



STOP

COVER

GODA TRAKUMAITE & ANNE MAILEY

FULL STOP

Founded in January of 2011, *Full Stop* focuses on debuts, works in translation, and books published by small presses. We believe that books exist in a supercollider, that their meaning and significance arise from high-energy collisions with the people and cultures that read, write, and share them. In an often insular and oscillating field, we seek to highlight the unknown, the precarious, and the as-yet unrealized.

Issue Editors: Helen Stuhr-Rommereim, Michael Schapira, Jesse Miller

Art: Goda Trakumaite & Anne Mailey

Layout: Eric Jett

Reviews Editors: Jesse Miller, Caren Beilin, Eleanor Gold, Allison Noelle Conner

Features Editors: Helen Stuhr-Rommereim, Nina Renata Aron, Max Rivlin-Nadler

Interviews Editors: Michael Schapira, A. M. Davenport, Devin Kelly

Blog Editors: Nathan Goldman, Kaila Philo

Web Editor: Eric Jett

Editors at Large: Alex Shephard, Jesse Montgomery, Meagan Day

Founding Editors: Alex Shephard, Jesse Montgomery, Max Rivlin-Nadler, Amanda Shubert, Eric Jett, Nika Knight

Full Stop is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization.

full-stop.net

This project was made possible through a New York Technical Assistance Program grant given out by the Community of Literary Magazines and Presses.



**Council on
the Arts**





FULL STOP

JULY 2018

LIMITS

pg. 10
THE CHILDREN'S CLASSIC THAT SECRETLY BROUGHT
EXISTENTIALIST PHILOSOPHY INTO AMERICAN HOMES
JESSE SCHOTTER

pg. 20
THE AMERICAN SOLDIER IN ARAB NOVELS
M. LYNX QUALEY

pg. 30
GOOGLE, GODWIN, & THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE
SAM ROWE

pg. 43
GRAFFITI IN THE WOODS
JOSH DAVIDSON

pg. 57
TURNING BACK
MATTHEW JAKUBOWSKI

2/\$4

LISTENING

pg. 63
CONFOUNDING READING
HESTIA PEPPE & JULIA CALVER

pg. 74
DIALOGICAL EXPERIMENTS
SHARON MASHIHI & AARON FINBLOOM

pg. 89
RITA BULLWINKEL
MAX RIVLIN-NADLER

pg. 96
UTOPIA CAN BE BANAL
ADAM FALES

pg. 109
THE TENDERNESS JUNCTION
ANNA VITALE



INTRODUCTION

Odysseus tied to a post—this is perhaps the most paradigmatic and primal scene of the limits of listening, or more precisely, of trying to listen past one’s limits. So cleverly restrained, Odysseus tries to know what should kill him. Literature—that is, fiction—takes shape via Odysseus’s trickery: The song can be heard, but Odysseus’s bindings foreclose from the start the fulfilment of the desire it opens up. Out of Odysseus’s crude hunger for an experience he should not be able to live with, aesthetic distance is born—that boundary, which makes it possible to encounter the truth without disappearing into it.*

Listening is frightening if it feels as though that distance, which Odysseus maniacally policed, might not hold. In such a case, the listener disappears, and listening ends. But listening might never begin if the terms are decided in advance, and not by consensus.

If Odysseus, lashed above the water, listening without thus succumbing to dissolution, is a figure for one type of aesthetic experience, modern psychology, plunging in, gives us another model. In 1954, neuropsychiatrist John C. Lilly developed the isolation tank in order to experiment with the effects of sensory deprivation on human consciousness. In the isolation tank one floats surrounded in salt water at body temperature, in blankness and in silence. Here, one hears their own blood pumping, breath blowing: the sound of the body which one is, it’s finitude. But here also is a kind of transcendence of limits. The edges of the body start to shimmer and one begins to hear things, to sense things that weren’t there before: Are they hallucinations? Are they something else, something hitherto imperceptible? Here we see an attempt to break apart the boundaries of the self, in a way that attracted artists of the 1950s and 60s interested in merging art

* This scene is borrowed from Maurice Blanchot’s short essay “Encountering the Imaginary,” in *The Book to Come* (1959).

and life, heedlessly listening to the song of the sirens, breaking the space between work and audience, listener and listened to.

Odysseus and Lilly are two strangely proximal instances of the psychedelic optimism that experience and perception can be opened up and extended by subjecting oneself to various constraints. In the afterword to his 1979 book *Modern Tragedy* the British literary critic Raymond Williams spoke from the other side of this optimism, describing a new social reality devoid of hope, marked by “the slowly settling loss of any acceptable future.” There was certainly plenty to be bummed out about in Thatcher’s Britain, which radiated a no-hope, no-future ideology (TINA, There Is No Alternative) as the pathetic successor to Britain’s imperial legacy. But perhaps if Williams listened a little closer to the stirrings of the 1977 generation, with punk, no-wave, and the invention of the LED screen, he might have heard a different mood reverberating out of this lost future—*irony*, much more the mark of the comic than the tragic. Maybe there is nothing slow about the loss of the future and maybe, as Lauren Berlant argues, optimism and hope can have a cruel streak that a little ironic distance could challenge.

“There is a direct link between listening and life, perceivable in its absence,” Anna Vitale writes in her essay “The Tenderness Junction.” “What we cannot say and what we cannot hear matter.” We have organized this quarterly into two sections, *Limits* and *Listening*. Aside from the alliterative appeal we see in these essays and conversations an important connection between these two themes.

Once a limit is recognized or overcome—say the ability to connect across great distance with satisfying intimacy, or the recognition that that satisfaction is something distance cannot meet—then you are on that precipice of the future that Williams and the 77ers render in their own ways. In his essay on the curious obsession with immortality amongst the tech-capitalist elite, Sam Rowe argues that the possibility of transcendence that death reveals has proved too tantalizing for reformers or men of ambition (and it has been primarily men) across the ages. This issue takes shape around such a desire to stand on both sides of the fence, of life and death, or as Josh Davidson explores, of the secular and the sacred. Another response to this desire might be the sort of irony that Adam Fales finds in listening to David Cohn’s metafictional albums.

Listening is simultaneously a means of transcending limits and of un-

derstanding where they lie. When we listen we hear what is beyond us, and the sounds that our actions make as they reverberate. When we listen to other people, we have the opportunity to hear something we didn't expect, something beyond our perspective. Finbloom and Mashihhi experiment with conversation as a form, placing limits as a strategy for saying something else, creating a space for honesty, intimacy, and discovery.

On the other hand, listening is a way of realizing limits, a way of accessing the intractability of the real, beyond fantasies of freedom. In Matt Jakubowski's critico-fictional book review, reviewer speaks through imagined reviewer, listening to the book while pushing the limits of critical perspective. M. Lynx Qualey's essay shows how the stories told about the Iraq War limit our perspective—pointing to other stories, the stories where “we” Americans do not speak, do not even necessarily appear as significant, rounded characters, as those in which the reality of the war is most forcefully articulated.

These two aspects of listening to limits are connected. In both cases, listening is about an encounter with the outside, with the other. It involves humility because it involves receptivity. When one listens, one opens oneself to the world.



DIALOGICAL EXPERIMENTS

SHARON MASHIHI & AARON FINBLOOM

Sharon Mashihi and Aaron Finbloom are part of a team that runs The School of Making Thinking (SMT), an experimental residency program that invites participants to challenge disciplinary conventions of art-making, thinking, and living. Each session, we reinvent our structures and themes.

This session, our theme was “Dialogical Experiments.”

We invited artists who use conversation in their creative practice to create a thirty-minute dialogical structure to be enacted 5 times throughout the session. These structures existed alongside creative collaboration, workshops, and opportunities for revision. By signing up for the session, each artist was agreeing to participate in the structures of all the other participants. By the end of the ten days, we had each participated in thirty structured dialogues. Our goal was to investigate how structure, rules, and iteration can be used creatively to help design innovative conversational content and form. In other words, if a conversation has rules, can it somehow go deeper?

When we were asked to write an article for Full Stop about dialogue, we decided to record ourselves in dialogue about our Dialogical Experiments SMT session. We scheduled our dialogue for the mid-way point in the session, after we had already been through 3 iterations of each participant’s dialogical structure. Before we sat down to talk, we asked each of the participants to provide us with one constraint for our dialogue. We told them the constraints could be anything at all, as long as they were rooted in their practice at SMT. The participants came up with their constraints, and told us we should start by enacting constraints #1 and #2. Constraints #3 and #4 would be added to the conversation at the twenty-minute and forty-minute marks, respectively, as indicated by our timer.

CONSTRAINT #1—LIZ RAO

To be Applied Throughout: Each time a particular Dialogical Structure project is mentioned it must be attributed to its maker along with a descriptive epithet. Like so: Hayley, full of light. Liz, the most beloved and obedient. Lisa, dark and stormy. Robin, of the wood. Anita, gentle and fierce. Similarly each (and any) time a session participant’s name is mentioned you must include the above epithet.

CONSTRAINT #2—ANITA OLSON & ROBIN ERIKSSON

To Be Applied Throughout: Once you have enacted a constraint posed by another session participant, take a five-second pause in silence to reflect. Share your reflections with each other and carry on. Keep in mind that if another constraint is triggered during your five-second pause, you should follow that constraint and then immediately begin a new five-second pause and reflection cycle.

CONSTRAINT #3—LISA SABAN

To Be Added After Twenty Minutes: Set a timer for eight minutes. Keep resetting after it goes off. Every eight minutes, the first line that comes from each of your mouths must be a rhythm that you must say while holding hands.

CONSTRAINT #4—HALEY ROESER

To Be Added After Forty Minutes: Every time you say the word “structure” you need to give the other person a value-based complement.

SHARON MASHIHI & AARON FINBLOOM’S DIALOGUE

The following is an edited transcript of our dialogue. Throughout the conversation, we reference the projects of the participants of SMT. For a description of each participant’s project, see the appendix at the end of this article.

PART 1

SHARON: So we’re here to talk about why it’s worthwhile to structure dialogue. I’ll start by stating one of my beefs of this session: Most of the residents aren’t really *structuring* dialogues. They seem to be creating performative events instead.

AARON: Haha. I don’t have a clear idea of what we mean when we say “structure”. We never really defined it.

SHARON: I guess maybe structure is just a stated constraint. So at its very base, when someone says, “Sharon and Aaron, you will talk to each other,” that’s a choice; that’s a stated constraint.

AARON: Right. Its explicit.

SHARON: So I guess I was hoping for more complex structures.

AARON: Right. Yeah. There certainly is not a lot of complex structure. And there is certainly not a lot of explicit structure. I think there’s a lot of implicit structures that are in place.

SHARON: Yes.

AARON: People have been choosing the locations for their dialogues. Like the living room vs. the kitchen.

SHARON: And there have been rules such as, wait your turn to speak, don't speak at the same time.

AARON: Yes, THAT is implicit within all conversations, but here people are all designing certain things and changing conversation in such a way to make it *do* something. So when **Haley full of light** decided to have her performance over on the stage in the backyard, wasn't that something that structured the conversation?

SHARON: In that case, the constraint was: We have to be on the stage when we have our dialogue. You could argue that when someone is standing on a stage, they are more likely to say certain things, and less likely to say certain other things.

AARON: Absolutely!

SHARON: Yea, but I don't think that environment and structure are the same thing.

AARON: Yeah. Ok, but let's take **Liz, most beloved and obedient's**, project on the first day. She arranged the group into a triangle. And she decided an order in which we could speak, and the constraint was we could only speak in clichés.

SHARON: That was structured.

AARON: That was structured, but it was spatially structured, in terms of how people were organized into a triangle.

SHARON: There was a spatial structure. Yes. I wouldn't say that her choice of having us be in the forest was a structure, but I *would* say that her choice of having us in a triangle was a structure. The reason I considered it a structured dialogue was that there was a very precise set of instructions about who could speak when, and the kinds of things they could and couldn't say.

AARON: Totally. There was an explicit rule of what you could and couldn't say. And there was an ordering of who could talk at what time. Not many other projects have done that. I think others projects may have implicit structures.

SHARON: Yes, but when you think about the intention of this session, it's to be playing with the kinds of choices and constraints that we don't actively

make in regular life. But if I went to a regular old workshop that wasn't thinking about dialogical structures at all, there might be dialogue, and those dialogues would have implicit structures. But here at the dialogical structures session, it seems like people here are explicit about the content they want to discuss, but not explicit about the structures of the discussions.

AARON: Yeah. So I think what structured dialogue is, is an explicit and conscious and conscientious consideration of some number of elements that could be like almost anything. I think it could be place, but it's a conscious choice of place. I guess it could be one place, but then that's only one conscious choice you are making.

SHARON: Yes, exactly. I'm going to do it on the stage because I believe it will affect the content of the dialogue in such and such way.

AARON: Yea.

PART 2

SHARON: Let's go back to our original question: Why structure dialogue? I think it's because when we study dialogue, we can understand how to communicate more effectively. We can see why some thoughts are successfully communicated and others are not.

[PAUSE]

SHARON: Um, I'm very aware that we have eight seconds left and the timer is about to go off. The timer for example, is a structural element that's affecting the content of our current dialogue.

AARON: Absolutely.

[ALARM GOES OFF. WE HAVE HIT THE TWENTY-MINUTE MARK]

AARON: Um, so we need to take a five second pause in silence to reflect and then share your reflections with each other. Okay.

[PAUSE]

SHARON: Yeah. Well, my first reflection is a question: Are we having the conversation that we intended to have about the purpose of structuring dialogue or are we getting too much into the nitty gritty of our pet peeves about how this session is going?

AARON: Yes, I agree. We were getting into the nitty gritty of what structure is, but not talking about the purpose of why we're doing this.

SHARON: Ok, I'll pick the next constraint. It says, "Set a timer for 8 minutes. Keep resetting after it goes off. Every eight minutes, the first line that comes from each of your mouths must be a rhyme that you must say while holding hands.

AARON: Great. Okay.

SHARON: Do you know what my first thought is? These are the exact constraints that I imagined would exist inside people's Dialogical structures.

AARON: Yeah. But I want to play devil's advocate. I want to defend our residents for not structuring their dialogues in the way we imagined they would. For example, let's take **Liz Most Beloved and Obedient's** triangle structure from the first day. Even though we consider that to be a well executed structure, so what? Like what's the point? Did that structure do anything good or useful? I don't think so. Perhaps these types of constraints are just a waste of time.

SHARON: I disagree. Some constraints *are* useful. I have received a profound, new and exciting understanding from the development of *your* structure. That second day when you brought in the transcript of our first session's conversation, and you had all of these constraints around how we were going to read the transcript and talk about it, I understood how many worlds live inside one conversation. I understood how much just whizzes by in most conversations because they happen so fast and there's so much I'm thinking about and so much going on. And I so appreciated how the transcript, and the constraints you created, gave me the opportunity to really hear every word and understand every thought.

AARON: Yeah. So what does that point to?

SHARON: It points to elegant design. I was not necessarily interested in the content of your conversation, which was desire and intention. I find that topic boring, uninteresting, and it means nothing to me. And yet, I got a lot out of the dialogue, because it was structured in an exciting way.

On the other hand, there are projects here at this session which are about love and intimacy, which is my favorite subject in the world. But because

those conversations have lacked structure, I haven't gotten anything new out of them. I'm just having conversations I've had a million times before.

With the exception of **Lisa dark and stormy's** first structure. That dialogue was about love, but it was structured in an innovative way. She found a technique where each of us had to identify with an idea that we disagreed with most. For example, ideas like "love is scary", and "I am more in love than I have ever been," and, "Love is a hallmark card." Then the person who most *agreed* with the idea, "Love is a hallmark card" had to have a dialogue with the person who most disagreed with "Love is a hallmark card." *That* was new. That doesn't exist in real conversation—an opportunity to identify the idea that you disagreed with most and have a conversation with the person who most agreed with it. It became a very emotional conversation.

And in that conversation, new ground was covered for me. Even though I have spent the last thirty-four years having conversations ad nauseum about love. So that was extremely successful and something new did come out of it.

AARON: Right. So I think that's a great articulation of a goal. And it's interesting because this goal you are articulating is a content goal, of coming to new innovative content of conversation.

SHARON: But the structure allows that new content to emerge.

AARON: Yeah, but not all the time. I think people typically don't think this. People think, "oh, just get someone who knows the content, get an expert on the content and then you just have your content. These scientists have this content you want to talk about, we'll get them to talk, and now your conversation has the content you need."

SHARON: It's so important to me that conversations be an opportunity to discover new ideas. Experts are the worst in the world at saying new things. They have their script, and they stick to it.

AARON: Ok, but structure doesn't necessarily lead to new conversational content either. Take this conversation we're having right here. Our residents gave us a number of constraints. But these particular constraints aren't pushing us to new places, to innovative topics or ideas.

SHARON: But the structures are adding some levity. Moreover, this first in-

struction to say the residents' names in a new way got us in the first place to talk about the residents. So that was a structure that guided the content a bit.

AARON: But what's the groundbreaking new content and conversation you want to get to? Where's the problem or the new thing you want to get to?

[beep beep beep]

SHARON: *Yes. Can reset it. Don't forget it.*

AARON: *Where do we want to get to? I wish I had a shoe.*

SHARON: Well at the very least, that made us forget what we were talking about. So we have to recreate something new to talk about. Also, I do think that **Anita Gentle and Fierce and Robin of the Wood's** constraint, where we have to give reflection, is potentially changing the content of this conversation because we're having a moment to reflect on how it's going so far. Because in everyday conversation people don't necessarily stop to evaluate at regular intervals. So I would say their constraint has the most potential to affect the content. So I would say their constraint is a good one.

AARON: Yeah. So maybe we could ask any of our residents a question "what new kind of content do you want to get to?" And what are some dialogical structures you can use to get there?"

PART 3

AARON: So I feel like what might be really helpful to do, which we haven't talked at all about in this session, is to talk about the structure and the constraints themselves and to ask what they're doing. For example: When you get people to only talk to someone they disagree with, what does that do? Or when you put people in a triangle in the woods, what does that do? We can be making a massive spreadsheet of all our structure components.

SHARON: And were these questions that came up last year when you did this same kind of session?

AARON: No, the main question that came up last session, which isn't coming up at all here, is the question of meta-structure versus microstructure. So we were talking all about the little structures of the pieces themselves, but not talking at all about how the conversational content is also determined by the macro-structure of the entire session.

SHARON: Of being at a residency together . . .

AARON: Yes, of being at the residency, where it was very intense, for five days, where everyone's projects were creating conditions of intimacy.

SHARON: Yeah. That's an interesting question. But for me our question of the intentionality of structural choices and their various effectiveness at meeting the facilitators' goals is a more charged question.

AARON: Hmm. Yeah. My immediate question that sort of I'm drawing from both of these is I'm thinking about like how much we can take these structures and put them in another environment. Because if a thirty-minute structure is actually conditioned by the eight-day structure, then all this research you're doing into your thirty-minute structure is for naught, because as soon as you take any of the resident's structures and put them somewhere else, they are going to change drastically.

[beep beep beep]

SHARON: *Well, I would say
that on the first day,
the structure that **lisa dark and stormy** made
could in other places be successfully played.*

AARON: *And I am not so sure about that.
But about why and where
I can't figure that out.*

SHARON: Well, let me draw a scenario. Imagine that **Lisa dark and stormy** is invited to a couples retreat in Vermont that's being run by some famous therapist.

[Alarm]

[Five seconds reflection]

SHARON: Should we open the next one?

AARON: Yeah.

SHARON: "Every time you say the word structure, you need to give the other person a value-based complement." What's a value-based complement? Like "I think you're beautiful"?

AARON: I have no idea what a value-based complement is.

SHARON: Let's just give each other compliments. So can I get back to my example? So let's say that Lisa Dark and Stormy was invited to this retreat in order to help couples or grieving families connect better to love. I could very easily . . .

AARON: . . . see her taking the exact same structure? *I love the way that you're holding your hand.*

SHARON: Thank you. Yes, and make it work there. Or I could similarly see her taking this into a high school that was having a radical health class, and she could come into the room one session and she would have an impact.

AARON: I kind of agree. I think that the techniques can migrate. They can go to all different places and still be very powerful. But I do think that there's so much that comes before the technique itself that conditions the outcome. So yes, I do think that making a chart of different techniques could be effective. But I'm just saying that the surrounding micro-techniques, and all the context around it, has an effect, right?

SHARON: Yeah. But I would say, not a huge effect. Saying that the residency puts us in a particular mood that makes us react to the structures (*I love your hair*) in a particular way, that's like saying if you go to the movies, when you're in a good mood, you're more likely to enjoy the movie. Or if you meet someone on a gorgeous summer night, you're more likely to fall in love with them. That's true. But the movie is the movie and the person is the person. I really actually think there's something extremely valuable about thinking about techniques to find active potent disagreements as quickly and efficiently as possible and then having people discuss those disagreements. That, I think is genius, and I think I'm going to take it with me and I do think it's a standalone element.

AARON: For me, the technique is a seed, you can't just place a seed anywhere and it's going to grow, you need in a certain kind of condition.

SHARON: Yeah, it's true. I mean, for example, in these conditions, we're much more likely to be honest and open with each other, because there's a lot of trust. If **Lisa dark and stormy** were to take her structure, (*I have always found you to be profound*) into a high school, maybe the kids in that

high school wouldn't be as prepared to go as deep as we are here at the residency. But that to me is a small matter. It doesn't change the fact that the technique we're describing has potency.

AARON: Yeah. Maybe it's a small point I'm arguing, but I think the set up for the technique matters a lot.

[beep beep]

SHARON: *I agree with you fin,
but I must begin
to urge you
to help me
change the subject
as a we
because I'm tired of arguing this particular myered minutia.*

AARON: *This minutia is something I did pick
and the pain of it. It's something I continue to inflict
and with it I too. I'm growing sick.*

[Laughter]

SHARON: Yeah. So maybe we can change the subject?

PART 4

AARON: I think we started to touch on it, but I'm not sure if we have really defined yet why what we are doing is important. Maybe that's something we could talk about.

SHARON: Yeah, let's talk about that.

AARON: Because I mean, what do people think an important conversation is? I'd say some examples would be: a political conversation that gets people to not vote for Trump, or a conversation in a court of law that makes those who are innocent not be found guilty, a conversation that heals your psyche. So why frolic in experimentation when you can just take something directly that you know needs to be changed and have those conversations that are really needed?

SHARON: Well, I'm just wondering if some of the discoveries that we make in a session like this can be applicable to those kinds of conversations and

many others. And I know that I keep coming back to this one revelation from **Lisa dark and stormy's**, but I think that's a perfect example. So let's say there are two factions and it's some negotiator's job to bring these factions to the table. A technique, like the one discovered here, can be used to efficiently spark productive dialogue in such a setting. And if no one ever did things like this experimental dialogues session, if no one ever experimented with what happens if x, y, or z, then we would be limited to our habitual patterns and conversations that don't always lead to positive results.

AARON: Yeah, totally. But one critique is "well, but **Lisa dark and stormy** is never going to actually do that. She's never going to be the negotiator bringing two factions to the table." So wouldn't it be better for at least **Lisa dark and stormy** or all of us to just like go to the places that need these kinds of conversations to happen and then do the experimenting there?

SHARON: I think this is a better place to fail, be nurtured, get the critical feedback of our peers, get to think in a different way. And maybe one of those residents takes something that they've learned and either writes a paper about it or includes it in a play and whoever witnesses that will learn and the number of witnesses will multiply. In fact, this residency seems so much more obviously relevant to the problems of the world than a poetry artist residency. Which is not to say that I'm against a poetry artist residency, I think that's important too. But the discoveries here can affect divorce negotiations and United Nations conflicts and so many very obviously agreed upon important elements of being part of a world culture.

[PAUSE]

AARON: Ok. Yea so one other thing that I wanted to think about is the idea of facilitation. And this relates totally to **Anita gentle and fierce and Robin of the woods'** project. Because I think the idea of facilitation is that you can't pre-structure anything because anything that you structure, any technique that you bring, might not be placed at the right moment. Because if you structure (*that sweater is really great*) if you create that sense of sequencing in advance, that might not be what the conversation is asking for. So the idea of facilitation goes against a lot of what we're talking about here. It might be something interesting to bring up. A good facilitator is perhaps better than any technique.

SHARON: Are you also saying that a good facilitator, if given the exact structure (*you were born to run SMT*) that I designed yesterday, they would have been able to get better results than I did?

AARON: Maybe yes. But here's one argument against facilitation. Facilitation moves through all the techniques and rules and all these things so quickly that we can't even see what's happening. Also, it does so by having a singular person in charge of the movement of that thing. So I think by creating these dialogical structures (*I think you've been amazing in this conversation, I'm so in awe*) so by creating those, I think what we do is we move away from having a person be in charge of the movement and we focus on the actual things that are happening in the conversation that are moving too fast for us to even see and we create something that can persist. That's the thing which I'm excited about. We can make something that we can take and repeat and repeat and repeat.

SHARON: Yes, I agree!

[TIMER]

SHARON: *This is so annoying.
I am not enjoying
this prompt.*

AARON: *I think if you just had a little more light,
you would learn to not make it such a fight.*

SHARON: So in that sense, any one of us could ideally be able to write up one of our structures (*and your eyes are so beautiful*) and anyone else could repeat it. So that people wouldn't be dependent on the skill of the facilitator. They could simply rely on the structure.

AARON: Exactly. There's a certain kind of greater ethical claim that's being made. There is a certain hierarchy that says, "we need a good facilitator to do this thing," but creating a structure (*you're one of my best friends*) that can be repeated, takes away that need. It's even more democratic, in that anyone can do it.

SHARON: I love that.

AARON: Yup. Anyway, time's up.

SHARON: Ok, bye.

AARON: Bye, see you.

“DIALOGICAL EXPERIMENTS” SESSION PARTICIPANTS

ANITA OLSON AND ROBIN ERIKSSON

Anita and Robin practiced arts-based facilitation to get at what they described as “the heart” of the group. In each of their sessions, they asked us to try a series of exercises primarily drawn from Augusto Boal and other impulse-based exercises. One example was an exercise where we had to simultaneously draw a cross with one hand, and a circle with the other hand. This challenging physical procedure was then used in a following session as the group attempted to conceptualize and embody the “cross” and the “circle” using mapping and physical theatre exercises.

SHARON MASHIHI

Sharon created dialogical structures that aimed to instigate never-before-had conversations about self-hatred, negative inner dialogue, and habits of thought. During one session, participants created moment-by-moment snapshots of self-critical thinking they had engaged in in the past few hours. This list was then discussed using focused dialogical prompts.

AARON FINBLOOM

Through the use of conversational games, prompts, and rules, Aaron explored the un-spoken possibilities in moments of conversation. Aaron created a verbatim transcription of a conversation which occurred on the first day. This transcription was then read aloud by the exact same participants, creating an eerie replay of a conversation. The re-reading also created brief opportunities for participants to stray from the script and offer new interpretations and insights.

LIZ RAO

In each of her Dialogical Structures, Liz tried to work out an artistic process hang up, while at the same time proving or disproving something about group dynamics and language. Most hang-ups were issues she encountered as a filmmaker, such as: the fear of being boring, and the desire to instigate conflict. In one example of dialogue, Liz arranged the group into a triangle formation as we were walking through the woods. She assigned the

group members an order in which we could speak, and instructed us to only speak in clichés.

HALEY ROESER

Haley's Dialogical Structures drew on her interests in sensual mapping, walking, love, and sex. For example, she had participants integrate tinder swipes into conversations on love, curate make-believe galleries, and walk in small groups while noticing, describing, and reflecting on what we were sensing in our immediate surroundings.

LISA SABAN

Lisa explored tension in two-person theatrical dialogues. In each of her structures, she identified topics for tense dialogue and observed what happened when two people were asked to engage in those dialogues. In one example, she made a script out of a moment of tension between two members of the group. This script was then used to improvise and direct a series of theatrical scenes based on this encounter.

SHARON MASHIHI makes movies, radio, and performances. Her work can be heard on the podcasts *The Heart*, *Strangers*, *United States of Music*, *The New Yorker Radio Hour*, *Snap Judgment*, *Unfictional*, and many others. Her performances and installations have been featured at The Painting Center, The Wassaic Project, Tapefest, The Hearsay Festival in Ireland, and Moogfest. Sharon is co-writer of the 2017 feature film, *The Ticket*, and story editor of the forthcoming film, *Madeline's Madeline*. As an editor, Sharon was a 2017 Peabody Award Finalist. She also facilitates residency sessions at The School of Making Thinking.

AARON FINBLOOM is a philosopher, performance artist, musician and co-founder of The School of Making Thinking (SMT), an artist/thinker residency program and experimental college. Much of Finbloom's creative practice functions as an attempt to expand the scope of philosophy's pedagogy via structured conversations, dialogical games, improvisational scores, contemplative audio guides and performative lectures. Finbloom has taught philosophy at Suffolk County Community College, curated dozens of courses playing with radical pedagogy for SMT, and led numerous interactive workshops at places which include: EMERGE Residency Program, The Performance Philosophy Conference, Elsewhere, and Milk Bar. He holds an MA in Philosophy and Art from SUNY Stony Brook and currently working towards his PhD at Concordia University's Interdisciplinary Humanities program with advisers Sandeep Bhagwati, Erin Manning, and Nathan Brown.