

Importantly, the documentary also critiques narrow institutional and academic definitions of asexuality. The AVEN definition of asexuality as a "lack of sexual attraction" does not fully reflect the experiences of individuals who feel desire, sensuality, or engage in sexual behaviour under certain conditions. Brunning and McKeever (2019, 498) suggest using a broader definition that separates sexual attraction, desire, and behaviour. Similarly, conflating attraction, desire, and behaviour in empirical research leads to the exclusion of many asexual voices from scholarly and clinical recognition. This internal diversity is not a marginal footnote but central to understanding asexuality as a legitimate and multifaceted orientation. The stories in *Desire?* make it clear that treating asexuality as a singular, fixed identity is both reductive and harmful. Instead, the documentary calls for a shift toward recognition of asexuality's heterogeneity-an acknowledgement that is essential for creating inclusive social, medical, and academic discourses. As Barker et al. (2013) argue, identity categories must be understood as flexible and negotiated, not as static containers. By making space for these differentiated narratives, *Desire?* contributes to a more empathetic, accurate, and politically potent understanding of

asexuality. It pushes back against essentialist assumptions and fosters a mode of viewing in which identity is seen as lived, plural, and evolving.

Asexuality: Myths, Compulsory Sexuality and Allonormative Socialisation

Myths, cultural assumptions, and systemic norms continue to pathologise or erase asexual identities. While Bogaert's (2004) early study estimated that about 1% of people report never experiencing sexual attraction, later research allowing self-identification, such as Rankin & Associates (2014), places this figure closer to 5%, particularly among younger populations. Nonetheless, dominant discourses continue to obscure the legitimacy of asexuality as a spectrum identity.

A primary myth is that asexuality is unnatural or a threat to social continuity. In *Desire?*, Shambhavi shares how she was told that she is “a threat to the human race” (14:39), revealing how sexual nonconformity is cast as socially deviant. This stigmatisation echoes Michel Foucault's (1978) theory. He argues that sexuality is a site of power-knowledge production. In this view, deviance is constructed through discursive regimes that police desire. Asexuality disrupts the heterosexual matrix. It questions the centrality of sex in human life. It also challenges what Foucault terms the “deployment of sexuality.” Another enduring misconception is that asexuality results from trauma or repression, or that it is merely a phase. Meghna recalls being told her asexuality was due to her engagement with feminist theory (12:14-12:20), revealing how structural ignorance conflates ideology with identity. However, studies have consistently shown that asexuality is not rooted in negative psychological experiences (Yule et al., 2013). It should be understood as a valid orientation. It is not a condition to be cured (Bogaert, 2012). The confusion between celibacy and asexuality further complicates social recognition. As argued in *Asexuality Archive*, celibacy is a choice, while asexuality is an orientation— a distinction blurred in religious or culturally conservative contexts. The framing of asexuality as a lack rather than presence aligns with what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (1990) critiques as a binary logic of sexuality that renders invisible non-normative identities falling outside the homo/hetero framework. Participants in *Desire?* contest these assumptions through narratives that foreground intimacy beyond sexual desire. Mallika, Meghna, and others articulate how love, care, and relational depth are not inherently tied to sexual activity. These accounts support Carrigan's claim that many asexual individuals actively seek and maintain meaningful romantic or queerplatonic relationships, thus decentring sexual attraction as a basis for human connection.

Underpinning these myths is compulsory sexuality, a term expanded from Adrienne Rich's (1980) notion of compulsory heterosexuality. Rich critiques the social mechanisms that presume heterosexuality as a given, enforced through institutions like marriage, family, and education. Similarly, compulsory sexuality, as discussed by Mollet and Lackman (2023), refers to the expectation that all people are or should be allosexual. These norms frame sexuality as universal, desirable, and necessary for adult life, marginalising asexual individuals who fall outside that framework. In *Desire?* Mallika recounts how her in-laws sent her to therapy to “correct” her asexuality (08:29), and Meghna discusses the pressure to marry due to cultural timelines and expectations (10:17). This aligns with Gayle Rubin's (1984, 267) “charmed circle” model, which critiques how socially sanctioned forms of sexuality particularly monogamous, heterosexual, reproductive sex—are privileged over others. Asexual identities, lacking alignment with these

norms, are placed firmly outside this “circle” and subject to cultural invalidation. The documentary also sheds light on allonormativity, the presumption that sexual attraction is a universal human experience. Meghna points out that in India, where marital rape remains uncriminalized, the societal assumption that sex is obligatory within marriage can normalize abuse (13:07). Mallika adds that asexual men, too, face emotional trauma from failing to meet masculine expectations of sexual assertiveness (21:42). These insights show how allonormativity intersects with patriarchy to reinforce systems of coercion, especially in gendered institutions like marriage. Through these testimonies, *Desire?* challenges dominant sexual scripts and opens space for reconsidering how we define desire, intimacy, and relationality. Asexuality, when situated within queer theory and the critique of normativity, offers a radical rethinking of sexuality not as absence, but as a space of agency, resistance, and redefinition.

Representing Asexuality on screen: Patterns, Problems and Propositions

Michel Foucault (1978) argues that sexuality is shaped by discourse and power structures, and asexuality’s invisibility in media reflects this systemic exclusion. Adrienne Rich’s (1980) concept of *compulsory heterosexuality* further explains how normative media scripts reinforce heterosexual desire as the default. In line with Elizabeth Brake’s (2012) notion of *amatonormativity*, such portrayals privilege romantic and sexual relationships as universally desirable, thereby marginalising asexual identities. These frameworks help analyse the documentary *Desire* as a counter-narrative to dominant cinematic representations, advocating for the inclusion of diverse experiences of desire.

By “patterns of representation,” we refer to repeated ways in which asexual identities are ignored, misunderstood, or silenced in media portrayals. In *Desire?* the opening visuals (0:11–0:24) immediately introduce the idea of *compulsory sexuality*, presenting idealised body images, like the Vitruvian Man (1:00), as symbols of socially acceptable, reproductive, gendered bodies. These images reinforce the heteronormative idea that sexual attraction is universal and essential. Humour is another site of erasure. As D.E. Berlyne notes, humour often relies on sexual innuendos. Humour reinforces heterosexual masculinity and social hierarchies. Asexuality becomes the butt of such jokes dismissed as “a sad kind of guy” (0:29) which alienates and delegitimizes asexual people. These jokes are not harmless but queerphobic, generating internal anxieties that pressure individuals to conform to dominant norms. This illustrates how media uses humour to maintain heteronormative order. A persistent misconception is that asexuality is a disorder or a temporary state. Scholars like Bogaert (2006, 2015), Brotto et al. (2010), and Brunning and McKeever (2021) have studied how medicine often pathologises asexuality. In *Desire?* Dr. Kothari criticises the medical field’s hesitation to validate asexuality as a legitimate identity (16:14). The suggestion that asexual people simply need to “find the right person” reinforces the false narrative that they are broken and must be “cured” through heterosexual relationships. Media also misrepresents asexual characters as cold, robotic, or incapable of emotional intimacy. This simplification overlooks romantic asexualities and the diverse forms of non-sexual connection many asexual people experience. These portrayals implicitly argue that sexual attraction is necessary to be emotionally whole (Bogaert, 2012), dehumanising those who do not feel it. The psychological effects of such narratives are severe. Kelleher and Murphy (2018) describe how asexual individuals often internalise these social messages, leading to feelings of alienation and self-rejection. *Desire?* highlights this struggle

through firsthand accounts of rejection, ridicule, and forced normalisation. This reflects broader amatonormative pressures (Brake, 2012), as Mallika describes the expectation to marry, Meghna recalls advice to do so “regardless,” and Shambhavi is condemned as a “threat to humanity” for being asexual. Yet *Desire?* also proposes critical alternatives. As Chattoo (2020) notes, documentary storytelling can initiate social conversations and foster belonging (p. 5). Nichols (2001) describes the *performative* documentary mode as one that centres marginalised experiences and resists dominant media forms (p. 93). Similarly, Geiger (2016) stresses the importance of queer storytelling as a rejection of sanitized, mainstream scripts (p. 3).

The documentary offers several key propositions:

- a) Realistic media representation of asexual lives can break stereotypes and affirm asexuality as a valid identity.
- b) Medical discourses must stop pathologising asexuality and recognise it as part of human sexual diversity.
- c) The definition of desire should expand to include emotional, intellectual, and relational dimensions, not just sexual attraction.
- d) Bodily autonomy and consent must be respected; each person has the right to define their own experiences of intimacy.

Through these recommendations, *Desire?* challenges sexual universality and opens space for inclusive narratives that affirm asexuality as part of the spectrum of human identity.

Conclusion: Towards Inclusive Asexual Representations

Desire? produced by the Public Service Broadcasting Trust, exemplifies how independent documentaries can powerfully spotlight gender and sexual diversity. By placing asexual individuals and their lived experiences at the forefront, the film directly challenges the widespread erasure and misrepresentation of asexuality in mainstream media. Through its intimate storytelling, it exposes the limitations of conventional fictional portrayals that often simplify, ignore, or distort non-normative identities. The documentary uses the voices of its participants to build a compelling narrative that resists dominant cultural norms, particularly those that assume romantic and sexual attraction as universal. In doing so, it creates a space where alternative understandings of identity and desire can be explored and validated. The approach taken by the filmmaker reflects a thoughtful and nuanced understanding of queer lives, allowing personal testimonies and visual metaphors to speak powerfully without needing overt explanation. This storytelling style expands the meaning of desire to include emotional, intellectual, and relational dimensions. Set within the Indian cultural context, the film also speaks to the specific societal expectations that often marginalise those who do not conform, such as pressure to marry or the framing of asexuality as unnatural. By confronting these norms, the documentary not only reclaims space for asexual voices but also redefines concepts like intimacy, embodiment, and autonomy. Rather than relying on theoretical abstraction, it foregrounds real-life narratives that prompt audiences to rethink their assumptions about human connection and identity. Ultimately, *Desire?* offers more than representation—it proposes a new way of thinking about desire and identity. It encourages more ethical, inclusive media practices and calls for a broader cultural shift toward recognising the full spectrum of human experience. In doing so, it becomes a significant contribution to both regional and global discussions on queerness and visibility.

Works Cited

- Asexuality Archive. "Asexuality and Celibacy: What's the Difference, Anyway?" *Asexuality Archive*, 14 Sept. 2011, <https://www.asexualityarchive.com/asexuality-and-celibacy-whats-the-difference/>.
- Aufderheide, Patricia. *Documentary Film: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Barker, Meg-John, et al. *The Bisexuality Report: Bisexual Inclusion in LGBT Equality and Diversity*. Open University Centre for Citizenship, Identities and Governance, 2012. https://oro.open.ac.uk/52881/1/The%20BisexualityReport%20Feb.2012_0.pdf
- Berlyne, D. E. *Humour and Its Kin*. Harper & Row, 1972.
- Bogaert, Anthony F. "Toward a Conceptual Understanding of Asexuality." *Review of General Psychology*, vol. 8, no. 4, 2006, pp. 241–250.
- Bogaert, Anthony F. "Asexuality: Prevalence and Associated Factors in a National Probability Sample." *The Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 41, no. 3, 2004, pp. 279–287. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490409552235>.
- Bogaert, Anthony F. *Understanding Asexuality*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2012.
- Brake, Elizabeth. *Minimizing Marriage: Marriage, Morality, and the Law*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Brunning, Luke & McKeever, Natasha (2021). Asexuality. *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 38 (3):497-517.
- Bruzzi, Stella. *New Documentary*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2006, pp. 186–189.
- Carrigan, Mark. "A Realist Theory of A/Sexual Categories." *Mark Carrigan*, 3 July 2011, <https://markcarrigan.net/2011/07/03/a-realist-theory-of-asexual-categories/>. Chattoo, Caty Borum. *Story Movements: How Documentaries Empower People and Inspire Social Change*. Oxford University Press, 2020.
- Decker, Julie Sondra. *The Invisible Orientation: An Introduction to Asexuality*. Skyhorse Publishing, 2015.
- Delgado, Richard. "Storytelling for Oppositionists and Others: A Plea for Narrative." *Michigan Law Review*, vol. 87, no. 8, 1989, pp. 2411–2441. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1289308>.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1978.
- Geiger, Jeffrey. *American Documentary Film: Projecting the Nation*. Edinburgh University Press, 2016.
- Gupta, Kristina. "Compulsory Sexuality: Evaluating an Emerging Concept." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 41, no. 1, 2015, pp. 131–154. <https://doi.org/10.1086/681774>.
- Kaul, Garima, director. *Desire?* Public Service Broadcasting Trust, 2019. PSBT, <https://psbt.org/films/desire/>.
- Markiewicz, Maria. "Is Sex Dead? Towards a Radical Understanding of Asexuality." *Academia.edu*, 2021, https://www.academia.edu/73595072/Is_Sex_Dead_Towards_a_Radical_Understanding_of_Asexuality.
- Marks, Laura U. *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses*. Duke University Press, 2000, pp. 162–180.
- Nichols, Bill. *Introduction to Documentary*. Indiana University Press, 2001.

- Rankin & Associates Consulting. *Campus Climate Project Report: Asexual Inclusion and Awareness*. Commissioned Report, 2014. https://campusclimate.ucop.edu/_common/files/pdf-climate/ucla-full-report.pdf.
- Rich, Adrienne. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 5, no. 4, 1980, pp. 631–660.
- Rubin, Gayle. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality." *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality*, edited by Carole S. Vance, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984, pp. 267–319.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. University of California Press, 1990.
- Yule, M. A., et al. "Mental Health and Interpersonal Functioning in Self-Identified Asexual Men and Women." *Psychology & Sexuality*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2013, pp. 136–151. Taylor & Francis, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19419899.2013.774162>.