

'Important' issues are intellectually tackled with a *calculated* rigour. ~~If any interjections into such debate(s) are to reveal anything new, they need to be calculated.~~

~~Therefore, The typical formality of such 'discussions' (i.e. the essay format, for instance) is deemed to represent an appropriately ~~such a~~ methodical approach.~~

Word for Word

Nick Thurston and Pavel Büchler

Our conversation ~~I was going to start by saying that~~ today is probably too pre-meditated to be a simple or casual conversation. So I'm going to use the term 'discussion', ^[which implies certain formality and a topic] ~~rightly~~ or wrongly – maybe there's no great difference. Errm If we think that talk traditionally is considered 'ordinary' – it's 'recognisable', 'informal' – and for those same reasons it's construed as inappropriate for proper, 'elevated' uses. For such uses, I guess, conventional academic discourses are deemed 'correct' and ~~so preferred. So, I'd like to think there might be a reason we might undertake a~~ ^{try} project which may at least look to disrupt the relegation of discussion to a part of the preliminaries of investigation, ~~the simple 'everyday' uses. So, I guess, one~~ ^{ordinary' talk.}

The first question is: 'What is it?'. Essentially it's a ^e sort of, it's an, it's the process of exchanging. It's the verbalised formation of those thoughts, opinions or ^{simple} comments which one believes it's worth or appropriate to share. It's not a ~~single~~ swap. ~~But erm, but the translation of our continually evolving thought patterns, which we present in stages. Each insertion we make into discussion, is err a~~ ^{intervention the} temporary phase of our ^{constantly} re-negotiated position. I think then, it's ^{must} ~~to be~~ ^[reactive] necessarily considered reactionary. And it requires engagement. ~~It requires the~~ ^{It is} engagement of two or more people. ~~So, it may be~~ quintessentially mutual, ~~you might say — it could seem as though it's the epitome of collaboration in that~~ ^{simple} sense. ~~We have to you, You have to contribute to be involved in a discussion. It's not, an 'interview' or a 'lesson', but it is instinctive. I guess communication is the natural activity of social creatures. Familiar, 'oral intercourse', if you like, is the most commonly developed format we share. I've erm, I've sort of noted down here, that two heads might not always be better than one. but erm (certainly not as clear or as focused in belief), but they can between them make available a wider expanse of possibilities. You have a lot of facets in what you~~

Our conversation today is probably too premeditated to be a simple or casual conversation. So I'm going to use the term 'discussion' which implies a certain formality and a topic. 'Important' issues are intellectually tackled with a calculated rigor. The typical formality of such 'discussions' (the essay format, for instance) is deemed to represent an appropriately methodical approach. I'd like to think that our project may try to disrupt the relegation of discussion to a part of the preliminaries of proper investigation. The first question is: 'What is it?' Essentially it's a process of exchange. It's the verbalized formation of those thoughts, opinions or comments which one believes worthy or appropriate to share. It's not a simple swap, but a translation of our continually evolving thought patterns, which we present in stages. Each intervention we make into the discussion is a temporary phase of our constantly re-negotiated position. I think, then, it must be considered reactive. And it requires the engagement of two people. It is quintessentially mutual, the epitome of collaboration. You have to actively contribute to be involved in a discussion. Two heads might not always be better than one but they can between them make available a wider expanse of possibilities.

'stage' = a temporary stasis between the completed formation of thought and its completed delivery as an interjection into discussion (A platform to build upon)

you can passively consume the info relayed in a discussion, but you cannot be passively involved.

said. I think if you, if for a start, you want to pin down one term which err
pins it down, maybe better than either of the two (conversation or discussion) that
you propose) is the term 'interlocution'. It sounds incredibly kind of Roland

Barthesian, but, but er, it implies that collaboration through exchange that you
are on about. When you say that the conversation, as a mode of doing

something together, is 'necessarily reactionary', I understand it in the sense of
responding to one another: reacting to what has been said, rather than being

'reactionary' in an ideological or political sense. ... Sure, that's as it's meant. But

Yet, it

is that **What** makes conversation such a fertile ground for developing ideas or

getting closer to some kind of a common aim, is not just the answer-response,
because the answer-response method (or logic) leaves the gap between the two

identities involved in the conversation essentially intact. But that kind of it's

Rather, it is something

like a process of 'bringing into'. If you visualise the conversation between the two

interlocutors as a space that separates them, the creative part of the

conversation consists of bringing things into that space until it somehow 'fills

up'. ... Yeah ... It is interesting to think about it from that perspective – rather

than thinking about it in terms of 'coming together' – because that gives you a
different kind of perspective on the role of consensus and the tension that may

[implies convergence rather than exchange]

separate the positions of the respective speakers and so on. Well I've said to you
before that I believe in conversation as a fast, constantly refreshing forum,

capable of utilising the various knowledge and insights of those persons involved.

It is a contributive thing. It is a contributive thing, but what is it exactly that is

being contributed?

You have two or more people who are bringing 'something' into
a situation, but because of the nature of that type of interaction, not

everything that is brought into that situation just stays there. It's like it's like

cooking or something. With every additional step everything is being constantly

transformed. If you... So, there's a residual effect, as much as a sort of

noticeable affect? Yeah, that's interesting. No, it is noticeable I think... But it's

A better term than either of the two (conversation or discussion) that you propose may be 'interlocution'. It implies that collaboration through exchange that you are talking about. When you say that conversation, as a mode of doing something together, is 'necessarily reactionary', I understand it in the sense of responding to one another: reacting to what has been said, rather than being 'reactionary' in an ideological or political sense. Yet, it is not just the answer-response method (or logic) that makes conversation such a fertile ground for developing ideas, because that leaves the gap between the two identities involved in the conversation essentially intact. Rather, it is something like a process of 'bringing into'. If you visualize the conversation between the two interlocutors as a space that separates them, then the creative part of the conversation consists of bringing things into that space until it somehow 'fills up'. It is interesting to think about it from that perspective – rather than thinking about it in terms of 'coming together' – because that gives a different role to consensus and the friction or tension between the positions of the respective speakers, and implies convergence rather than exchange. I have told you before that I believe in conversation as a fast, constantly refreshing forum capable of utilizing the diverse knowledge and insights of those involved. It is a contributive thing. But what exactly is being contributed? Two or more people are bringing 'something' into a situation, but everything that is brought into that situation is being constantly transformed. So, there's a residual effect, as much as a noticeable affect.

= an interview
Q: Is that really
a discussion?

The components of that space are an admixture whose evolution depends upon the course of the conversation

not immediately apparent ~~✓ or ...~~ The word 'residual' is interesting here. ~~Because it is kind of like throwing chopped carrots into the pot and they sort of, boil down, and it all keeps transforming. It's not that when you then kind of, strain the whole bloody thing, you find the carrots as they were in the first place. They are.~~

In conversation the space between conversants is the space into which you bring your contribution, but that contribution changes with every subsequent response, along with every subsequent ... Absolutely ... Subsequent new idea that

Like in cooking, it all boils down to something.

is thrown in. ~~There is the thing that,~~ the spoken, like the performed, and unlike the written, is 'bound by time'. So, pinning down the affects or effects of your contribution is quite difficult. In the same way that you can't quite be sure what the

↓

Q: Is it possible to separate the contributions?

(probably not)

↳

carrots have done to everything else in the pot. Umm Well yes. If you consider that there is such a thing as an 'outcome' of a conversation (which is actually what we are trying to create here) whose authorship is shared between the contributors, it is not that straightforward. You can't simply say 'this is what I contributed,' 'this is my bit,' 'this is his bit,' because of ~~course,~~ ^{what} as you implied with the term 'reactionary', ~~things kind of react. Maybe that's a better way of looking at the work than in,~~ ^{like} in strictly in terms of statement/response. It's a reaction as in a chemical reaction. You know, one thought or one statement, ~~becomes~~ ^{may} become a catalyst for something that transforms ~~previous or subsequent statements.~~ ^{the} Mmm Guess. ~~Maybe, what I should have said is that they're~~ mutually affecting. Right. They bounce off one another, and, and they affect the position and re-positioning. ... Yeah, well ... The re-negotiating of one another's position in that sense. They can do all kinds of things. Errm. They may 'bounce off' in the sense that they never kind of 'meet again'. They go in their separate directions. They may kind of merge together, and find some new trajectory or whatever. But the I think the interesting thing there is that it's more than just an intertwining or just a kind of, formation of a texture. It's really like a meltdown. It's really like a complex process, in which the two voices, while still perhaps

But it's not immediately apparent. The word 'residual' is interesting here. In conversation the space between conversants is the space in which your contribution changes with every subsequent response, with every new idea that is thrown in. As in cooking, it all boils down to something. The spoken, like the performed, and unlike the written, is 'bound by time'. So, pinning down the affects or effects of your contribution is quite difficult, in the same way that you can't quite be sure what the carrots have done to everything else in the pot. If you consider that there is such a thing as an 'outcome' of a conversation (which is actually what we are trying to create here) whose authorship is shared between the contributors, it is not that straightforward. You can't simply say 'this is what I contributed,' 'this is my bit,' 'this is his bit,' because of what you implied with the term 'reactionary'. It's like a chemical reaction. One thought, one statement or any other 'ingredient' may become the catalyst for something that transforms the previous or subsequent statements. They're mutually affecting. They bounce off one another and they affect one another's relative position. They can do all kinds of things. They may 'bounce off' in the sense that they never 'meet again'. They can take off in their separate directions or they may merge together and find some new trajectory or whatever. But it's more than just an intertwining or formation of a texture. It's really like a meltdown in which the two voices, while still perhaps

distinguishable via a subsequent reading (listening to the record of that conversation), do not necessarily suggest two individual passages. It becomes. It is a more complex movement, something like a vortex, or something like that, where ... ~~So there's a kind of entropy? ...~~ Where the individual directions do not necessarily create a third. ~~Yeah, yeah -~~ There's. So there's. ~~Within the given structure of the chosen linguistic (sort of) format,~~ there's a kind of entropy, in that the outcome can't be prescribed or foreknown. And the outcomes might be various, and certainly not necessarily harmonious — but they could be. The outcome cannot be prescribed in any, you know, any form, in any type of formulation, [^]really. Not least because you cannot guarantee a definitive reading, or a definitive understanding, of any form of a statement, except perhaps in mathematics. But, in a live conversation more than anywhere else, there isn't even a clear erm, erm I mean, what is an outcome in conversation? What is a conclusion? You can have a formal discussion which can end in an agreement, but I think the way we are talking about it here, rather than just having ^[in contrast to an objective] uncertain outcomes, one goes further and says, even the aim of a conversation cannot be predicted. Or that ^{that} the conversation cannot really have an à priori aim, because ^{it} if it had had an à priori aim, it would really be reduced to a 'straightforward' exchange of what the parties had to bring to the table ... I'd see it as a matter of re-negotiation. Where at one point you've negotiated a position; one entry into that conversation is A, and you're coming out maybe at B, C, D, ~~you don't know which, which or where it will come out.~~ But it's true that some effect ~~or~~ change has taken place ... Yeah, convers-... regardless of how menial or mundane that conversation may have been ... Yeah, yeah conv-... and the topics might have seemed. ~~Yeah, conversation, in that sense,~~ is a process whose rules are continuously being negotiated by the process itself. Umm... Well we've ^{those negotiations} agreed that we'll work back into this ~~printed~~ transcript, physically with pen or pencil, and leave the evidence of our 'interventions' ~~(like the word or not) ...~~

try and suggest so



distinguishable via a subsequent reading (listening to the record of that conversation), do not necessarily suggest two individual passages. It is a more complex movement, something like a vortex, where the individual directions do not necessarily create a third. There's a kind of entropy. The outcome cannot be prescribed or foreknown, not least because you cannot guarantee a definitive reading, or a definitive understanding, of any form of a statement, except perhaps in mathematics. What is an outcome in conversation? What is a conclusion? You can have a formal discussion which can end in an agreement, but in a live conversation, not even the aim – in contrast to an objective – can be predicted. The conversation cannot really have an à priori aim, because that would reduce it to a 'straightforward' exchange of what the parties had to bring to the table ... I'd see it as a matter of re-negotiation, where at one point you've negotiated a position; one entry into that conversation is A, and you may be coming out at B, C or D, you don't know which. Some change has taken place regardless of how menial or mundane, 'inconsequential' that conversation and the topics may have seemed. Conversation, in that sense, is a process whose rules are continuously being negotiated by the process itself. We've agreed that we'll bring those negotiations back into this transcript by working on it physically, with pen or pencil, and leaving the evidence of our 'interventions' visible.

as a format, conversation mutates recursively

[?]



conversations themselves develop recursively

Visible. ... visible. ~~Exactly.~~ And the residue of this method ^{will be} – the scribbles and annotations reproduced and – the stimuli which inform our next discussion.

So we're planning ~~almost~~ to treat the document as 'given material' once we have a physical copy. This method, for me, intends to prize ~~back open, as I've said to~~

~~you before,~~ a semi-concluded text, and raise fresh questions. ~~So~~ I see it as a 'literal' extension of the re-negotiative process. Now, this brings quite obvious concerns – from our duties to preservation (you know, the sincerity of the what

we put forward), to how conceited is our offering (to what extent are our contributions pre-conceived, given ^{that} we know how our dialogue is going to be used). I mean, ~~You have said that the disparity between sincerity and outcome~~

~~isn't a massive concern, or that outcome ... It's not disparity between sincerity and outcome.~~ I mean, Sincerity is of no great value in a project like this. What is of value, is the search for the method. Strictly speaking, to test the method,

which is one of inclusivity – that is to say, a method whose every step remains part of the final record ^{⊙ ^} ~~...~~ Visible, as we both said. ~~To test that method, one~~

could take almost anything. You could take any kind of accidentally found statement and test the method on that. ~~I think the~~ [≡] the question is not one of authenticity of the source material, but of the distance you have travelled, since that distance ought to be legible in whatever the final form of ~~that~~ presentation is.

It ought to be possible to imagine perhaps, or to read back, to understand, the extent to which the material has been transformed. It doesn't really matter so much what kind of material you start with [▽] ~~Well ... That's one thing. The second~~

~~thing is that the~~ [⊙] ~~only thing that is lost, and would be lost in any case, is some~~ kind of initial preparation, which takes place in silence. ~~Whatever is prior to the~~

~~conversation. If I come up with something I listened to on the radio this morning, where am I standing? How genuine or authentic, in your terms – or sincere, in your terms – would that statement be? Yeah, well, I think what is~~

~~allowed by re-working, particularly~~ a verbatim transcript ([≡] should it prove to

The residue of this method – the scribbles and annotations reproduced – will be the stimuli which will inform our next discussion. We're planning to treat the document as 'given material' once we have a physical copy. This method, for me, intends to prize open the semi-concluded text and raise fresh questions. I see it as a 'literal' extension of the re-negotiative process. This brings about quite obvious concerns – from our duties to preservation (the sincerity of what we put forward), to how conceited is our offering (to what extent are our contributions pre-conceived, given that we know how our dialogue will be used). Sincerity is of no great value in a project like this. What is of value is the search for the method. Strictly speaking, to test the method, which is one of inclusivity, that is to say, a method whose every step remains part of the final record – visible, as we both said – one could take almost anything. You could take any kind of accidentally found statement and test the method on that. The question is not one of authenticity of the source material, but of the distance you have travelled, since that distance – from the moment to the document – ought to be legible in whatever the final form of presentation is. It ought to be possible to imagine, perhaps, or read back and understand, the extent to which the material has been transformed. It doesn't really matter so much what kind of material you start with. The only thing that will be lost, in any case, is the initial preparation, which takes place in silence, prior to the conversation.

Q: Should the preoccupation of the method be to articulate the many dimensions of the conversation and express the process of conversion from the moment to the document, rather than simply restate what was said?

apologies for
the clichés

will allow us
~~be), is a chance~~ to re-consider that which we 'cast in ink'. We may have cast
 that a little hastily, ~~or~~ in the 'heat of conversation', if you like, and if nothing else,
 it offers us ~~involved~~ an opportunity to ^{and perhaps} identify, ~~maybe~~ re-phrase, those points
 which we see as ^{the} most pertinent, with the forgiving benefit ~~of (or as I've said to~~
~~you before,~~ the confusing irritation) of hindsight. But the publication of the raw
 and worked-upon material – the paper itself – is, I think, also a refusal to hide
 our 'constructing' ~~Err.~~ ~~our influence or editorship,~~ our active building. ^{will} It's
 leaving the layers evident. That can both make available the ^{random} thought processes,
 influencing the realisation of this project (~~you know, the conversation and~~
~~document),~~ and also display the actual constructional process, ~~which I do believe~~
~~can enable fast and considered development of ideas.~~ So, it's a publicising of the
 act of communication. And publicising in that it wants to make available and
 also promote (~~you know, no hiding from those connotations~~). ~~I mean,~~ quite
 literally (~~and I don't want to try and overstate the importance of what we're~~
~~doing), but~~ it's a laying bare. ~~Yes.... Or at least hopes to.~~ Yes, but at the same
 time, what will happen in this process, or what it will lay bare, is not the
 accidental, the un-premeditated, the spontaneous and so on that takes place in
 a conversation, but the degree to which those accidents, those moments of
 spontaneity ~~and so on~~ have to be ~~somehow~~ brought under control, and played
 with, and restrained ~~and so on~~. [^] So that, ~~you know,~~ something coherent can
 emerge from what is essentially just a mass of raw material. ~~Yeah. Of course,~~
 what is intrinsic to any sort of recording or re-presenting, is the issue of editorial
 influence. ~~In this situation,~~ I don't think it's just a question of how genuine the
document we're offering 'is', but also of how genuine it 'could have been'. So,
~~when equating the sincerity or or the actuality of our offering,~~ we're looking for
an outcome that accords with the possible. ~~It can't be ...~~ The document as a
document is by definition genuine because it is a document. ~~Because it is~~
~~going to be written or a printed document,~~ a piece of paper, ^{But} it only certifies, if you

Re-working a verbatim transcript (should it prove to be such) will allow us to re-consider that which we 'cast in ink'. We may have cast that a little hastily, in the 'heat of conversation', if you like, and if nothing else it will offer us an opportunity to identify, and perhaps re-phrase, those points which we see as the most pertinent, with the forgiving benefit (or the confusing irritation) of hindsight. But the publication of the raw and worked-upon material – the paper itself – is, I think, also a refusal to hide our 'constructing', our active building. It will make the translucent layers evident. That can both make available the random thought processes influencing the realization of this project and display the actual constructional process. So, it's publicizing the act of communication in the sense that it wants to make available and also to promote. Quite literally, it's a laying bare. Yes but, at the same time, what it will lay bare is not the accidental, the unpremeditated, the spontaneous, and so on, that takes place in a conversation, but the degree to which those accidents, those moments of spontaneity, have to be brought under control, played with and restrained, so that something coherent can emerge from what is essentially just a mass of raw material. I don't think it's just a question of how genuine the document we're offering 'is', but also of how genuine it 'could have been'. So, we're looking for an outcome that accords with the possible. The document as a document is by definition genuine.

aiming for a
transparency

ephemeral
factors that
cannot be
retained

The method
can only
indicate
these
factors. The
document
can never
evidence
them; they
are 'wipped
off the
record'.

all-involved-are-culpable
for-the-outcomes-of-a
conversation
(its consequences)

like, to the ^{possible} kind of ~~genuine~~ conversation rather than re-presenting it, strictly speaking. Or ... So, it attests to its having taken place. ^{but} Or it suffers from the same inauthenticity as any representation ~~does~~. It is something that has been subjected to a ^{repeated} process of encoding, ^{and} then decoding, even if it is perhaps, ~~by non-conventional means~~. ^[the code] The authenticity in question here, really concerns the final ~~printed~~ form of it, not the initial moment. Yeah. — OK, yeah. Well, I guess the task we've undertaken here is translating the oral into the written — ~~from one medium to another~~. The puzzle of that may be: 'What affect on the material do we, and the process itself, have ^{in the translation of} during transposition?'. What are the unavoidable affects of transference? But also, what do we intentionally do to it, to the original material — ~~the conscious manipulation~~ — for which we have to take responsibility, if nothing else(?). I mean. To some extent this is stating the obvious; the oral and the written are two very different modes. What we are perhaps trying to make visible is the written as a mode of engagement with the oral. ... Right. The relationship between the two? A relationship between the two, and because of the topic we have chosen to discuss, it's not an entirely one-sided relationship. We are ^{as we speak} kind of thinking in terms of transcript ~~now~~, but ^[the transcript is the objective] it's a, it's more like it's a way of . Are there any particular unions or conflicts between the two that you'd expect to see? Here, or in the final ... Well, there is ^{there is a, you know,} the question of the union between the oral and the written is centered on the content; the conflict is centered on the form. ~~And things~~ become obvious when one tries to think in terms of the reading. ~~The reading is~~ a ^{type of} visual apprehension of the text. You analyse visually the shape of the letters, the letters make up words, the words conform to some kind of rules of grammar or otherwise, and that is how you proceed ~~in reading~~. But if you imagine somebody trying to read the text aloud, for instance, imagine the possibility of a complete reconstruction of the conversation, and if you at the same time visualise what the text might look like ^{(that is to say, full of over-}

But a piece of paper only certifies to the possible conversation rather than, strictly, re-presenting it. It attests to its having taken place but suffers from the same inauthenticity as any representation. It is something that has been subjected to repeated encoding and decoding, and the question of authenticity really concerns the code of the final form of it, not the initial moment. The puzzle of that may be: 'What effect on the material do we, and the process itself, have in the translation of the oral into the written?' What are the unavoidable affects of transference? But also, what do we intentionally do to the original material – the consequences of the conscious manipulation – for which we are culpable and have to take responsibility, if nothing else? To some extent, this is stating the obvious; the oral and the written are two very different modes. What we are perhaps trying to make visible is the written as a mode of engagement with the oral – a relationship between the two – and because of the topic we have chosen to discuss, it's not an entirely one-sided relationship. We are thinking in terms of the transcript as we speak. Are there any particular unions or conflicts between the two that you'd expect to see? Well, the union between the oral and the written is centered on content; the conflict is centered on form. Things become obvious when one tries to think in terms of reading. Reading is a visual apprehension of the text. You analyse visually the shapes of the letters, the letters make up words, the words conform to some kind of rules of grammar or otherwise, and that is how you proceed. But imagine somebody trying to read the text aloud and, at the same time, visualize what the text might look like.

Q: Would this be a good test of our method?

~~writing in multiple layers, and god knows what), I can't quite visualise it. I can~~
visualise even less, someone trying to re-articulate the ^[reading] text in writing. If you
transcribe a conversation, verbatim ... [^] Word-for-word ... or, ~~or otherwise~~, and then
you get someone to read the script out loud, you are not getting the same
script conversation back. And that is not only because of the rhythm of the voice, the
texture of it, that kind of ... The application of tones etc. ~~All that kind of thing is~~
~~obviously lost.~~ I mean, ~~There maybe ways of preserving it, but it's~~ ^{also} because the
transcription has ^{activated} ~~really done~~ 'something' ^{of} to the spirit of it – ~~to~~ the spirit of
conversation – ^{even if} ~~the text is fixed~~ ^{and} there is nothing that can be changed. The text is
~~the definitive form of the conversation. Whereas, a sentence as it's being uttered,~~
~~kind of heads for a very uncertain destination – as you said at the beginning.~~ So
~~the...~~ ^{But} ~~So that,~~ while in reading one is aware of there being a destination of the
idea or the thought, in conversation anything can happen. And that kind of
anything, that kind of, unpredictability cannot be preserved. So, the resultant
document is more the conversation – 'the conversation' – than the
conversation can or could ever again be seen to be. In that the conversation can
only be a memory, ... In a way... If it exists nowhere else outside that transcript,
as a, as a record, ... In a way... So it is the definitive. Yes. Any form of record –
written or otherwise – is a fixed thing, isn't it? The interesting thing here is
whether there are forms of transcription that can re-activate, ~~if you like,~~ the
spirit of the moment, that can re-activate somehow the, that can create enough
room for imagination in reading, ~~that bring back those aspects of conversation,~~
~~those aspects of the live moment, that you would expect to be lost in conventional~~
~~types of record.~~

not just lost, it is replaced

there is no need to resuscitate it

has no other fixed material existence



If you transcribe a conversation, verbatim, word-for-word, and then you get someone to read the script out loud, you are not getting the same script back. And that is not only because of the rhythm of the voice, the texture of it, the application of tone, etc., but it is also because the transcription has really activated 'something' of the spirit of conversation – even if the text is fixed and there is nothing that can be changed. The text is the definitive form of the conversation. But while in reading one is aware that there is a destination of the idea or the thought, in conversation anything can happen. And that kind of anything, that unpredictability cannot be preserved. So, the resultant document is more 'the' conversation than the conversation can be and there is no need to resuscitate it. The conversation can only be a memory of a possibility co-existent with the transcript; as a record, it is the definitive: a certainty. The interesting thing here is whether there are forms of transcription that can re-activate the spirit of the live moment, that can create enough room for imagination in reading, so as to lose sight of the destiny of a thought.

PS: I came across Derrida's 'Chora' the other week (trans. Ian McCloud), in which he tries to explain the unrepresentability of the unintelligible and comments with regard to attempts at presenting (active) chora thus:

'With its ceaseless re-launchings, its failures, its super-impositions, its over-writings and reprintings, this history wipes itself out in advance since it programs itself, reproduces itself, and reflects itself by anticipation. Is a prescribed, programmed, reproductive, reflexive history still a history?'

The conversation, initiated by Nick Thurston, took place in Pavel Buehler's studio at Manchester Metropolitan University on 11 November 2003. It lasted 30 minutes.