

DAN FARRELL / P. INMAN  
*PhillyTalks* 14 Monday Nov. 29, 1999  
Kelly Writers House 3805 Locust Walk Philadelphia PA 19104

P. Inman

Notes on slow writing

1. Against it. The overwhelming noise of late capitalism. The omnipresent signal of capital (of "product" minus production) wearing away at everything else: at anything apart, anything aside from its own tautologism. "Noise [visual, auditory] as a weapon . . ."1 The communications [sic] network driving not only the superstructural, but the economic & political as well. "Electrification" given a perverse twist with the digitalization of banking, commerce, investment, production, text, weapons delivery &&&.

2. An ideology made up as a cosmetics. The glitter of surfaces & the erasure of all intervening space between one surface, one frontal shot, & the next. Everything immediately before us: pre-packaged.

3. Any unitary word as a point of resistance, an interruption in the ongoing transmission. That which remains single & planted, which doesn't move along the line, which isn't swept along by the trajectory of information & bytes of sensation, of electronic current &/or currency. There's no longer any lead time up to anywhere. No distance between one thing & the next; no space cleared out in which to reflect; no time in which to have an attention span. It's always-already past tense. If I could just put my finger on it it'd already be gone.

4. "As coisas nao tem pez." ("Things have no peace.")<sup>2</sup>

5. "[History up to now] has been, as Marx comments, 'pre-history'. History has not even started yet. All we have had so far is the realm of necessity — the ringing of changes on the drearily present motif of exploitation."<sup>3</sup> . . . Why not every word as a "first instance", long before the last instance of the economic ever arrives (although, of course, it already has). Why not freezing that instance before it's incorporated, drowned in the data.

6. "I, um, ah, ah, um; I, ah, um, um, ah; ah, I, um; ah . . ."4 Those single, separated utterances as interruptions: breaks in the unceasing wave of impulse. As transmission shut down.

7. If one talks in terms of "depth", they're not necessarily psychologizing things. The inside of the object might be social, rather than personal. Interiority doesn't (have to) equal subjecthood. Resonance doesn't (have to) emanate from an

ego. What'd be in there then? The grist of past & present usage (Dickensian ring notwithstanding). The accretion of the social. Layers of linguistic act.

8. If there was such a thing as uncanniness in language it'd originate from the history of terms: from the dissipation of their social substantivity. The glow from an energy leak. Some negative aura.

9. Isn't it a case of putting words into relief? Of sculpting them? The move of edging off one thing from the next, rather than having language be a series of spillages. The form of words rather than their formlessness. Their concreteness re-established from moment to moment.

10. Language under quarantine. A wall between it & "the ever-changing production of what is always the same . . ." <sup>5</sup> Language which is too difficult to be seamlessly incorporated. Too uneven. If writing does nothing else it should always verge on the non-assimilable.

11. One word does not equal another. Language is not a medium of equivalence. Words are not denominations. Or shouldn't be. Language is not (shouldn't be) immediately "convertible". <sup>6</sup> Every unit of the written or spoken needs to be recuperated via its own particularity. The signal's valence re-thickened. Obstinacy & discreteness as defense mechanisms.

12. Overpunctuation's as one available strategy. Its dual effect to at once contract & expand the reader/writer's focus upon the text. 1) to contract: to slow down the text, to counteract the socially constructed tendency to move through the present word to the next as quickly as possible (read: "Taylorism") <sup>7</sup>: to skim over, to scan: to reach the end; 2) to expand: to cut the reader/writer adrift in the text; to neutralize punctuation's directive function & thus leave the length of each phrasal unit undefined: so that at any one point on the page one would always be in its midst.

13. Picasso reportedly said that painting's role was to arrest motion: the better to isolate form's possibility. The painter had to make a stab at recapturing the terrain of objects. To keep the surrounding social flux . . . that which corroded the object, destroyed its integrity . . . outside of the painting. <sup>8</sup>

14. "Speed distance obliterates the notion of physical dimension. Speed suddenly becomes a primal dimension that defies all temporal and physical measurements." <sup>9</sup> Speed is its own law: everything else bypassed. Capital's message now flattened into a carrier wave headed toward the next social widget, the next reception point. Efficiency would be based on velocity, on ballistic thinness: the social dimension to things, their differences, stepped on, squeezed out. <sup>10</sup>

15. Stillness as antidote. To write using only nouns? Grenier or early Saroyan.<sup>11</sup> Each word put down as part of a work action, a communication slow-down.

16. "Town hall meetings" on TV or on the Web: instead of at a meeting hall. Re: Marx's prediction that the concentration of workers at one locale, in the factory, would lead to a heightening of class consciousness, ie. to a class for itself. Re: telecommuting as a form of union-busting . .

17. [word] [period] [word] [period] . . . The need to slow down the text. To anchor the single word in its own insistence & indigestibility. With apologies to Benjamin, writing might be that which shuts duration (a duration controlled by capital) down, if only for its own instant instance, the better to recapture duration. To regain history.<sup>12</sup>

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> Attali. Noise. Bracketed words mine. <sup>2</sup> Antunes. "As coisas" on Caetano Veloso & Gilberto Gil's CD Tropicalia 2. <sup>3</sup> Eagleton. "Base & superstructure in Raymond Williams" in Raymond Williams: critical perspectives (ed. Eagleton). <sup>4</sup> Farrell. Last instance. <sup>5</sup> Adorno. "Cultural criticism & society" in Prisms. <sup>6</sup> Marx. Capital via Adorno. Negative dialectics. <sup>7</sup> I'm assuming that the family resemblance between Taylor's time & motion studies, which sought to rid the assembly line workers jobs of excess movement & the gradual pruning of digression & ornamentation from narrative (the difference between Balzac & Grisham, for instance) is not coincidental. <sup>8</sup> Helene Parmelin on Picasso, as cited in Krauss, The optical unconscious. <sup>9</sup> Virilio, Lost dimension. <sup>10</sup> Just as space has been mutated into some uniform, homogenized dimension to be passed through "en route" to delivering the goods, so too has time become homogenized. The length of an hour used to be pegged to how much time there was between sunrise & sunset, ie. to agricultural time. "The shift to hours of uniform duration near the end of the Middle Ages" was synchronous with the growth of industry & wage labor. Cf. Biernacki, "Time cents" in Space, time, and modernity (Friedland & Boden, eds). <sup>11</sup> Robert Grenier's recent handwritten works seem to me to represent a limit case of such a possibility. rhymms, in particular, seems to approach a nominalism in which each word names only itself & the labor invested in its having been written down. <sup>12</sup> Cf. Benjamin, "Theses on the philosophy of history" in Illuminations: "A historical materialist cannot do without the notion of a present which is not a transition, but in which time stands still & has come to a stop."

## Dan Farrell

-Much I marveled this ungainly fowl to hear discourse so plainly,  
Though its answer little meaning – little relevancy bore;  
For we cannot help agreeing that no living human being  
Ever yet was blest with seeing bird above his chamber door-  
Bird or beast upon the sculptured bust above his chamber door,  
With such name as “Nevermore.”

-- Poe, “The Raven”

Dear P.

- Where as I have used flitting signifiers as punctuation, you, Inman, at least in *at. least.* use punctuation as... whatever the Raven is doing quothing ‘nevermore’. Those interruptions resist interpretation, are continuously present, and do little to reconcile the disappointments of what isn’t future. Inman’s grim, ungainly, ghastly, gaunt and ominous periods, stopping traffic, contributes to what I would characterize as a participatory materialism, a fatalism discouraged.

- What’s the difference between what Inman writes as stopped attention, on a social scale and stabilization of meaning, on a social scale, necessary for social cohesion? An answer I came up with seems like a contradiction; that stabilization may only be an effect of being passed over, ignored, incorporated in a sentence i.e. [democracy] vs. [Democracy was finally brought to East Timor.] The single word falls prey to concept ~~dictionary~~, etymology, diffusion, etc., a kind of attention not I think what Peter is you’re thinking of. But as a part of a sentence or *line* it is prey to the passing over he you talks about. Incorporated: frozen, not in time, but, dare I say, ideology. A succession of slowings = sense.<sup>1</sup> Yes we have no grammars.

- I worry that ~~Will~~ just focusing on what is immediate and present will ~~not~~ distract from a notion of transition or an experience of history.<sup>2</sup> But although I think Peter would acknowledge that ~~to~~ expand focus (see note 12) risks ~~may also be to~~ dissipating ~~dissipate~~ focus his frame is such that there is little incongruity. Since history is to be read in terms of political change, the attention is clearly on the future.

- My initial reaction is a reluctance to ~~I don’t think I can~~ agree with countering a monolithic data stream with individual contemplation. Isn’t this already a traditional role of poetry? Usage and social accretion (of #7), seems a better framework than the creation of attention spans (of #3). “Social substantivity” definitely comes through in the work. What then does one achieve or ~~recover~~ produce from the extra time taken? The overwhelming presence of the punctuation poses the question of its ~~origin and~~ use -- not what *I* can do with my leisure time.

- ~~I’ve~~ I had been thinking of ~~your~~ Peter’s his strategy differently. In *at. least.* the literal focusing of attention at so many points, the hesitation, is checking up on the mechanism: making sure it is

---

<sup>1</sup> “the anticipations of grammar are always and only retroactively installed.” Judith Butler, *The Psychic Life of Power*, p 124.

OK to continue. It seems to invite or implicate the users of language, maybe with no grammar it brings one to other basics to rely on. But to form anything like a sentence or utterance, or unit beyond the word/syllable, means ignoring or consciously forgetting the ongoing 'handshake' (a term used to describe the electronic disturbance modems recognize themselves in). In between communication. For me the continuous starting and stopping, rather than creating a contemplative space, brings one (back?, forward?) to the conditions under which language/communication is possible – a contingent agreement that it is, or an unrepresentable iteration of the whole:

, "what it utters is its only stock and store,

Caught from some unhappy master"

- It's an experience of not being *dependent* on the feed, that is -- surrendering life to the technology, to the agency which seems to exist there. De-alienation effect. Dear Dan, What's it like being me? Dis-articulation has them rolling in the aisles.

Somehow, in spite of language's fluidity, (or spillage as ~~you~~ Peter says) the full stop, culmination, seems like a request to give it a rest. But we know the world exists beyond truncation. We are surrounded by invisible syllables. That obviousness isn't the point, but maybe where production and reproduction start and stop is.

- Where is the site of production? Just in the writing? The movement in *Avail*, you're dying to know, isn't just within the text, to the extent that it gives one the sense that somehow history can be confused with movement. This is not my intent, I'd rather start with a sense of how history might move through the material ~~≠~~ than find a homology for it within its qualities. *Avail* is composed of actual (we can get back to this) diagnostic choices for feelings of anger and descriptions of one's state of health. Two separate questions and lists of responses. Their function is value-creating information gathering and their copyrights reflect this. To me bringing these two subjectively and technically differentiated realms together must bring their socio-economic materially-historical relationship together at this moment. For instance the conjunction of (a) not eating but (b) feeling good about one's self signals a specific nexus (a+b) of body image, eating disorder etc. Same goes for feelings of anger and the state of managed health care in this country, the most obvious of the connections.

- This is the one piece in *Last Instance* which carries forward a method I've used in most of my previous work: narrowing in on a specific source and using just that vocabulary, but using it in a way which is specific to its nominal usage, hopefully opening up that nominal to what it excludes: its ideology and practice. I hope to make it interact with what it as a form of communication ignores or assumes: a larger social field which it affects and is affected by. I like to think of material as not just medium, a lot of lang-po gets reduced to this, hence 'material' is weakened as a tool to think of conditions of social existence. So when writers talk of materiality we tend to see ~~do you see that as~~ the words, letters etc.: recuperation of the stuff of language from its alienation, fetishization, present in the practices of a great many writers (including ourselves). ~~Or is there an historical reason or shift for this emphasis in poetry I'm just missing?~~ What I'm trying to think through though is an expanding notion of what 'material' is. Doesn't it

include ~~practices~~, uses, acts, relations? What ~~you~~ Peter refers to as the “historical and socialized nature of such a [language’s] materiality.”

- Looking for congruence without sameness in writing and politics is definitely where I would locate some of my work; that starting and stopping may be both a movement forward and the sloth of material which drives one’s nail into the present state of things. So no I don’t have a *reluctance* to relinquish motion as much as a relation with materiality: that which pushes and pulls at the same time. This I think is pointing to a definition, or a part of one, of materiality; it is active, not an ensemble of facts, not just matter. ~~Maybe it is not ‘material’ that I’m thinking of. I just read an essay on what I might call informationalized affectivity. The shift in the economy in the industrialized nations away from industry towards what has been called immaterial production: production of a service, knowledge or communication. The immaterial is now seen to be productive of more value than material goods. The category of the immaterial within materialism? Yes I can see how a redefinition of what the (non-producing) working class is may be a better account of this.~~

- If one can’t get outside ideology, what is the practice -- not outside -- but opposed? In this way the method of *Avail* is the opposite of distancing: thinking/speaking from the ideologically saturated places, or where ideologies/ discourses are at cross purposes; ~~maybe~~ they can cancel out each other, or form new pathways, short-circuits are what I hope to achieve. For instance this piece of writing has become a pastiche of address rather than a progression of thesis. But maybe I just should have cut more.

- Is the material of ideology such that it can be set apart, or something to be dis-articulated? It’s not that I think dis-articulation is possible outside of political movement but that it is necessary for, or a part of it. ~~You’re fairly explicit in wanting to create a space separated from ideology. I’m willing to go along with “attention” or “analysis” to describe a non-romantic conception of this space. The question(s) then becomes whether it is possible to use language non ideologically [one would hope so] or cleansed of ideology [doesn’t seem possible]; the same question with two conflicting answers. It’s that relation between answers I see us trying to focus on.~~

“The effects of the imaginary can only appear through and by means of the real, and the effects of the real through and by means of the imaginary.” “To act is to play a game with many players, sometimes tricking or finessing, with and against the risks of ideology and economy”<sup>2</sup>

- As a writer I’m not satisfied with the material of my practice being restricted to the medium of my practice. So the notion of materiality I work with includes practices. Ideology is instituted through practices. [Althusser – No ideas but in apparatuses.] It is the relation between the ideational and material which informs ~~my our~~ writing. That interplay between idea and material is a life not ~~reducible~~ reducible to determination. Conventions misfire, rituals change, talk happens but action stops. We talk of practice but how does one practice relate with another?

---

<sup>2</sup> Etienne Balibar, “The Infinite Contradiction” p 163

One practice may block or interfere with the realization of another. What material gives material can take away.

- ~~But Therefore a~~ A Last instance is not anywhere or anytime I'm ever going to get to. I, as a subject, necessarily have to be distant or not co-terminus with whatever determines me. (But that set or sequence of determinations is what subjecthood is.) And when it is not I won't care because I'll be a citizen, i.e. living without contradiction. Same goes for society; its not about to be transparent to itself.

~~Yours, Dan~~

**P. Inman**

"studio w. talk"

spelled. his.  
inch. nose.  
of. (how. much  
distance. can.  
signatures.  
people. by.

the. key.  
phrase. (slowed. to.  
subtraction.  
in. any. (pesks.  
whites.  
rule. of. (suit.

thumb. (factory. (limps.  
council. oated. w.  
Malthus.  
could. mean. (in.  
bearings. along. (periods.  
how. the.

nearest.  
the. same. reading.  
thick. sea.  
into. some. (grained.  
sunstroke.  
under.

its. ebb. rouge. (at.  
goal. swimstrokes.  
a. thusserian.  
only. nouns. (elloed.  
workday. only  
w/out. marole. nash.

Messiaen.  
long. ink.  
his. beiges. lean.  
the. mump. (collapses.  
some. sea.  
under. (how. birthdates.

whatever. literature.  
how. (sidedness.  
someone. (lymph.  
to. nestles. (marks.  
between.  
forest. floor. out.

of. car. (tax.  
breaks. spread.  
nestles. between. (hair.  
starts. tawned.  
proverbs. (showing.  
through.

in. what. people.  
put. speech. (a.  
hewn. (meter. there.  
was. no. one.  
structure. spread. (else.  
into. rooms. (beneath.

some. woodpecker.  
whited. starts.  
the. same. initialisms.  
each. chord.  
for "scarcity". (a. walk.  
gone. through.

different. (but. made.  
music. (stocked. wits.  
each. time.  
notes. of.  
haired. winter.  
pawed. find.

likeness.  
shone. footprints.  
a. lake. age. (to.  
"too. many. notes.  
left. (at. once."  
a. noise. from. where.

wolf. edges.  
existed. over.  
someone's. meal.  
mind. (progress. out.  
put. to. squareness.  
author's. sister.

as. (how. any. of.  
decimal.  
could. mean.  
the. bounds. pencilled.  
at. (needs. (under.  
window. frame.

how. round. is.  
the. world. &. all.  
it. contains. (at.  
a. timing.  
not. to. constitute. but.  
meantime. money.

to. dissolve. (piano. in.  
directions.  
fees. light.  
whitening. taken.  
hoods. (in.  
longhand.

some. drained.  
woods. below. (jaunts.  
a. title. thighed. into.  
its. nature.  
rock. (mien. side.  
its. own. burred.

ever. end.  
logic. to.  
mice. Gould.  
the. monk. whose. (paused.  
squint. roots. (in.  
the. bound. thickened. to.

cigarette. the.  
notes. once (sides.  
someone's. (of. glass.  
the. business. (limped.  
end. after. his. death.

each. but. (along. mutters.  
leggedness. in. what.  
half. (i. read. (that. under.  
the. daylight. (a. map.  
i. had. veined. (not.  
a. telephone.

Avail<sup>1</sup>

I feel anxious when I think about my health. I have the ability to take care of any health problems that I may encounter. I am very aware of how healthy my body feels. I do not feel angry. I do things that keep me from becoming physically unhealthy. I feel angry. I am pretty angry about things these days. The status of my physical health is determined mostly by chance happenings. I think about my physical health all the time. I'm very assertive when it comes to looking out for my own physical health. I am not particularly angry about my future. I am becoming more hostile about things than I used to be. When I think about my future, I feel angry. I feel sad when I think about my present physical health. I expect that my health will be excellent in the future. I don't have any persistent angry feelings that influence my ability to make decisions. I am not all that angry about things. I am to blame for those times when I become sick or don't feel well. I don't feel particularly hostile at others. People sometimes dislike being around me since I become angry. I sometimes wonder what others think of my physical health. I don't feel that others are trying to annoy me. I feel hostile a good deal of the time. I feel quite hostile most of the time. I feel hostile all of the time. I'm very motivated to be physically healthy. When I am ill, I myself am in control of whether my health improves. I don't feel angry when I think about myself. I derive a sense of self-pride from the way I handle my own physical health. I am very satisfied with my own physical health. I'm concerned about how my physical health appears to others. The status of my physical health is determined largely by other more powerful people. I'm worried about how healthy my body is. Not only am I in good physical health, but it's quite important to me that I be in good health. I am in good physical health. I am angry to the extent that it interferes with my making good decisions. If I am careful to avoid becoming ill, then I will be in good physical health-shape. I'm not so angry and hostile that others dislike me. I don't have angry feelings about others having screwed up my life. I am depressed about my current physical health. I don't shout at people any more than usual. I feel like my physical health is something that I myself am in charge of. I feel angry about myself a good deal of the time. Things are not more irritating to me now than usual. I am competent enough, I am angry most of the time now, to make sure that my physical health is in good shape. My appetite does not suffer because of my feelings of anger. I notice immediately when my body doesn't feel healthy. My anger does not interfere with my sleep. Sometimes I don't sleep very well because I'm feeling angry. My anger is so great that I stay awake 1-2 hours later than usual. I am so intensely angry that I can't get much sleep during the night. I think about my physical health more than anything else. I am motivated to keep myself from becoming physically unhealthy. I'm very direct with people when it comes to my own physical health needs. When I become sick or ill, I am the person to blame. Sometimes I am so angry that I feel like hurting others, but I would not really do it. I don't feel angry enough to hurt someone. I believe that the future status of my physical health will be positive. The status of my physical health is controlled by accidental happenings. I'm so angry that I would like to hurt someone. I feel angry that others prevent me from having a good life. I'm very concerned

---

<sup>1</sup> From *Last Instance* (Krupskaya, 1999).

with how others evaluate my physical health. I'm strongly motivated to devote time and effort to my physical health. During times when I am sick, my own behavior determines whether I get well. I am proud of the way I deal with and handle my health. I shout at others more now than I used to. I am very satisfied with the status of my physical health. My physical health is largely controlled by people other than myself (e.g., friends, family). It makes me angry that I have failed more than the average person. Not only do I take care of my physical health, but its very important to me that I do so. My feelings of anger are beginning to affect my appetite. My feelings of anger leave me without much of an appetite. My anger is so intense that it has taken away my appetite. My body is in good physical shape. I can pretty much prevent myself from becoming ill by taking good care of myself. I am disappointed about the quality of my physical health. My health is something that I alone am responsible for. My ability to think clearly is unaffected by my feelings of anger. Sometimes my feelings of anger prevent me from thinking in a clear-headed way. It makes me angry that I feel like such a failure. My anger makes it hard for me to think of anything else. I'm so intensely angry and hostile that it completely interferes with my thinking. I have the skills and ability to ensure good physical health for myself. I shout at others so often that sometimes I just can't stop. My feelings of anger don't interfere with my health. I try to avoid engaging in behaviors that undermine my physical health. My feelings of anger are beginning to interfere with my health. I tend to be preoccupied with my own physical health. My feelings of anger leave me less interested in sex than I used to be. My anger does not make me feel anymore tired than usual. My current feelings of anger undermine my interest in sex. I'm sensitive to internal bodily cues about my physical health. Thinking about my physical health leaves me with an uneasy feeling. Whether (or not) I am in good physical health is just a matter of luck. My feelings of anger occasionally undermine my ability to make decisions. I do not expect to suffer health problems in the future. If I were to become ill, then I'm to blame for not taking good care of myself. I'm very aware of what others think of my physical health. I have a strong desire to keep myself physically healthy. I don't feel so angry that it interferes with my interest in sex. I am somewhat passive about getting my health needs met. If I were to become ill, I myself would be responsible for making myself better. I am pleased with how well I handle my own physical health. My present degree of physical health is personally satisfying to me. I feel angry about what I have to look forward to. My health is largely determined by the actions of powerful others (e.g., health professionals). It's beginning to make me angry that others are screwing up my life. More often than not, people stay away from me because I'm so hostile and angry. I am a well-exercised person. People don't like me anymore because I'm constantly angry all the time. Not only am I in good physical health, but it's important to me that I stay physically healthy. My anger prevents me from devoting much time and attention to my health. If I look out for my health, then I will stay in good physical health and avoid illness. When I think about my current physical health, I feel really down in the dumps. I will probably experience a number of health problems in the future. The status of my physical health is determined largely by what I do (and don't do). I usually worry about whether I am in good health. I am able to cope with and to handle my physical health needs. I know immediately when I'm not feeling physically well. I am angry and hostile about everything. I really want to prevent myself from getting out of shape. My physical health and shape have little or nothing to do with luck. I'm constantly thinking about my physical fitness. When I think about myself, I feel intense anger. I do not hesitate to ask for what I need for my physical health. I feel intensely angry about my future, since it cannot be improved. If I were to start feeling sick, then it would be my own fault for

letting it happen. My anger does not interfere with my interest in other people. My anger sometimes interferes with my interest in others. I am becoming so angry that I don't want to be around others. I'm so angry that I can't stand being around people. It makes me angry to feel like a complete failure as a person. As I look back on my life, I feel angry about my failures. It's really important to me that I keep myself in proper physical health. My current level of physical fitness is very pleasing to me. I have positive feelings about the way I approach my own physical health. Whether I recover from an illness depends in large part on what I myself do. My feelings of anger do not interfere with my work. In order to have good health, I have to act in a pleasing way to other more powerful individuals. At times I think people are trying to annoy me. I feel more angry about myself these days than I used to. More people than usual are beginning to make me feel angry. I am so angry and hostile all the time that I can't stand it. From time to time my feelings of anger interfere with my work. I feel that others are constantly and intentionally making me angry. I feel so angry that it interferes with my capacity to work. I feel unhappy about my physical health. My feelings of anger prevent me from doing any work at all. My body needs a lot of work in be in excellent physical shape. I keep myself physically healthy, and it's very important to me that I stay fit and healthy. I will be able to avoid any illnesses, if I just take care of myself. I am constantly angry because others have made my life totally miserable. I think about my physical health the majority of the time. I feel nervous when I think about the status of my physical health. What happens to my physical health is my own doing. I don't believe that chance or luck play any role in the status of my physical health. I have the capability to take care of my own physical health. I am really motivated to avoid being in terrible physical shape. I'm very aware of changes in my physical health. I'm so angry that I can't make good decisions anymore. When it comes to my own physical health requirements, I ask for what I need. My physical health is in need of attention. My anger is so intense that I sometimes feel like hurting others. I anticipate that my physical health will deteriorate in the future. My feelings of anger are beginning to tire me out. My anger is intense enough that it makes me feel very tired. When something goes wrong with my own physical health, it's my own fault. I'm concerned about what other people think of my physical health. I strive to keep myself in tip-top physical shape. I feel slightly more irritated now than usual. If I were ill, my recovery would depend on how I myself deal with the problem. I feel irritated a good deal of the time. I feel good about the way I cope with my own physical health needs. I'm irritated all the time now. My physical health is largely determined by people who have influence and control over me. I shout at people all the time now. I'm so angry about my life that I've completely lost interest in sex. When I think about my present physical health, I am very satisfied. I try to stay in good physical condition, and it's extremely important to me that I do so. Being in good physical health is a matter of my own ability and effort. If I just pay attention to my health, I will be able to prevent myself from becoming sick. My feelings of anger leave me too tired to do anything. I'm so angry at everything these days that I pay no attention to my health and well-being.

## Call for response

The "PhillyTalks" project invites two poets to begin a dialogue on each other's work, then have the resulting exchange published in newsletter form & made available to readers prior to the event. The poets, following their poetry reading, informally extend their dialogue. The audience then joins in. A future newsletter will feature a transcript of the event, as well as written responses to previous newsletters. **Call for response:** Please email [lcabri@dept.english.upenn.edu](mailto:lcabri@dept.english.upenn.edu), or write: Louis Cabri, 529B - 19 Ave SW, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2S 0E3.

## Back issues

- 1\*: David Bromige / Laura Moriarty
- 2\*: Andrew Levy / Jackson Mac Low
- 3\*: Jeff Derksen / Ron Silliman
- 4: Tina Darragh / Jena Osman
- 5: Alan Gilbert / Rodrigo Toscano
- 6: Transcript & response issue: Derksen/Silliman
- 7: Brian Kim Stefans / Fred Wah
- 8: Bruce Andrews / Rod Smith
- 9: Steven Farmer / Peter Gizzi
- 10: Heather Fuller / Melanie Neilson
- 11: Ammiel Alcalay / Tom Mandel
- 12: Transcript & response issue: Levy/Mac Low
- 13\*\*: Rachel Blau DuPlessis / Barrett Watten

\* Newsletter available at <http://english.upenn.edu/~wh/phillytalks> thanks to Aaron Levy; more to follow.

\*\* Live event webcast at <http://www.english.upenn.edu/~wh/webcasts/>

Curated edited produced with indispensable help of the poets, Writers House staff & volunteers; funded by subscribers (\$12/5 issues) & by the Kelly Writers House (<http://www.english.upenn.edu/~wh>) at University of Pennsylvania. Copyright © reverts to authors on publication.

Next...

*PhillyTalks* 15

Kevin Davies / Diane Ward

Tue. Jan. 18, 1999, 6pm, free

(for intown reservations, bookings, accommodation, please contact [lcabri@dept.english.upenn.edu](mailto:lcabri@dept.english.upenn.edu))