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NOTE ON THE 2008 REPUBLICATION OF REWIND

REWIND was first published in 1995 to accompany the VHS edition of Surveying the First Decade: Video Art and Alternative Media in the U.S., 1968-1980. Edited by Survey curator Chris Hill, REWIND included her introductory essay and interviews with artists, as well as writings about video preservation by Consulting Editor Deirdre Boyle and Contributing Editor Maria Troy. In addition, the original REWIND included an extensive Resources section that detailed information on institutions and organizations of particular relevance to those interested in early video art, artist biographies, artist videographies and an extensive bibliography.

On the occasion of the relaunch of Survey as a DVD box set in 2008, we have extensively re-edited REWIND. While some information contained in the writings is now outdated, we have republished them here mostly in their original form because of their growing historical interest, as well as the insight they offer into the state of the media arts field in the early nineties. We have comprehensively updated the Resource Guide to Early Video by utilizing the many sources of information on early video now available on the Internet. The sections detailing artist Biographies and Videographies contain information up to 1980; recent updates can be found on the www.vdb.org website. The Bibliography section has been reprinted in its totality with the knowledge that many of the books, articles and interviews cited are now available on the Internet in addition to the original publications listed here.

We would like to thank the original editors for their enthusiasm and assistance in the task of re-editing REWIND.

Abina Manning, Director, Video Data Bank
Brigid Reagan, Assistant Director, Video Data Bank
December 2008

Mayday Realtime
David Cort and Curtis Ratcliff
Readers of this book will find their way to it along many different avenues of interest. Although teachers and students of video art history and video production are the most obvious users, many others will find in these pages and in the titles in the collection valuable resources and inspiration. Whether you are interested in American studies, feminism, television, the documentary, time arts, the history of radicalism, or art and technology—to name a few likely subjects—you will find important primary and secondary sources here. We encourage you to unpack this material to suit your own needs, creatively selecting from the titles in the collection and the resources in this book, ordering both according to your own design.

Begin with Chris Hill’s introductory essay, Attention! Production! Audience! which offers an overview of the social, political and cultural context of the late ‘60s and ‘70s when portable video became a leading medium for art and activism in the United States. Where you go next is up to you.

The video collection has been organized into programs around eight broad themes. These programs are accompanied by introductory notes and followed by annotations for each tape, providing descriptions supplemented by artist remarks and historic commentary by curators and critics. Even if you do not have access to viewing the titles, the program notes and tape annotations create a more detailed picture of this early work and why it was made. Each program is accompanied by a reading list, which is divided in two parts: firstly, Recommended Texts—recommended outside readings germane to the titles and artists in each program; and secondly, Background Texts—additional background readings on the artists and/or themes of the program. The reading lists will point future scholars to some interesting avenues and lesser known byways of video history. And for zealous researchers looking beyond these lists, a more extensive bibliography can be found at the end of this book.

The eight programs in Surveying the First Decade can be used effectively in a semester-long history of video course or as a reference collection for museums, galleries or media arts centers. Some teachers may wish to use the programs exactly as they have been configured, but others may want to create their own structure. One can begin a study of early video with any program. For instructors who have only one session in which to present early video art history or who are using this collection to supplement study in other disciplines, judicious selection of titles and readings can be made to suit your course goals and time constraints. If you do not have time to preview all the titles in the collection, reading the annotations will steer you to preview those that seem most likely for your purpose.

For example, if you are teaching a course on feminism and searching for visual documents on the rise of the feminist movement in the late ‘60s and early ‘70s, you could preview tapes from several programs. In addition to all the works in program 4, “Gendered Confrontations,” you could consider: The Politics of Intimacy and Women’s Liberation March NYC, from program 6; My Father, Exchange, and Vertical Roll, from program 1; and Fifty Wonderful Years and Technology/Transformation: Wonder Woman, from program 7. Readings by Sylvia Bovenschen and Martha Gever, among others, will help illuminate the movement and many of these titles.

If you are teaching a production class in video documentary, the following works could highlight the development of a documentary video aesthetic: all the titles in program 6, “Decentralized Communications Projects,” and in program 8, “Independents Address TV Audiences;“ The Continuing Story of Carel and Ferd, from program 3; Ama L’Uomo Tuo (Always Love Your Man), from program 4; and from program 7, Fifty Wonderful Years, Proto Media Primer, The Business of Local News, and About Media. Readings from “Radical Software,” “The Videotape Book,” and those by Arthur Ginsberg, Juan Downey, and Raymond Williams, among others, will prove helpful.

* This essay was originally published in 1995. It has been edited for the 2008 DVD edition of Survey.
If you only have a few hours in which to introduce the history of early video, you might select a two-hour sampler that draws from all of the programs. For example, to introduce the relationship between radical aesthetics and radical politics, you could show excerpts from the following: *Island Song* by Charlemagne Palestine, *Double Vision* by Peter Campus, *Nun and Deviant* by Nancy Angelo and Candace Compton, *Vital Statistics of a Citizen*, *Simply Obtained* by Martha Rosler, *Participation* by Steina and Woody Vasulka, *Gay Pride March NYC* by People’s Video Theater, and *Queen Mother Moore Speech at Greenhaven Prison* by People’s Communication Network.

To present two poles of early video practice, formal invention and the critique of television, and how they intertwine, you could program excerpts from the following: *Performance/Audience/Mirror* by Dan Graham, *Undertone* by Vito Acconci, *Vertical Roll* by Joan Jonas, *Television Delivers People* by Richard Serra and Carlotta Fay Schoolman, *Technology/Transformation: Wonder Woman* by Dara Birnbaum, and *Four More Years* by TVTV.

To introduce image processing and artist-made video tools, you could show the following: *Five-minute Romp through the IP* by Dan Sandin, *Crossings and Meetings* by Ed Emshwiller, *Exquisite Corpse* by Ernest Gusella, part two of *Merce by Merce* by Nam June Paik, and all of *Einstine* by Eric Siegel.

The Resources section supports the programs by providing users with Biographies—of all the artists and video collectives included in the Survey as of 1995; Videographies—a selected list of video works produced by these artists and collectives between 1965 and 1980; and a Bibliography—an extensive listing of essays, reviews, books, and exhibition catalogs as at the time of original publication.

Whether you choose to lecture before, during or after a video screening, to incorporate discussions immediately following a work or in another class session—the methods of using video in a class are varied and offer different advantages and drawbacks. If your course is lecture-oriented and designed for a large audience, discussion may seem like a luxury, but including some form of discussion will be especially valuable. The experience of seeing a program with twenty others and discovering that they have seen twenty different works is a powerful departure point for further discussion. Providing time between screening and discussion will allow students to process their notes and responses, complete readings, and come prepared for discussion. Discussion following a screening allows you to get immediate impressions before students have had a chance to conform their ideas to what critics, scholars or classmates have said about the work, allowing you to build on their reactions and interpretations. Whether you prefer the spontaneity and dynamism of the latter approach or the measured effectiveness of the former will depend on your own teaching style.
1. A radical communications paradigm for a participatory democracy

"The argument was not only about producing new form for new content, it was also about changing the nature of the relationship between reader and literary text, between spectator and spectacle, and the changing of this relationship was itself premised upon new ways of thinking about the relationship between art (or more generally ‘representation’) and reality... the adequacy or effectiveness of the devices employed depends entirely upon the historical moment or ‘conjecture’ within which they are manifest.”

—Sylvia Harvey [1]

a. Cultural agency and new technologies

Artists and social activists declared video a cultural praxis in the United States in the late ‘60s, a period of radical assertions fueled by a decade of civil rights confrontations, controversy surrounding U.S. involvement in Vietnam, and the rise of a new youth culture intent on consciousness expansion. Within a charged atmosphere of personal and social change and political confrontation, the production of culture was understood to be a necessary step in the development of a reinvigorated participatory democracy. The first issue of Radical Software (1970), a tabloid published by the New York media collective Raindance Corporation, asserted that video making and other “information software design” were radical cultural tools and proposed that, “unless we design and implement alternate information structures which transcend and reconfigure the existing ones, our alternate systems and lifestyles will be no more than products of the existing process.”[2]

The video art and communications projects nurtured by this radical climate were fused into a cultural “movement” by the introduction to the U.S. market of the relatively affordable ($1500) and lightweight half-inch open reel Portapak in 1967-1968. In the half decade before the arrival of this mobile video production unit, art about television or its technology had entered the cultural imaginary through Fluxus artists’ modified TV sets that challenged bourgeois teleserial sensibilities, and art and technology exhibitions at major galleries. Speculation by the influential Canadian media theorist Marshall McLuhan on the parallel evolution of communications media and structures of consciousness fueled utopian conjecturing about a new information-based society. McLuhan’s writing had particular impact on the post-war generation that grew up with television. In 1968 artists and social activists welcomed the new attentional terrain offered by the unintimidating, real-time video medium and the possibility of developing an accessible democratic communication system as an alternative to commercial television.

Unified by cultural imperatives for a more open and egalitarian way of living as well as by the pragmatic need to pool equipment—Portapaks, microphones, and a growing assortment of independently engineered tools—a number of artists, activists, and electronic tool designers formed working collectives. Woody Vasulka described video in 1969-1970 as, “a very free medium, and the community was very young, naive, new, strong, cooperative, no animosities, kind of a welcoming tribe. So we ganged together west coast, east coast, Canadian west and east coasts, and we created overnight a spiritual community.”[3]

Even before the appearance of the Portapak in the late ‘60s, sculptors, experimental filmmakers, painters, performers, musicians, and dancers had begun to seriously challenge long-held modernist concepts about the formal separation of specific art disciplines and interpretive discourses. Some would eventually include video in their interdisciplinary investigations. Starting in the late ‘50s, Happenings expanded paintings into interactive environments, engaging those aspects of art, which, “consciously intended to replace habit with the spirit of exploration and experiment.”[4] By the late ‘60s some members of the counterculture involved with the absorbing psychedelic underground of music, experimental film, theater, and light shows found video to be...
a provocative new moving image and installation medium. Sculptors who had been working within the emerging vocabulary of post-minimalism found video to be a medium with which they could foreground the phenomenology of perceptual or conceptual process over the aesthetic object or product. Artists participating in the “high” art gallery and museum spaces as well as those positioned in the clubs, concerts and mass cultural scenes found reasons to explore the new moving image and sync sound medium.

The manifestos and commentary by those caught up in the early video movement of 1968-1973 reflected an optimism stemming from the belief that real social change was possible; they expressed a commitment to cultural change that bordered on the ecstatic. During this heady period political theorists, artists, and activists delivered powerful arguments for a participatory democracy. The possibility of working for radical social change was conflated with the task of personal change and with imperatives to explore one’s consciousness through music, art, drugs, encounter groups, spirituality, sexuality, and countercultural lifestyles. The valorization of “process” and “an almost religious return to experience” was shared by both political and cultural radicals of the late 60s, even though their agendas and strategies varied considerably.[5] Much of the enthusiasm expressed about the “process” and “experience” available to artists and audiences through the new portable video technology centered on instant replay and the immediate “feedback” of one’s experience.

The social and cultural challenges of the ‘60s were, “a disruption of late capitalist ideology, political hegemony, and the bourgeois dream of unproblematic production.”[6] The decade opened with the beginning of the civil disobedience phase of the civil rights movement and the formation of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which organized interracial Freedom Rides to integrate restaurants and restrooms in the South in 1961. According to Todd Gitlin, ‘60s activist and sociologist, “The [civil rights] movement’s rise and fall, its transmutations from southern nonviolence to black power, its insistence on the self-determination of the insulted and injured, was the template for every other movement of the decade.”[7]

Influenced by SNCC’s egalitarianism, where middle class and poor struggled together, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in 1962 issued the Port Huron Statement which called for a “participatory democracy” based on “love and community in decisions shaping private lives.” This New Left asserted that necessary social change would come about only by replacing institutions of control not by reforming them.[6] The civil rights movement, SDS, the growing anti-war movement, and community organizing around urban poverty, provided activist models that would challenge the generation coming of age in the mid-’60s to interrogate institutionalized authority, national priorities, and conventional expectations of personal satisfaction and class privilege. On college campuses, teach-ins, information sharing, and local organizing around issues of housing, health, and legal rights offered practicums for a radically revised education for living. By 1968, 50% of the population was under 25, and across the country young people were swept up in the intoxication of the expanding and celebratory counterculture, its music, and its libertarian lifestyle choices. Although deep divisions between political radicals and lifestyle radicals remained throughout the decade, the country experienced a profound transformation of cultural relations in their wake.

As part of the progressive dialogue on college campuses between 1968 and 1973, tracts by writers like Herbert Marcuse were broadly circulated and discussed. They described the media as a “consciousness industry” responsible for the alienation of the individual, the commodification of culture, and the centralized control of communications technologies. In his widely read books, One-Dimensional Man (1964) and An Essay on Liberation (1969), Herbert Marcuse identified a relationship between the consciousness of the individual and the political, asserting that “radical change in consciousness is the beginning, the first step in changing social existence: the emergence of a new Subject.” This new citizen, aware of and actively dealing with “tragedy and romance, archetypal dreams and anxieties” would be less susceptible to “technical solutions” offered through contemporary society’s homogeneous “happy consciousness.”[9] Marcuse’s writing framed other mandates for consciousness expansion and change and validated the role that personal agency should play in accomplishing social change.

In Depth: Tony Conrad

Hill: Could you talk about the confluence of experimental film, music, and video making in the late ‘60s?

Conrad: In the context of the underground... in film, as in theater, you had already overlapping forms and intersecting forms. Of course, out of this potpourri, there began to emerge other terms of this crossover having to do with the imbrication of high culture with the low culture. Already in the Velvet Underground you have the Exploding Plastic Inevitable shows at the Fillmore East or at the Dom [in New York City] where Gerard Melanga theatrically wielded a whip on stage, the band played pop music, and there would be a light show. A lot of the syncretism of different elements was abetted by the taste for that kind of overlapping and totalizing experience on the part of the drug culture.

There were two things going on at the same time, as sort of dialogical forces—one was minimalizing and one was totalizing. In some respects these weren’t so remote from one another as they appeared to be, other than as functions of temperament. The totalizing drug culture of course was not as repressive, characteristically. There were people who were mixtures, like Andy Warhol, who is in a way the exception that proves the rule in both cases.
By 1969, through confrontation and consciousness raising—the sharing and study of personal experience and history—African Americans and women had declared themselves new historical “subjects.” Strategizing around separatism and alliances, their liberation movements developed solidarity with other U.S. and international movements as global awareness permeated their public discourse. The gay rights movement born after the 1969 Stonewall confrontation, and the American Indian Movement (AIM) also asserted political and cultural identities through public actions and cultural networking during the early ’70s. These new movements focused both on histories of economic exploitation and systemic cultural domination. The Port Huron Statement had demanded a less alienated society and claimed a definitive subjectivity for the generation coming of age in the ’60s; these new movements also sought profound transformation in both socioeconomic and cultural relations.

Although the New Left and the anti-war movement in the late ’60s had close ties with progressive documentary filmmakers, for example the Newsreel film collective, their reports and analyses were disseminated primarily through an extensive underground press.[10] The Left regarded mainstream media, including commercial television, with distrust. Planning for the 1968 anti-war protests in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention did include strategizing around national press coverage, but it was fringe groups like the Yippies that specifically sought confrontation with and coverage by commercial media. Forays into network broadcasting, such as the Videofreex collaboration with CBS on the aborted 1969 Subject to Change project, revealed the industry’s contradictory aspirations for new broadcast programming and reinforced alternative videomakers’ wariness of aligning with corporate television.

By the early ’70s video theorists writing in Radical Software along with Marxist critic Todd Gitlin and German socialist Hans Magnus Enzensberger had outlined arguments for an alternative, independent electronic media practice. In 1970, building on ideas developed earlier by Bertolt Brecht regarding the corporate structure of radio communications, Enzensberger critiqued the asymmetry between media producers/transmitters and media consumers/receivers. The radio and television industries had centralized and controlled access to the production, program-

The discovery of minimal culture arose out of three different things. One was the serious discovery on the part of the artists that by confining their tools and concerns more narrowly than had ever been proposed, that they could achieve wider understandings and more profound circumstances for the reception of their work. That perception was encapsulated in the maxim “less is more.” The second thing that went into the hopper was that [minimalism] was a route to irony and humor. That is, there was both the possibility of disturbing the bourgeoisie, but more generally in taking advantage of the expectations that were to be found in the environment of high culture. For example, Maciunas’ [Fluxus] concerts were frequently staged as high culture events, but then deviated radically from the forms of high culture. The spirit that motivated this had a lot to do with having fun. The third element in all of this, I think, was the fact that the gallery scene found it possible to cash in on these developments. There was a ready-made ideology and set of circumstances which resulted in a high level of salability...

The Kitchen environment was set up to sort of overlap between video, technical work with video, work that was concerned particularly with a technological engagement, a build-it-yourself ethos, a dirty hands ethos in the approach to video. There was a lot of enthusiasm which underlay

Although McLuhan’s and others’ prescriptions for technological utopia appeared poetic to many, he popularized the notion of television, a “high participation” “cool medium,” as a generational marker and as a potentially liberatory information tool in the hands
of the first generation that had grown up with it. McLuhan did not address ways of restructuring a more democratic telecommunications system, but did inspire others to apply his ideas as they investigated video production and theorized about the new medium.

The belief that new technologies would inspire and generate the foundation for a new society was underwritten in part by the American post-war investment in the grand cultural imperative of science, which had brought about the international green revolution in agriculture and the space race. Americans had landed on the moon in 1969, in the “biggest show in broadcast history.”

The rational spirit of science resonated in a series of art and technology exhibitions at major museums. Critic Susan Sontag articulated this “new sensibility” as it related to the arts:

“What gives literature its preeminence is its heavy burden of ‘content,’ both reportage and moral judgment… But the model arts of our time are actually those with much less content, and a much cooler mode of moral judgment—like music, films, dance, architecture, painting, sculpture. The practice of these arts—of which there is no divorce between science and technology, are the locus of the new sensibility… In fact there can be no divorce between science and technology, on the one hand, and art, on the other, any more than there can be a divorce between art and the forms of social life.”

Enthusiasm about new technologies—computers and the information-based society they might anticipate, and theorizing on human evolution, cybernetics, human perception, ecology, and transformable environments—appeared at a time when post-war economic growth generated confidence and society seemed to be capable of radical change. Through the writing of McLuhan, Norbert Wiener, Buckminster Fuller, Gregory Bateson and others, the intersection of information and systems theory with biological models provided communications and human potential references for a generation that had grown up with the increasing availability of powerful and expressive personal tools—cars, television, transistor radios, 35mm and 8mm movie cameras, electronic musical instruments, and now portable video cameras and recording decks. The mixed metaphors of science, biology, and revolution, dubbed “cyber-scot” by critic David Antin are evident in Michael Shamberg’s 1971 description of “Media-America”:

“It may be that unless we re-design our television structure our own capacity to survive as a species may be diminished. For if the character of our culture is defined by its dominant communications medium, and that medium is an overly-centralized, low-variety system, then we will succumb to those biologically unviable characteristics. Fortunately techno-evolution has spawned new video modes like portable videotape, cable television, and videocassettes which promise to restore a media-ecological balance to TV.”

b. Early video collectives

The video collectives that formed between 1968-1971 embraced the new portable video technology and assumptions about the need for cultural and social change that could include humbly reconfigured technologies. The individual groups were bonded by the practical need to share technical resources and to collaborate on the many tasks required for productions. Some groups functioned as communes, with members living together as well as working regularly with video. Parry Teasdale, a member of the Videofreex, recalled, “the video medium... was part of the concept of enjoyment as well as experimentation, as well as art, as well as politics—all those things.”

Philip Mallory Jones described his involvement with the Ithaca video community, initially as a member of a video-producing commune:

“For me it was a two way thing. There was the individual vision and the individual maker working with a set of tools to do something. The tools were something I could get access to one way or another, without a lot of money. The other concern was the serious business of making revolution. These things were not separated. These things were a part of everybody else’s concern too.”

The expansion of these various collectives into an informal national network of producers with common interests can be traced through the “Feedback” sections of the early issues of Radical Software, published by the New York City collective Raindance. The masthead from the first issue articulates the broad aspirations of the editors’ proposed cultural intervention:

The work is part of a larger cultural object, which includes the production and viewing situation, and that the object itself cannot be sensibly taken out of context as an object of contemplation in and of itself. That it is simply incomplete or fragmentary without regard to its functioning as a consequence of the circumstance of its generation and the audience...
Interviewed March 1995. Tony Conrad produced experimental music and films in the ’60s and since the ’70s, has worked with video, performance, and music. He is a professor in the Department of Media performance, and music. He is a professor in the Department of Media Study at the State University of New York at Buffalo.

“Videotape can be to television what writing is to language. And television, in turn, has subsumed written language as the globe’s dominant communications medium. Soon accessible VTR [video tape recorder] systems and videocassettes (even before CATV [cable antenna television] opens up) will make alternate networks a reality.”[19]

Manifestos about making video with Portapaks and practical user information were made available through publications like Radical Software (1970-1976), which reported on videomaking initiatives in art, education, psychotherapies, and community building. Hands-on technical guides like Spaghetti City Video Manual (1973), written by the Videofreqx, and Independent Video (1974) by Ken Marsh, co-founder of People’s Video Theater, demystified the technology and encouraged independent problem solving and self-sufficiency with video tools. These publications were critical in promoting a vision of radicalized personal communications, providing an education for the uninitiated and curious, and identifying a network of fellow enthusiasts. Their pragmatic approach to the present and sometimes utopian visions for the future were shared by others who examined and challenged the delivery of basic institutional systems—education, communications, government, health—and envisioned new grassroots configurations which often centered on new or reconfigured technologies. The first edition of the widely referenced Whole Earth Catalog (1969) begins with a section on “understanding whole systems,” including communications, featuring descriptions of Super-8 filmmaking and audio synthesizer construction and describing the role that accessing and understanding tools might play in a new society:

*So far, remotely driven power and glory—as via government, big business, formal education, church—has succeeded to the point where gross defects obscure actual gains. In response to this dilemma and to these gains, a realm of intimate, personal power is developing—power of the individual to conduct his own education, find his own inspiration, shape his own environment, and share adventure with whoever is interested. Tools that aid this process are sought and promoted by the Whole Earth Catalog. [20]*

Most of the early video collectives developed projects that articulated production and reception as essential structural components of their telecommunications visions, reflecting a pragmatic need for new exhibition venues that would accommodate videomakers’ aspirations as well as the period’s recognition of the politicization of culture. Specific audience feedback structures were envisioned which exercised portable video’s capacity to render real time documentations of everyday events, perceptual investigations, and experimental tech performances. These structural concerns combined with the imprecision of early video editing initially overshadowed the production of a singular tape in favor of the documentation of “process.” The work of the early collectives revealed their acknowledgement of video as mediating social relations—managing or guiding the attention of viewers, directly engaging viewers in some aspect of the expressive, performative or production process, and educating audiences as new users. The often-stated goal of radicalized communications was further reflected in the early collectives’ strategies for the distribution of information they produced. Tape libraries, tape exchanges, and mobile services were established; the print media—journals and books—were considered important adjunct communications “software”; experimental video labs and theaters accommodated interactive screenings; transmission using low power broadcast, cable television, and public broadcast television was explored.

The diverse “cultural data banks” inventoried in the early issues of Radical Software read as maps to the counter cultural imagination of the time. Random examples include: “Dick Gregory speaking at San Jose State College 11/69” by Electric Eye; Eric Siegel’s tapes made with his Psychedelevision color video synthesizer; “a tour of el barrio by a Minister of the Young Lords Party” and “Gay Liberation Day” by People’s Video Theater.[21] Enzensberger recognized the radical potential of video data banks to be a “memory-in-readiness” for a changing society, and contrasted it with class-based notions of intellectual “heritage.”[22] These pioneering recordings were documentations of the counterculture, by the counterculture. Like home movies, they were collections of personal experiences, but unlike those private records, these tapes were contributions to an information bank from which anyone could draw, where often no one person was specifically credited with having produced the tape. The contents of the video libraries posted in Radical Software were not commodities for sale, but participated in an alternative
The cultural exchanges performed through the production/reception configurations of early collectives’ projects varied greatly according to specific agendas and sites of operation. Descriptions of a few of these early projects give some sense of the range that existed across the country. People’s Video Theater (PVT) was founded by Ken Marsh, an artist working with light shows, and Elliot Glass, a language teacher videotaping his students’ conversations in Spanish-speaking neighborhoods in New York. PVT videotaped interviews and events on the streets of New York during the day and then invited interviewees to their loft “theater” in the evening for screenings and further discussions as part of “activating the information flow.” PVT also taped community “mediations” where points of view on a particular issue would be researched and recorded, then played back for politicians, community leaders, and neighborhood people as part of the negotiating process. Ken Marsh regarded video production at the time as an aspect of citizenship. “The rhetoric that we subscribed to was that ‘the people are the information’... Everybody could do it and everybody should do it. That was the mandate—pick it up, it’s there. Like the power to vote—vote, take responsibility. Make it and see it.”

In 1972 the Videofreex, initially a New York City collective, moved to the Catskills, and began broadcasting a mix of live and recorded programming each week over a low power, pirate TV station to their tiny community in Lanesville. Another seminal group formed around experimental filmmaker and dancer Shirley Clarke. Her T.P. Video Space Troupe produced interactive exercises and events using video, dance, and performance, which also served as a video training model for participants. One of Clarke’s exercises, a sunrise project, concluded when participants reconvened at her Chelsea Hotel rooftop apartment at sunrise to replay the evening’s Portapak documentation of New York’s nightlife. A little further west, the Ithaca video commune collaborated with local social service projects and screened their sometimes controversial programming in bars and bookstores, generating discussion about local and national issues as well as educating local audiences to the possibilities of portable video. Philip Mallory Jones and others eventually initiated the Ithaca Video Festival, the first touring video festival (1974-1984) and an important showcase for early video art and documentary.

At Antioch College in Ohio an active national tape exchange was maintained by students through their Community Media Center. At the Antioch Free Library people were welcome to borrow tapes or add their own tapes to the collection. Through the college’s alternating semesters of work and study and its new program in communications, media students became actively involved in planning and establishing public access cable operations all over the country.

c. Access to cable and public broadcast TV

Alongside the inspiration of the Portapak, the burgeoning cable television industry was heralded as a promising technological development by artists writing in Radical Software, as well as by community activists and urban policy planners. Portable video technology could introduce non-professional people to production, and cable television companies that contracted with individual municipalities could use their local systems to disseminate the citizen-generated and community-responsive programming. Cable companies anxious to expand into new markets offered public access provisions as incentives to potential municipal clients. For public policy planners and community media activists public access provisions could be negotiated as a resource in exchange for the companies receiving access to municipal infrastructures (utility poles, right-of-way to lay cable). Citizens’ access to cable TV was welcomed by diverse factions as potentially invigorating the voices of those largely unrepresented by commercial television.

In a 1970 issue of The Nation, Ralph Lee Smith chronicled the competition among broadcast TV, cable TV, and the telephone companies for a “wired nation.” Smith cited post-war federal commitment to building the interstate highway system as a precedent for mandating similar planning in the public interest for the development of an “electronic highway” in the ’70s. Smith’s prescient article concluded:

“It is hard to assign a dollar value to many or most of the educational, cultural, recreational, social and political benefits that the nation would receive from a national communications highway.
We hoped that it would improve people’s watching and make it a less passive experience. They’re watching and make it a less passive experience. Lack of concern and alienation could easily deepen, with effects that could cancel the benefits of community expression that the cable will bring to inner-city neighborhoods. At the very least, such dangerous possibilities must be foreseen, and the educational potential of the cable itself must be strongly marshaled to meet them.\(^{[25]}\)

The “benefits of community expression” cited by Smith are echoed in “Minority Cable Report” written for Televisions magazine in the early 70s. Roger Newell argued for minorities’ stake in the cable business and community projects that would keep the public informed and also “operationally involved.” He pointed out that in the findings of the 1968 National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder (the Kerner Commission), “blacks interviewed by investigators for the commission felt that the media could not be trusted to present the true story of conditions that led to the riots.” Furthermore, “proponents of the use of cable in minority communities saw it as the clear alternative to commercial broadcasting... Cable gives us a second—and perhaps last—chance to determine whether television can be used to teach, to inspire, to change humans’ lives for the better. The task will be demanding and expensive.”\(^{[26]}\)

The movement to develop public access to cable in the United States initially centered around New York University’s Alternate Media Center (AMC) and George Stoney, who had directed the Canadian National Film Board’s Challenge for Change from 1968-1970, a project that encouraged “community animation” by training people to use media to represent themselves and local issues to government agencies. Dorothy Henaut and Bonnie Klein describe the investment of citizens participating in Challenge for Change in the first issue of Radical Software:

“Half-inch video allows complete control of the media by the people of a community. They can use the camera to view themselves and their neighborhood with a new and more perceptive eye; they can do interviews and ask the questions more pertinent to them; they can record discussions; they can edit tapes designed to carry a particular message to a particular audience—an audience they have chosen and invited themselves.”\(^{[27]}\)

Stoney worked with other video activists taking Portapaks into New York City neighborhoods, strategizing with city officials, federal regulators and cable companies, and speaking out at public hearings about the need to establish diversity of programming voices in order to prevent cable from becoming a copy of commercial broadcasting. In 1970, Stoney and Red Burns founded the Alternate Media Center at New York University with support from the Markle Foundation and, shortly thereafter, the National Endowment for the Arts to train organizers to work with interested community groups, cable companies, and city governments to develop public access to cable TV around the country. Descriptions of tapes made by Alternate Media Center interns in Washington Heights, one of the first neighborhoods in Manhattan to be cabled, indicate their commitment to process-oriented productions and the viability of community participation in cable television:

“Tape 190: Black Response to Riots 9/25/71. Cabled: Teleprompter, Sept 14, 16, 18. Because of an article in the NY Times about Dominican and black gangs fighting, Joel went up to 164th St. and Amsterdam Ave. to see if videotape could be used in any way to help in this situation possibly by using tape to get information to both sides, possibly putting this information on public access to bring the communities’ attention to this incident. It was the first time Joel had gone out alone, so he gave the mike to the people because he had no partner to take sound. At the beginning, Joel asked questions, but then the people just started relating to each other and totally ignored Joel. He felt they really wanted to get something out and had a strong need to speak. He played the tape back for the people through the camera and they dug it. The stereotyped image of a Black voice is destroyed by the information on the tape showing the difference of views. People talk to each other as well as to the camera.”\(^{[28]}\)

In 1972, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), under the leadership of Nicholas Johnson, issued regulations which required every cable system with 3,500 or more subscribers to originate local programming and to provide one dedicated,
noncommercial public access channel, available without charge at all times on a first-come, first-served, non-discriminatory basis to carry that programming. At that time the cable industry had a 7% penetration of U.S. households. This legislation provided the groundwork from which citizens, municipalities, or cable companies could initiate public access production and programming anywhere in the country.

Cable access facilities typically supported local production by providing consumer video equipment, training, and programming access to cable channels, and were funded primarily by federally mandated fees paid by cable companies to cities. By 1976, former AMC interns had established the National Federation for Local Cable Programmers (NFLCP), an umbrella organization whose newsletters and conferences generated communication and ongoing education within the growing number of access centers. The NFLCP continued to support citizens, municipalities and cable companies interested in initiating public access cable facilities around the country, and their legislative and grassroots advocacy impacted significantly on national communications legislation throughout the decade. By 1986 there were over 1,200 public access facilities in the United States, actively supporting local productions and programming by the public on cable TV.²²⁹

Public libraries also pioneered community video activity—extending their mission by loaning out Portapaks, collecting and screening tapes, and advocating for public access to cable. Public libraries in Port Washington, New York, the Cattaraugus-Chautauqua Public Library in Jamestown, New York, and Donnell Library in New York City became notable sites for videotape production and dissemination. Port Washington Public Library’s video director Walter Dale asked the questions: “Could the library maintain in the area of video those qualities it fought for in print; namely, the right to read all views and expressions? Could the library become a true catalyst for the free market place of visual as well as printed expressions?”²³⁰ To Dale, the answer was yes.

Although cable could reach potentially large television audiences, not all communities were cabled, and because cable companies charged viewers for their service, many households chose not to subscribe. So despite the opportunities offered by cable TV, local public (broadcast) television remained important channels for early video producers. The stand-alone time base corrector appeared on the market in 1973, stabilizing the signal of 1/2” open reel tapes and effectively ending early technological objections to broadcasting portable video. As video began to replace film for news productions, independents using portable video equipment began calling for more diversity in points of view, challenging existing union policies as well as programming policies. Some video groups established working relationships in the early ’70s with their local PBS stations—Portable Channel with WXXI in Rochester (New York) and University Community Video with KTCA in Minneapolis—to produce news and documentaries specifically for local broadcast audiences. Technical developments—portability, color video, 3/4” U-matic cassette format, CMX computer video editing—all enhanced video production throughout the decade. At the same time debates, which continue today, began to take shape around independents’ access to new technologies and the receptivity of public television and its legislative and corporate funders to independent programming.

Reflecting back on the formative period (1968-1973), both technological utopians and social historians testified to an inspired engagement with the possibilities of a new society. Hans Magnus Enzensberger commented on the year 1968, when “...utopian thinking seemed to meet the material conditions for its own realization. Liberation had ceased to be a mere wishful thought. It appeared to be a real possibility.”²³¹ Videofreex member Parry Teasdale recalled the imperative to make a commitment: “Without understanding the dynamics of the war in Vietnam and what that did to society, I don’t think you can understand video... it spawned the technology and it created the necessary groundwork for an adversarial relationship within the society that defined sides so clearly that people could choose and choose righteously to be a part of something.”²³² Ralph Lee Smith looked back on his first encounter with advocates for public access cable TV: “Those people were... applying not just technology but appropriate technology. That is to say they were adopting enough of the technology, at a level of expression which was just adequate to do the job and no more, to achieve what they wanted to achieve... They were way ahead of their
In Depth: Philip Mallory Jones

Hill: What got you involved in media in the late 1960s?

Jones: We were all talking about making revolution because... we all had similar basic sympathies and we all understood the tools as part of that process. This was an opportunity to redefine the way information is made, distributed, and experienced. There were glorious and grand schemes and expectations about what small gauge video was going to do. It didn’t happen. What the early video makers were looking for largely didn’t happen because the money was more powerful than we knew at the time. Television was more powerful than we recognized at the time and it didn’t cave in. It just bought it and ran away with it, claimed it and largely didn’t acknowledge where any of this came from. I’m still seeing today things that video artists were doing 20 years ago and it’s new on TV...

In terms of making revolution, there was a critical, concrete need to make things and distribute things. And that was not luxurious; it was very exciting because the people who were doing it didn’t have a lot of precedents to go on. The 16mm documentary techniques were not really applicable. Television techniques were not appropriate. The experience had to be sorted out and the ways of doing time.”

Woody Vasulka recalled a time when many welcomed, “a new society that would be based on a new model... a drive for personal enlightenment... the possibility of transcendence through image as an actual machine-made evocation... Some thought of this as a healing process or... a restructuring of one’s consciousness.”

Despite limits to systemic change sought by the early video practitioners, widespread questioning of fundamental ideological and lifestyle choices did inspire the invention of experimental community structures and economies founded on the use value of media production. Such emphatic commitments focused a radical subjectivity that identified itself as an alternative to the “alienated” and spiritually bankrupt bureaucratic mainstream. Collectives and networked individuals invented new cultural forms and nourished an energy that focused, invigorated, and sustained productive social scenes. Existing institutions—television networks, museums, schools, libraries—were challenged to respond to the interests and needs of their audiences, markets, and users. Optimistic about the role the new media technology could play in a new society, these early video tribes committed themselves to the performance of a radically de-centralized and potentially more democratic electronic communication practice. This alternative vision of decentralized media culture(s) was funded starting in the early ’70s as not-for-profit artist projects, artist-run spaces, video access centers, and public access cable facilities by federal, state and local arts councils, private foundations, public television and cable companies.

**d. Invisible histories—reconstructing a picture of decentralized media practice**

Few of the tapes from the immense body of work produced by these early collectives and access projects have been restored and are available today. Most open reel tapes from this period are in desperate need of preservation. Archivist Roger House recently described *Inside Bed-Stuy*, one of the first (1968) black-produced community access shows as revealing, “a community in the midst of trying to speak to itself, articulate its needs, appreciate its creativity, and urge its residents to rise to the challenges of the times.” He commented on, “how healthy it was to see average people of all ages, in splendid planniness of speech and appearance, speaking out on the Vietnam War, unemployment, urban blight, black capitalism, and black power.” Much research is needed to identify, recover, and evaluate a comprehensive history of the alternative video culture from this period.

Videotaped documentation of community “process” set out to establish a media vocabulary for a new way of speaking and participating in American society. Why have so many of these tapes been relegated to the back shelves of social and educational institutions and producers’ attics? One part of the answer lies in the social and institutional dynamics of any cultural scene. Almost any cultural production, whether destined for a museum or a living room via public access cable, depends on intersecting social and institutional systems that construct the motivation for the work’s production, and the distribution or exhibition vehicle which connects it with an audience, all contributing to its value and meaning. In working to establish a decentralized media practice that had more to do with practice and process than product, especially in the early ’70s, producers consciously positioned themselves on the cultural margins. Many of these early initiatives were undertaken by members of minority groups or geographically isolated communities, which had never established cultural currency outside their local scenes.

Many of these early communications projects were intended to be narrow-casted to specific audiences, and conceived essentially to intersect with locally constructed social and cultural territory. Are these challenges to existing limitations imposed by class, race, age, and gender less legible today? Contemporary viewers may require a context explaining the previous generation’s commitment to process, lack of narrative closure, and rough editing.

Cultural theorist Fredric Jameson claimed at the end of the ’70s:

“Authentic cultural creation is dependent for its existence on authentic collective life, on the vitality of the ‘organic’ social group in whatever form... [The] only authentic cultural production today has seemed to be that which can draw on the collective experience of marginal pockets of the social life of the world system... and this production is possible only to the degree to which these
forms of collective life or collective solidarity have not yet been fully penetrated by the market and by the commodity system.”[56]

Jameson cites women’s literature, black literature, and British working class rock as examples of this authentic collective life, but the alternative video scenes efforts to realize a new citizen-based, locally responsive media culture across the United States at the time would also qualify.

2. Video art practice and its interpretive strategies

“A few years ago Jonas Mekas closed a review of a show of videotapes with an aphorism to the effect that film is an art but video is a god. I coupled the remark, somehow, with another, of Ezra Pound’s; that he understood religion to be, ‘just one more unsuccessful attempt to popularize art.’ Recently though I have sensed a determination on the part of video artists to get down to the work of inventing their art, and corroborating their faith in good works… A large part of that work of invention is, I take it, to understand what video is.”

—Hollis Frampton[37]

“Perceptual and structural changes… have to go with relevance rather than forms. And the sense of a new relevance is the aspect that quickly fades. Once a perceptual change is made, one does not look at it but uses it to see the world. It is only visible at the point of recognition of the change. After that, we are changed by it but have also absorbed it. The impossibility of reclaiming the volatility of perceptual change leaves art historical explanations to pick the bones of dead forms. In this sense, all art dies with time and is impermanent whether it continues to exist as an object or not.”

—Robert Morris[38]

a. Post-minimalist perceptual relevance

Although they often remarked on the pleasure of working in aesthetic territory that was open to new gestures and a new critical vocabulary, the first artists to explore new video technology in the late ’60s were educated through minimalism’s measured structures and procedures and shared late modernism’s investment of the “real” in the materials of art making. The mid-’60s saw a shift, if not a crisis, in contemporary modern art predicated on a radical reassessment of aesthetic foundations and a politicized evaluation of the institutional delivery system for art. Critic Clement Greenberg’s reigning tenets of post-war modernism argued that art was, “an escape from ideas which were infecting the arts with the ideological struggles of society,” and that, in contemporary art, “a new and greater emphasis upon form… involved the assertion of the arts as independent vocations, disciplines, and crafts, absolutely autonomous, and entitled to respect for their own sakes…”[39] This description of an art object, whose integrity was specific to a discipline and which was intended to be appreciated in isolation from the complex social and cultural contexts of its making, had begun to be challenged in the late ‘50s. The multi-disciplinary, participatory nature of Happenings, the invasion of mass media via parody in Pop Art, and the aberrant humor of “intermedia” Fluxus projects, fractured audience expectations of what had come to be considered normative conditions for art making. While many modernist artists began the ’70s by investigating the “essential” properties of video, by the end of the decade the confluence of “high” and “low” art forms, the performances of radical subjectivities, and shifting attitudes toward cinema, television and narrative would set in motion competing cultural agendas for videomakers.

By the mid-’60s painters, sculptors, filmmakers, musicians, and dancers were not only embracing interdisciplinary work but also contributing important critical perspectives, articulating their own working assumptions in major art journals like Artforum. Fluxus artist Dick Higgins argued in 1965 for the “populism” and “dialogue” of “intermedia” and against, “the concept of the pure medium, the painting or precious object of any kind.”[40] Conceptual art, articulated by artists like Sol LeWitt, minimized the importance of objecthood altogether in the aesthetic exercise. Participating in this debate critic Michael Fried wrote in 1967 that, “in previous [modern] art what is to be had from the work is located strictly within it,” and the art object should occupy a privileged meditative space. He objected to the “degenerative theatricality” of new process-oriented works of art that acknowledged the viewer and were, “concerned with the actual circumstances in which the beholder encounters work.”[41] However other critics, such as Annette Michelson, heralded post-minimalism for acknowledging, “temporality as the condition or medium of human cognition and
and digital media. Currently producing video projects of the Ithaca Video Project and is Jones was co-founder and director of the 1968 video in 1968, what led up to that? Sculptor, performer, and sometime videomaker Robert Morris traced the shift from his early minimalist project of describing objecthood, to a post-minimalist articulation of the new “landscape” of material and perceptual processes:

“What was relevant to the ‘60s was the necessity of reconstituting the object as art. Objects were an obvious first step away from illusionism, allusion and metaphor... [However] object making has now given way to an attention to substance... substances in many states—from chunks, to particles, to slime, to whatever... Alongside this approach is chance, contingency, indeterminacy—in short, the entire area of process... This reclamation of process refocuses art as an energy driving to change perception... What is revealed is that art itself is an activity of change, of disorientation and shift, of violent discontinuity and mutability, of the willingness for confusion even in the service of discovering new perceptual modes.”

This attention to the process of working with specific materials and art making as a way of changing perception itself constituted, “a dialectic between structure and meaning which is... sensitive to its own needs in its realization.” This phenomenological dialogue was articulated through an essentially formalist vocabulary that attempted to focus precise attention on fundamental structures and procedures involved in producing work, more akin to science than poetics. Experimental filmmaker Paul Sharits described the critical vocabulary brought to bear on non-narrative film of the ‘60s, a way of speaking about work, which was adopted by the early videomakers:

“It is noteworthy that during the 1950s and 1960s a relatively successful vocabulary (‘formalism’) was employed by critics of painting and sculpture. It was a mode which by-passed the artists’ intentions, dismissed ‘poetic’ interpretations, and focused on apt descriptions of the art object; the aim was a certain discrete objectivity.”

Experimental film, like sculpture and painting, had been grounded in modernism’s materials-based formal vocabulary and was strictly anti-illusionist (vis a vis the Hollywood narrative), and videomakers would assume this bias for their moving image medium as well. Filmmaker Malcolm LeGrice commented in 1977 on experimental film’s investment in the descriptive reality of physical materials and viewers’ perception:

“The historical development of abstract and formal cinema... seeks to be ‘realist’ in the material sense. It does not imitate or represent reality, nor create spurious illusions of times, places and lives which engage the spectator in a vicarious substitute for his own reality.”

Artists and critics were re-examining fundamental assumptions about modern art which in the post-war period had been isolated within a personal contemplative moment and distinctively removed from popular culture and mass media. Hermine Freed remarked:

“Just when pure formalism had run its course; just when it became politically embarrassing to make objects, but ludicrous to make nothing; just when many artists were doing performance work but had nowhere to perform, or felt the need to keep a record of their performance... just when it became clear that TV communicates more information to more people than large walls do; just when we understood that in order to define space it is necessary to encompass time, just when many established ideas in other disciplines were being questioned and new models were proposed, just then the Portapak became available.”

In step with late modernism’s imperative to explore the essential properties of materials, videomakers were initially rhapsodic about the inherent properties of the medium, such as immediacy and real time feedback. Compared to film, videotape was inexpensive, immediate, and recyclable like audiotape. Editing videotape between 1968-1971 was primitive; aesthetic strategies and narrative constructions that relied on precise editing emerged only with the development of more sophisticated video editing equipment and eventually access programs available through

Hill: What were the precursors of what you described as being a revolutionary time? If you came to work in video in 1968, what led up to that?

Jones: A period of working with the Panther Party before ever touching a video camera. Before that working with Delta Ministry in Wallow County, Mississippi, doing voter registration and other kinds of guerrilla organizing. In ‘68, I’d be in and out of jail in Mississippi, in and out of jail in Memphis. I got released from jail in Memphis a week before King was assassinated...

Interviewed June 1995. Philip Mallory Jones was co-founder and director of the Ithaca Video Project and is currently producing video projects and digital media.
media art centers, TV labs, and public access centers in the early '70s. During this very early period, the simultaneous recording and exhibition of events in “real time” or the real time "synthesis" of images using analog electronic instruments dictated the structure of the work. Early tapes using these time-based instruments foregrounded duration itself, along with the mapping of attention over time, and relationships between space/time and sound/ time. Critic David Antin discussed at length early videomakers’ calculated denial of the attentional framework, or “money metric,” of television. Joanna Gill, writing for the Rockefeller Foundation in 1975, described these early video works as “information/perception pieces,” projects determined to expand the limits of viewers’ ability to perceive themselves in video-mediated environments.

The mapping of perceptual, social and/or technological “processes” was valorized above the tape as an art “product.” Early video projects often took the form of interactive installations—configuring cameras, monitors, and/or recording decks with immediate or delayed playback, a common adaptation of an open reel tape recorder accomplished by creating a tape loop between the record and playback heads on one or more decks. Wipe Cycle, a multi-monitor installation by Ira Schneider and Frank Gillette, part of Howard Wise’s historic 1969 exhibition TV as a Creative Medium, featured an 8-second tape loop whereby people entering the gallery encountered delayed images of their own arrival played back to them on a bank of monitors. The artists described the installation as an “information strobe” in which, “the most important thing was the notion of information presentation, and the notion of the integration of the audience into the information.” Antin, writing about this installation said that, “what is attempted is the conversion (liberation) of an audience (receiver) into an actor (transmitter).”

Other artists pursued these ideas throughout the decade. Dan Graham, for example, structured “consciousness projections” which featured technical and human feedback and delay systems in which the audience could explore its apprehension of present and past time, subjective and objective information. Graham wrote:

“Video is a present time medium. Its image can be simultaneous with its perception by/of its audience (it can be the image of its audience perceiving)... video feeds back indigenous data in the immediate, present-time environment or connects parallel time/space continua.”

Through the use of videotape feedback and tape delay the performer and the audience, the perceiver and his process of perception, are linked, or co-identified. The difference between intention and actual behaviour is fed back on the monitor and immediately influences the observer’s future intentions and behaviour. By linking perception of exterior behaviour and its interior, mental perception, an observer’s ‘self’, like a topological moebius strip, can be apparently without ‘inside’ or ‘outside’.

Video artists exploited the phenomenon of video “feedback,” a specific artifact of video tools, accomplished by pointing a video camera at a monitor, which produces an infinite tunneling or mirroring effect. Besides being an easily produced and mesmerizing psychedelic effect, however, feedback also expressed an essential concept in information systems theory. The feedback effect was a powerful metaphor for the ability of a self-monitoring information system to function as an organic or self-regulating physical system. It was invoked by artists in investigations of duration, information exchange and modification, the phenomenology of self and the everyday, and relationships with audiences. Strategies using information feedback were also employed by community activists interested in models of participatory social mediation and political advocacy where citizens could represent themselves and deliver their messages as a kind of extended dialogue with public officials on video, the image currency of the time.

The portability and unity of image and sound represented by the Portapak meant that the video cameraperson could approach documentation in terms of his or her ability to enter into a relational process with a constantly evolving situation. Bob Devine commented on how the attention of the cameraperson constructed the event:

“There are qualities which distinguish the sort of tape in which resonance or receptivity predominates. The takes tend to be unbroken. The point of view has the unity of a single continuous...
Like all social movements and like all historical periods of time, things seep up like ground water in many places at once. There’s no authorship because literally from coast to coast, every place that we looked, people had been doing the same things and looking at Radical Software. Everybody was thinking about these same things. And we thought we were the only people doing that... The fuel was that those were tumultuous times, those were civil libertarian times, those were liberal apologist, social democracy times, those were information economy times. And there was this new technology that got melded in there and made the whole stew have a distinct flavor.

Interviewed April 1995. Bob Devine helped originate public access in Dallas and was the first director of MATA, the Milwaukee Access Television Association. Devine taught in the Cultural & Interdisciplinary Studies Department at Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio.

interactive perspective. The camera moves through and among; it does not define space with fronts, backs, sides or even frame-edges, but instead ‘occupies’ the interior of the space and presents a structural awareness of that interior. The camera is distractible; it reacts, is drawn through attention to particular features or interactions. The tape represents a record of the focus of receptive attention in the taping context. Attention is edited in real-time.\

c. The electronic material of video and the development of tools

Artists working directly with the technologically charged environment of this time-based medium generated a discourse celebrating the particular processes of electronic image-construction. The video camera transforms light and sound information into the video and audio signals as waveform, frequency and voltage, which can be displayed on a cathode ray tube—a television monitor—or magnetically encoded and stored on videotape. Steina and Woody Vasulka articulated their video project in 1975 as primarily a “didactic” one, an inquiry into developing a “vocabulary” of electronic procedures unique to the construction of a “time/energy object.”\n
During the early 1970s, such artistic research into interfaced electronic tools and the new images produced was understood to be the development of a fundamental electronic lexicon, long before similar constructions would assume the role of a pre-programmed stylistic embellishment, the television industry’s menu of “special effects.”

By 1978, Woody Vasulka had broadened his discussion of electronic image vocabulary to include digital as well as analog codes.

“I want to point to the primary level of codes, notably the binary code operation, as a principle of imaging and image processing. This may require accepting and incorporating this primitive structure (the binary code) into our views of literacy, in the form of binary language, in order to maintain communication with the primary materials at all levels and from any distance. The dramatic moment of the transformation into a binary code of energy events in time, as they may be derived from light, or the molecular communication of sound, or from a force field, gravity, or other physical initiation, has to be realized, in order to appreciate the power of the organization and transformation of a code.”

Throughout this period artists, usually in conjunction with independent engineers, modified and invented new video “instruments” or imaging tools, making possible the construction of new video and audio systems shaped by their individual aesthetic agendas. Throughout the late ’60s, Experiments in Art and Technology (EAT) celebrated collaborations between visual and sound artists and scientists in a number of exhibitions, seeking to integrate new ideas in technology with contemporary culture. Labs and studios designed specifically to explore electronic imaging and facilitate collaborations between video artists and engineers emerged including the National Center for Experiments in Television at KQED in San Francisco, the Television Lab at WNET in New York, the Experimental Television Center in Binghamton and later Owego, New York, the studios at the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, and the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

One aesthetic and technical issue carried over from music and experimental film that provoked the interest of early videomakers was the structural relationship between electronic sound and image production. Nam June Paik’s experimentation with the electromagnetic parameters of television and instrument design were extensions of his earlier activity in avant-garde music. Paik’s 1963 Fluxus modifications of television sets with powerful magnets and his TV bra for cellist Charlotte Moorman were ironic gestures, exposing television’s electronic materiality and toying with audience expectations around the TV set as an everyday site for Americans’ meditation and cultural reception. In earlier Fluxus projects he had attacked and compromised pianos as icons of German culture. In 1969 with engineer Shuya Abe, Paik pioneered the construction of the Paik-Abe video synthesizer, an instrument that enabled an artist to add color to the standard black and white video image. In the production of video, both sound and image are determined by the same fundamental analog electronic processes. Modular audio synthesizers, developed in the early ’60s by Robert Moog and Don Buchla, were models for much of the video synthesizer development. Video artists’ explorations into the physical materiality underlying visual, aural, and cognitive phenomena and into the fundamental structuring of
sound and image through mathematical algorithms and machine systems, occupied common territory at this time with aesthetic inquiries in music, experimental film, and sculpture.

d. Video and performance and its audience

If video was celebrated by late ’60s artists for its immediacy and ability to function within or capture a sense of real time, so too was performance art a “situation” or gesture which invigorated the present. Both videomaking and performance supported the investigation of the everyday, the vernacular, the conditions of active perception and information gathering in various settings. Portable video with its immediate playback, as well as performance art, foregrounded the producer/performer and his/her negotiation of a theatrical moment removed from a gallery setting and resituated in the streets or the studio. Both video and performance raised questions about the function of art at a time when modernism’s validation of the transcendent aesthetic experience was challenged by artists. Barbara Rose commenting on the politics of art in 1969 observed: “The real change is not in forms of art, but in the function of art and the role of the artist in society, which poses an absolute threat to the existence of critical authority.”

Performance art posited the aesthetic gesture in the body of the artist, with his or her personal tools, in the present tense, and video could function as one of those personal tools or as a recording instrument for documenting the situation. The subjectivity of the artist and/or the expectations of the audience could be investigated through performance. Vito Acconci, whose early work as a poet involved words and the page as space, remarked that his involvement with performance was a shift away from the material to understanding the self as an instrument and, “an agent which attends to it, the world, out there.”

Performance art had often functioned historically as a transgressive gesture. With its postwar experimental roots in the aleatory music of John Cage, who advocated the listener’s focused “learning” so that, “the hearing of the piece is his own action,” and in paradoxical Fluxus events, which embraced boredom in combination with excitement to, “enrich the experiential world of our spectators, our co-conspirators,” performance art in the ’60s and ’70s undermined audiences’ cultural habits and expectations. It also shared with multi-media happenings, “in a real, not an ideological way, a protest against museum conceptions of art—preserved and cherished.” Performance art clearly participated in an economic critique of the art establishment’s investments in objects through its refusal to be commodified. Video installations, performance documentations, and process-oriented recordings at the time, shared with performance art an accommodation of chance events. As unedited documentation of live events, with grainy black and white images of unknown stability, video also had questionable archival, and therefore investment, value within the art market.

Performance assumes a relationship with a present, local audience, who share to some degree in the risk-taking or experimental nature of performance work. Writer and artist Liza Bear cited the, “heightened awareness of audience as an intrinsic element of the whole performing situation.” Vito Acconci’s video performance work in particular functioned as a kind of encyclopedic study of relationships constructed between the performer and his/her audience through the video monitor. His repertoire of entertaining, erotic, and threatening overtures catalogued the narcissism, seduction, and risk-taking in personal theater and its proto-narrative gestures by directly engaging the viewer in the construction of attentional needs. By exposing his intentions within his performances, he begged the audience members’ consideration of their own intentions and unsted assumptions. Acconci has written about the intimacy involved with video performance and its, “fertile ground for relationship.”

At the same time that artists were venturing structural studies of video performance and measures of intimacy, feminists drew on the intimacy of shared life and art experiences generated through conscious-raising groups and women-centered cultural scenes. Concentrating on the body as a performance vehicle as well as critiquing its representation in mass media and art history, feminist artists such as Hermine Freed, Joan Jonas, Martha Rosler, and Linda Montano, among others, used video and performance to assert and focus female presence and raise issues of gender and subjectivity in art. The invigorated confidence of women as performers and producers, their ambivalence about being the object of desire before the lens or audience, and their politicized

---

**In Depth: Peer Bode**

*Hill:* Could you talk about the Experimental Television Center, an artist-run facility in Owego, NY?

*Bode:* By the end of the ’60s and in the early ’70s a number of factors came together so that there could be funding for these alternative artists-run centers, and so they happened. And then a whole range of work was created within those centers. The Experimental Television Center had an early access program that had to do with loaning out the five or six Portapaks. Ralph’s [Hocking] was dealing with the idea of serving and sustaining a community. How is it that one extends the idea of these tools and deals with some of the needs of an artmaking community? Also, how does one deal with electronic tools in a way that doesn’t create a model which just imitates industry when, in fact, it uses industrial tools?... People needed to actually learn how these tools worked and what new configurations might be that would deliver what they might want, since possibilities for these electronic tools were largely unknown. The model of industry was not the model one wanted to imitate because it was structured to produce certain genres of work... It was a kind of joke—the Detroit way of working. And one didn’t need to make work that way... The material in the studio begins to be in dialogue with the
material of the world, and at that point one can critique the world as well...

People like Nam June [Paik] and Shuya Abe were good examples of what we would now call computer hackers, where this sort of kludging of found stuff would happen. The Paik-Abe synthesizer was a color encoder from a color camera and a video mixer. They didn’t invent those components, they were found... At this time, the early ’70s, ideas would come from music and sound... For example, the guys from WNET came to the center. John Godfrey was a broadcast engineer and very sympathetic and interested in a new kind of working, and David Loxton was a producer. I remember them being at the Center wearing their white shirts and ties and looking very formal, like business men, and holding clip lights for Nam June while he had a little model of the Empire State Building on a lazy susan spinning around [one of the shots in the tape The Selling of New York, 1972, by Nam June Paik]. They had several cameras going at once that were then being colorized and keyed and overlaid. The scene was Nam June grabbing the Empire State building with his hand and pulling it out of the frame. In any case, WNET didn’t have their lab yet in New York and Paik and Abe came to the Center to do their work. Within a year or so they established their lab for artists to work and make new television. So again, these ideas, these things all

relationship to audiences and institutional venues developed into a vital and complex discourse through video and other camera-based media like photography and film. Having attended the second Women’s Video Festival in New York, reviewer Pat Sullivan offered her experience as audience member: “The striking feature of the festival was the revival of communal viewing... Being puzzled or amused or even angered by the responses of the other viewers forced me to search on the screen or in my mind for the origins of my own reactions.”

For feminists, community producers, and artists, the video project’s relationship to its audience was assumed to be a structural aspect of work that expressed a range of radical subjective assertions. The early feminist insight, that both cultural production and viewer reception were constructed according to gender, continued to be articulated across other cultural differences such as class, race, and ethnicity.

The investigation of social, phenomenological and psychological exchanges mediated by video also inevitably (re)introduced and referenced television, a remote (“tele-”) technology located in the home. Television’s paradoxical intimacy with audience was taken up in diverse west coast work by William Wegman, Ilene Segalove, Ant Farm and T.R. Uthco. In The Eternal Frame (1976), Ant Farm and T.R. Uthco reenacted the media spectacle of the Kennedy assassination and revealed its “inscribed audiences” members of the general public who had originally witnessed television’s public channeling of the horror and intimate details of the Kennedy assassination and who now inadvertently found themselves in the middle of public performances recorded in the streets of Dallas and San Francisco. The taped comments of those audiences confirmed the pseudo-familiality of the events; the audiences became unalienated partners in an ironic dissembling of the authority of the news media.

The tourists standing in Dealey Plaza in 1976 may have been unwitting cultural collaborators with Ant Farm and T.R. Uthco, but, like the New York audiences for video and performance events, they were valued as receivers of video by this first generation of video artists. Liza Bear, writing about performance in Avalanche in 1974, stated: “Part of content was an articulation of... the audience’s knowledge, beliefs, expectations of the artist in question... and it was a consciousness of the audience as people who’ve come to see a particular artists’ work, as people who know or work within the art context, and also, in some cases, a consciousness of the limitations of that context.”

Critic Peggy Gale concluded that by, “shifting away from the marketplace and the production of a precious object... the role of the audience was redefined to play a part in the completion of the work through their response and feedback: the video model of simultaneous record and presentation, objectification and immediacy, was in effect reiterated.”

e. Video and the construction of “reality”

Artists explored the immediacy and performative possibilities of video, producing work that legitimized new political and cultural assertions about subjective, lived experience and extended to audiences a considered and responsive function. These critical intimacies and ideological realities as they were mapped out through the video art and alternative media culture, however, were largely antithetical to the commodified “reality” portrayed through mass culture. Although the spectacle of television appealed to the intimate wants and desires of its audience or market, as Enzensberger elaborated, the relationship proffered through television inevitably resulted in a false intimacy:

“Consumption as spectacle contains the promise that want will disappear. The deceptive, brutal, and obscene features of this festival derive from the fact that there can be no question of a real fulfillment of its promise... Trickery on such a scale is only conceivable if based on mass need.”

The viewers’ expectations of video art were complicated by their experiences living with television. That experience was described clearly at the end of the decade by Dan Graham:

“TV gains much of its effect from the fact that it appears to depict a world which is immediately and fully present. The viewer assumes that the TV image is both immediate and contiguous as to time with the shared social time and parallel “real world” of its perceivers—even when that may not be the case. This physical immediacy produces in the viewer(s) a sense of psychological intimacy where people on TV and events appear to directly address him or her.”
The capacity of camera-based work to signify truthfulness, to claim to witness or represent reality, results in its legibility to many viewers as an "essential" and confirming realism. The documentary form, which introduces images and sound as evidence, was embraced by many women and other previously marginalized producers working with video in the '70s, in part because seeing new images of self was undeniably powerful and evidenced the production of a new version of the real. At the same time documentary representation was challenged by women and others as inevitably a product of a specifically focused lens and ideology, with edited inclusions, omissions, and censorships.[72]

Contending ideas about the phenomenological, political, and subjective constructions of the real dominated cultural debate at the end of decade. New developments in narrative film theory, feminist theory, and the semiotics of image-making repositioned late '70s and early '80s art making within an emerging discourse that focused on the construction of subjectivity through the signifying practices of mass media, in which ideology was transacted through commodified and reproducible images. Cultural shifts by the end of the decade, generally regarded as postmodern, forced a reevaluation of critical strategies for artists creating video "texts."

In the early '70s videomakers had articulated their opposition to television’s codes and one-way distribution system, evident in assertions such as "VT is not TV, " and exhibitions at new artists' centers titled "No TV," "Alternative TV," "Process TV," and "Natural TV."[73] David Antin had pointed out that unlike television, an artist’s videotape ended, not when it was time for a commercial, but when the artist's intention was accomplished.[74] The independent network at the end of the decade included media collectives, artists-run media centers, public access organizations, and artist collaborations with public television, and remained a vital alternative to corporate television, however marginalized those cultural scenes. Whether intentionally oppositional or desiring the attention of mainstream audiences, video artists, public access producers, and independent documentarians worked with technologies and cultural codes shared in part by the dominant communications media that, in the United States, though not in all countries, remained primarily a commercial venture. Independent work intended for television would inevitably be evaluated in terms of its marketing value, which would shadow its other intentions or merits. By the late '70s increasing numbers of video artists and independent producers were negotiating the contradictory possibilities of broadcast television’s great visibility and potential censorship.

A decade of producing work, exploring relationships with audiences, and nurturing a viable alternative media infrastructure developed into a video cultural discourse which framed the capacity of a videotape to represent its maker’s access to production technologies, to reveal its maker’s strategies for approximating or constructing the "real," and to engage a performative interaction with an anticipated audience. Alternative videomakers were able to map out diverse intentions as they developed modes of address specific to different audiences—the art world, public television, women, and local communities. The videomaker’s various strategies—attentional, representational, formal, performative—for articulating an art or communications event remained a choice, and always measured the critical distance between the dominant language of commercial media and the videomaker’s independent voice.

3. Emergence of public funding for media art

‘Artists with electronic skill have transformed old TV sets into the dazzling ‘light machines’ that have appeared in galleries and museums, and some have developed video colorizers and synthesizers which permit electronic “painting.” A relative few have penetrated the engineers’ citadels of broadcast television to create experimental videotapes with the full palette of the switching consoles. A larger number, working since 1967 with half-inch portable video systems from Japan, have explored the potential of videotape to reach out and open circuits of communication within a variety of small communities—giving substance to attitudes and concerns which monolithic broadcast television has ignored to a point of near obliteration... This new area of Council [New York State Council on the Arts] involvement suggests the extraordinary potential of the medium still to be explored as we go forward into tomorrow’s wired nation.”

—Russell Connor[75]

happened simultaneously. There were clearly people with these ideas in the newly established PBS structures...

That whole relationship between the PBS artist centers and the other artists-run centers is another interesting one to flesh out, because the artists-run centers had connections to their local communities and also created a different definition of community... There was a difference between the large capital investment productions and the low capital investment productions. This is something that doesn’t get talked about enough—what does it mean for something to be a $50 production, or a $100 production or a $10,000 production or a $5 million production? It was clear that some work could be made with just that Portapak.

That same kind of difference began to set up around different aspects of media production. When you have a larger capital outlay system for the production, you also have a larger capital outlay for the promotion and distribution of that production. These activities are certainly part of working in an information and an advertising based culture. The resulting perception can be, though, that those projects which didn’t spend the money on advertising never existed, and that’s part of the history that needs to be done. Dig up what actually happened because a lot of the focus and the commitment in the '70s was to put
In the decade following the introduction of the Portapak, video art and documentary practice developed within an alternative media infrastructure nurtured by the parallel growth of public arts funding. Calls for structural changes in institutional support for the arts came from working artists in the form of challenges to the economic assumptions of the art world establishment. Demonstrations at major museums protested the lack of support for living artists and called for a general reassessment of the business of art making and art dealing. Although many galleries and museums supported new work and were responsive to criticism from working artists, the very existence of new artist-run cooperatives and media and performance laboratories indicated the existing system was not adequately meeting the shifting needs and interests of a new generation of artists.

Early video arts funding supported proposals by artists and collectives, and developed by the mid-'70s into funding programs for both individual artists and a nationwide system of regional media arts centers. By the late '60s public funding for experimental and documentary film had been established through the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), which would increasingly fund video along with film projects. The New York State Council on the Arts (NYSCA), an early supporter of video as a medium distinct from film, greatly expanded its funding of video starting in 1970. Between 1969 and 1970, NYSCA's overall budget increased almost ten-fold from $2.3 million in 1969-1970 to $20.2 million in 1970-1971. This same period saw NYSCA film and television expenditures grow from $45,000 to almost $1.6 million, with over $500,000 going to new video projects. The NEA, established by Congress in 1965, initiated its Public Media Program in 1967 and by 1971 was spending $1.26 million on film and television art. By the end of the decade the NEA was spending $8.4 million on media arts (film and video) and committed to supporting a network of regional media arts centers.

Gerd Stern, an artist and early NYSCA staff consultant, outlined the rationale for NYSCA's early commitment to the new medium of video art as, "a societal shift away from stockpiling a product... [T]he Council had always maintained a very open attitude toward new art forms,... to recognize the difficulties of arriving at tight value judgments in new situations where the standards were still nascent, embryonic."[76] At this time, funding of not-for-profit cultural organizations and artists was promoted by public policy planners and legislators who asserted that cultural research and design would invigorate the marketplace and enhance the quality of life in a democracy. Some artists argued that public funding for the arts would force individuals to become institutionalized and could co-opt or blunt the edge of cultural dissent and creativity. Others countered that public funding would maintain a publicly accessible platform for discussion of cultural values which would contribute alternatives to a marketplace of ideas dominated by art collecting and the interests of commercial media.

Often building on the existing media collectives, new media centers and multi-disciplinary artist-run spaces were required to be incorporated as not-for-profit organizations. Expanding on the collectives’ communications paradigm, these emerging sites of alternative cultural activity typically offered production facilities, training workshops, and active exhibition programs that positioned video within a critical environment of other disciplines that often included experimental, documentary, and narrative films, as well as music, performance, photography, and visual arts. Screenings by visiting artists were common and were often accompanied by discussions with critical local audiences about the work and news about the growing field. Many media centers and museums published their own bulletins, catalogs, regular program notes, and posters, which, in keeping with the values of the time, were generously informative. This ephemeral material, in combination with contemporaneous periodicals, catalogs, and critical journals, offers the most vivid picture of alternative media “scenes” and their respective activities during this first decade.

Additionally, a respected video art and alternative media discourse was disseminated by publications such as Radical Software, Afterimage, Vidicon, and Televisions. Avalanche, Art News, and other arts magazines featured special issues on video. The National Federation of Local Cable Programmers published The NFLCP Newsletter, which was succeeded by Community Television Review in 1979. The Independent began publication by the Association of Independent Video and Filmmakers (AVIF) in 1976, and Video 80 started publication in 1980 in San Francisco. Sightlines, published by the Educational Film Library Association, regularly reviewed independent videotapes. Video distributors such as Electronic Arts Intermix, Castelli-Sonnabend,
Anna Canepa, Video Data Bank, Third World Newsreel, California Newsreel, Art Com, and Women Make Movies were critical in building and sustaining informational conduits among artists, exhibitors, curators, and educators.

A more thorough tracking of the dialogues, initiatives, policies, and the negotiations between public and private funding institutions, legislative and judicial bodies, commercial interests, not-for-profit arts organizations, public access supporters, and artists’ peer panel participation during this early period is essential for understanding the development of independent video practice, but must be developed elsewhere.

By 1983 at a conference of the National Alliance of Media Arts Centers (NAMAC), then a three-year-old organization that claimed 80 institutional members, speakers asserted that media arts centers had, “now become a significant presence in our culture.” NAMAC's chairman, Ron Green, identified the “cultural lack” addressed by media arts centers:

“Blacks and women may have realized that lack inherent in the images of them that has been perpetrated by the media art of the film and television industry, but American society did not... Democracy was understood [by our forefathers] to require universal education, specifically the ability of all citizens to read and write in order not only to assimilate the issues on which they would vote, but also to contribute to the formulation and presentation of those issues through writing. Since much, if not most, of our information two centuries later is presented through the media instead of writing, and since the media are not accessible to most of us (nor even to most of our best media artists), this requirement of our political system is not being met.”

By the late "70s a media arts infrastructure supported by public and private funders had expanded the production and exhibition opportunities for emerging media artists, foregrounding new art forms and becoming a critical factor in the development of new audiences for this work, but not without significant resistance. Mapping the trajectory of public support for the arts, David Trend quoted a 1981 Heritage Foundation document written during the Reagan Administration that accused the NEA of having grown, “more concerned with the politically calculated goals of social policy than with the arts it was created to support. To accomplish goals of social intervention and change... the Endowment... serve(s) audiences rather than art, vocal constituencies rather than individually motivated artistic impulses.” A struggle, which would eventually be described as a “cultural war," was underway for the legitimacy and survival of an independent media arts practice and infrastructure, one that by the early ‘80s had become more alternative than oppositional, and was described accommodatingly by NAMAC as a, “counterculture... only in comparison to the mass media.”

4. Conclusion—(re)considering the first decade now (in the mid-'90s)

Independent video production was spawned at a historical moment when personal and collective experimentation and institutional invention made sense within a widely embraced vision of a radically changing society. Inspired by the availability of the Portapak, a personal media tool, and emerging at a time when culture was posited as political terrain, videomakers performed initiatives which sought to radically reconfigure art and communications structures locally and globally, invigorating their respective communities’ capacities for informational and participatory feedback. Communications production and reception were reinscribed within contemporary culture by early video independents as social relations that could be negotiated by ordinary people and art scenes, as well as by media corporations and advertisers. In a period that advocated for expanded consciousness and a critical reassessment of institutionalized authority, artists engaged a range of attentional constructs using information and electronic signals fed back through a newly accessible time-based medium, and experimented with the fundamental structures of a new electronic image language. The negotiation of attentional terrain with viewers, the sharing of authority in the work through efforts to guarantee broad access to production, and the recognition of audience as subjective participant in the work and social partner in sustaining cultural scenes, all characterized the performance of video art and communications projects throughout their first decade.

An enormous range of art, performance, and documentary projects survive today as tapes, deserving conservation and study
as both individual projects and collectively as archives. This early media work and its cultural aspirations beg to be considered part of our normative education for living in the contemporary world. At this moment, however, many of the surviving tapes from this period are in a precarious state—many tape collections are badly documented and sit deteriorating on dusty shelves. Most remain unviewable in their current condition, requiring both conservation attention to the tape medium and/or transference of the electronic signal to a viewable contemporary format. Bodies of work, produced within certain communities or by collectives, need to be (re)discovered and addressed, as well as do the tapes of individual artists whose work is already valued. And it is clear that today’s gatekeepers to these materials—librarians, curators, editors, artists, public access workers, distributors, funders, and folks who may not realize the value of the old rotting tapes taking up space in their closets—will play very important roles in determining which work will be identified, which tapes will be allocated funding for preservation, and which projects will survive as the cultural and historical record. Robert Horwitz, a citizens’ radio activist and arts editor, presciently pointed out on a panel discussing art and communications on public access TV in 1983 that it is these editorial positions that are, “the most creative and empowering within.... an information rich environment.” These gatekeeping positions will create a cultural economy from the existing media data banks, routing and regulating the flow of information in our increasingly digitized world.

Video art and alternative media production were developed by artists in the late ‘60s and early ‘70s as a public dialogue about new cultural forms and access to telecommunications technology distributed through a proliferation of new sites for production, exhibition, and exchange. The revisiting of that period through a survey of ideas that informed that body of work is, in part, an effort to link the cultural insights and strategies of portable video’s first decade with the present conditions for producing media culture. Attention to the video projects of the late ‘60s and ‘70s, those identified and valued and others yet to be rediscovered, is timely in view of the advent of international media hardware and software expansion and new decentralized multi-media networks such as the Internet. The democratic use of these tools can only be realized with considerable efforts toward widespread media literacy and direct experience with media production, a necessary extension of basic reading and writing skills in the contemporary media cultural world.

Such an education for media cultural fluency must encompass access to and experience with production and post-production tools in combination with an understanding of the interpretive structures of moving image media “literatures”—video, film, sound, digital multi-media, radio, cinema, television, internet—that have been produced to date. It is necessary to beware of the emancipatory claims of new technologies, as well as the liberal notion that access to production alone will bring about critical participation in view of the capacity of the mass media to assimilate new cultural forms. However, the early ‘70s participatory affirmation of an alternative democratic media practice bears amplification at the present time in order to reconsider the efforts of that earlier generation to initiate new forms of cultural exchange, and to share the authority of technologically intensive cultural production with diverse audiences and local communities. In supporting the production of a vital, inventive, multi-vocal, and accessible contemporary media culture, artists and educators must continue to question—what were the cultural issues negotiated by past bodies of work, who has training and access to increasingly sophisticated tools, and how can diverse audiences approach the work produced—and on a much broader scale than has been accomplished to date.
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Program 1: Explorations of Presence, Performance, and Audience

Performer/Audience/Mirror, Dan Graham, 1975, 22:45, U.S., b&w, sound

Selected Works (Dog Duet, Used Car Salesman, Dog Biscuit in Glass Jar), William Wegman, 1972, 08:44, U.S., b&w, silent and sound

Baldessari Sings LeWitt, John Baldessari, 1972, 03:38 (excerpted from 12:50), U.S., b&w, sound

Undertone, Vito Acconci, 1972, 09:15 (excerpted from 37:20), U.S., b&w, sound

Vertical Roll, Joan Jonas, 1972, 19:37, U.S., b&w, sound

My Father, Shigeko Kubota, 1975, 14:46, U.S., b&w, sound

Exchange, Robert Morris, 1973, 36:02, U.S., b&w, sound
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Introduction

“Video, with its capacity to immediately record and play back recorded moving images, was not only relatively inexpensive to buy and easy to operate, but was also easily adaptable as a new perceptual instrument, an extension of the human body. The appropriation of video into artmaking followed enormous changes in the art world in the late 1950s and early 1960s; the emergence of Minimalism, Happenings, Performance, and Fluxus demonstrated a new interest in the gestures and materials of everyday life as well as a desire to explore multimedia and intertextual forms of artmaking.”
—John G. Hanhardt (1990)

“The works implied a very close and multi-leveled rapport with audience consciousness; in fact, in many cases, part of their content was an articulation of that consciousness itself—of the audience’s knowledge, beliefs, expectations of the artist in question. This made the performances very far removed from a self-referential display situation. And it was a consciousness of the audience as people who’ve come to see a particular artist’s work, as people who know or work within the art context, and also, in some cases, a consciousness of the limitations of that context.”
—Liza Bear (1974)

The artists included in “Explorations of Presence, Performance, and Audience” moved into video from performance, sculpture, photography, writing, and dance. They used the video camera and monitor as time-based tools to investigate perception or as performative strategies within the paradoxically intimate and distanced theater of the video monitor. Video’s unique ability to monitor presence and deliver informational feedback through recording and editing structured situations allowed the artist to create personal exchanges with collaborators and/or audiences (Morris, Kubota, Acconci) and formal paradigms about the phenomenology of perception (Graham). In this early performance-based work, the video monitor often functioned as a mirror, a diary, a theater, and an ironic reference to television’s “perceptual imperialism” (Ryan, 1970). Videotape, a reusable and relatively inexpensive recording medium, was an ideal tool for performing artists to meditate on presence and to foreground perceptual process over commodifiable product.

In most of these tapes the performer constructs an active relationship with the audience. The viewer’s awareness is specifically acknowledged under both live and remote viewing conditions. Such an aesthetic focus reflects, in part, the period’s cultural agenda to radically rethink personal and institutional relationships of all types. A variety of strategies for engaging the viewer’s attention, some of them confrontational and transgressive, are played out in these tapes. Provocations of viewers’ erotic projections (Acconci, Jonas), social histories of television viewing (Wegman), expectations around high and low art (Baldessari), and art as a discrete object of contemplation rather than experiential process (Kubota, Morris) challenged assumptions brought to a video tape screening or art performance using video.
In *Performer/Audience/Mirror* Graham uses video to document an investigation into perception and real time informational “feedback.” The performance is doubly reflected back to the audience by the artist’s lecturing and the architectural device of a mirrored wall. Graham has written extensively on how video, which can deliver information in real time, functions semiotically as a mirror. Using the mirror at the back of the stage as a monitor, Graham voices his unrehearsed observations, activating the various feedback cycles taking place within himself as performer, between the performer and audience, and among audience members. Issues of duration and attention are critical for both performer and audience.

“Through the use of the mirror the audience is able to instantaneously perceive itself as a public mass (as a unity), offsetting its definition by the performer’s discourse. The audience sees itself reflected by the mirror instantly while the performer’s comments are slightly delayed. First, a person in the audience sees himself “objectively” ("subjectively") perceived by himself, next he hears himself described “objectively” ("subjectively") in terms of the performer’s perception.”

—Dan Graham (Lori Zippay, 1991)

Wegman uses the area framed by the camera as his performance space, employing a single, fixed camera to record the scenes as he, and Man Ray, his Weimaraner, act them out. It has been suggested that Wegman’s performances with Man Ray are uncanny invocations of broadcast television’s manipulations of its viewers. Man Ray and his companion are collectively mesmerized by a tennis ball. The misrepresentations and lewd stroking of Man Ray as Wegman delivers a used car salesman’s monologue apes television’s crass marketing. Man Ray’s pursuit of a dog biscuit inside a glass bottle creates the type of narrative suspense that draws us into the action on the screen. These tapes are a selection from the hours of short performances Wegman recorded in his studio from 1970-1978.

“[Man Ray is] like an object. You can look at him and say, how am I going to use you, whereas you can’t with a person… You can manipulate him so that he doesn’t feel manipulated, so that he feels he’s doing something he’s supposed to do or having fun, one of the two.”

—William Wegman (Liza Bear, 1973)

West Coast artist John Baldessari refers ironically to the mass audience potential of video when he portrays his project—making a videotape in which he sings Sol LeWitt’s statements on conceptual art to popular tunes—as a way to bring LeWitt’s high art texts “to a much larger public.” If LeWitt’s 45-point tract on conceptual art was one strategy for radicalizing the reigning modernist discourse, then Baldessari’s introduction of a pop soundtrack sets up yet another model for undermining modernist aesthetics. Baldessari’s videotapes, like his photomontages from this period, are investigations into sign systems using appropriated material and often an ironic juxtaposition of photographic or video images and written or verbal texts. His videotaped performances often take the form of parables or lessons. Each tape lasts only as long as necessary to deliver the lesson at hand. About an earlier photographic series of “Art Lessons” he observed, “I think when I’m doing art, I’m questioning how to do it.”

“In its infancy, TV was truly magical and full of promise. One went to see artists’ tapes with excitement. But, looking backward, I think we went to witness the medium, and not what the artist had done with it… I think that, for there to be progress in TV, the medium must become as neutral as a pencil. Just one more tool in the artist’s toolbox.”

—John Baldessari (1977)
This tape exemplifies Acconci's transgressive performance style. Influenced by writing on kinesics by Kurt Lewin, Erving Goffman, and Edward Hall, Acconci in the early '70s moved into an examination of the "performance areas" that exist between people. In *Undertone*, the artist seats himself at a table whose opposite end coincides with the bottom edge of the monitor, such that the viewer could imagine him/herself at the other end of the table. Acconci alternates between sitting with his hands folded on the table, confiding to the viewer: "I need to look you straight in the eye, to prove I'm not hiding anything..." and then placing his hands under the table and looking down, fantasizes: "I want to believe there's a girl here. She's touching me, rubbing my legs..." These gestures are repeated, exploring variations on what the performer "needs" and "wants" from both the assumed viewer's and his own sexual projections. *Undertone* sets up a relationship in which the viewer is implicated in the sexual projections of the performer. The conflation of public and private disclosure introduces issues of Acconci's vulnerability as a person and performer, as well as the vulnerability of the audience's attention.

"What interests me about video is its use as a kind of home companion, it's a place for close-up. I can be face-to-face with a viewer, I can be one point in a space that includes the viewer..."  
—Vito Acconci (Liza Bear, 1974)

"Video as hot seat (this could be its use as part of a gallery installation, combined with other "furniture" in a "set"); video as resolve—a place for me to come into, out of the corner, show my face. You, the viewer, can use TV to survey what could have been my private activity—you have me on the spot [I might be trying to turn my face away from you]—I can lose face: I might have to save face."  
—Vito Acconci (Schneider and Korot, 1976)

In this video, Jonas performs the belly dancer Organic Honey, one of her female archetypal "alter egos." During her performance, the video frame continues to roll, a condition produced by adjusting the timing of the vertical hold on the monitor. The final video recording is made by pointing a second camera at the rolling monitor image, thereby enveloping the performances of both human and machine. The constant, regular visual rhythm of the vertical roll, accented by the percussive beating of a spoon, becomes a moving framework for gestures and visual rhythms set up by Jonas' writhing, fractured figure. The rolling black band interrupts the frame, breaking the false three-dimensionality of the monitor space; the monitor becomes a "screen" which distorts and obscures, rather than a window that opens up a privileged view. The movements and rhythms produced in the tape can be experienced as mesmerizing and moderately disorienting or aggressively disturbing, assaulting the viewer and frustrating the desire to gaze at the female body on the screen. The vertical roll functions both as a structural feature, which Jonas integrates into her choreography, and as a kind of venetian blind, alternately seducing and frustrating the viewer/ voyeur.

"At first I saw the monitor/projector as an ongoing mirror. Watching myself I tried to alter the image using objects, costumes, and masks, moving through various identities (the sorcerer, the floozy, the howling dog). Narcissism was a habit. Every move was for the monitor."  
—Joan Jonas (Schneider and Korot, 1976)

"The vertical roll of the monitor was used in my work as a structural device with which activities were performed in and out of sync with its rhythm. I play with the peculiar qualities of the TV,
imagistically and structurally. The vertical roll seems to be a series of frames in a film, ongoing by slowly obscuring and distorting the movement. Portions of the movement are lost as the mind passes or jumps the monitor. The vertical roll affects one’s perception of the TV image and of the space around the monitor. Floors seem to rise when you look away from the continuous vertical roll.”
—Joan Jonas (Davis and Simmons, 1977)

My Father, Shigeko Kubota, 1975, 14:46, U.S., b&w, sound

In this personal elegy, Kubota mourns her father’s death and embraces the monitor while watching a videotape she made when they were last together. Kubota leans, sobbing uncontrollably, on his technological/television body, seeking the monitor as a source of comfort, as it has now become a replacement for her father’s natural body. In this way the monitor becomes an actor, establishing a presence in the work. The television emerges as the link between Kubota and her father in another sense, as the crooning of Japanese pop singers provides a melodramatic backdrop for their last time together and a soundtrack for Kubota’s real-life tragedy. The distance and intimacy of recording are carefully structured into this very personal tape. Post-produced at Electronic Arts Intermix.

“Videotape acts as an extension of the brain’s memory cells. Therefore, life with video is like living with two brains, one plastic brain and one organic brain. One’s life is inevitably altered.”
—Shigeko Kubota (Davis and Simmons, 1977)

Exchange, Robert Morris, 1973, 36:02, U.S., b&w, sound

In 1972, Robert Morris and Lynda Benglis agreed to exchange videotapes in order to develop a dialogue building off each other’s work. Morris’ tape Exchange is part of that process, representing his response to Benglis’ 1972 videotape Mumble. The work relies on the re-recording of images off the monitor to reference memory and the accumulation and assimilation of fragments of thoughts and images. The voice-over narration proposes and re-evaluates Morris’ formal and personal intentions in making the tape. Exchange documents the multiple dialogues and points of view that were focused and elided through this artistic and personal collaboration.

“In the first tape he tried to get at his feelings, gave it up in the second tape, toyed with it in the third, went into a rage in the fourth, mumbled incoherently in the fifth, and returned, greatly cleansed, to the subject in the seventh. I can’t recall what he did in the sixth. She speaks for herself. Here you can see that she has hit her stride. He stalks, she strides. Actually, he stalked and she strode. She insisted that I say this and I do it reluctantly but it is her tape, or rather this sequence is hers. Generally she speaks for herself. He attempted to talk about continuity in the fourth tape after the rage had passed.”
—Robert Morris, excerpted from the tape (1974)

“In a broad sense art has always been an object, static and final, even though structurally it may have been a depiction or existed as a fragment. What is being attacked, however, is something more than art as icon. Under attack is the rationalistic notion that art is a form of work that results in a finished product... What art now has in its hands is mutable stuff which need not arrive at the point of being finalized with respect to either time or space.”
—Robert Morris (1969)

Note: Technical distortions during playback of the video are inherent, either as a result of the artist’s process (e.g. re-recording images off the monitor) or physical and irreversible deterioration of the tape stock.
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Introduction

“To show that light is a constant moving force, an ever-changing form... And when creative people begin to get involved with this idea of energy rather than the idea of making pictures then we will come to some creative aspect not belonging to one particular class but toward a new exploration which is for all.”
—Aldo Tambellini (1970)

“[In *Boomerang*]... a delayed audio feedback system (two tape recorders, earphones) was set up in a television studio... This system established a distance between the apprehension and the comprehension of language as words split, delayed, mirrored, and returned. Thoughts were partially being formulated, comprehended, and vocalized. The reiteration presented a revolving, involuting experience, because parts of the words coming back in on themselves stimulated a new direction for thoughts... This unit of discourse examines and reveals the structural framework of the system.”
—Richard Serra (1976)

Some tapes in this program were made by artists who had already developed a distinguished body of work in sculpture, performance, painting, music, or film. In extending aesthetic preoccupations beyond mid-'60s interests in objecthood and materials specific to traditional painting or sculpture, many of these projects featured the body of the artist and its capacity to articulate perceptions, stamina, and the generation of sound. In these works the body of the artist functioned as one kind of instrument in the presence of, or complicated by, the video and audio recording instruments (McCarthy, Nauman, Serra and Holt, Palestine, Hill). Issues of attention such as boredom and exhaustion of both the artist and the audience, were embraced as part of the potential dynamic range of the work (Nauman). Also related to an introduction of the body as an idiosyncratic recording or expressive device are other video projects that proposed structural relationships between natural or biological and electronic systems (Campus, Kos).

Reflecting their roots in '60s minimalism, many artists produced videotapes that generated their own descriptive systems for physical operations and materials: inventorying synthetic spaces constructed by interfacing two cameras and a mixer (Campus), reporting on the experience of audio delay of one’s voice (Serra and Holt), testing the capacity of the vibrating cones in audio speakers to move sand and water as well as air (Hill). Grounding these physical explorations in the routines and materials of everyday life, these artists traced habitual movements in the studio (Nauman), harmonized with a motorcycle engine (Palestine), and demonstrated fundamental musical harmonies on a simple calculator (Conrad). Some of these materials-based operations introduced the controlled methodology of a science experiment (Fox, Kos, Campus), and others registered transcendent or mythic metaphors for fundamental physical and electronic processes involving light, sound, and space (Viola).
Black and White Tapes, Paul McCarthy, 1970-75, 06:30 (excerpted from 33:00), U.S., b&w, sound

Black and White Tapes derives from a series of performances Paul McCarthy undertook in his Los Angeles studio from 1970 to 1975. Conceived for the camera and performed alone or with only a few people present, these short performances use video to articulate both monitor and studio space. In the first excerpt, McCarthy paints a white line on the floor with his face, dragging his body from one end of the studio to the other. In doing so, McCarthy performs a recognizable formal gesture—drawing a white line. Radically inserting his body into the painting process may have been intended as a parody of prevailing minimalist sensibilities. McCarthy confounds viewers’ notions of physical space by seeming to hang from the upper frame of the picture as he spits into an unseen microphone. McCarthy’s auto-erotic art was influenced by body art and the physicality of artists like film-maker and performer Carolee Schneeman. He has stated that using the body as part of the ground of the painting was a compelling issue at the time. Related impulses can be seen in happenings of the early and mid-’60s, which often fused audience and performers into the setting and action of the extended painting.

Stamping in the Studio, Bruce Nauman, 1968, 05:00, (excerpted from 1:01:35), U.S., b&w, sound

From an inverted position high above the floor, the camera records Nauman’s trek back and forth across the studio. His repeated stamping suggests an obsessive or ritualized activity. This short excerpt is taken from a 60-minute tape in which Nauman stamps through his studio without stopping; the duration of the tape was determined by the length of standard tape stock. Repetition and the potential boredom of both the audience and artist were attentional strategies explored by a number of post-minimalist artists and media makers during this period. Stamping in the Studio underscores an interest in the artist’s everyday routine and in the process of art making. Nauman’s sculpture and photography during this period consistently refer to a range of materials and disciplines, often employing language puns.

Double Vision, Peter Campus, 1971, 14:22, U.S., b&w, sound

Campus investigates the metaphoric overlap between properties of the video camera and processes of human perception, an area of great interest to many early video makers. Double Vision inventories strategies for comparing simultaneous images of a loft space produced by two video cameras whose signals are fed through a mixer, thus producing an electronic version of what in film would be called a “double exposure.” The cameras are set up to perform variations of binocular vision; for example, in the section entitled “Copilia,” the two cameras are set at different focal lengths and search independently around an empty room, attached to the same moving body. In “Convergence,” the cameras are stationary and separated but focused on the same distant wall; their images gradually merge as the artist repeatedly returns to the cameras and moves them closer together. Double Vision is an elegant and systematic exploration of vision using basic video technology.

“[Double Vision is] an exploration of double or two-camera images and works its way up to an eye-brain model, always conscious of how this model differed from its subject matter.”

—Peter Campus (Lori Zippay, 1990)

Note: The occasional break-up during playback is a result of a break in the video signal, an artifact of the original tape.
Boomerang, Richard Serra with Nancy Holt, 1974, 10:27, U.S., color, sound

In Boomerang, Serra records Nancy Holt’s experience of having her words fed back to her with a delay (an electronically produced echo). The viewer, like Holt, hears both her direct speech and the delay. Listening to the delayed audio over headphones seems to confound Holt’s ability to speak; she speaks slowly and deliberately, stating that she has “trouble making connections between thoughts.” She observes that “the words become like things... and they're boomeranging back,” a reference to the aesthetic shift from the production of objects to an elucidation of process. The call letters of an Amarillo television station and the “Please Stand By” sign that interrupt the image place the work in the context of a television production. The harsh lights of the studio, according to Holt, contribute to the “insubstantiality of the situation.” She acknowledges the audience is also participating in this “double reflective” construction.

“Boomerang is a tape which analyzes its own discourse and processes as it is being formulated. The language of Boomerang and the relation between the description and what is being described is not arbitrary. Language and image are being formed and revealed as they are organized.”
—Richard Serra (1976)

Island Song, Charlemagne Palestine, 1976, 16:02, U.S., b/w, sound

Strapping a video camera to himself as he drives a motorcycle around an island, Palestine harmonizes with the engine, maniacally repeating the phrase, “Gotta get outta here… gotta get outta here…” His chanting voice merges with the vibrations of the motor, forming an incessant soundtrack that echoes the jarring motion of the camera. Palestine creates a kind of composite instrument in motion as well as an “articulated personal drama” (1976). His stated desire for escape is contained by the boundaries of the island. Palestine was a trained cantor, and he often used his moving body and sustained vocalizing to generate a physical and aural intensity in his musical/video performances of this period.

Cycles of 3s and 7s, Tony Conrad, 1976, 02:51 (excerpted from 30:54), U.S., b/w, sound

Cycles of 3s and 7s is a performance in which the harmonic intervals that would ordinarily be performed by a musical instrument are represented through the computation of their arithmetic relationships or frequency ratios. Conrad and the other members of the Theater of Eternal Music—LaMonte Young, Marian Zazeela, John Cale, and Angus MacLise—composed and performed “dream music” in the early ’60s. This seminal group was a major influence on what became known as minimalist music. Conrad’s tape points to an important intersection of conceptual and performative experimentation in which the theoretical basis of sound and visual imaging tools were explored by musicians, filmmakers, video makers, and electronic instrument designers.

“I felt that it would be interesting to do computer art using a computer much simpler than the kinds of computers that were being fetishized at the time [’70s] because the tendency was for the artist to access the most lavishly endowed computer possible. I decided I’d use a hand calculator… I did not see the computer as a means for arriving at an artistic solution so much as implementing an artistic process… as a performance tool.”
—Tony Conrad (Interview with Chris Hill, 1995)
The Children’s Tapes, Terry Fox, 1974, 29:36, U.S., b&w, sound

These phenomenological dramas, involving household objects like candles, spoons, and matches, unfold through an extreme economy of gesture. Fox balances a spoon and a piece of ice on top of a bent fork; as we watch, the ice melts, the spoon is thrown off balance and falls. Inventing new situations with the same objects, Fox created these works as an alternative to commercial children’s television. In this sense, the work forms a critique of the pace of television, which never affords the time to see processes develop. The play of objects in delicate flux with each other serves as a meditative exercise on the symmetry of physical forces. A wide-angle camera lens delivers this intimate tabletop performance world to a larger audience. The sublime beauty of these elemental observations recalls the aesthetic of Fox’s one-time mentor, Joseph Beuys.

“In The Children’s Tapes, Fox focuses on a series of short experiments, illustrating basic scientific principles (such as heat transfer, evaporation, balance, etc.) using everyday objects to form a personal lexicon. The elegance and brevity of the composite segments allows the work to function as an intriguing and instructive experience for children, as well as an indication of Fox’s evolved metaphorical concerns.”
—David Ross (1984)

Soundings, Gary Hill, 1979, 17:41, U.S., color, sound

Soundings is a meditation on the phenomenology of sound, the translation of image into sound and sound into image through a series of experiments on an audio speaker. The speaker delivers sound, both audibly and visibly, with the camera revealing the minute vibrations of the speaker’s cone. Referring to the cloth covering of the speaker as a “skin,” Hill intones, “This is the skin of space where I voice from.” The materialized voice is clearly an extension of the artist’s intention. Hill proceeds to bury, puncture, burn, and drown the audio speaker in an effort to physically alter or overwhelm the sound coming out of it, the sound of his own voice. Each carefully constructed experiment explores the confluence of sound, image, and text, suggesting a kind of concretized poetry or “electronic linguistics.”
—Gary Hill (Lucinda Furlong, 1983)

This tape was conceived as a work for broadcast and produced at the TV Lab at WNET, New York.

Lightning, Paul and Marlene Kos, 1976, 01:17, U.S., b&w, sound

“When I look for the lightning, it never strikes. When I look away, it does.” This short tape, recorded inside a car, focuses on machine-aided human observation and a naturally occurring light show. In this experiment about a fascinating and powerful natural event and the possibility of recording it, the video camera occupies a privileged position, recording the woman and what she sees as well as what she cannot see. At a time when video was lauded for its ability to reveal the world in real time, Paul and Marlene Kos speculate on the nature of objectivity, the limits of our senses, and the sensing of machines.

“Lightning is an unedited, real-time minute of a lightning storm in northwest Wyoming. In a major storm the soonest lightning can strike again in the same area of the sky is approximately 15-18 seconds. Therefore, the phrase and the silence which follows was timed to allow a possible strike to occur.”
—Paul Kos (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)
Viola has referred to *Sweet Light* and other tapes from this period as "songs"—personal lyrical statements. Articulated through precise editing, *Sweet Light* incorporates symbolic imagery, changes of scale, and a radically mobile camera suggesting shifting points of view. The tape is grounded in common references to illumination—incandescent lamp light, daylight, flashlight, firelight—that serve as metaphors for artistic inspiration. Viola’s access to sound facilities at the ZBS studio in Fort Edward, New York, and to video post-production at the TV Lab at WNET, New York allowed him to exercise precise and rhythmic flexibility in editing this tape.

"The title of Bill Viola’s... tape contains a certain irony. The compulsion of moths and men toward sources of illumination, in both physical and metaphysical senses, is most compellingly depicted by images of annihilation; the smoke of moths burning in the heat of an incandescent lamp, and the brief intense searing of the artist’s face upon the video camera and the viewers’ eyes. The tape is a meditation upon this compulsion and its relation to the creative act—the passion for the all-consuming moment of inspired illumination—and the conclusion of *Sweet Light* with the artist’s symbolic self-immolation is the work’s primary statement."

—John Minkowsky (1978)
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Program 3: Approaching Narrative – “There are Problems to Be Solved”

The Red Tapes Part II, Vito Acconci, 1976, 57:55, U.S., b&w, sound

Out of the Body Travel, Richard Foreman, 1976, 23:50 (excerpted from 42:00), U.S., b&w, sound

The Continuing Story of Carel and Ferd, Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America, 1972-75, 33:15 (excerpted from 1:00:00), U.S., b&w and color, sound
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Introduction

“The necessity for digressing from and undermining a coherent narrative line driven by characters, or simply refusing to comply with its demands for spatio-temporal homogeneity, uninterrupted flow of events, closure, etc., has always been a basic assumption in my scheme of things. The necessity for inducing identification has only recently become worrisome, because once it is hooked, how do you unhook this audience that dreams with all its eyes open?”

—Yvonne Rainer

“I am personally happiest when I am forced to solve a problem. The aggression on stage has to do with that. I want the performer and the performance to give the audience the feeling that there are problems to be solved. And I’ve made the solution available, somehow.”

—Richard Foreman (Eric Bogosian, 1994)

The works in “Approaching Narrative” establish inventive formal staging for epic story telling. These projects have no interest in seducing an audience into accepting a seamless narrative illusion of reality. Instead, problems are constructed around an audience’s understanding of the “real” and the construction of their attention. “Film and video by artists working within the art world and avant-garde cinema... sought to subvert the tradition of narrative illusion as the sole means of constructing meaning in filmmaking and television. To achieve this, they employed various formal and aesthetic strategies, including directly addressing the technologies and properties of film and video, turning the camera upon themselves... and exploring the conceptual basis of the processes of production.” (John Hanhardt, 1990)

Audiences have to work to derive meaning from videotapes that sought to rupture expectations of narrative closure and illusions of an authorial point of view. They may be unsettled often—by buzzers that repeatedly interrupt a meticulously staged theater in a box (Foreman), by a speaker’s emphatic “cut it out! cut it out!” (Is it Acconci’s stage directions or part of the confrontative dialogue he performs?), or by a couple’s intimate disclosures (Ginsberg).

These three epics are structured around collected physical “evidence”: a series of scenes and diary entries that may or may not share a common place or time (Acconci); tableaux that fill up with furniture, books, and dancers (Foreman); and hours of videotaped living (Ginsberg). The various performers—the banished revolutionary, the searching young woman, the countercultural couple and their videographers—are committed to exploring their artifacts. Notably, there is little effort by the video makers to provide neatly packaged answers or a moral.

The “problems to be solved” through these fragmented narratives were housed in radically revised theaters. They included the “obsolete buildings” within the theater of video, the site of a cultural revolutionary’s address, a formal tableau paradoxically coupled with a revolution-in-progress (Foreman), and the interactive, multi-monitor, multi-channel video theater that aggrandized the small video image (Ginsberg). These experimental video epics challenged public storytelling and sought to decentralize cultural mythmaking by inventing new forms of theatrical space.
The Red Tapes is a three-part epic that features the diary musings of a committed outsider—a revolutionary, a prisoner, an artist. The series offers a fragmented mythic narrative and a poetic reassessment of the radical social and aesthetic aspirations of the previous decade. Acconci “maps a topography of the self,” constructing scenes which suggest both the “intimate video space of close-ups and the panoramic landscape of film space.” Tape 2 opens with the image of a small white square of sunlight framed on a wooden beam. As the camera zooms out, the square is revealed to be part of a monumental architectural set. Later on, Acconci delivers one reflection on this formal architecture: “We have to give the masses visual evidence that we are here to stay… They associate power with obsolete buildings. These buildings then are empty symbols…” At the end of Tape 2, the white space has become a performance ground, an “island” of light from which the prisoner reads diary excerpts: “Someone said: in peace time you get nowhere; in war time you bleed to death. The question I have is: on an island like this, what ground do I have to build a history?” Throughout the tape Acconci verbally and visually introduces structural metaphors that function both as formal elements and as expressive segues. The production of The Red Tapes involved painters and filmmakers Ericka Beckman, Ilona Granet, Richie O’Halloran, Kathy Rusch, David Salle, and Michael Zwack.

“Ontology is ‘the science of being or reality; the branch of knowledge that investigates the nature, essential properties, and relations of being.’ In his writing, Foreman takes the fundamental conflict (hysteric) basis of most traditional theatre and renders it phenomenologically—retarding and breaking up the hysterical situation or state, and focusing on the moment-to-moment reality of things-in-and-of-themselves.”

—Kate Davy (1976)

The Red Tapes Part II, Vito Acconci, 1976, 57:55, U.S., b&w, sound

Out of the Body Travel, Richard Foreman, 1976, 23:50 (excerpted from 42:00), U.S., b&w, sound

A “young woman who finds herself surrounded by the relics of Western culture” is the subject of Richard Foreman’s formal tableaux. The narration centers on a young woman’s struggle to find a relation between her body and her self as mediated by language. The text is a poetry of formal relations that carries personal and historical implications, including the desires of the woman paradoxically voiced by a male narrator: “You see I want to know my body in order to know myself. Correction. I want to make my body known. My body came from the world but it turned into a secret, i.e. my body.” The title suggests the vivid virtuality of dreaming; scenes repeatedly refer to both reading and sleeping. Richard Foreman, founder and director of the Ontological-Hysteric Theater in New York, produced this first videotape project with students from the American Dance Festival and cinematographer Babette Mangolte.

“Video innovators sought to extend the limits of the small video screen to embrace a larger spectacle. Since playing back a single-channel, edited tape on a small video monitor lacked the impact and spontaneity demanded of the happenings of the era, producers devised multichannel video installations as live theatrical events. This called for live mixing of a variety of inputs—including performance, video feedback of an audience, and edited video and film clips—displayed on ten or more monitors in specially designed video theaters.”

—Deirdre Boyle (1990)
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Rainer, Yvonne. “More Kicking and Screaming from the Narrative Backwater.” Wide Angle, 8-12.
Program 4: Gendered Confrontations

Art Herstory, Hermine Freed, 1974, 14:49 (excerpted from 22:00), U.S., color, sound


Ama L’Uomo Tuo (Always Love Your Man), Cara DeVito, 1975, 18:52, U.S., b&w, sound

The Mom Tapes, Ilene Segalove, 1974-78, 03:39 (excerpted from 26:52), U.S., b&w and color, sound

Primal Scenes, Linda Montano, 1980, 09:52, U.S., b&w, sound

Nun and Deviant, Nancy Angelo and Candace Compton, 1976, 14:08 (excerpted from 20:28), U.S., b&w, sound
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Introduction

“Art Herstory: The alteration of the past through reinter-pretation in the present. Superimposition of the present over the past. Role-playing. The discrepancy between the image and the event. History and actuality. The individual in time and place. The still frame vs. the moving frame. Time in history.”
—Hermine Freed (1976)

“Large tracts of the common ground currently occupied by feminism and art were delineated in two essays that circulated widely in the 1970’s. In keeping with feminist investigations into the implications of gender for all cultural forms, the titles of both articles were framed as questions: ‘Why Are There No Great Women Artists?’ [by art historian Linda Nochlin, 1971] and ‘Is There a Feminine Aesthetic?’ [by Sylvia Bovenschen, 1977].”
—Martha Gever (1990)

The growing influence of feminism politicized cultural territory in the late ‘60s and ‘70s; women asserted themselves as performers, artists, producers, and viewers. The observation that “the personal is political,” central to the period’s widespread consciousness-raising (CR) groups, became an important impetus for using video to examine one’s own life and the experiences of female friends and family, and to question one’s own relationship to what was coming to be understood as “her”/history. As histories of women in the arts and in society as well as strategies of empowerment were explored, critical attention was also focused onto speculation about the existence of an essential female aesthetic, and the position of women as objects of the (male) gaze.

Studies of mass culture’s relationship to women led to explorations of America’s complicated para-familial relationship with television and para-romantic relationship with film, including representations of lesbian experience and the fractured and fetishized depictions of women by commercial advertising. Although some artists sought an overtly oppositional media practice by formally grounding work in performance (Rosler, Benglis), documentary (DeVito), and home movies (Montano), which eschewed the representational codes of commercial television and film, others strategically repositioned familiar images from art history (Freed) and mass media (Angelo and Compton, Segalove).

These powerful feminist videotapes challenged the reigning but waning modernist and materials-based discourse of the ‘70s, as well as psychoanalytic theory and the construction of the subject. They continue to inform the cultural theory of the ‘80s and ‘90s.
Art Herstory is a seminal work, which takes aim at the art historical canon from Byzantine times through Andy Warhol, updating it through a decidedly feminist filter. Using chroma key technology, Freed and friends insert themselves into famous paintings, invigorating the otherwise silent female models of art history. Constructing a critique of the “masterpiece,” Freed further empowers the subjects of these paintings by placing portable video equipment into their hands, enabling them to look back at the painter/producer capturing their image. Freed’s voice-over narration foregrounds the process of making this tape and the difficult process of constructing a history. Produced at the TV Lab at WNET, New York.

“In 1974, I was invited by the Television Lab at WNET, New York to produce a video art work. Most of the people who had worked there before me were very electronics oriented.... What I wanted to do at the Lab was to make a tape which used the technology available there, but which transcended the pyrotechniques of so much electronic art I had seen.”

—Hermine Freed (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)

As two women take turns directing and caressing each other, it becomes clear that framing their own image is part of their agenda. The self-conscious and sensuous visual image is contrasted by a talk-radio soundtrack characterized by the brutish, sexist attitude of its male host. The juxtaposition between these two distinctly gendered “sensibilities” poses the question of their relationship to one another. Are these two sensibilities operating on completely independent channels? This tape is both deliberately titillating in its erotic presentation and potentially disturbing in its structural disjunction between separated discourses. Benglis’ interest in layering, evident in her sculpture during this period and in tapes such as Mumble (1972), suggests that the relationship between the video and audio tracks may be created by the act of turning on the radio. This tape is a response to ideas debated in the early ’70s, a belief in a distinctly feminine artistic sensibility and a necessary lesbian phase in the women’s movement. (Susan Krane, 1991)

“She was drawn to the unselective recording of the actual as it happens, free of aesthetics or ideology; a kind of mindless one-to-one. Spatial superimpositions—piling image on image—interest her... For Benglis, video is ubiquitous and expendable, like magnetic sound tape that, when it is recycled to record new information, effaces the old.”

—Robert Pincus-Witten (1974)

This carefully structured documentary is both a character study of DeVito’s grandmother, Adeline LeJudas, and an incisive social critique of patriarchal society. In contrast to the domestic comforts of her Brooklyn home, Adeline recounts the violence she suffered at her abusive husband’s hands and how she survived a dangerously late, illegal abortion. The intimacy of the video camera (requiring only a one-person crew) plays an intrinsic role in the type of exchange created between granddaughter and grandmother. Ama L’Uomo Tuo is based on the sharing of personal histories, a common practice of the early women’s movement and consciousness-raising groups. Growing numbers of feminist health projects in the early ’70s advocated for health information networks, the development of clinics for safe, legal abortions, and intensified public scrutiny of rape and violence against women. Ama L’Uomo Tuo is, admittedly, an example of a very sympathetic documentary; DeVito’s presence and relationship with her grandmother is obvious and informs much of the oral history which she manages to record.
Segalove takes her mom as subject in these short videotapes, which sample her stories, her advice, and her daily routine. The tape is as much a document of her mother’s dry self-parody and willingness to perform as it is a portrait of a mother-daughter relationship encompassing complaints, boredom, and a macabre sense of humor. She admits that, “Just to put your hands on the camera was a feminist act.” (Podheiser, 1984) Mom’s performance resonates with the schtick of everyday television, an avowed interest of Segalove and a common reference in her work. While many video artists at the time turned away from television, Segalove’s work always maintained a flirtatious relationship with the monster that so influenced her upbringing in Beverly Hills.

“Segalove’s license plate serves as a perfect metaphor for her work: ‘TV IS OK.’ When she got the plates, a friend warned her that they would get her in trouble. ‘When I went up to Berkeley, somebody threw a bottle through my window because they didn’t agree with the plate. People stop me at lights and say, ‘Well, film is good, but television...’”
–Bruce Postman (1982)

Primal Scenes foregrounds women’s eroticism, focusing on a woman’s experience of her body as both powerful and deeply mysterious. Over a black-and-white home movie of a woman giving birth, Montano reads the story of a nun’s sexual self-discovery. The transgressive sexual revelations of the nun and the direct witnessing of a birthing experience challenge personal and cultural taboos, and draw viewers into an intense feminist theater. Montano recasts the traditional roles of nun and mother, and demonstrates the possibility of claiming sexual intensity. The title can be read as a reference to Freud’s theory of the primal scene, in which intercourse between mother and father is observed by the infant child. According to psychoanalytic theory, this traumatic event is the source of the child’s hostility against the father who is perceived as hurting the mother in the sexual act. Montano’s tape reveals the passion of the mother and woman as fully legitimate. The tape is also an example of appropriated film footage used in a videotape.

“At the time I was interested in issues of sexuality, sensuality, guilt, permission and the ability of institutions to betray dreams and subvert ideals... I wanted each sense to be totally saturated, filled, dislodged, and de-habituated. Only then do we approach waking up... Erotica seemed an artistic way to transform my Catholic past into a powerful friend. Having been a nun for two years and interested in the Via Mystica, I tried combining disparate elements (sex, nuns, and Tibetan chant of tara) to produce ecstasy.”
–Linda Montano (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)

“I, Linda M. Montano, produced the tape Primal Scenes in the late 1970s. At the time I was in rebellion against everything, including the Catholic Church, the religion of my birth. I made this tape and NOW feel that it is disrespectful to the Church in its eroticism, and having been a Catholic Novice at one time, I know that it completely disregards the sacredness of Catholic spiritual life, Catholic values and the Commandment, which prohibits mockery of the Church.

For 20 years, I had no question about the tape’s content, but having returned to the Church in the 1990s, I NOW view it as a historical document of my mind...THEN... And I view it as the act of rebellion that it was, and not an indicator of my present belief or practice of Roman Catholicism.

I ask forgiveness of those viewers offended by this tape, and in the spirit of St. Augustine, admit my past sin, asking your co-celebration of my re-conversion to the Church of my youth, Roman Catholicism.

In ART/LIFE, Thank you.”
–Linda M. Montano (Letter to Video Data Bank, August 2006)
Angelo and Compton establish stereotypes and then dismantle them in this feminist performance, which incorporates autobiography in a cathartic theatrical process for coming to terms with gendered artistic and personal identities. The performances expose common representations of the female in Western culture—often formulated as pairs of opposites such as Madonna/whore or nun/deviant—as clichés that force women to assume self-constricting and self-defeating roles. Through the process of autobiographical sharing and collaboration, Angelo and Compton make the personal political. This tape developed out of the workshops at the Los Angeles Women’s Building.

“The basis of art making moved from isolated individual endeavor to an act reflecting relationship—to self, to others, and to community.”
—Nancy Angelo (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)

Taking aim at the social standardization enforced on women’s bodies, Rosler critiques the politics of apparently “objective,” scientific evaluation, which results in the depersonalization of women. Rosler exposes the female body as a site of an ideological struggle and a site of physically realized domination. Vital Statistics was originally staged as a performance and then restaged for the camera four years later. Undertaken by a team of clinicians in white coats, the tasks of measuring and judging the status of a cooperative subject remind the viewer of just how routine such evaluations are, not only by sanctioned experts but by women themselves who internalize these judgments. The tediousness of the ritual assaults the comfort of the viewer, denying any pleasure in the corporeal revelations or in the verdict on the subject’s sexual and marital eligibility.

“I did my best to interrupt voyeurism by having a long shot—a stationary shot that fatigues the viewer and diminishes aspects of the character’s presence on the screen. It becomes boring to look at something without camera mobility and without reaction shots.”
—Martha Rosler (Martha Gever, 1981)

“I want to make art about the commonplace, art that illuminates social life. I would like to make art that unfreezes the frozen block of the current moment, its “facts” and our “feelings,” and aids in the development of an understanding of the historical currents bringing this moment into being. I want to reassert the rootedness of art in social life, to question the mythical explanations of the everyday. I would like to aid in the development of a critical consciousness of the relationships between individual experience, family life, and the culture of corporate capitalism—especially as it affects women.”
—Martha Rosler (Huffman 1984)
Program 4
Reading List

Recommended Texts


Background Texts

Johnston, Claire. “The Subject of Feminist Film Theory/Practice.” Screen, vol. 21, no. 2 (Summer 1980).
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Program 5: Performance of Video-Imaging Tools

**Calligrams**, Steina and Woody Vasulka, 1970, 04:00 (excerpted from 12:00), U.S., b&w, sound

**Illuminatin’ Sweeney**, Skip Sweeney, 1975, 05:00, (excerpted from 28:38), U.S., color, sound

**Video Weavings**, Stephen Beck, 1976, 04:06 (excerpted from 28:00), U.S., color, sound

**Five-minute Romp through the IP**, Dan Sandin, 1973, 06:34, U.S., b&w and color, sound

**Triangle in Front of Square in Front of Circle in Front of Triangle**, Dan Sandin, 1973, 01:40, U.S., b&w, sound

**Video-Taping**, Ernest Gusella, 1974, 02:41, U.S., b&w, silent


**General Motors**, Phil Morton, 1976, 10:25 (excerpted from 1:00:00), U.S., b&w and color, sound


**Crossings and Meetings**, Ed Emshwiller, 1974, 04:04 (excerpted from 27:33), U.S., color, sound

**Complex Wave Forms**, Ralph Hocking, 1977, 04:11 (excerpted from 05:00), U.S., color, sound

**Pictures of the Lost**, Barbara Buckner, 1978, 08:04 (excerpted from 23:00), U.S., color, silent

**Video Locomotion (man performing forward hand leap)**, Peer Bode, 1978, 04:56, U.S., b&w, silent

**Music on Triggering Surfaces**, Peer Bode, 1978, 03:06, U.S., b&w, sound

**C-Trend**, Woody Vasulka, 1974, 07:19 (excerpted from 09:00), U.S., color, sound

**Switch! Monitor! Drift!**, Steina Vasulka, 1976, 03:48, U.S., b&w, sound

TRT: 1:54:05
Introduction

“I started with light, light and shadow, a typical filmic agenda; I started working with stroboscopic lights. Then I encountered video, whose principles essentially negate film. I gave up film instantly. Video was undefined, free territory, no competition, a very free medium. The community was naive, young, strong, cooperative, a welcoming tribe. There was instantly a movement mediated by two influences. One, the Portapak, made an international movement possible, and two, the generation of images through alternative means—the camera no longer carried the codes.”
—Woody Vasulka (Interview with Chris Hill, 1995)

“Distribution Religion: The image processor may be copied by individuals and not-for-profit institutions without charge. For-profit institutions will have to negotiate for permission to copy. I think culture has to learn to use high-tek [sic] machines for personal, aesthetic, religious, intuitive, comprehensive, exploratory growth. The development of machines like the Image Processor is part of this evolution. I am paid by the state, at least in part, to do and disseminate [sic] this information; so I do.”
—Dan Sandin (Lucinda Furlong, 1983)

Artists who explored video as an electronic “material” were interested in the process of translating energy and time into waveforms, frequencies, voltages, and finally into video and audio images. Some artists stated their intentions to develop a new formal “vocabulary” for this electronic medium, collaborating with independent engineers to develop new analog and, eventually, digital imaging tools. Tapes were often documents of “dialogues with tools” (Vasulkas) or real-time performances of tools where a video signal would be routed through an interface of modifiable electronic instruments.

An elementary vocabulary for what second generation video artists in the ‘80s came to regard as video’s “special effects” was developed in the late ‘60s and early ‘70s by artists inspired by, among other phenomena, the production of light shows and the possible adaptation of audio synthesizer design to video. Eventually, the video and electronics industry marketed stan-
dardized instruments for producing a range of video effects. The first generation of video artists, however, were introduced to the image-making potential and formal vocabulary of the medium through hand-built instruments like Bill Hearn’s Vidium (1969), the Paik/Abe Synthesizer and Scan Modulator (1970), Eric Siegel’s Electronic Video Synthesizer (1970), Dan Sandin’s Image Processor (1972), George Brown’s Video Sequencer and Multikeyer (1973), the Rutt/Etra Scan Processor (1973), and Stephen Beck’s Direct Video Synthesizer (1974). Working outside the television industry during most of the ‘70s, these artists and independent engineers established opportunities for others to work directly with their custom-built tools through access programs in media art centers, artist-run residency projects, university media programs, and experimental labs at public television stations.

“Video synthesizer” refers to machines designed to produce a video image without using a camera as well as instruments that alter or “process” the camera image. In the production of a video image, the video signal can be generated by the electron scan of a video camera, but it also can be produced by a waveform generator, or an audio signal. Video signal mixing, colorizing, and luminance and chroma keying are a few of the fundamental video effects that can be produced using basic image processing tools. The self-generating, pulsing vortex of video feedback, achieved by pointing a video camera at the monitor to which it is cabled, was the simplest of effects yet it fascinated many early producers.

Artists’ efforts to produce new kinds of synthetic or processed images led them to use the range of video and audio instruments available. The tapes included in this program foreground such aesthetic issues as the relationship between electronic sound and image synthesis (Bode) and the possibility of radically reconceptualizing the unit of the frame (Vasulkas), a structural element common to both video and film but produced by entirely different electronic and chemical processes. These works sample a range of sensibilities—psychedelic play (Gusella, Emshwiller), formal abstraction (Hocking), spirituality (Buckner), rock music (Sweeney), bravado (Morton)—and testify to the formal, visual, and musical ambitions of the artists.
Calligrams, Steina and Woody Vasulka, 1970, 04:00 (excerpted from 12:00), U.S., b&w, sound

Calligrams is one of the Vasulkas’ earliest experiments with altering the analog video image. An image is rescanned from the monitor, “to capture and preserve the violated state of the standard television signal.” The “violations” include deliberately re-adjusting the horizontal hold of the monitor, and then slowly advancing the reel-to-reel tape manually. The repetition of the horizontally drifting video image not only functions as visual rhythm, but is key to the conceptualization of the video image as unrestricted by the concrete frame, as in film. The Vasulkas have described their work in the ’70s as “didactic,” exemplified in this tape by Steina’s voiceover. Their commitment to foregrounding a new electronic image vocabulary and working with other artist/engineers to develop new video instrumentation led to work that reveals the process of its making.

“Our works are forms of demos, artifacts. They were never intended to be compositions... We’re both from socialist countries. The transmission of knowledge is important. This was the mission of our times—not to compete with painting. Of course this [concern with communication] is utopian.”
—Woody Vasulka (Interview with Chris Hill, 1995)

Illuminatin’ Sweeney, Skip Sweeney, 1975, 05:00, (excerpted from 28:38), U.S., color, sound

Skip Sweeney was an early and proficient experimenter with video feedback. A feedback loop is produced by pointing a camera at the monitor to which it is cabled. Infinite patterns and variations of feedback can be derived from manipulating the relative positions of camera and monitor, adjusting the monitor controls, and interfacing the signal with other video processing tools. The image constantly spins out of control, becoming a swirling vortex. Sweeney and others were intrigued with feedback’s ability to generate pulsing images like a living organism. He claimed he would “just as soon be a video rock-and-roll musician” and produce feedback as a performance instrument (Anthology Film Archives, 1981). Sweeney produced many variations of feedback and processed imagery, and is especially noted for his works incorporating dance and movement. Illuminatin’ Sweeney was produced for WNET, New York’s “Video and Television Review.” This sampling of Sweeney’s work shows feedback processed through a combination of a Moog audio synthesizer and the Vidium colorizing synthesizer invented by Bill Hearn in 1969. Recorded off the monitor with a black and white camera, the images were later colorized. Sweeney produced this feedback during a “video jam session” at Video Free America.

Video Weavings, Stephen Beck, 1976, 04:06 (excerpted from 28:00), U.S., color, sound

Inspired by the analogy between weaving (vertical warp threads traversed by horizontal weft threads) and the construction of the television image (vertical and horizontal scans of an electron gun), Stephen Beck built the Video Weaver in 1974, and produced Video Weavings in 1976. The patterns in this tape are based on sequences of colors in dynamic mathematical progressions, inspired by non-representational Islamic art. Beck was also intrigued with the problem of synthesizing aspects of human perception. Arriving at video through music, Beck had moved from jazz to electronic music and then to electronic instrument building. For many of the early video tool designers, audio synthesizers served as important models. Beck developed his first video instrument, the Direct Video Synthesizer, in 1970 during his residency with the National Center for Experiments in Television (NCET) in San Francisco.

“Television has a history based on the objective, photographic image. Experimental television is for me a process of exploring and portraying images of an opposite polarity.”
—Stephen Beck (Schneider and Korot, 1976)

“I was also doing a lot of work at this time in inner visual phenomena, partially with things like phosphenes... The synthesizer was sort of an outgrowth... I began to realize that you could break an image from the visual field down into discrete elements, create those elements in a synthesizer, then put those elements back together to make any image.”
—Stephen Beck (1977)
In 1973, Dan Sandin designed and built a comprehensive video instrument for artists, the Image Processor (IP), a modular, patch programmable, analog computer optimized for the manipulation of gray level information of multiple video inputs. Sandin decided that the best distribution strategy for his instrument “was to give away the plans for the IP and encourage artists to build their own copies. This gave rise to a community of artists with their own advanced video production capabilities and many shared goals and experiences.” (Furlong, 1983). In this segment, Sandin demonstrates the routing of the camera signal through several basic modules of the IP, producing a “primitive” vocabulary of effects specific to video. This tape was produced at the University of Illinois Chicago.

“The moral of the story is that the language you use to describe a video event can limit what you think is possible from a video event.”

—Dan Sandin (Video letter to Steina and Woody Vasulka, 1974)

Gusella’s title creates a pun on the term video “tape” by using a split screen in which one half is the electronic negative of the other. Gusella set up a glass sheet and suspended it from light poles. The glass was covered with black or white tape. As he slowly removes the obscuring tape from one half of the screen, his ghostly negative image emerges, further confusing the viewer. Electronically constructed using a VideoLab—a voltage controllable; multi-channel switcher, keyer, and colorizer built by Bill Hearn—the tape relies on the use of a luminance keyer to “cut out” specific brightness levels (determined by voltage) from one video signal and replace them with a video signal from a second camera. Keying is a video effect seen commonly on television weather reports, in which the images of the map displayed behind the announcer are electronically matted into the image.

“The basis of keying is a comparison within the circuitry of the keyer, between voltages, or luminances. More simply, the user of the keyer decides upon a threshold level of brightness, and that any portion of an image-signal of a brightness above or below that threshold will be replaced by a second image/input. The effect is often one of revealing the second image as though it were behind the first; in actuality, we are seeing a special type of composite of two video signals.”

—John Minkowsky (1978)
Exquisite Corpse, Ernest Gusella, 1978, 08:23, U.S., b&w and color, silent

The “exquisite corpse” named in the title of this piece refers to a favorite game of the Surrealists, played by passing a folded sheet of paper among a group; each person draws one section of a body on the folded segment without looking at the other sides. What was done with pen and paper, Gusella accomplishes electronically using the VideoLab. Utilizing quick, voltage-controlled live switching between two cameras, Gusella approximates composite images. For example, his torso appears to combine with a close-up of his face. The perceptual effect is mesmerizing and disorienting.

“Exquisite Corpse is a piece about the inability of the human eye and mind to perceive the differences between fast switching images because of the inherent lag of our physical processing mechanisms, which results in persistence of vision.”
—Ernest Gusella (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)

Einstine, Eric Siegel, 1968, 05:22, U.S., color, sound

Eric Siegel, a child prodigy in electronics, built his first TV set out of scrap parts at the age of 14. He developed his first video synthesizer, the Processing Chrominance Synthesizer, in 1968-69; it was used to generate the installation Psychedelevisioin in Color for the seminal “TV as a Creative Medium” exhibition held at the Howard Wise Gallery in 1969. Because the early version of the machine was unable to record the images it generated, Einstine was re-created by Siegel after the exhibition. The tape uses colorized video feedback to generate its psychedelic effects, as a picture of Albert Einstein dissolves into a shimmering play of light. Besides the reflection of a countercultural sensibility, the tape romanticizes science through its coupling of Albert Einstein’s image with the heraldic strains of Rimsky-Korsakov.

“I see television as bringing psychology into the cybernetic twenty-first century. I see television as a psychic healing medium creating mass cosmic consciousness, awakening higher levels of the mind, bringing awareness of the soul.”
—Eric Siegel (Gene Youngblood, 1970)

General Motors, Phil Morton, 1976, 10:25 (excerpted from 1:00:00), U.S., b&w and color, sound

A response to the inability of his local General Motors dealer to fix Morton’s 1974 Chevy van to his satisfaction, this tape blends experimental image-processing techniques with documentation of the faulty vehicle. Morton states that he is upset primarily because General Motors “can’t get their tech together,” and as a video producer involved with using and maintaining high-tech equipment, this strikes Morton as especially bothersome. The tape reads like a consumer’s manifesto, and addresses the popular notion that video could be used to reconfigure power relations, for example, between manufacturers and consumers. Morton delivers his psychedelically-inflected performance with humor and the conviction of an embattled consumer. The tape was produced at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago.
Merce by Merce by Paik is a two-part tribute to choreographer Merce Cunningham and artist Marcel Duchamp. The first section, Blue Studio: Five Segments, is an innovative work of video-dance produced by Merce Cunningham and videomaker Charles Atlas. The dance was choreographed by Cunningham specifically for the two-dimensional video monitor screen. Atlas uses a variety of video imaging effects, including chroma key, to electronically transport Cunningham’s studio performance into a series of outdoor landscapes. (Chroma key is also known as “blue box,” where a performer or event is videotaped against a blue set; anything with the color blue is then “subtracted” electronically from the image and replaced with another video signal.) The audio track includes the voices of John Cage and Jasper Johns. The second part, produced by Paik and Shigeko Kubota, further queries the relationship between everyday gestures and formal notions of dance. Snapshots of the New York art world, a rare interview with Marcel Duchamp by Russell Connor, and a meeting between Jasper Johns and Leo Castelli are re-edited by Paik. The seemingly random mixing of material produced by artists—such as Bill Gwin, Nancy Graves, Jean Marie Drot, Steina and Woody Vasulka, and Erik Martin—with commercial television programming can be traced to Paik’s training in music and the influence of John Cage’s ideas about chance in art-making. The montage includes video images produced by colorizers, mixers, chroma key, and a Rutt-Etra Scan Processor. This tape was produced at the TV Lab at WNET, New York.

“I think I understand time better than the video artists who came from painting-sculpture. Music is the manipulation of time. All music forms have different structures and buildup. As painters understand abstract space, I understand abstract time.”

–Nam June Paik (Paik and Schimmel, 1974)

Crossings and Meetings explores the image and sound of a walking man, expanding a simple image into increasingly complex permutations and arriving at what Emshwiller calls a “visual fugue” in time and space. Emshwiller uses various techniques to develop his images: fast-forward, rewind, multiple keying, audio modulations, etc. With its rhythmic repetition of images and concatenation of sound, this tape represents the fusion of audio, video, and dance explored by many artists during this period. According to Emshwiller, this tape was an attempt to use video techniques in an essentially musical structure. Produced at the TV Lab at WNET, New York.

“The aspects of video that appeal to me most at this time are the immediacy of seeing what you have just done and the great flexibility one has in mixing, keying, and transforming images... Like opera, video can incorporate many art forms: film, live action, music, dance, literature.”

–Ed Emshwiller (Seth Feldman, January 1975)

“Indeterminism and variability are underdeveloped parameters in the optical arts, though they have been the central problem in music for the last two decades.”

–Nam June Paik (Fluxus Newspaper, June 1964)
Produced without camera input, this intense electronic landscape transports the viewer into a world that is an abstract study in machine-generated imagery. Produced at the Experimental Television Center.

“Complex Wave Forms is one in a series of short tapes which explored oscillators. In the series oscillators had multiple uses—to create images and sounds directly and to control voltages, which interfaced with additional image processing instrumentation. Signals were generated, mixed and controlled in amplitude and frequency by using a machine that was designed and built by David Jones and Richard Brewster. The audio and video were controlled by the same voltages, resulting in an interconnection between the two. The video output was fed into a Paik/Abe colorizer and recorded, along with the stereo audio signal in real time.”

—Ralph Hocking (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)

Composed in 22 movements that introduce a series of silent, haunting, other-worldly landscapes, Pictures of the Lost hovers between figuration and abstraction, and reveals Buckner’s sustained interest in spirituality. Produced at the Experimental Television Center.

“I began with a desire to create a kind of electronic poetics, where the video image expressed a metaphoric identity emerging from its organic structure, yet had a universal quality drawing on the traditions of poetry, painting, and music. There were always two central concerns—exploring the medium with the tools that were available, and expressing inner states of beingness and becoming.”

—Barbara Buckner (Marita Sturken, 1985)

In this homage to photographer Edward Muybridge, a photo grid of a walking man is resituated in video space. Movement is created by detuning the video synchronization (time base) signal, producing horizontal and vertical drifts that expose the electronic space between the video frames, which is visually identifiable as black horizontal and vertical bars. A second image is luminance-keyed into this area, giving the appearance of two discrete image layers. These image planes are manipulated to apparently “drift” at different speeds in different directions. Borrowing images from Muybridge’s serial photographic studies in the perception of motion, Bode produces a crude persistence of vision system, creating his own type of “para-cinematic shutter.” Produced at the Experimental Television Center.

“How do you make access to this capital-intensive equipment... make sense in terms of what it really takes for people to make art with these tools, to think through something and to spend time really exploring... The learning aspect was part of the whole process. This need to learn how these tools worked and what new configurations might be that would deliver what you might want, since possibilities for these electronic tools were largely unknown. The model of industry was not the model one wanted to imitate because it was structured to produce certain genres of work.”

— Peer Bode (Interview with Chris Hill, 1995)
In *Music on Triggering Surfaces*, Bode constructs an interface between audio and video systems. The luminance information (voltage) from the visual images traversed by the black dot is routed to an oscillator to produce the audio signal, which varies according to the changing luminance. The video image itself then triggers the audio. The shifting grey-scale of the image becomes a two-dimensional sound map or audio score. This tape was produced at the Experimental Television Center.

“The image is a field of information, a score to control sound.”
—Peer Bode (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)

In *C-Trend*, one of Woody Vasulka’s “dialogues with tools,” the video raster, or monitor screen, is controlled by the Rutt-Etra Scan Processor, a scan deflection tool designed by Steve Rutt and Bill Etra in 1973. The camera image being modified is urban traffic, whose synchronous sounds are clearly recognizable on the audio track. Two basic modifications of the electronic image are evident: each horizontal line scanned by the electron beam is translated into a live graphic display of voltage, radically reconfiguring the luminance information and the video image, and functioning as a wave form monitor. The shape of the video frame itself, the raster, is also skewed. The deflection coils, which electromagnetically control the electron gun and thus the raster, receive mathematically recoded analog information and reconfigure the normally rectilinear video frame. The “empty spaces” between the altered frames, which appear to drift or roll throughout *C-Trend*, are the horizontal and vertical blanking intervals between electronic frames.

“The work with the scan processor indicates a whole different trend in my understanding of the electronic image. Emphasis has shifted towards a recognition of a time/energy object and its programmable building element—the waveform. We would... make a tool and dialogue with it... We belong to the family of people who would find images like found objects. But it is more complex because we sometimes design the tools, and so do conceptual work as well.”
—Woody Vasulka (John Minkowsky and Bruce Jenkins, 1979)

In *Switch! Monitor! Drift!*, one of a series of “machine visions” constructed by Steina in the ’70s. In this documentation of a studio landscape, two cameras’ signals are combined through a luminance keyer. One camera is mounted on a turntable; the second camera is pointed at the first. The image from the stationary camera is time-base adjusted so that it appears to drift horizontally across the monitor, exposing the horizontal framing interval, a black (low voltage) area that is normally hidden from view. The signal of the revolving camera is keyed into this area. The revolving second camera continuously pans the studio, occasionally revealing Steina walking around and flipping a directional switch at the turntable. As the tape progresses, the luminance key is adjusted to include a broader tonal range through which the signal from the revolving camera is increasingly visible.

“It was a challenge to me to create a space that would not deal with the idiosyncrasy of human vision.”
—Steina Vasulka (Robert Haller, 1983)

“Another characteristic of our work has been a consistent traveling of the frame, horizontal traveling... The television image, rather than a series of fixed celluloid images, is a continuously evolving and decaying sequence of lines being tracked by an electron gun on a phosphor coated television screen. The movements of this electron gun are “normally” regulated by horizontal and vertical control signals, which insure a stable, non-traveling image.”
—Steina Vasulka (Minkowsky and Jenkins, 1979)
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The Red Tapes Part II

Vito Acconci
Program 6: Decentralized Communications Projects

*Mayday Realtime*, David Cort and Curtis Ratcliff, 1971, 10:27 (excerpted from 1:00:00), U.S., b&w, sound

*People's Video Theater (Women's Liberation March NYC, Gay Pride March NYC, Young Lords Occupy Manhattan Church, Native American Action at Plymouth Rock)*, People's Video Theater (Elliot Glass and Ken Marsh), 1970-72, 28:22 (excerpts), U.S., b&w, sound

*Participation*, Steina and Woody Vasulka, 1969-71, 04:37 (excerpted from 30:00), U.S., b&w, sound

*First Transmission of ACTV*, George Stoney and Austin Community Television (ACTV), 1972, 04:31 (excerpted from 08:00), U.S., b&w, sound

*Jonesboro Storytelling Festival: Kathryn Windham Telling Ghost Stories (The Jumbo Light)*, Broadside TV, 1974, 05:22, U.S., b&w, sound

*The Politics of Intimacy*, Julie Gustafson, 1974, 09:26 (excerpted from 52:20), U.S., b&w, sound

*Attica Interviews*, Portable Channel, 1971, 08:44 (excerpted from 30:00), U.S., b&w, sound

*Queen Mother Moore Speech at Greenhaven Prison*, People's Communication Network, 1973, 17:41 (excerpted from 1:03:00), U.S., b&w, sound

*The Laughing Alligator*, Juan Downey, 1979, 26:30, U.S., color, sound

TRT 1:58:15
Introduction

“Video was inexpensive, easy to use, anybody could do it, everybody should do it. That was the mandate, like the power of the vote. Vote. Take responsibility. Make it and see it.”
—Ken Marsh (Interview with Chris Hill, 1992)

“The experiments with public access on cable television continue to be among the more significant in contemporary communications. On specific channels set aside by a cable company, groups or individuals are afforded, without charge, an opportunity to present themselves directly, undiluted by the direction or inhibitions of media professionals. The only restrictions on content at present relate to laws on libel and profanity. The over-all concept, however, carries in its highly decentralized structure staggering ramifications for the electronic media... Eventually, it seems, television's monologues may have to make room for cable-vision's dialogue.”
—John J. O'Connor (1972)

Generated by artists, public access cable producers, and video collectives, these tapes mark the efforts of cultural activists to redefine the asymmetrical relationship between transmission and reception, the production and consumption of American television. The introduction of the Portapak in the politically charged late '60s inspired proposals for a radically decentralized information system. “Culture needs new information structures, not just improved content pumped through existing ones.” (Radical Software, 1970) Community activists and artists were further supported by a 1972 Federal Communications Commission (FCC) ruling requiring public access provisions in cable systems with over 3,500 subscribers, and by dramatically increased media arts funding from government agencies and private foundations. By mid-decade, there existed a burgeoning alternative media network of public access cable channels, media art centers, public television stations, and a range of independent venues that included pirate TV, media laboratories, and library video programs, which would continue to expand through the end of the decade.

Many of these communications projects were intended to appeal to specific communities and audiences, proclaiming themselves “local, vocal, and non-commercial.” Citizens could be trained to make tapes and video could become integrated with local social and cultural agendas. In the mountains and hollers of Appalachia, independent videomakers trained citizens who recorded and distributed on cable a local culture that previously had been transmitted through a rich oral tradition (Broadside TV). Videomakers' documentation of the public speech and demonstrations of citizens in urban areas led to their participation in significant cultural and political events that might be screened for further discussion or as part of a community mediation process (David Cort and Curtis Ratcliff, People's Video Theater).

Citizen producers used this growing network of alternative venues to foreground voices and opinions that were unrepresented or misrepresented in the market-driven mass media (ACTV, Gustafson, Portable Channel). Notions of cultural community were also expanded as producers undertook explorations of their ethnic heritage, building bridges across otherwise distant cultural territories through historical and/or spiritual re-examination of their roots (People’s Communication Network, Downey). Because many cable TV projects were produced around local issues for local audiences and never intended for a national audience, many of these tapes remain virtually forgotten in community centers, schools, and museums across the country.
Mayday Realtime, David Cort and Curtis Ratcliff, 1971, 10:27 (excerpted from 1:00:00), U.S., b&w, sound

As a vérité documentation of the May 1, 1971 demonstration against the Vietnam War staged in Washington D.C., Mayday Realtime presents a largely unedited flow of events from the point of view of participants on the street. Cort’s camera captures the random, disorienting incidents that marked the day—demonstrators holding up traffic in the Capitol, skirmishes with police, on-the-scene interviews with onlookers. The camera impulsively responds to shouting and movement on the street. Voice-over narration is absent, and the real time images are left to convey the urgency and confusion of unpredictable events. The Portapak was promoted as a tool of the counterculture, recording video images that challenged its representation by the mainstream media. As social history, the tape provides a window into the ideological divisions that rocked society during these years, capturing demonstrators fleeing tear gas and helicopters airlifting troops, not to a battlefield in Vietnam, but to a trimmed lawn in the nation’s capitol.

People’s Video Theater (Women’s Liberation March NYC, Gay Pride March NYC, Young Lords Occupy Manhattan Church, Native American Action at Plymouth Rock), People’s Video Theater (Elliot Glass and Ken Marsh), 1970-72, 28:22 (excerpts), U.S., b&w, sound

People’s Video Theater (PVT) wrote that “the people are the information; media processes can reach out to their needs.” (Ken Marsh, 1971). PVT’s use of video as social feedback typically involved carrying Portapaks in the streets of New York City where they conducted video polls and documented public actions. People participating in street tapings would be invited to their video “theater” to watch and discuss the tapes, taking advantage of a kind of immediacy impossible with film. PVT documented historic public demonstrations by liberation movements in 1970-1971. Sampled here are: the first Women’s Liberation March in New York, the first Gay Pride March, the Young Lords’ (a Puerto Rican liberation group) protest occupation of a Manhattan church, and an action taken by Native Americans at Plymouth Rock on the 350th anniversary of the pilgrims’ landing.

Participation, Steina and Woody Vasulka, 1969-71, 04:37 (excerpted from 30:00), U.S., b&w, sound

Shortly after they arrived in the United States from Prague in 1965, Steina and Woody Vasulka began documenting New York City’s underground theater and music scenes with a Portapak. Steina has remarked that she learned the craft of camerawork as documentarian of these celebratory, countercultural scenes of the “sexual avant-garde.” These excerpts from Participation feature a performance by an anonymous rhythm & blues group led by a young, charismatic singer, a pulsing light show projection at the Fillmore East, and a scene from off-Broadway drag theater.

“We are primarily known for the generation of electronic imagery with no camera. At one time, however (1969-1971), we worked primarily with a single camera and a portable recorder. Participation is a new edit of some of that earlier material; it shows the particular way that video has affected us.”
—Steina and Woody Vasulka (Global Village, 1977)

“A meaningful definition of environment must include human interaction in determining a sensitive and responsive solution to alienation, which is psychic pollution. People must participate in shaping the environment by exposing their interests, their investments, their feelings, thoughts, and confusions regarding their life situations—in short, they must communicate.”
—People’s Video Theater (Gene Youngblood, 1970)

Note: The digital wipes used as edit transitions in the women’s liberation documentation were inserted when the material was re-edited by the producers in the late ‘80s. When these tapes were first produced, editing was done with a razor blade, creating a noticeable glitch in the tape.
This tape documents the first cablecast of Austin Community Television (ACTV) in which George Stoney and a group of University of Texas students assembled playback equipment on a hilltop at the cable system’s head-end. The head-end is the site of the cable company’s antenna where broadcast signals are pulled down, amplified, and distributed through the cable network. George Stoney, shown here telling of his experience with cable access in Mexico, was a community access pioneer.

“After the FCC's decision in 1972, several University of Texas students asked the local operator to make channel space available for access; Austin Community Television was formed and began cablecasting. It took extraordinary dedication to keep access going in these early days; at ACTV, volunteers had to drive 12 miles out of town to the head-end and cablecast from borrowed playback decks perched on the car hood. This brought new meaning to the term “remote production,” as car headlights were known to have been used for illumination of live cablecasts done from the site.”

–Community Television Review (1986)

Founded by Ted Carpenter as a video training and production center in Johnson City, Tennessee, Broadside TV produced tapes to be cablecast as local origination programming. Drawing on the strong oral tradition in the mountains, tapes featured local history and issues of regional importance, such as local craft traditions, the history of union struggles in the area, resistance to strip mining practices, music, midwifery, and much more. This tape features Kathryn Tucker Windham, a noted children’s author and librarian from Selma, Alabama, relating a ghost story about “The Jumbo Light” at the 1974 Jonesboro Storytelling Festival. This front porch gathering is typical of the casual nature of many of the Broadside tapes.

“Carpenter held his Portapak camera in his lap and used a monitor rather than his camera viewfinder to frame a picture, allowing him to establish an intimate rapport with his speakers. He then shared these tapes with remote neighbors, inviting them to make their own tapes. Half-inch video’s portability, simple operation, and unthreatening nature made it easy for people to speak their piece before the camera.”

–Deirdre Boyle (1990)

“Long isolated by hills and hollers, mountain people have a rich background of oral learning and culture, but little access to formal media... What cable and closed systems provide is an intimacy and access to a closed and knowable audience—a system that can afford to serve a small group of its audience as well as a large group... Under no circumstances are we trying to be “teachers,” “missionaries,” or “film-makers” taking a curriculum, message or other form of “enlightenment” to people in the mountains. We assume that people in the region have a ready access to experience, language and ideas when it comes to their own vital interests. We assume, too, that they are willing to share this experience through tape with someone like themselves. We never tape anyone who has not viewed a tape of someone else first.”

–Ted Carpenter and Mike Clark (1973)
The setting for *The Politics of Intimacy* recalls the widespread consciousness-raising (CR) groups in the late '60s and early '70s inspired by the emerging feminist movement. CR groups provided a forum to openly and collectively validate women’s otherwise private experiences. In the video, Dr. Sherfy, one of the first doctors to write about female sexuality, and nine women of different ages, sexual preferences, and economic and social situations discuss their sexual experiences.

"While the structure of the tape is basically clinical—different subjects such as "Arousal" and "Masturbation" are discussed under appropriate sub-headings—*The Politics of Intimacy* transcends the factual to communicate to an audience what women’s sexual experience involves... The action consists of what [the women’s] faces, words, and body language convey."

–Global Village (1975)

Portable Channel, a community documentary group in Rochester, New York, was one of the first small format video centers to have an ongoing relationship with a PBS affiliate (WXXI). Portapakers interviewed Sinclair Scott, a member of the negotiating team that went into Attica when the prisoners’ rebelled at the federal prison in September 1971. Thirty-eight guards were taken hostage after prisoners’ demands to improve their conditions were ignored. After a three-day standoff between inmates and authorities, Governor Nelson Rockefeller called in the National Guard. During that action, 39 prisoners and hostages were killed. Culpability surrounding the deaths is still being argued in federal court today. The events at Attica brought national attention to conditions in and policies regarding American prisons. Portable Channel conducted interviews with lawyers, negotiators, and community members over a four-month period following the rebellion. This excerpt was taken from one of the unedited interviews housed in a regional archive.

Two years after the riots and deaths at Attica, New York, a community day was organized at Greenhaven, a federal prison in Connecticut. Think Tank, a prisoners’ group, coordinated efforts with African-American community members outside the prison walls to fight racism and poverty. The event was documented by People’s Communication Network, a community video group founded by Bill Stephens, for cablecast in New York City, marking the first time an alternative video collective was allowed to document an event inside prison walls. Seventy-five-year-old Queen Mother Moore speaks of her support of Marcus Garvey in New Orleans and her involvement with African-American education in Brooklyn. Her powerful delivery of lessons in black history, first-person accounts of resistance in the South, and finally her own *a cappella* performance of "This country ‘tis to me, a land of misery..." is a testament to the importance of people using media to document their own communities and tell their own histories. This tape was found in the Antioch College (Yellow Springs, Ohio) Free Library, a media access resource project organized in late 1966 by students interested in networking with social movements and media activists around the country.

"I want our young brothers who have been incarcerated here for, perhaps in a very small way, taking back that which has been taken from us... You are not the criminal. Let me ask you, have you stolen anybody’s heritage? Have you stolen whole countries?"

–Queen Mother Moore (excerpted from the tape)
The personal odyssey recorded in *The Laughing Alligator* combines methods of anthropological research with diaristic essay, mixing objective and subjective vision. Recorded while Downey and his family were living among the Yanomami people of Venezuela, this compelling series of anecdotes tracks his search for an indigenous cultural identity. This tape was made after the 1973-1975 “Video Trans Americas” series. Downey, trained as an architect, was interested in the “funerary architecture” of the Yanomami, who ritually consume the pulverized bones of their dead in a banana soup, giving rise to outsiders’ claim that they are cannibals. A curious incident occurs while hiking through the jungle. Downey looks through the viewfinder of his camera and turns to see his Yanomami guides pointing their weapons at him, acknowledging—seriously or playfully?—his camera as a weapon. Downey participates in the theater by continuing to shoot video. In his documentation of the tribe’s use of natural psychedelic drugs for healing, Downey mixes in image processed allusions to the North American urban psychedelic and underground scenes.

"Like a chemical catalyst I expected to remain as before after my video exchange which would enlighten many America peoples by the cross references of their cultures. I proved to be a false catalyst; I was devoured by the effervescence of myths, nature, and linguistic structures. The pretentious asshole leveled off! Only then did I grow creative and in manifold directions. Me, the agent of change, manipulating video to decode my own roots, I was forever deciphered and became a true offspring of my soil, less intellectual and more poetic."

—Juan Downey (1976)
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Program 7: Critiques of Art and Media as Commodity and Spectacle


*The Business of Local News*, University Community Video-Minneapolis, 1974, 16:57 (excerpted from 25:00), U.S., b&w and color, sound


*About Media*, Anthony Ramos, 1977, 15:36 (excerpted from 26:00), U.S., color, sound


TRT 1:49:25
Introduction

“The spectacle is not a collection of images, but a social relation among people, mediated by images.”
—Guy Debord (1970)

“John Baldessari: Ingres and Other Parables,” Konrad Fischer, Dusseldorf, October 8-22, 1971... The Best Way to Do Art. A young artist in art school used to worship the paintings of Cezanne. He looked at and studied all the books he could find on Cezanne and copied all of the reproductions of Cezanne’s work he found in the books. He visited a museum and for the first time saw a real Cezanne painting. He hated it. It was nothing like the Cezannes he had studied in the books. From that time on, he made all of his paintings the sizes of paintings reproduced in books and he painted them in black and white. He also printed captions and explanations on the paintings as in books. Often he just used words. And one day he realized that very few people went to art galleries and museums but many people looked at books and magazines as he did and they got them through the mail as he did. Moral: It's difficult to put a painting in a mailbox.”
—Lucy Lippard (1973)

For a brief period in the late '60s and early '70s, making art as a commodity for investment was broadly criticized by artists. Performance art and video had no established markets; both presented archival problems and unknowns for collectors. In early '70s publications, community producers and video artists from all over the country declared the necessity of creating a media culture opposed to corporate-owned television, dubbed “video's frightful parent” by critic David Antin. Global Village, an early New York City collective, referred to broadcast TV as a “comic book medium” and invoked video’s structural potential for “instantaneous feedback... as the visual counterpart to the underground newspapers.” Artists’ and audiences’ ambivalence around the spectacle of television became a subject for critical examination.

Through projects that were oppositional to both the economic and attentional structures of television, artists targeted the nature of its spectacle (Ant Farm and T.R. Uthco), spelled out critical manifestoes (Serra), undermined its selection of newsworthy events and public storytelling (Ramos, University Community Video), and challenged consumers’ investments in its cast of heroes and occasional heroines (Optic Nerve, Raindance). These artists showed their work in public spaces, on public television, in some museums, and in alternative cultural settings such as artist-run spaces.

Although most artists and community producers resisted corporate television’s authority, new critical strategies such as appropriation emerged toward the end of the '70s to analyze and comment upon a media world still dominated by commercial interests. Artists re-presented or quoted corporate television and film images in an effort to reframe them and deconstruct the ideological context that constructs meaning for viewers (Birnbaum).
The Eternal Frame is an irreverent reckoning with and re-enactment of the image of the assassination of John F. Kennedy as recorded in the famous Zapruder home movie. This tape/performance was a collaboration between West Coast collectives Ant Farm and T.R. Uthco. The Eternal Frame presents the performers’ rehearsals of the Kennedy assassination in Dallas’ Dealey Plaza, including a series of run-throughs for unsuspecting tourists who eagerly photographed the assassinations with Instamatics and Super-8 cameras. The reactions of the viewers are inscribed within the work, representing important testimonials to America's fascination with and repression of this event. The tape was post-produced at the Long Beach Museum of Art.

“The intent of this work was to examine and demystify the notion of the presidency, particularly Kennedy, as image archetype... This work seems particularly appropriate today when one considers that image politics has been refined to the point that we can elect an actor to be our president.”

—Doug Hall (1984)

Television Delivers People, Richard Serra and Carlotta Fay Schoolman, 1973, 05:55, U.S., color, sound

This tape is a seminal text in the now well-established critique of commercial television as an instrument of ideological and social control, one that enforces itself softly on viewers through "entertainments" for the benefit of corporations that manage and profit from the status quo. To a soundtrack of upbeat “Muzak," a continuous scrolling text reveals the media industry’s marketing strategies. By reflexively utilizing the medium he is criticizing, Serra taps into a strategy in keeping with the counter-corporate tactics of early video collectives, a strategy that remains integral to video artists committed to a critical dismantling of the media’s political and ideological stranglehold. Serra’s critique came at a time when the medium was being reclaimed by countercultural videomakers. Serra focuses his unsettling analysis directly on his audience: the television and art consumer.

“The Business of Local News, University Community Video-Minneapolis, 1974, 16:57 (excerpted from 25:00), U.S., b&w and color, sound

Showcasing local documentaries made on 1/2” equipment, “Changing Channels” was a weekly alternative video magazine produced by University Community Video (UCV) and aired on public television station KCTA, Minneapolis. In The Business of Local News, which aired as part of the “Changing Channels” series, several area television news operations were asked to examine their objectives and their markets. The candid comments of news directors and station managers outline the conflicting forces of entertainment (market share) and information that continue to shape the nature of television news across the country.

“As television news becomes more powerful and influential in people’s lives, serious questions need to be discussed. How does television news as a commercial enterprise affect the information people get? How does the format limit the amount and type of news covered? How does management’s perspective filter into the program? This program examines the operations of three local TV newsrooms. It provides a unique look at a seldom examined institution that will interest any consumer of TV news.”

—University Community Video (1976)
As one of the early media collectives, Raindance Corporation celebrated an eclectic use of the Portapak by taping everything from man-in-the-street interviews to concerts and demonstrations. Intended to serve as a cultural data bank, their media primers provide an impressionistic smorgasbord of late '60s and early '70s American society. In this primer edited by Paul Ryan, Abbie Hoffman is interviewed shortly before the verdict of the Chicago 7 trial is delivered. Hoffman describes some of the politicized media theater that punctuated the trial for conspiracy to incite a riot of the demonstrators at the 1968 Democratic Presidential Nominating Convention. The tape concludes with a duel between Raindance’s Portapak and a surveillance camera in a Safeway supermarket.

“The difference between broadcast television and the videotape recorder is the difference between Hippies and Yippies... Hippies are the products of the mass medium, while the Yippies create media events... Yippies treat television as an entire information system into which one can input such things as police brutality. The cost of getting a message on television for an honest man with little money is at least a few days in jail. That the Yippies are willing to pay this price seems to me a small indication of the increasing demand of the TV generation to have a share in television systems.”

—Paul Ryan (1970)

Tony Ramos’ astute deconstruction of television news focuses on his part in the media coverage of President Jimmy Carter’s 1977 declaration of amnesty for Vietnam draft evaders. Ramos, who had served an 18-month prison sentence for draft evasion, was interviewed by news reporter Gabe Pressman whose film crew meets Ramos’ video crew in a confrontation between technologies and sensibilities. At this time, some broadcast television news crews still used 16mm film, although the expensive transition to ENG (electronic news gathering) systems had begun in 1974. Ramos contrasts the unedited interview footage—and patronizing comments of the news crew—with Pressman’s final televised news report. In his ironic manipulation of the material, Ramos exposes the illusion of “objective” news and the point of view found in any work of journalism. Ramos’ tape also presents an important chapter of social history; accounts of Ramos’ prison term and his friend’s experience in the trenches of Vietnam underscore the extent to which the Vietnam War informed the political and cultural activity of this era. Post-produced at Electronic Arts Intermix.

“Ramos points out the unwritten laws of news production and the presentation of self on the news by violating them. When asked about his reaction to Carter’s amnesty decision, Ramos takes a deep breath before answering, a detail which might go unnoticed had Ramos not immediately cut to an image of himself blowing up balloon after balloon until each bursts in his face. The cut suggests the anger and frustration that cannot, and must not, be revealed in a cool newscaster’s interview. When asked if he’s bitter about spending 18 months in prison, Ramos responds with a composed remark ideal for the news interview:

“Malcolm X said there are two places to get an education: one is in universities and one is in prison. I’ve had the good fortune of having both.”

—Mickie McGee (1982)

*Fifty Wonderful Years* provides a behind-the-scenes look at the 1973 Miss California Pageant. In the early '70s beauty pageants across the country came under fire from feminists who targeted them as spectacles that exploited women. Avoiding an overtly pejorative position, *Fifty Wonderful Years* lets the pageant organizers and contestants hang themselves. This tape was one of the first documentaries shot on 1/2" open reel equipment to be broadcast on television. KQED, San Francisco “image-buffed” (rescanned it off of a monitor) the tape to maximize its signal stability.

"Under the aegis of KQED, San Francisco, Optic Nerve crews present Pageant Week with contestants and organizers of this peculiar American phenomenon. They follow the women through their learning to walk, to smile eternally, and to parade their wares for the judges. We hear their views on the pageant, their reasons for participating, and share their excitement as the final moments of the competition draw near."

—American Film Institute (1984)


A tightly edited progression of “extended moments” unmasks the technological “miracle” of Wonder Woman’s transformation, playing the fantasy of psychological transformation off the reality of television product. As one of the first artists to appropriate TV footage as a strategy to critically reposition the texts of television, Birnbaum produced this tape as part of a series of television studies. *Wonder Woman* performs its analysis through the repetition of image sequences and attention to the lyrics of the Wonder Woman song. These techniques allow the viewer to reconsider the messages wrapped up in so neat a prime-time package. The tape examines the production of television’s fantasy spectacle in relation to ideological constructions of women and power.

"I am a pirateer of popular cultural images... choosing what is most accepted and used for portrayal. Each work’s created movements of suspension/arrest call into question authorship and authenticity. I choose to reinvest in the American TV Image... in order to probe distributed senses of alienation and their subsequent levels of acceptance."

—Dara Birnbaum (1981)
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Program 8: Independents
Address TV Audiences

*Healthcare: Your Money or Your Life*, Downtown Community Television (DCTV), 1977, 57:00, U.S., color, sound

*The Ruling Classroom*, Peter Bull and Alex Gibney, 1979-80, 57:38, U.S., b&w, sound

*Four More Years*, Top Value Television (TVTV), 1972, 1:00:15, U.S., b&w, sound

TRT 2:57:15
Introduction

“With the new technology of verité, documentary could rise to the revolutionary potential which its pioneers always sensed in it, offering us an unprecedented range of experience against which, by endowing it with significance, to structure our consciousness and our values. But television as an institution, by its impoverishment of documentary’s reference to the world, proffers us in effect an impoverished world to which it invites us, by construing it as the world, to render assent. The only experience offered by most television is the experience of watching television; and the inertia of the system operates to keep things that way.”
—Dai Vaughan (1976)

“Independents have developed self-identity and effective organization and are now a constituency with allies as diverse as the public interest and minority groups and the Hollywood studios. As a result they cannot be ignored in policy constructs of the future... The central focus must become the determination of what proportion of the national schedule and how many hours per year should be devoted to non-station productions and who will administer such funds under what guidelines and procedures.”
—Nick DeMartino (1979)

Throughout the ’70s many documentary producers worked to establish relationships with broadcast television that would deliver their independently conceived and produced programming to large broadcast audiences. In the early ’70s, portable 1/2-inch open reel equipment guaranteed greater mobility than the 16mm film equipment used by professional news crews, but the electronic signal produced by the Portapak was usually rejected by broadcast engineers. Some of the first tapes broadcast on public television were rescanned by studio television cameras off a monitor cabled to a 1/2-inch open reel deck. In 1972, TVTV’s Four More Years was the first Portapak-produced documentary “electronically broadcast” by KQED, San Francisco’s public television station. In 1973, stand-alone time base correctors (TBCs) were introduced that could compensate for the Portapaks’ signal idiosyncrasies.

By mid-decade, independent documentaries by local producers had been shown on public television stations all over the country—KUHT, Houston; WTTW, Chicago; WXXI, Rochester; WETA, Washington; KQED, San Francisco; KCTA, Minneapolis; WNET, New York; and more. Independent productions by TVTV and Downtown Community Television challenged the structure of broadcast television documentaries and news reporting. Public access cable television and video access centers remained an important outlet for work that challenged assumptions about healthcare, education, and the police, and for projects by minority producers and women under-represented in the industry and in the arts. Nevertheless, many independent producers continued to lobby for the development of new funding sources and access to larger and more mainstream television audiences, even targeting appropriations by Congress for independent programs on public television.

Video pioneers saw their challenging projects co-opted by broadcasters, who appropriated independent eye-witnessing as stylistic inventions for television news and dramatic programs. Despite this, many continued to believe broadcast TV did offer important opportunities that the alternative networks could not deliver. In a society that receives so much of its culture and information from television, public television with its potential for reaching mass audiences continued to be a gamble for independents who organized themselves to argue for better funding. Whether video documentarians could maintain their independence in content and production values while working within broadcast television was hotly debated throughout the decade.
Healthcare: Your Money or Your Life, Downtown Community Television (DCTV), 1977, 57:00, U.S., color, sound

A timeless exposé on the disparity of health care services for the rich and poor in America, this incisive investigative report exemplifies the advocacy journalism of the Downtown Community Television Center (DCTV). The tape was produced by Jon Alpert and Keiko Tsuno, DCTV’s founders. With the viewer as direct witness to the unfolding life-and-death dramas, Healthcare: Your Money or Your Life contrasts two Brooklyn hospitals: Kings County Hospital, an overcrowded, understaffed, and under funded city-run institution, and the Downstate Medical Center, a well-financed private hospital across the street. A strong indictment of the economics of the medical system is articulated by victimized patients and beleaguered hospital personnel. It is noteworthy that the hospitals cooperated in this tape’s production. A contemporary review in the New York Times declared it “a devastating commentary on the state of health in urban America... a piercing study of hospitals and the business of medicine.” Production and broadcast was supported by WNET, New York.

The Ruling Classroom, Peter Bull and Alex Gibney, 1979-80, 57:38, U.S., b&w, sound

The Ruling Classroom documents a social studies experiment played out by seventh graders in Mill Valley, California. The students reorganize their classroom as an imaginary country until the principal staged a coup and brought the classroom republic to a halt. The educational experiment was the brainchild of teacher George Muldoon, who suspended the normal social studies curriculum in order to let his students learn about government by constructing their own country. Bull and Gibney videotaped the proceedings using a verité approach, coupled with after-school interviews of students. Over the course of the semester the make-believe society, like the one they would soon inherit, develops serious problems such as freedom of the press, white-collar crime, economic monopolies, and unemployment. While the airing of The Ruling Classroom by KQED, San Francisco was challenged by the school system, the tape was broadcast on public television stations across the country.

“We liked the immediacy of video, and its potential for furthering the interaction with the students through our ability to immediately play back footage that had just been shot, therefore helping to win the trust of our subjects.”

–Peter Bull and Alex Gibney (Letter to Chris Hill, 1995)

“In The Ruling Classroom, winner of the AFI National Video Competition, Peter Bull and Alex Gibney’s document of an experimental seventh-grade social-studies classroom turns into a low-key political horror story.
TVTV’s iconoclastic *Four More Years* chronicles the 1972 Republican National Convention, concentrating, in TVTV’s words, on “the social space that has been neglected, rejected and missing from media coverage to date.” While the network cameras focused on the orchestrated re-nomination of Richard Nixon, TVTV’s crew turned their cameras on cocktail parties, delegate caucuses, and anti-war demonstrations. As the first documentary produced on ½” open reel equipment to be broadcast nationally on public television, its success in reaching audiences helped to promote the work of other independent videomakers. Initial support for this production came from cable television companies that hoped to use the work of independents to attract new subscribers.

“With a style loosely modeled on New Journalism, and dedicated to making facts as vivid and entertaining as fiction, TVTV used a sharp sense of irony to puncture many a puffed-up ego. These self-proclaimed video guerrillas caught establishment superstars off guard with non-threatening, low-tech equipment that offered entry to people and places that network cameramen, burdened with the heavy equipment and seriousness of commercial TV, never thought of trying.”

–Deirdre Boyle, 1988
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Thanks to the efforts of staff and volunteers, most of the hundreds of tapes damaged in the 1991 “anniversary” flood at Downtown Community Television Center (DCTV) were salvaged. A year later Keiko Tsuno recalled how it took a week to dry out the waterlogged tapes, which included six years of tape originals as well as distribution copies. In the end, about five-dozen tapes had to be discarded as unrecoverable. The damage to the water pipe was $2,000, but the damage to an archive of historic video was inestimable.

Until now DCTV, like many other media arts centers and individuals with video collections, has had no funding for any of its preservation needs. Although Tsuno has cleaned some 1/2” tapes, she remains dissatisfied with the results: pictures are poor and heads clog on playback. She has transferred several tapes to Betacam SP, but urgently needs to clean and remaster about 40 more. DCTV’s most important tapes exist on 1” tape and are now stored at the home of Tsuno’s father-in-law, but the balance of the collection remains at the center, an old firehouse that is a disaster waiting to happen again. At the end of the interview, Tsuno sighed and said, “I almost gave up.”

This sense of near defeat is not unique: other individuals and video institutions have faced similar battles with unruly elements, natural and technical. Whether frustration is sparked by actual inundation or the psychological burnout occasioned by seemingly insurmountable problems in preserving video collections in a time of scant resources, recent developments offer the media arts community hope. These strategic alliances signal a movement toward consolidation, standards setting, and resource sharing that may benefit the entire field.

Preservation: Art or Science?

Although a national policy on video preservation has yet to be formulated, the NEA is encouraging challenge-grant applications to support the capital investment required to establish a national center for technical preservation. Since the Bay Area Video Coalition (BAVC) is the only remaining media arts center with state-of-the-art video equipment and professional engineering support, it has become a center for national technical preservation services. BAVC executive director Sally Jo Fifer is enthusiastic about adding preservation to their mission of providing technical services and skills education to individual artists, community centers, and nonprofit institutions. She explained how the idea came in response to requests for such a service from many individuals and institutions like the Pacific Film Archive, the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, and the San Francisco Public Library. Thus far BAVC has received only seed monies for research and development. Operations Coordinator Luke Hones has been sorting through issues of timebase correction and researching synch inserters. He has been talking with Recortec, a Silicon Valley company that has worked with NASA to recover tapes, and with engineers from Sony and the major tape manufacturers. Without the technical assistance and financial support of such obvious partners, BAVC will neither be able to develop a practical service, nor come up with the 3-to-1 match mandated by an NEA challenge grant. Optimistically, BAVC already has clients lined up for the service, and they hope to be able to go on-line in late 1993.

Hones is intent on developing straightforward technical procedures that will ensure consistent and reliable cleaning and remastering at an affordable cost. He is suspicious of those who claim preservation is, “as much an art as a science” and hopes to “take as much of the magic out of the process as possible” by developing a quality-controlled, methodical approach. Fifer believes the thorny question of who decides what tapes get saved will become relatively inconsequential once costs for cleaning can be significantly reduced. BAVC’s initial focus will be restoring 1/2” open reel formats and remastering them onto contemporary archival formats such as 3/4”, 1” and Beta SP; they eventually hope to be able to offer digital formats as well. Whether they will be able to extend the service to include other

* This essay was originally published in 1995.
rare or obsolete formats is unclear.

The Pacific Film Archive (PFA) is an integral partner in this proposed preservation service. BAVC plans to furnish PFA with cataloging information about all the tapes they restore. Producers who wish to keep their restored masters and sub-masters under archival conditions will be able to make arrangements with the Archive. Some criteria for what will be collected will need to be developed since the Archive’s vaults have limited space, according to video curator Steve Seid.¹

Without an acquisitions budget, PFA is dependent on donations of significant work, as well as obsolete format equipment. Seid has already begun to receive vintage models of early 1/2” recording equipment. “Ideally one wants the actual machine used by an artist,” Seid noted. One of his great discoveries was locating a videotape in the vault where paintings are stored. It was marked “Water—Andy Warhol” with no further information given. By borrowing the artist’s own deck from the Warhol Foundation, Seid was able to remaster what proved to be an historic tape made by Warhol for the Yoko Ono show at the Everson Museum in 1971.

Currently Seid is organizing a collection of Bay Area video, which features: the Quad master of Media Burn (by Ant Farm) and the 1968 TV series made by KQED and the Dilexi Foundation, which commissioned video work from such artists as Terry Riley (Music with Balls), Yvonne Rainer, Anna Halprin, Walter de Maria, Andy Warhol and Frank Zappa, among others. Historic video collections exist in the San Francisco Bay area, he noted, but some are unfortunately closed to the public and in danger of being lost forever. Without a video curator to supervise the arduous task of preservation, the de Saisset Museum in Santa Clara has been unable to meet requests for access to its important early video archive. Although a list of the de Saisset’s impressive video holdings exists, no one has seen the work in over a decade. For a curator like Seid, the proximity of such inaccessible work is both tantalizing and deeply frustrating. The situation points up the importance of joint efforts to insure access to the past before it is too late.

Strange Bedfellows?

One strategy for institutions faced with the dilemma of how to preserve and access an historic collection without abandoning their on-going services is being explored by Intermedia Arts of Minnesota. Director Tom Borrup approached the Minnesota Historical Society with the idea of forming a preservation partnership. He proposed to the Historical Society that they take over the on-going preservation and archiving of Intermedia’s historic regional video collection. Bonnie Wilson, curator of the Historical Society’s Visual and Sound Collections, was already familiar with Intermedia’s collection and its value, and agreed with alacrity. Although all the details remain to be spelled out regarding how tapes will be handled and who will have access to them, the first tapes will be presented to the Historical Society during 1993 when Intermedia Arts of Minnesota² celebrates its twentieth anniversary.

Intermedia’s collection currently includes over 2,500 tapes, a number of which are duplicates or copies of productions made elsewhere. They have all been cataloged from existing written information. Approximately 400 titles for deposit with the Historical Society will be selected for preservation by a panel convened by Intermedia Arts, and these tapes will be remastered from 1/2” open reel onto 3/4” with the help of a $10,000 grant from the Warhol Foundation for remastering costs. Intermedia plans to be one of the first clients for BAVC’s new service.

Intermedia’s first priority was identifying candidates for the Historical Society’s regional collection. They have already begun to identify additional subject collections within their archive—for example, dance tapes made by UCV during the ’70s—as well as other archives likely to be interested in acquiring these tapes. By isolating discrete collections, Intermedia hopes to be able to raise additional funds and locate new partnerships needed to preserve their extensive collection.

Video’s Union Catalog

The Pacific Film Archive is one of many video organizations participating in the ambitious National Moving Image Database (NAMID) project. Before joining NAMID, PFA had its records
on file cards, but now that information is accessible to anyone in NAMID’s computer network. According to Margaret Byrne, NAMID’s project director, approximately 1,000 fully cataloged video records were completed in 1992. About 15,000 additional records exist at “inventory level,” and another 2,500 are in an intermediary stage. By mid-1993, Byrne hopes to have 20,000 records begun.

NAMID is more than a cataloging project. Its mandate is to assist preservation, share cataloging, and facilitate access to collections. The aim is to help build new partnerships. “We don’t have a lot of money,” Byrne readily admits, so any amount given to an organization is virtually insignificant. Along with the symbolic sum of $5,000 or $10,000 comes advice from Byrne and her three staff members that is designed to help organizations invest wisely in hardware and software for cataloging and inventorying their collections. What NAMID gets out of the deal is information it needs for its national database. What the organization gets—besides computers and cataloging help—is support for their on-going preservation efforts. According to Byrne, when organizations keep good records, they are more attractive to funders who want to know what their money is going to preserve.

NAMID is selective about who it works with, rejecting charity cases and organizations that are weighted with a bureaucracy that skims the bulk of their funding off the top. Because their staff and finances are reduced in number, NAMID has chosen established organizations that stand to benefit the most from strategic assistance. Among those video organizations cooperating with NAMID are The Kitchen, the Video Data Bank, Pacific Film Archive, and Electronic Arts Intermix. Thus far the Project has prioritized artist tapes over documentaries.

By developing workable strategies for preservation, NAMID is able to enlist the cooperation of many collections and demonstrate the value of sharing cataloging records. Currently envisioned is a video and film preservation project of the work of media artist Shirley Clarke. Since Clarke’s video masters and film negatives are scattered about, NAMID hopes that assembling complete cataloging records of Clarke’s work will help smaller collections make the case for preservation. NAMID is also working with Anthology Film Archives, which is organizing a retrospective of media artist Ed Emshwiller’s work. By providing information about the whereabouts of an artist’s work, NAMID can greatly assist with the research necessary to organize and fund such exhibitions. Other plans include developing databases based on ethnic lines, such as African American, Asian American, and Native American databases.

Preservation Profile: The Warhol Video Collection

One of the most extensive efforts at archiving the works of an individual artist was undertaken by the Warhol Foundation in 1990 in preparation for the Warhol retrospective at the Whitney Museum of American Art. The tape collection included 311 1/2” helical tapes produced between 1971 and 1976, 11 1” Norelco tapes made in 1965, 1,495 3/4” tapes, 328 Betacam tapes, and 201 1” C tapes all produced between 1977 and 1987. Thus far approximately two-thirds of the helical tapes have been preserved as well as the 3/4” tapes made for cable television and all the 3/4” tapes in which Warhol appears.

Mirra Bank Brockman was contracted to make the preservation choices for the Whitney retrospective. She then hired Terry Irwin as the technical manager in charge of assessing the collection, cataloging and preserving it. Irwin spent four months researching the problem during late 1990 and early 1991. He contacted the Department of Defense, NASA, and even the CIA in his search for scarce machines like the handmade EL3400. Success was discovering a machine with the serial number #1; frustration was fruitlessly searching for the elusive 1” Norelco. Although people often promised they could make transfers of such obsolete formats, after weeks they invariably gave up.

The biggest concern was saving the endangered 1/2” helical tapes. In October 1987 a selection of tapes had been preserved on to 1”. Between August and December 1990, Irwin went back to the same lab and preserved 200 tapes. The biggest problem was cleaning them, especially the Kayrex tapes (a particularly unstable tape brand housed in a blue plastic box). Irwin decided to go with a wet cleaning method largely because the lab’s technician had the best success with that method. Tapes were fed the reel to a wet gauze and then fed back onto another reel;
the distance allowed the solvent to dry. This technique typically required two passes.

The decision to use 1" as the archival copy format was made based on conversations with the National Archives staff and reports generated by the Ad hoc Subcommittee on the Preservation of Video Recordings (see bibliography). The rationale was straightforward: 1" offers professional quality; many 1" machines exist; the format is stable and is likely to be in use in the future; and it is affordable (at least for this archive). Although archives like the Museum of Television and Radio were big on D2 at the time, Irwin felt digital technology was too unstable since it is changing so rapidly. Not many machines would be available in the future, and although backward compatibility might be provided, there were no guarantees. After a month of information gathering, Irwin began remastering on 1" and subsequently concluded it was a good decision.

After the Whitney Retrospective, Brockman decided to leave the first facility that preserved the 1/2" tapes and found another one that did dry buff cleaning. Unfortunately, the preservation work proved unacceptable, and Irwin was forced to pull the plug. He was not able to get one usable play because the tapes were riddled with interference and distortion: tapes rolled over badly and could not deal with a TBC; images were dirty or fuzzy, and playback clogged heads. When the tapes were inspected by an independent technician, they proved to be scratched and stretched. As a result, the project lost nine months and incurred considerable additional expense.

Irwin is quick to say he is not opposed to the dry process and admits the wet process can be abused: using the wrong solvent or gauze can destroy a tape. The traditional argument against the wet process is that it dries a tape and may damage the binder. And, if you damage a tape, you will no longer have it when a better preservation technique is developed later. But, argues Irwin, tapes have already lost their lubrication and, most importantly, have a limited life span, especially if made before the binder change.

Beware Glib Tidings

The real issue in cleaning helical tape, according to Irwin, is the technician, not the process. The critical factor is having a technician who knows how to spot a problem and how to solve it right away; what you do not want is someone who stumbles upon a solution while working on your tapes. Irwin strongly advises checking the credentials of people you hire to do such sensitive work. There is potentially a lot of money to be made in video preservation, and not everyone claiming to be an expert is one. “Never let an expert’s opinion sway you when your own experience says otherwise,” Irwin advises.

Irwin added that most advice given about storage conditions is “nonsense.” “Stable conditions are more important,” he stated. “The shock of moving tapes from one temperature to another is more damaging than a one or two degree difference in temperature.”

Irwin designed his own cataloging system, ultimately rejecting MARC records for an individualized system that met the collection’s inventory needs. Using the Federation of International Film Archive’s (FIAF) computer cataloging guide (see bibliography under Smither), he learned two basic rules of cataloging: be consistent, and make it work for you. He wrote his own programs using dBase 3+ and recommends *Understanding and Using dBase 3+* by Brady Computer (Rob Bowen Books).

Irwin began working with Steve Gong of the Pacific Film Archive on the idea of creating a Center for Obsolete Video Equipment in the Bay Area. In the process, he stumbled across Ampex engineers Ray Coustier and Pete Hammer, who had tried to create a Center for Obsolete Equipment over ten years earlier. Even though they tried working with organizations like the Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA), their efforts proved unsuccessful and eventually, suffering burnout, they gave up on the idea.4 Their’s was an idea whose time has finally come if only BAVC can succeed at creating its preservation service. Of course, locating obsolete equipment5 is only part of what it will take to make old tapes live again for new audiences.
Sex, Lies, and Videotape

If historic video is to survive it seems clear the future lies in forming new partnerships—not just shotgun marriages of convenience, but committed relationships between freely consenting parties. And just as marriage is not the happy ending envisioned in fairy tales, but the real-life beginning of compromises and negotiations, the partnerships detailed here have a way to go before we know how successful they will be. What is promising is that, despite limited financial support—and maybe because of it—these organizations are reaching outside the media arts community to embrace new alliances and attract new support for video preservation efforts.

At the 1991 Media Alliance symposium on video preservation Barbara London spoke about the significance of trust. That trust is being demonstrated by Intermedia Arts of Minnesota and the Minnesota Historical Society; by NAMID and its participating organizations; by the Bay Area Video Coalition and the Pacific Film Archive, along with regional facilities, engineers, and the NEA. Forming such partnerships is only one aspect of what is required to chart an agenda for video preservation, but it is a hopeful sign of progress. That moving image preservation has been chosen as one of the themes of the 1993 conference of the National Alliance of Media Arts and Culture signals growing national attention to this issue. Whether it is possible to create one routine method for cleaning obsolete tape remains to be seen. Whether one center can serve all the needs of the field or one cataloging system can meet the needs of all collections remains uncertain. But the movement toward agreed upon standards is surely a desirable end, especially given the emergence of entrepreneurs whose preservation sleight-of-hand may cost collections more than time and money.

What matters is that people are still trying to make the vulnerable and valuable video past last. By sharing resources—whether it be obsolete equipment, cataloging information, engineering expertise or dollars and sense—solutions to the difficult questions and thorny problems of video preservation begin to lie within everyone’s reach.

Endnotes

1. Locating reliable archival storage remains a critical issue for the field. Rick Prelinger’s recommendations in 1991 that a “Consortium for Safe Storage of Magnetic Media” be created has yet to materialize. The idea for creating a holding facility for work waiting for proper storage is still an elusive goal. The offers of storage by archives like Anthology Film Archives and the Pacific Film Archive are contingent upon donation of material to the archive. And even then, not all material will be accepted for deposit. Robert Haller of AFA reports they are willing to store videotapes for collectors for a price, but as of date there have been no inquiries. Other potential locations for archiving cited in the 1991 Symposium report have yet to respond.

2. Founded as University Community Video (UCV) at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, UCV changed its emphasis and name in the mid-Eighties, becoming Intermedia Arts of Minnesota.

3. Although some collections have experienced problems with 3/4” color tapes recorded as recently as 1979, the Warhol collection was not afflicted with problems except when tapes had not been fully rewound.

4. In 1991 Ralph Hocking of the Experimental Video Center in Owego, New York, proposed a “resurrection bus,” a mobile service equipped with all the technology needed to clean and remaster old video. Hocking, who owns much archaic equipment, was willing to research the costs and logistics of making a service available to regional media arts centers and individuals if there was sufficient interest. He received no inquiries and has given up on the idea. Similarly, an effort by NCFVP to compile a database of obsolete video equipment has been abandoned by Susan Dalton of the Center’s Washington, D.C. office.

5. Luke Hones found one book extremely helpful in tracking down information about what equipment was used to produce and post-produce historic work. Access—Film and Video Equipment: A Directory, edited by Nancy Legge for the AFI, lists the equipment holdings at major media centers circa 1978. Also useful to anyone interested in the history of image processing is the cat-
It is safe to say that you will outlive your videotapes three or four times over. Ten years after the widespread use of home recorders became the norm, our video memories are beyond the fading of old kodachromes; some are totally unplayable. Even before the mass logging of personal memories onto videotape, there were the early users of portable video beginning in the late 1960s, whose recordings are now significant cultural artifacts because they provide alternative documents of one of the stormiest American decades. Attitudes about videotape have shifted in the independent media field as well; once valued as a highly ephemeral material and a "non-object," producers now worry about the lifespan of their tapes.

"Video preservation" describes the physical refurbishing of tapes, as well as the ethical and aesthetic decisions about what images will become part of history. Re-mastering is a means to achieve an historical record, the content of which is at the heart of current preservation practice. Working for the Video Data Bank (VDB), I have supervised the preservation of the Castelli-Sonnabend collection and coordinated the compilation of 68 early titles for Surveying the First Decade: Video Art and Alternative Media in the U.S. I am encouraged by the increased interest in video preservation, yet awareness of the compelling need for preservation needs to grow if we are to save a vital piece of our cultural history.

General Practices

There are as yet no agreed-upon guidelines for video preservation, but that hasn’t stopped distributors and collectors from going ahead and doing it.¹ Nor should it, since cleaning methods have been tested and verified, and prices have come down. Here are some basic principles of preservation:

1) Transfers (Re-recording). The material to be preserved, often a tape on an obsolete format like 1/2” open reel or 1” type IVC, is played back and re-recorded onto another format that uses available technology and is considered more archivally stable.² (By conservator’s standards, video is not an archival medium because it has not been proven to last for 100 years. So, to conservators, “video preservation” is something of an oxymoron.) Digital tape shows some promise as a preservation medium, especially considering the fact that no information is lost in successive generations (copies from the master tape). Yet since the technology is so new, and constantly developing, it is impossible to predict how long even digital tape will last.³ Formats once considered standard and relatively stable, like 3/4” U-matic, now find their days numbered. Ampex has stopped making 3/4” machines, so in 5 or 10 years the decks and repair parts will be hard to come by. Re-mastering onto progressively better formats will continue until a permanent storage medium is found.

2) Cleaning. Tapes are usually cleaned before transferring to remove dust and dirt. There are many methods of cleaning; current practices include “baking” or heating tapes, dry or wet wiping, scraping, and chemical or water baths. The technology is adapted from that used to clean computer tapes. The major concerns are consistency and safety—it is important that the process does not damage the tape.⁴

3) Reference Copies. Before transferring cleaned tapes to a new master, it is advisable to first watch a VHS copy of the tape. This will allow for the condition to be checked and will avoid making an expensive new master of a tape that is unusable because of severe drop out or skew problems. If there are other working copies of the tape, the images are compared and checked for improvement.

4) Two “Masters.” The need for a dedicated master that is never played, only rewound periodically, is clear. In the past, one master was struck from the source, and was then used for making dubs or as a viewing copy. As time passed, those masters became badly degraded from excessive use and exposure to changing environmental conditions. Having two masters, one a dedicated or archival master, and the other a preservation dub master, protects your preservation investment.

5) Cataloging. Preservation is not complete without the creation

---

¹ This essay was originally published in 1995.
of clear, accessible records of what work was done, where, what source was used, and the content and condition of the tape. Ideally these records (and the terms used) would be standardized from archive to archive, and be accessible to other organizations. Storage: While the need for proper storage is well documented, few independent media centers have the money to establish climate-controlled storage. The Museum of Modern Art has recently developed such a facility for their considerable videotape and film holdings, but small and mid-sized institutions cannot afford their own facilities nor pay an independent facility to store tapes properly. There are preventative measures that these institutions can enact, however, such as having two masters, as mentioned above, storing tapes upright and not on their side, controlling the temperature of the space where tapes and machines are kept, and avoiding extreme temperature/humidity changes by limiting the number of times a master tape is shipped.

The practices and methodologies of preservation need further refinement, and media independents should enlist the help of professional conservators, librarians, and archivists. Toward this goal, the “Playback 1996” conference at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, March 29-30 (organized by Bay Area Video Coalition (BAVC) and New York City’s Media Alliance), gathered people from the conservation and media arts fields to begin a shared discussion on a range of preservation topics. Clearly, the independent media field can benefit from networking with groups like the Association of Moving Image Archivists and American Institute of Conservators, to share experience and build support for video preservation in related fields.

**Weird Science**

Video preservation is not only an inexact science—it is at times almost schizophrenic. In general, each tape marked for preservation opens up a completely different can of worms, technically, aesthetically, and ethnically. Just because two tapes are stored side-by-side on a shelf does not mean they will be in the same condition when played. Problems in playback can be the result of a number of factors, including intrinsic production values and the quality of the video signal as first recorded. The first generation of portable 1/2” open reel cameras was somewhat eccentric; different cameras generated slightly different video signals and the image produced was of a low resolution. Some early experimenters were deliberately altering the video signal to produce special effects. Tapes were reused over and over during an era that championed process over product. There were few character generators in the ‘70s so most tapes lack internal titles. Early editing techniques involved literally cutting and pasting the tape together, which creates a “glitch” (temporary loss of video and audio). In addition, companies experimented with the chemical and physical composition of tape stock in the early days, and some compositions have held up better than others.

The second biggest factor concerns the conditions under which tapes are stored—temperature, humidity, horizontal or vertical orientation, and condition of the wind (how the tape is wound around its spindles). Humidity is probably the worst culprit as it produces changes in the tape’s chemical composition. Storing a tape on its side causes the successive winds to separate and causes edge damage. Dropout is caused by bits of the magnetic coating flaking off the polyester backing of the tape, and produces an irreplaceable loss of video information. Some problems such as bad skew (a result of tape stretching) can be fixed in playback by stabilizing the signal through a time-base corrector (TBC).

Another consideration is that modern playback equipment does not process video signals in the same way as older machines do. For example, it is generally accepted that old 3/4” tapes play back better on old 3/4” decks. A former 3M technician told me that the older decks have different skew and time-code allowances, and can compensate better for old, slightly warped tape. Preservation techniques are developing with each tape that is preserved.

**Aesthetic and Ethical Issues**

Beyond the technical, there are other complications that fall into a more gray area. For example, the VDB distributes a copy of Robert Morris’ videotape *Exchange* (1973) that was preserved in the mid-’80s, probably from a 3/4” copy. (Since no records were kept, this is just an educated guess; 1/2” open reel decks are hard to come by, and it would be easier to use a 3/4” copy; plus the VDB has both a 3/4” and 1/2” open reel copy.) In 1994, the 1/2” open reel copy of the title was cleaned and found to be
four minutes longer than the previous version. On closer inspection, running the tapes on side-by-side monitors, it appears that the two tapes are completely different edits of the same source material. After conferring with the artist, and considering that one tape has a natural ending and the other cuts off abruptly, the VDB decided to distribute the newly recovered version of the tape. The shorter version may have been the result of a mistake made in the transfer of the tape decades ago; a mistake that was copied over and over again.

In another example, the VDB had a copy of Vito Acconci's Undertone (1972) that was very gray and had a bad flicker. When the 1/2” open reel copy was cleaned, the resulting tape looked beautiful, except for a four-minute glitch in the middle of the tape. The question was whether to cut out the blank part of the tape, creating an edit in a piece that originally had no edits, or ask viewers to sit through the break, both unsavory options. Luckily, another 1/2” open reel, nearly perfect copy with no glitch was found.

With more preservation work being done, problems like this will arise over and over again, especially for distributors. Do you leave in segments of the tape that are unwatchable because of bad skew, or do you omit them? Do you boost sound levels when they are inaudible, or adjust the gain so the image is not too “hot”? Should adjustments be made to the master or just distribution dubs? The ethical (and legal) considerations around the issue of copyright are another rat’s nest of problems. If the tape does not have a copyright, are the producers still to be paid a royalty? And when the original producers have vanished, disbanded, or died, what then?

A larger discussion of ethics has to incorporate the process of selection. Perhaps it is because no one wants to admit that their preferences will determine what gets saved, that they have the power to deem this artist’s videotape as more culturally significant than another. Few are comfortable making these assertions today now that, in postmodern fashion, we are all lost in the sauce of a relativized history. The process of selection seems hopelessly ideological. On a more comforting note, the issues surrounding video preservation are no different from the foibles and follies of every preservation effort, from art history to archeology. There will be mistakes and omissions, and hopefully enough interested scholars to correct them. Selection will occur both consciously (by curators, conservators, funders, distributors, etc.) and by default (the can of beer that spilled on a tape in 1975).

Videotape is a material dependent upon technology for access to its contents. Having an archive of tapes that are unplayable is as useful as a library of books that won’t open. Without a doubt, the physical condition of the tape will determine whether it can be saved, regardless of the value of its contents. The tape may be labeled, “The Secret of Eternal Life and a Conversation with God Himself,” but if it has congealed into a hockey puck, no amount of effort is going to unlock that material. Most archivists, curators, and conservators face decisions a bit more subtle than this; given a large number of one-of-a-kind tapes that seem to be in acceptable condition, how does a conservator establish priorities for preservation?

No single prescription can be made in this regard; priorities are hopefully going to be as various as the types of collections and number of people doing preservation work. Priorities will be determined in large part by the values and objectives each organization defines for itself, as well as the resources that can be mustered. In putting together Surveying the First Decade, the VDB preserved several tapes including: a 1976 performance piece that bridges minimalist music and early computer video, a 1973 prison community day speech by a woman expounding the ideas of Marcus Garvey, and a 1971 interview with a member of the negotiating team sent in during the Attica prison riots. One stumbling block in our research was that many collections are uncataloged and unwatchable without first being preserved. These collections are still valuable; present use is no indication of future value.

Individuals and institutions should right now be preserving those tapes that are important to them. Only in this way can a broad selection of culturally significant materials be saved, and the alternative visions of early videomakers be assured of availability for the next generation. Video as a practice began when the distinction between high art and mass culture was coming under attack from Pop Art, Process Art, Happenings, performance, etc. Radical artmaking meant radical politics and vice versa. The im-
mediacy of video makes for compelling historical study and has the potential to radically alter the stories we tell ourselves about our past.

It is impossible to predict the course of future scholarship and every effort should be made to preserve a broad cross-section of video recordings. Skeptics such as myself would say that there will never be enough money to preserve everything. Even if prioritized lists are made and a few tapes preserved, soon the money will run out and scores of tapes will continue to gather dust. For this reason, funders may exert considerable influence over what gets preserved. For example, there may be some cash available for video art preservation, but nothing to save community work, or vice versa. Organizations will do some of the discriminating themselves—they will only pitch ideas that appeal to a funder’s priorities. The development of preservation standards can help build confidence and awareness among funders, but standards can be used to cut the other way as well, excluding a large number of small to mid-sized organizations and their prized collections.\(^9\)

There are other funding options. Given the cultural currency that moving images enjoy, some collections could, for example, be converted into working image banks. Preservation work could be scheduled in phases to avoid a huge outlay of initial funding. Distribution income from tapes that have obvious market appeal can fund the preservation of significant works that might not enjoy such wide popularity. A different approach that stresses networking and the pooling of resources has been developed and implemented by Media Alliance. The models they have put forward in *Meeting the Challenges of Video Preservation* (1996) encourage cooperative cataloging as well as joint solutions to the costly problem of storage.

In order to reduce the cost and uncertainty of preservation, an approach mentioned at the “Playback” conference was to influence manufacturers to produce longer lasting videotape and to release details on the composition of their tapes. If the consumer market was sensitized to the problem of videotape degeneration, it could exert major pressure on the industry.

**Conclusion**

Like the beginning of an old joke, there is good news and bad news. The bad news is that the funding situation today is so dire that most media non-profits are barely keeping their heads above water, let alone planning preservation. Their collections are falling into greater decay, being discarded completely, or handed off to libraries and universities that do not have the resources for proper collection development either. The clock is ticking, tapes are getting older and stickier, and obsolete machines are succumbing to wear and tear.

The good news is that there is much more interest in the subject of video preservation than even four years ago, both from inside the field and from other fields, such as conservation and libraries. The “Playback” conference was hopeful in that it expanded the discussion; BAVC seems committed to such a dialogue and plans to publish the conference proceedings. The work of organizations like Media Alliance in networking New York State archives sets an important precedent for how to build partnerships and share resources. Some important funders, like the Andy Warhol Foundation and the Getty Grant Program (both of whom supported the “Playback” conference) have expressed interest.

In March 1996, the Library of Congress held hearings in New York City, Washington DC, and Los Angeles on the issue of magnetic media preservation. In years past, the Library of Congress has been less than receptive to discussions of video preservation, so this marks a significant shift in their position. They interviewed scholars, independent media-makers, educators, and video and television preservation specialists in order to establish a comprehensive national video and television preservation program. A report of the findings will be published, and may have major impact in re-organizing working relationships between technicians, archivists, artists, and funders.

Given the rough-and-ready nature of early video and its aspirations to challenge mainstream media by placing production technology in the hands of the people, it may seem ironic that so much attention is going toward preserving the past, instead of making new media ourselves. Preservation practice should promote, not hinder, the effort to make this material once more accessible to
the widest audience possible, instead of languishing in a hermetically sealed vault. As we face the latest technological revolution of computer networks, there are important parallels between our situation and the advent of consumer-grade video technology in the late '60s. The rhetoric is nearly identical; our hopes for the new technology can perhaps be informed by the generation that first dreamed of revolutionizing television.

Texts Consulted:

Endnotes
1. In the independent media field, preservation projects have been initiated by the Video Data Bank (VDB) and Electronic Arts Intermix (EAI) (both distribution collections), the Walker Museum (performance documentation), the Andy Warhol Foundation (Warhol’s films and videotapes), Anthology Film Archive (a smattering of tapes), a collaboration between Intermedia Arts Minnesota and the Minnesota Historical Society (University Community Video archive) and Eastern Tennessee State University—Archives of Appalachia (Broadside TV archive). The VDB and EAI have been doing on-going preservation work since the mid-1980s. Many more single tapes have been preserved by individuals and organizations.
2. What format to transfer to is a perennial question. Debbie Silverfin of NYSCA voiced the most rational approach at “Playback 1996,” when she said that the format you choose will be determined by your needs and your resources. There is no tape out there that has been proven to last forever, or even fifteen years. At this time, digital formats are too expensive for most. Evelyn Ioschpe, from Fundação ICHPE, São Paolo, Brazil, however said her group uses laserdisks, primarily because of the humidity problems for magnetic media encountered in a sub-tropical climate. She noted that after a large initial investment, the costs came down.
3. The problem with digital tape, besides the cost, is that heavy disturbances on an analog tape, such as skew or drop out, can overload the allowances on a digital deck and appear as pixelated distortions. This happens when the system does not have enough memory to mask distortions, and the image starts to break down into a pixelated pattern.
4. VDB did most of its preservation work through BAVC where a dry process was used, with a series of blades, slotted grids, cloth wipes, and vacuum chambers to remove dirt from both sides of the tape. Luke Hones of BAVC, who investigated different cleaning methods and technologies, feels this process has been consistently successful, has kept costs low, and has no discernible ill effects on the tape.
5. NAMID (National Moving Image Database), a project of the National Center for Film and Video Preservation, has undertaken, to some degree, the integration of video records into its catalog of moving images created as a USMARC-compatible database.
USMARC is the “machine-readable” format with specific field categories and codes that all libraries use. Like the Dewey decimal system, it means that entries and term definitions are standardized across the entire system. There are some problems, however, in integrating video into a descriptive system more suited to film, as well as the lack of education among a wider population about the history and value of video. There is also the complex issue of introducing a highly rigorous cataloging system to non-profit organizations that have traditionally operated on a much different logic.

6. There is no agreement in the preservation field as to the correct temperature and humidity standards to follow. The Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers (SMPTE) does publish recommended practices, and the American National Standards Institute/Audio Engineers Society (ANSI/AES) is expected to issue a report later this year.

7. Not only do tapes need to be saved, the machines that play them need to be saved too. Ralph Hocking has started a repository of older machines, both manufactured and hand-built tools, at the Experimental Television Center in Owego, NY.

8. Jim Lindner has written a piece, cited above, to aid in the setting of preservation priorities. While this article does explain technical considerations, his model does not apply to media arts institutions that have mostly one-of-a-kind tapes in their collection and not enough money to preserve more than a handful.

9. In meetings prior to the Library of Congress hearings, there was discussion about requiring facilities to have climate-controlled storage before being considered an archive. The upshot of such a requirement is that real estate becomes the focus, not collections of videotape.
This section details the major resources available on the Internet to students and scholars researching the first decade of independent video. Partly based on a survey conducted by Margaret Cooper in 1995 for the original version of REWIND, it includes links to collections of early video art, print materials and resources, organizations that preserve video art, early video art collectives, community television stations, relevant educational resources, and other ephemera.

**Collections**

- **Alliance for Community Media**

- **Anthology Film Archives**

- **Appalshop**

- **Artist's Television Network Collection**
  Department of Special Collections
  University of Iowa Libraries
  [http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/spec-coll/ltfs/ftn.htm](http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/spec-coll/ltfs/ftn.htm)

- **Bay Area Video Coalition**

- **British Artists' Film and Video Study Collection**
  [http://www.studycollection.co.uk/](http://www.studycollection.co.uk/)

- **Broadside Television**
  c/o Archives of Appalachia
  East Tennessee State University

- **Centro de Estudios Puertorriquenos**
  Hunter College
  [http://www.centropr.org](http://www.centropr.org)

- **Shirley Clarke Collection**
  c/o Wisconsin Center for Film and Theater Research
  [http://www.wcftr.commarts.wisc.edu](http://www.wcftr.commarts.wisc.edu)

- **de Saisset Museum**
  Santa Clara University
  [http://www.scu.edu/deSaisset/](http://www.scu.edu/deSaisset/)
Donnell Media Center
New York Public Library
http://www.nypl.org/branch/collections/dmc.html

Downtown Community Television Center
http://www.dctvny.org/

Electronic Arts Intermix
http://www.eai.org

Everson Museum Video Collection
Syracuse University
http://www.everson.org

Experimental Television Center
http://www.experimentaltvcenter.org/history/index.html

Hallwalls Contemporary Arts Center
http://www.hallwalls.org/

Intermedia Arts Minnesota
http://www.intermediaarts.org

The Kitchen Center for Video, Music and Dance
http://www.thekitchen.org/

Long Beach Museum of Art, Video Annex
(Now housed at The Getty)
http://www.getty.edu/news/press/center/long_beach_video_art.html

Media Alliance
c/o WNET/Thirteen
http://www.media-alliance.org/

Media Burn
http://www.mediaburn.org

The Museum of Broadcast Communication

The Museum of Modern Art
Department of Media
http://www.moma.org/

National Endowment for the Arts
Media Arts Program
http://www.nea.gov

New Orleans Video Access Center
http://www.novacvideo.org

New York State Council on the Arts
http://www.nysca.org

911 Media Arts Center
http://www.911media.org/

Pacific Film Archive
http://www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/

Port Washington Public Library
http://www.pwpl.org/

Raindance Foundation, Inc.
http://www.radicalsoftware.org/e/history.html

Southwest Alternate Media Project (SWAMP)
http://www.swamp.org/

Steina and Woody Vasulka (personal)
http://www.vasulka.org

Video Art: the Early Years
http://ukvideoart.tripod.com/

Video Data Bank
http://www.vdb.org/

Video Free America
http://www.videofreeamerica.com/

Video of Freeex
http://www.vdb.org/smackn.acgi$tapedetail?VIDEOFR
EEX

Visual Studies Workshop
http://www.vsw.org/

Walker Art Center
http://www.walkerart.org

WGBH - Educational Foundation
Media Archives and Preservation Center
http://openvault.wgbh.org/

Woodstock Community Video
c/o Woodstock Public Library
http://www.woodstock.org/

Video Preservation Sites

American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works
http://aic.stanford.edu/

American Library Association
http://www.ala.org/

Archiving the Avant-Garde
http://www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/about/avantgarde

Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA)
http://www.amianet.org

Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC)
http://www.arsc-audio.org

Bay Area Video Coalition (BAVC)
http://www.bavc.org

Conservation OnLine (CoOL)
http://palimpsest.stanford.edu/bytopic/video/
Council on Library and Information Services (CLIR)  
http://www.clir.org/

CRUMB: Curatorial Resource for Upstart Media Bliss  
http://www.crumble.org

The Daniel Langlois Foundation for Art, Science and Technology  
http://www.fondation-langlois.org/

Danish Video Art Data Bank  
http://www.videoart-denmark.dk

Dead Media Project  
http://student.vfs.com/~deadmedia/frame.html

Digital Preservation Coalition (DPC)  
http://www.dpconline.org

The Early Video Project  
http://davidsontsfiles.org/

Electronic Arts Intermix  
http://www.eai.org

Electronic Resource Preservation and Access Network (ERPANET)  
http://www.erpnet.org

Experimental Television Center - Video History Project  
http://www.experimentaltvcenter.org/history/index.html

FIAT/IFTA – The International Federation of Television Archives  
http://www.fiatifta.org/

Independent Media Arts Preservation  
http://www.imappreserve.org/

Institute of Museum and Library Services  
http://www.imls.gov/

The International Association for Media and History (Iamhist)  
http://www.iamhist.org/

The International Network for the Conservation of Contemporary Art (INCCA)  
http://incca.org

ISEA: Inter-Society for the Electronic Arts  
http://www.isea-web.org

LabGuy’s World  
http://www.labguysworld.com

Library of Congress  
http://www.loc.gov/

Media Matters: Collaborating Towards the Care of Time-based Media Works of Art  
http://www.tate.org.uk/research/tateresearch/majorprojects/benchmarking.htm

Moving Image Collections  
http://mic.loc.gov/

National Film Preservation Board of the Library of Congress  
http://lcweb.loc.gov/film/

National Film Preservation Foundation  
http://www.filmpreservation.org/

National Media Lab  
http://www.nml.org/

Netherlands Media Art Institute: Montevideo/Time Based Arts  
http://www.montevideo.nl/en

Pacific Film Archive  
http://www.bampfa.berkeley.edu/

Radical Software  
http://www.radicalsoftware.org/e/

Rhizome.org: Artbase  
http://rhizome.org/artbase/report.htm

ScreenSite: Film/TV/Video College Programs  
http://www.screensite.org/

Society of American Archivists (SAA)  
http://www.archivists.org

SPECS BROS.  
http://www.specsbros.com/

Texas Commission on the Arts Videotape Identification and Assessment Guide  
http://www.arts.state.tx.us/video/

Training for Audiovisual Preservation in Europe (TAPE)  
http://www.tape-online.net/

UCLA Film and Television Archive  
http://www.cinema.ucla.edu/

V2_ : Institute for Unstable Media  
http://capturing.projects.v2.nl/

Variable Media Network  
http://www.variablmedianet.net/

Video Data Bank  
http://www.vdb.org

VidiPax  
http://www.vidipax.com/
Video Preservation Education Programs

Charles Sturt University, Australia – Audiovisual Archiving

George Eastman House - The L. Jeffrey Selznick School of Film Preservation
http://selznickschool.eastmanhouse.org/

New York University – Moving Image Archiving & Preservation (MIAP)
http://cinema.tisch.nyu.edu/page/miap.html

University of Amsterdam, Netherlands – Preservation and Presentation of the Moving Image
http://www.studeren.uva.nl/ma_preservation_presentation_moving_image/

UCLA – Moving Image Archive Studies (MIAS)
http://www.mias.ucla.edu/

University of East Anglia, England – Film Studies with Archiving
http://www.uea.ac.uk/eafa/
This section provides brief portraits of the individuals and collectives included in the Survey collection of videos, highlights of their activity and affiliations between 1965 and 1980. Primary sources include biographical material provided directly by the artists as well as publications from the period such as Radical Software and Afterimage. The distribution catalogs of Video Data Bank and Electronic Arts Intermix also served as invaluable resources. To read up to date artist biographies, please visit the “Artist Index” at www.vdb.org.

Vito Acconci
Born in the Bronx in 1941, Vito Acconci received a BA from Holy Cross College and an MFA from the University of Iowa. A poet of the New York School in the early and mid '60s, Acconci moved toward performance, sound, and video work at the end of the decade in order to “define my body in space, find a ground for myself, an alternate ground for the page ground I had as a poet.” Acconci’s early performances/situations, including Claim (1971) and Seedbed (1972) were extremely controversial, transgressing assumed boundaries between public and private space and between audience and performer. Positioning his own body as the simultaneous subject and object of the work, Acconci’s early videos took advantage of the medium’s self-reflexive potential in mediating his own and the viewer’s attention. Consistently exploring the dynamics of intimacy, trust, and power, the focus of Acconci’s projects gradually moved from his physical body (Conversions, 1971) toward the psychology of interpersonal transactions (Pryings, 1971), and later, to the cultural and political implications of the performative space he set up for the camera (Red Tapes, 1976). Since the late '70s, Acconci has designed architectural and installation works for public spaces.

Nancy Angelo and Candace Compton
Working in video and performance from 1976-80, Nancy Angelo was a member of Sisters of Survival, a performance group that “used the nun image symbolically,” and a member, along with Vanalyne Green, Cheri Caulke and Laurel Klick, of Feminist Art Workers. Angelo and Compton were both actively involved with the Los Angeles Women’s Building, an outgrowth of the Feminist Studio Workshop (FSW). Established in 1972 as a college and graduate-level school for women in the arts, FSW had a core faculty of Sheila de Bretteville, Arlene Raven, Deena Metzger, Suzanne Lacy, Helen Roth, and Ruth Iskin. The Woman’s Building was founded a year later by Judy Chicago, Sheila de Bretteville, and Arlene Raven who published Chrysalis, a magazine of women’s culture. Both organizations were unique in their aim of reinventing the institution according to feminist principles. Angelo directed the educational programs at the Women’s Building and, along with Annette Hunt and Jerri Allyn, she and Compton co-founded the Los Angeles Women’s Video Center (LAWVC). Angelo and Compton’s Nun and Deviant (1976), reflects many of the theoretical concerns and activities gener-
ated within these pioneering institutions. The videotape and print archives of the LAWVC are currently housed at the Long Beach Museum of Art.

Ant Farm

A San Francisco-based collective of artists and architects working from 1968 to 1978, Ant Farm's activity was distinctly interdisciplinary, combining architecture, performance, media, happenings, sculpture, and graphic design. With works that functioned as art, social critique, and pop-anthropology, Ant Farm tore into the cultural fabric of post-World War II, Vietnam-era America and became one of the first groups to address television's pervasive presence in everyday life. As Chip Lord, who co-founded the group with Doug Michels, states, “Video became Ant Farm’s equivalent to the architectural model, to record the group’s live-in design process (The Warehouse Tapes, 1971); to explore the multi-barreled impact of electronics on auto-America (Cadillac Ranch, 1974 and Media Burn, 1975); and to exploit the structure of pure electronic culture (The Eternal Frame, 1975, and Off-Air Australia, 1976).” As graphic artists, Ant Farm contributed to numerous underground publications including Radical Software and designed Michael Shamberg’s Guerrilla Television (Hold, Rinehart, Winston, 1971). Ant Farm members included Chip Lord, Doug Michels, Hudson Marquez, and Curtis Schreier.

John Baldessari

Born in 1931, John Baldessari studied art, literature, and art history at San Diego State College and the University of California, Berkeley. Influenced by dadaist and surrealist literary and visual ideas, he began incorporating found materials (billboard posters, photographs, film stills, snippets of conversation) into his canvases, playing off of chance relationships among otherwise discreet elements. Baldessari explained, “Everybody knows a different world, and only part of it. We communicate only by chance, as nobody knows the whole, only where overlapping takes place.” Allowing pop-cultural artifacts to function as “information” as opposed to “form,” Baldessari’s works represented a radical departure from, and often a direct critique of, the modernist sensibility which had dominated painting for decades. In 1968, Baldessari met poet and critic David Antin, who helped launch Baldessari’s career, introducing him to a like-minded group of emerging conceptual artists including Lawrence Weiner, Joseph Kosuth, Dan Graham, and On Kawara, all of whom would have a great influence on the development of Baldessari’s work. Baldessari’s videotapes, like his phototext canvases, employ strategies of disjunction (Some Words I Mispronounce, 1971), recontextualization (Baldessari Sings LeWitt, 1972), and allegory (The Way We Do Art Now and Other Sacred Tales, 1973) pointing to the gap between perception and cognition.

Lynda Benglis

Born in 1941 in Lake Charles, Louisiana, Lynda Benglis studied sculpture and painting at Newcomb College and the Brooklyn Museum School. Well known for her sculptures, Benglis was one of a handful of artists associated with the emergence of an anti-formalist, Post-Minimalist sensibility in the mid-’60s. Influenced by the work of Jackson Pollack, Barnett Newman and Franz Kline among others, Benglis experimented with a wide range of materials (poured polyurethane, latex, wax, glass, metal neon) in works that, in form and scale, referenced the human body and allowed formal and expressionistic concerns to coexist. In a series of advertisements designed for Artforum in 1973-1974, Benglis found an outlet for her investigations of power, desire, and gendered identity, themes implicitly tied to her anthropomorphic and environmental installations. She began using video in 1970 while teaching at the University of Rochester, New York. “I saw [video] as a big macho game; a big, heroic, Abstract Expressionist, Macho, sexist game. How big?” Benglis’ highly stylized videos continue her exploration of sexual roles and the social formation of identity (Female Sensibility, 1973) while exploiting the intrinsic form and texture of the medium (Mumble, 1972). The Amazing Bow-Wow (1976), a narrative re-working of the Oedipus myth, was produced in collaboration with Stanton Kaye during Benglis’ residency at Artpark, Lewiston, New York.

Dara Birnbaum

An architect and urban planner by training, Dara Birnbaum studied at the Carnegie Institute of Technology and the San Francisco Art Institute. She began using video in 1978 while teaching at the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design in Halifax, Nova Scotia, where she worked with Dan Graham. Recognized as one of the first video artists to employ the appropriation of television images as a subversive strategy, Birnbaum describes her early videos as “attempts at slowing down ‘technological speed’ in order to
arrest movements of TV-time for the viewer. For it is the speed at which issues are absorbed and consumed through the medium of video/television, without examination and self-questioning, that remains astonishing.” Recontextualizing pop cultural icons (Technology/Transformation: Wonder Woman, 1978-79) and TV genres (Kiss the Girls: Make them Cry, 1979) to reveal their subtexts, Birnbaum described her videos as new “ready-mades” for the late twentieth century, works that “manipulate a medium which is itself highly manipulative.”

Peer Bode
Educated and working in film until the early ’70s, Peer Bode was first exposed to electronics technology by his father, Harold Bode, a pioneer in developing the first modular audio synthesizer. Bode’s interest in exploring the intrinsic properties of the film medium informed his subsequent work in video. He worked for the Experimental Television Center as Program Coordinator, collaborating with resident artist/engineers in constructing prototype imaging tools, reinforcing his commitment to “tool expansion” and “personal studio making.” As Bode explains, “Clearly there was something about constructing the personal, independent side [of video] that, in fact, the industry models would never agree to construct. It’s a challenge to that commercial system, and the people who challenge the system mostly won’t be represented within that system. That’s what it means to be outside.”

Recognizing the limits imposed by designers of industrial and consumer technology, Bode sought to externalize the “hidden coding and control structures” of the video signal, experimenting with different combinations of tools and processes. His videos investigate the semiotics and phenomenology of the medium, specifically through the synthesis of audio and video signals (Ring Modulation, 1978, Music on Triggering Surfaces, 1978).

Broadside TV
Active from 1973 to 1978, Broadside Television was a unique experiment in community-based, local-origination cable production. Broadside TV was founded by Ted Carpenter, a VISTA volunteer who spent years working on community-based education projects in Appalachia. His approach to video was influenced by the Highlander Center in Kentucky, Canada’s Challenge for Change, and its U.S. spin-off, the Alternate Media Center in New York City: “I almost never tape any situation unless the people involved first learn about the machinery, fool with it themselves, and then listen to a tape by someone else in the mountains who shares their experience. The techniques are not media-oriented, but oriented to education and conversation.” Carpenter borrowed the community newspaper for his cable programming model, drawing on a flexible editorial policy that allowed a broad range of subjects and often contradictory viewpoints to coexist—sports (high school basketball), culture (mountain music, storytelling) religion (Baptist church services), and politics (strip-mining reform). Located in Johnson City, Tennessee, Broadside distributed programming via four regional cable TV systems and also circulated videos to public schools, universities and individuals. Once federal requirements for local cable programming were abandoned in 1975, Broadside TV lost its financial base. Although grants allowed it to struggle for a few more years, Broadside TV finally went bankrupt. A selection of Broadside titles and written records were deposited with the Archives of Appalachia at Eastern Tennessee State University.

Barbara Buckner
Born in 1950, Barbara Buckner attended New York University and began working with video and computers in 1972 while studying with engineer and electronic tool designer Bill Etra. In 1976, Buckner moved to Rhinebeck, New York, where she and fellow media artists Gary Hill, David Jones, and Stephen Kolpan lived collectively under the auspices of Woodstock Community Video, an early media access center founded by Ken Marsh. Buckner became an artist-in-residence at the Experimental Television Center where she experimented with a complex array of electronic imaging tools and systems. Buckner’s predominantly silent, non-narrative videos and installations sought to unleash the transformative properties of the electronic signal. “In my work I have been concerned with the spiritual consciousness of the individual and how one views one’s position in Eternity. In this work, I—as soul—an immortal and eternal physical essence, view some aspects of the physical life as a finite yet ever-changing phenomenon in space/time.”

Peter Bull and Alex Gibney
Peter Bull and Alex Gibney were both born in New York City in 1953. While studying at the University of California at San Diego, they produced experimental films and worked as assistant
producers in commercial television before collaborating on *The Ruling Classroom* (1979). Using video because of its low-cost and capacity to record in real time, they spent a semester documenting an experiment conducted in a Mill Valley seventh grade classroom in which students invented and enacted the political, social, and economic aspects of an imaginary country. The video was aired nationally on PBS and stirred up local controversy when the school’s principal called off the experiment when the video team uncovered a story about a teacher slapping a student. He then tried to prevent its further release.

Peter Campus
Born in 1937, Peter Campus studied experimental psychology at Ohio State College and film at the City College of New York. His early titles explore the anatomy of the video signal in relation to human psychology and perception. “The video camera makes possible an exterior point of view simultaneous with one’s own. This advance over the film camera is due to the vidicon tube, similar to the retina of the eye, continually transposing light (photon) energy into electrical energy...it is easy to utilize video to clarify perceptual situations because it separates the eye-surrogate from the eye-brain experience we are all too familiar with.” Campus was one of a group of artists in the mid-‘70s who produced work through the experimental TV labs at WGBH in Boston and WNET in New York. In addition to numerous single channel works, he has investigated the characteristics of “live” video through closed-circuit video installations and elaborate sculptural works whose structural components included video cameras, projectors, and monitors.

Candace Compton (See Nancy Angelo and Candace Compton)

Tony Conrad
With a background in mathematics and computer programming, Tony Conrad became active in performance and music composition during the ‘60s and was associated with the founding of both minimal music and underground film in New York City. Along with Marian Zeezela, LaMonte Young, John Cale, and Angus MacLise, Conrad was a co-founder of the Theater of Eternal Music, which utilized non-western musical forms and sustained sound to produce what they called “dream music.” Conrad’s work in film ranged from experiments in physically transforming the film’s surface, to theatrical productions featuring New York’s underground scene. *The Flicker* (1966) is considered a key early work of the structural film movement. Conrad began working in video and performance in the ‘70s while teaching at Antioch College in Ohio and the Center for Media Study, State University of New York at Buffalo. Conrad observed that his early videos “deal with the construction of the viewer, in the authorizing context of the art environment or within a broader sociopolitical context.” Conrad’s commitment to developing and sustaining a decentralized cultural infrastructure is evident in his active involvement with Hallwalls Contemporary Arts Center, Squeaky Wheel Media Coalition, and Buffalo Cable Access Media.

David Cort
With a background in theater, David Cort began using video in the late ‘60s to document political events and “bring together divergent peoples.” Attracted to the intimacy of the portable medium and its interactive potential, Cort’s individual work ranged from documentary and video theater to interactive video games, installations and live video environments. Cort was a founding member of Commediation, an early activist video group, and Videofreex, a pioneering collective of video activists and technicians formed in 1969 to explore alternative communications processes. Reflecting on the impetus behind these groups, Cort wrote, “I think a lot of people are in video because they have no choice - it’s so overwhelmingly around you. It’s almost like a responsibility you have to take, that you have to work with because it’s all pervasive.”

Cara DeVito
Born in 1951, Cara DeVito received a BA from Beloit College in Wisconsin. She began producing videos in 1972 and went on to work on the independent documentary series “Changing Channels,” produced by University Community Video for KTCA/Minnieapolis. Her documentary work, focusing primarily on social and cultural issues, received a number of awards including an Emmy. She is best known for her pioneering feminist portrait of her grandmother. *Ama L’uomo Tuo (Always Love Your Man)* (1975), was produced at a time when the incidence of rape and woman battering was first being publicized.
Juan Downey
Born in Santiago, Chile, Juan Downey studied architecture at the Catholic University, then continued his studies in Paris at S.W. Hayter’s Atelier 17 and at Pratt University in New York City. Downey was already experimenting with audio delays and instant playback when he heard about video in 1966. He began his early work in the medium by creating electronic environments and multi-channel installations. Beginning in 1971, Downey took a portable 1/2 inch camera and embarked on what he termed “cultural expeditions” through Mexico and Central and South America: “After exposure to the New York art world, I decided to return South and recuperate my culture.” The resulting “Video Trans America” series, which he developed in single and multi-channel formats, combines autobiography and anthropology, cross-referencing western and non-western cultural practices and artifacts. Later works (Las Meninas, 1975, The Looking Glass, 1981) were meditations on the architecture and psychology of pictorial space.

Downtown Community Television Center
Founded in 1972 by Jon Alpert, Keiko Tsuno, and Yoko Maruyama in New York’s Chinatown, Downtown Community Television Center (DCTV) is one of the oldest continuing community video access centers offering video training, equipment access, and social-issue programming for community members and independent producers. In 1974, DCTV made history as the first American television crew to be invited to Cuba since the 1959 revolution. Cuba: The People (1974) was the first half-inch color video documentary broadcast on public television. As part of the first team of American journalists allowed into Vietnam after the U.S. withdrawal, DCTV continued to break new ground with Vietnam: Picking Up the Pieces (1978). Employing a direct interview approach and a signature up-close reporting style focused on the voices of ordinary people, DCTV has produced an extensive body of work that consistently addresses inequality and injustice in American society. DCTV’s success in broadcasting its work was critical in opening television to other independent documentarians.

Electric Eye (See Video Free America)

Ed Emshwiller
Born in 1925, Ed Emshwiller studied graphic design at the University of Michigan and L’Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris. By the late ’60s Emshwiller was working as a science fiction illustrator and had established his place in the American avant-garde cinema with such works as Relativity (1966) and Image, Flesh and Voice (1969). His early films featured collaborations with dancers and choreographers, a theme he carried over into his video works. As both an artist and a teacher, Emshwiller’s pioneering efforts to develop an alternative technological language in video were enormously influential. His early experiments with synthesizers and computers included the electronic rendering of three-dimensional space, the interplay of illusion and reality, and manipulations of time, movement, and scale—exploring the relationship between “external reality and subjective feelings.” Emshwiller was among the first artists-in-residence program offered by the TV Lab at WNET where he produced the groundbreaking Scape-mates (1972). Sunstone (1979) was made over a period of eight months at the New York Institute of Technology. Emshwiller passed away in 1990. An extensive collection of his work is housed by Anthology Film Archives.

Experimental Television Center (ETC)
The Experimental Television Center (ETC) was an outgrowth of the Student Experiments in Television (SET) program established in 1969 by Ralph Hocking at the State University of New York at Binghamton. As the demand for community access increased, the Center formally organized as a not-for-profit organization and moved to a loft space in downtown Binghamton. ETC’s programs addressed potential uses of new technology by artists, social, cultural and educational organizations, and interested citizens. Workshops and equipment access were offered at no charge and videos produced at the Center were screened throughout the region as well as on the Center’s weekly community cable show, “Access.” Hocking initiated a research program to develop a more flexible set of imaging tools for artists. An early project resulted in the construction of the second Paik/Abe video synthesizer for the Television Lab at WNET. In 1972, the Center began a residency program inviting artists such as Paik, Shikogo Kubota, poet Jackson MacLow, and glass artist/video activist Rudi Stern to explore the Center’s tools. Engineer David Jones expanded the Center’s image processing system in 1974 with the first Jones
Colorizer and, in 1975, a set of keyers, a multi-input synchable sequencer, and a bank of oscillators. A computer-based digital imaging system, designed by Jones, Walter Wright, and Don MacArthur in collaboration with Steina and Woody Vasulka and Jeffrey Schier, was also introduced in 1975, laying the groundwork for subsequent innovations in artist-oriented software and tools, including Jones’ frame buffer with two-dimensional print software. Over the years, the Center’s residency program gained international recognition through the works of visiting artists, among them Peter D’Agostino, Peer Bode, Shalom Gorewitz, Barbara Hammer, Ken Jacobs, and Gary Hill. In 1978 the Center relocated to Owego, New York, where it continues to operate today.

Richard Foreman
Born in 1937, Richard Foreman studied at Brown University and Yale University before founding the Ontological-Hysteric Theater in 1968. Since that time he has written, directed, and designed over 20 major productions including Rhoda in Potatoland and Vertical Mobility. Foreman’s productions are characterized by complex interplays between spoken language and visual tableaux. His videotapes represent the crossover between video and theatrical traditions, and were accomplished during a period when video dance and video theater emerged as more than mere documentation of performance. Artists like Foreman conceptually reinvented theater as a video experience, exploring the properties of the new medium. Employing disruptive devices that puncture theatrical illusions and audience assumptions, Foreman’s works are distinctive in their rigorously controlled compositions, complex linguistic structures, and intricate collusions of language and image, and as such are considered mainstays of the American avant-garde. Foreman’s plays and essays have been collected in the publications, Richard Foreman Plays and Manifestos (1976) and Reverberation Machines, The Later Plays and Essays (1985).

Terry Fox
Born in 1943, Terry Fox studied at the Cornish School of Allied Arts in Seattle, and at the Academia Di Belli Arti in Italy before moving to the Bay Area in the late ‘60s. A central participant in the West Coast performance art, video, and conceptual art movements of the late ‘60s and early ‘70s, Fox became well-known for his political, site-specific performances which explored ritual and symbolic content in the objects, places, and natural phenomena of everyday life. Fox made his first videotapes in 1969-70 as documentation of performances taped by George Bolling, then curator at the de Saisset Art Gallery and Museum at Santa Clara University, California. Describing Children’s Tapes (1974), one of his first efforts to set up situations specifically for a video camera, Fox states: “The medium of video was chosen largely because the subjects were too intimate for performance and because of the special appearance and attention-holding power of TV for children.”

Hermine Freed
Born in 1940, Hermine Freed studied painting at Cornell University and New York University. During the late ‘60s she taught at NYU, working as program editor for an NYU-sponsored series on art books for WNYC. Assisted by colleague Andy Mann, she began using video to produce a series of contemporary artist portraits, beginning with painter James Rosenquist. Although the program did not meet WNYC’s broadcast standards, Freed continued to produce the series, showing the videos to her students and in other venues. In 1972 she was invited to participate in the groundbreaking exhibition, “Circuit: A Video Invitational” by Everson Museum curator David Ross whose encouragement led her to explore other aspects of the medium and produce a new body of work. Freed continued to produce both documentaries and art works exploring female perception and self-image. Art Herstory (1974) was made while she was an artist-in-residence at the Television Lab at WNET. Freed taught at the School of Visual Arts in New York after 1972. She passed away in 1998.

Arthur Ginsberg (See Video Free America)

Global Village
Founded by John Reilly and Rudy Stern in New York City in 1969, Global Village was one of the first video groups in the United States. Banking on the revolutionary potential of instant playback of controversial current events via video, Global Village presented regular screenings on Woodstock, the RFK assassination, Nixon’s Vietnamization speech, Black Panther Party speeches, and anti-war demonstrations, among other events. Reilly wrote in Radical Software in 1970: “We orchestrate these
images from performance to performance to give a sense of the ongoing violence, waste, pollution, and emotion of this society. We hoped to move to a point where Global Village is open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to offer people a continuous video immediacy of news and kinetics. In addition to these “reports”, Global Village produced documentaries and installations, including The Irish Tapes by John Reilly and Stefan Moore (1975). As a media center, Global Village organized workshops, seminars, and an annual documentary video festival (1974-1989; renamed The Documentary Festival of New York in 1990 and now defunct). Early workshop participants produced a number of powerful single-channel works, including Transsexuals (1970) and Lifestyles: A Study in Feedback (1970). During the ’70s and much of the ’80s, Global Village offered video production courses through the New School for Social Research and became a well-known center for documentary productions for public television; Julie Gustafson and John Reilly collaborated on a number of notable videos, including Home (1979).

Dan Graham
Dan Graham was born in 1942 in Urbana, Illinois. In 1964 he became the manager of the John Daniels Gallery in New York, where he exhibited the work of then emerging artists Sol LeWitt, Donald Judd, Robert Smithson, Dan Flavin, and Carl Andre. His own work at the time included critical writing about art, architecture, and the television culture, performances exploring self-awareness, architectural space, and group behavior, and conceptual works designed for popular and art magazines. Graham’s investigation into the ideology behind, and relationship between, mass forms of architecture and media continued through the ’70s when he began working in film and video. Incorporating mirrors, windows, surveillance cameras, and video projectors, Graham’s installations addressed the social function of architecture and television in mediating public and private life. His single-channel works include documentation of performances and later, documentary essays exploring, among other things, suburbia and punk music. Graham has published numerous critical and theoretical essays including Video-Architecture-Televisions (1980) and Rock My Religion (1993).

Ernest Gusella
Born in Calgary in Alberta, Canada in 1941, Ernest Gusella studied classical music as a child and received a BA and MFA in painting from the San Francisco Art Institute. Gusella was introduced to the video movement after moving to New York City in 1969. There he became friends with Woody and Steina Vasulka, founders of The Kitchen, and Nam June Paik, the “grandfather of video art.” Between 1971 and 1974 he produced a series of abstract videotapes generated by the signal from an audio synthesizer. In 1974 he began a series of dadaist rituals in front of the camera that utilized electronic manipulation of sound and image. In addition to producing his own videos, Gusella worked throughout the decade as a cameraman and audio and special effects technician for video artists and musicians such as Sara Hornbacher, Doris Chase, Shegeko Kubota, Nam June Paik, Count Basie, and Benny Powell.

Julie Gustafson
Born in 1949, Julie Gustafson studied at Brandeis University before she began producing video documentaries on women’s issues in the early ’70s. She was co-director with husband John Reilly of Global Village, a major center for video documentary at the time and a founder of the Global Village Documentary Video Festival, which she renamed The Documentary Festival of New York in 1990 (now defunct). Gustafson collaborated with Reilly on a number of award-winning video documentaries for public television, works that scrutinized American society and offered trenchant analysis of political and social issues, such as Giving Birth (1976) and The Pursuit of Happiness (1983). Gustafson’s first video, The Politics of Intimacy (1972), was a feminist landmark because of its frank discussion on women’s sexuality. Her later work combined a sensitive vérité camera style with a polished literary narrative structure.

Gary Hill
Born in Santa Monica, California in 1951, Gary Hill was a surfer who became interested in sculpture in high school. He studied sculpture and painting in Woodstock, New York, and in 1973 he borrowed a video Portapak from Woodstock Community Video (WCV). From 1974 to 1976 he was TV lab coordinator at WCV, producing work that “arose out of a dialogue with the properties of the medium.” From 1975 to 1977, Hill was an artist-in-residence at the Experimental Television Center in Owego, New York, where he made use of various tools, including the
Rutt/Etra Scan Processor and David Jones’ colorizer which Hill helped build. In 1976 Hill met poet George Quasha who, along with Charles Stein, inspired Hill’s first experiments with language. Hill’s early works investigated synthesized imagery, ecological subjects, post-minimal political statements (*Hole in the Wall*, 1974); works exploring the intertextuality of image, sound, speech, and language emerged in the late ‘70s and early ‘80s, such as *Soundings* (1979) and *Around and About* (1980). Hill has gained an international reputation for his video art titles and installations.

**Nancy Holt**

Nancy Holt studied at Jackson University and Tufts University in Massachusetts. In the mid-’60s, Holt helped introduce a post-minimalist sensibility in the field of sculpture. She used video for the first time in 1969 “when Peter Campus rented a video camera and came over. There was a tremendous sense of discovery because it was so accessible and so Bob (Smithson) and I immediately did a work of art. We invited a large group of people over to our loft that night, including Richard Serra, Michael Heizer, Nancy Graves, and Keith Sonnier to see it. It was very unusual [to] discover a medium, make a work of art and show it in the same day. That broke the ice and gave me a sense of what it was about - what were film ideas and what were video ideas.” Holt’s early work, like her site-specific sculptures, explore the recorded experience of a particular time and place and the function of memory in perception. Holt’s titles twist the technical limits of video, calling attention to the medium’s artificial nature and maintaining a critical distance between public presentation and private reality.

**Joan Jonas**

Joan Jonas studied sculpture and art history at Columbia University and Mount Holyoke College, and dance with Tricia Brown at the Boston Museum school. Widely know for her work in performance in the mid ‘60s, Jonas first incorporated a live video camera and monitor into a 1972 performance, *Organic Honey’s Visual Telepathy*. In the same year, she began producing single channel videos, among them *Vertical Roll* (1972), which are recognized as landmark investigations into the structural and performative nature of the medium. “Space was always a primary concern, and in considering the space of the monitor I then dealt with the box-like structure, positioning it in relation to myself. I tried to climb into the box, attempting to turn the illusion of flatness into one of depth.” Jonas’ titles draw on the essential connection between performance art and the video monitor, as time-based media especially suited to materializing the artist’s psyche. Exploring the dislocation of physical space and mythical female archetypes, Jonas’ work occupies an important position in the development of both early formalist and early feminist video.

**Paul and Marlene Kos**

Paul Kos began using video while teaching at the University of Santa Clara introduced to the medium by George Bolling, curator of the de Saisset Art Gallery and Museum, which owned the only Portapak in town. In collaboration with wife Marlene, Kos produced numerous videotapes throughout the ‘70s that explored the hypnotic and illusory aspects of the televised image. Their installation works treated the video monitor as an essentially sculptural element with its own inherent structural language. In several cases, the monitor was made to function as a window offering a view of events occurring simultaneously in another location. They likewise reassessed the role of the audience, actively structuring viewers into the performance of the work (*St. Elmo’s Fire*, 1977).

**Shigeko Kubota**

Shigeko Kubota was born in Niigata, Japan in 1937. After receiving a bachelor’s degree in sculpture from Tokyo University, Kubota moved to the United States where she studied at New York University and the New School for Social Research in the mid ‘60’s. Kubota encountered video through her involvement with the New York-based Fluxus Movement, which included Nam June Paik, Allison Knowles, Allan Kaprow, and George Maciunas. In 1972 she produced the first of her video diaries (*Europe on 1/2 Inch a Day*), while also exploring the image processing equipment at WNET’s TV Lab (*Video Girls and Video Songs for Navajo Skies*, 1973). “I want to create a fusion of art and life, Asia and America, Duchampiana and Levi-Straussian savagism, cool form and hot video, dealing with all of those complex problems, spanning the tribal memory of the nomadic Asians who crossed over the Bering Strait over 10,000 years ago. Then, I came, flying in a Boeing 707, on July 4th in 1964, drawn to the glittering Pop Art world of New York.” The fusion of spontaneous autobiog-
raphy and electronic processing characterized her subsequent work, which ranged in focus from everyday events to meditations on the work of Marcel Duchamp. Kubota helped coordinate the first annual Women’s Video Festival at the Kitchen in 1972, which featured work by Susan Milano, Charlotte Moorman, Jackie Cassen and Steina Vasulka, among others.

Lanesville TV (See Videofreex)

Media Bus Inc. (See Videofreex)

Linda Montano
Originally trained as a sculptor, Linda Montano began using video in the ‘70s. Attempting to obliterate the distinction between art and life, Montano’s artwork is starkly autobiographical and often concerned with personal and spiritual discipline. She spent two years in a convent and studied Yoga and Zen for many years. In 1983 Montano and artist Hsieh were literally tied together for one year in a living performance. Her avowed interest lies in “learning how to live through lifelike art works,” with personal growth evolving out of shared experience, role adoption and ritual. Exploring a wide range of subjects, from personal transformation and altered consciousness (Primal Scenes, 1980) to hypnosis and eating disorders (Anorexia Nervosa, 1980), Montano’s work from the ‘70s and early ‘80s was critical in the development of video by, for, and about women. Her early work includes Mitchell’s Death (1978), Handcuff with Tom Marioni (1975), and Characters Learning to Talk (1976-1978).

Robert Morris
Born in 1931 in Kansas City, Missouri, Robert Morris studied at the University of Kansas, Kansas City Art Institute, and Reed College. Well known in the early ‘60s for his minimalist sculptures, Morris marked the transition to a post-minimalist sensibility by reintroducing everyday processes into his sculptural works and producing critical texts which provided the movement with a theoretical foundation (“Notes on Sculpture” series, Artforum). In 1968, Morris organized “Nine at Castelli,” one of the first exhibitions of post-minimalist, anti-formalist art, which featured the work of Eva Hesse, Richard Serra, Keith Sonnier, and Bruce Nauman, among others. Involved in the E.A.T. (Experiments in Art and Technology) project, Morris worked briefly in film and video in the late ‘60s and early ‘70s, employing structural devices such as layering, framing, mirroring in an examination of the medium’s distinct features and its use as means of communication (Exchange, 1973).

Phil Morton
Born in 1945, Phil Morton received degrees in art education and fine arts from Pennsylvania State University and Purdue University. He began teaching at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago in 1969. Within a year he established the first video department in the country to offer both BA and MFA degrees in video production. In following years, Morton continued to expand the media resources and educational opportunities at the School of the Art Institute, establishing the Video Data Bank as a collection of videotaped presentations and interviews with artists in 1972. In collaboration with Dan Sandin, Morton distributed plans for the Image Processor (IP), a modular video synthesizer based on the Moog audio synthesizer. In 1974, he established “P-Pi’s” or the Pied Piper Interactioning System, a cable TV station in South Haven, Michigan. He was later editor of the West Yellowstone News. Morton passed away in 2003.

National Center for Experiments in Television
In 1967, broadcast TV station KQED, San Francisco established the first experimental video workshop under the visionary direction of Brice Howard and, later, Paul Kaufman. In addition to opening the workshop to artists working in a variety of disciplines, Howard targeted artists and technicians interested in television. A core group of producers emerged including Willard Rosenquist, Bill Gwin, Stephen Beck, Don Hallock, Bill Roarty and composers, Richard Feliciana and Warner Jepson. Roarty describes an average day at the workshop during this period: “Warner and I would be working on a complex sound composition and immediately to our left would be Stephen, designing a circuit and then on the other side of that would be Bill Gwin, looking for a tape and over there would be Willard, working on light form. You couldn’t help but be completely excited by the thoughts and perceptions of all the people working around you approaching things each in their own way.” In 1969 the workshop became the National Center for Experiments in Television (NCET). By removing the pressures of the broadcast situation, Howard created an atmosphere where experimentation could thrive. Network television personnel from
around the nation participated in the Center’s internship program where they were exposed to often shocking new approaches to the medium. By 1972, the Center had begun an outreach program, screening work in college and university art departments and encouraging them to develop their own video production programs. In 1973, following a highly productive period when Jepson and Beck toured the country performing with their audio and video synthesizers and Don Hallock presented his “Videola” at the San Francisco Art Museum, a change in leadership blunted NCET’s experimental edge. Although projects continued to incorporate many of the experimental strategies developed in preceding years, the Center’s overall focus turned toward the dissemination of social and political ideas through television. NCET came to an end in 1976.

Bruce Nauman
Born in 1941 in Fort Wayne, Indiana, Bruce Nauman studied mathematics and physics at the University of Wisconsin before receiving an MFA from the University of California at Davis in 1966. By the late ‘60s Nauman had earned a reputation as a conceptual pioneer in the field of sculpture and his works were included in the groundbreaking exhibitions, “Nine at Castelli” (1968) and “Anti-Illusion” (1969). He began working in film with Robert Nelson and William Allen while teaching at the San Francisco Art Institute. He produced his first videotapes in 1968, describing the transition from film to video, thus: “With the films I would work over an idea until there was something that I wanted to do, then I would rent the equipment for a day or two. So I was more likely to have a specific idea of what I wanted to do. With the videotapes, I had the equipment in the studio for almost a year; I could make test tapes and look at them, watch myself on the monitor or have somebody else there to help. Lots of times I would do a whole performance or tape a whole hour and then change it. I don’t think I would ever edit but I would redo the whole thing if I didn’t like it.” Using his body to explore the limits of everyday situations, Nauman explored video as a theatrical stage and a surveillance device within an installation context, his thinking influenced by the experimental work of Merce Cunningham, Meredith Monk, La Monte Young, Steve Reich, and Phillip Glass.

Optic Nerve
Optic Nerve began in 1970 as a still photography and filmstrip production group. Two years later, the San Francisco collective embraced portable video and produced Psychological Bullrider (1973), a documentary on rodeo cowboys, and Fifty Wonderful Years (1973), a behind-the-scenes look at the Miss California Beauty Pageant. These early works established Optic Nerve’s aesthetic: free-style narrative, little or no voice-over, and a strong commitment to personal contact. Founding members included Lynn Adler, Jules Backus, Mya Shore, Sherry Rabinowitz, Bill Bradbury, John Rogers, and Jim Mayer. Finding collectivity a challenging and exciting creative process, the group explored a range of production forms and strategies, such as working with community groups to produce organizing tapes, working with artists, and presenting video to the public. Optic Nerve stressed non-hierarchical production, skill diversity, and collective editing. The resulting videos vary in subject matter, from interviews with Anais Nin and Dennis Banks of the American Indian Movement (AIM) to documentation of local political struggles. In addition to producing their own work, Optic Nerve collaborated with members of Ant Farm and T.R. Uthco, two other Bay Area collectives, on Media Burn and The Eternal Frame in 1976. Like many other independent video groups, Optic Nerve began to focus on public television as an outlet. On the Boulevard (1979) and Pushed Out For Profit (1978, made in collaboration with KQED), were two projects designed specifically for broadcast. In the face of a worsening economy, Optic Nerve ceased to function as a producing group in 1979. Former members reconfigured to produce documentary video under the name Ideas in Motion.

Nam June Paik
Born in Korea in 1932, Nam June Paik studied music and art history at the University of Tokyo in Japan, writing a thesis on Arnold Schoenberg that earned him a degree in aesthetics. Paik’s studies continued in Germany at the universities of Munich and Cologne and at the Conservatory of Music in Freiburg. During this time (1958-63), Paik met avant-garde composer John Cage and worked with Karlheinz Stockhausen at the WDR Studio for Electronic Music in Cologne. After meeting Fluxus founder George Maciunas in 1961, he participated in numerous European Fluxus performances, actions, and events. Paik’s first one-man exhibition was the 1963 Exposition of Electronic
Music-Electronic Television at the Galerie Parnass Wuppertal in West Germany, which featured his series of “altered” TV sets. Paik came to New York in 1964 where he participated in the Fluxus scene and began developing performances in collaboration with cellist Charlotte Moorman. In 1969, Paik was included in the landmark “TV as a Creative Medium” show at the Howard Wise Gallery. In this same year, Paik and electronics engineer Shuya Abe designed and built the first Paik/Abe Synthesizer at WGBH in Boston. Many of Paik’s videos, including Global Groove (1973) and A Tribute to John Cage (1973) were produced through the artist-in-residence program at WNET’s TV Lab. In addition to his pioneering work as an artist, performer, and inventor, one of Paik’s major contributions to the field was his early effort as an advocate for the medium, consulting with the Rockefeller Foundation and the New York State Council on the Arts to establish funding systems which would sustain the video movement throughout the decade. Nam June Paik passed away in 2006.

Charlemagne Palestine
Born in 1945, Charlemagne Palestine studied at New York University, Columbia University, Mannes College of Music, and the California Institute of the Arts. Palestine’s work as a composer/performer in the late ‘60s and early ‘70s explored the filtering of sound through performer, instrument, space, and audience in an effort to bring inner dramas to the surface. His interest, as a musician, in externalizing intense psychological and emotional states underlies his subsequent work in video. In a series of tapes and installations produced throughout the ‘70s, Palestine’s use of sound, motion, and ritual set up a primal confrontation with the audience. He was among a number of video artists to work at Art/Tapes/22, Florence, Italy, where he produced Body Music I and II. Palestine describes the process behind his videos, which stresses the camera’s function as a performer, rather than a neutral observer of events, as “reading form some kind of emotional space and picking up the emotive essence of the presence.”

People’s Video Theater
Founded in 1970 by Elliot Glass and Ken Marsh, People’s Video Theater sought to bring video to the streets and vice versa. As Marsh argued, “the whole idea of community-based theater is that the people who generate the information and the audience are one and the same.” People’s Video Theater’s unique brand of journalism involved gathering man-on-the-street interviews and then inviting participants to watch the tape at a local “hardware station” or loft space outfitted with playback equipment. Post-screening discussions were also taped and once again fed back to participants. This process introduced hundreds of people to the video medium and its potential use in everyday life. People’s Video Theater’s experiments with “video mediation” took feedback in yet another unprecedented direction, as Marsh describes, “creating lines of communication between antagonistic groups whereby each can experience the information of the other without direct confrontation; therefore, working for and toward a resolution of conflict through dialogue.” People’s Video Theater’s other activities included the production of “video newsreels” documenting countercultural events and “video columns” on subjects ranging from music to lead poisoning. People’s Video Theater ceased operation in 1972. Ken Marsh went on to establish Woodstock Community Video, an early video access center that organized an artist residency program through near by Rhinebeck TV. Howie Gutstadt, who participated in many People’s Video Theater activities, went on to found Survival Arts Media in Jamestown, New York, in 1972.

Portable Channel
Portable Channel was founded in Rochester, New York in 1972 as a community media and documentary video center. The center’s activities included providing portable video equipment access and training workshops, production for broadcast and cable TV and published the quarterly newsletter, Feedback/Feedforward. Portable Channel was one of the first small-format video centers to have an ongoing relationship with a PBS affiliate, WXXI in Rochester. This collaboration resulted in the regular broadcast of “Homemade TV,” a series featuring videotapes by staff, interns, workshop members, and guest artists. After 15 years of serving the Rochester community, Portable Channel closed its doors due to declining economic conditions. The archives of Portable Channel are housed at the Visual Studies Workshop in Rochester, New York.

Raindance Corporation
Founded in 1969 by Frank Gillette, Michael Shamberg, and Ira Schneider among others, Raindance was a self-described
“countercultural think-tank” which embraced video as an alternative form of cultural communications. The name “Raindance” was a play on words for “cultural R & D” (research and development). Influenced by the communications theories of Marshall McLuhan and Buckminster Fuller, the collective produced a data bank of tapes and writings that explored the relation of cybernetics, media, and ecology. From 1970 to 1974, Raindance published the seminal video journal Radical Software (initially edited by Beryl Korot and Phyllis Gershuny), which provided a network of communications for the emerging alternative video movement, reaching a circulation of 5,000. In 1971, Shamberg wrote Guerrilla Television, a summary of the group’s principles and a blueprint for the decentralization of television. In 1976 Raindance members Ira Schneider and Beryl Korot edited Video Art: An Anthology, one of the first readers on video art. The original Raindance collective dispersed in the mid-1970s; the nonprofit Raindance Foundation continues to exist today.

Anthony Ramos
Born in 1944, Anthony Ramos studied fine arts at Southern Illinois University and the University of California at San Diego. He began working in video in the early ‘70s when, in addition to producing his own tapes, he served as a video consultant to the United Nations and the National Council of Churches. Ramos used video as a tool for breaking down mass mediated “truth” and as means of cultural documentation: “In my tapes I attempt to develop a different perception of events ... The information tells one story but it is not developed as a linear narrative.” Having served an 18-month prison sentence for draft evasion, Ramos produced About Media (1977), juxtaposing network news stories with his own unedited footage. Ramos traveled widely in Europe, Africa, China, and the Middle East, documenting the end of Portugal’s African colonialism in Cape Verde and Guinea-Bissau, as well as the 1980 Iran hostage crisis.

Martha Rosler
Born in 1944, Martha Rosler studied at New York University and Fordham University, moving to San Diego in 1968. While working as a freelance editor and raising a son, Rosler became active in the anti-war and women’s movements. Working as a teaching assistant at UCSD, Rosler produced assemblages and photomontages about the war. She began making videotapes in the late ‘70s. Describing her work in video, Rosler states, “The subject is the commonplace; I am trying to use video to question the mythical explanations of everyday life. We accept the clash of public and private as natural, yet their separation is historical. The antagonism of the two spheres, which have in fact developed in tandem, is an ideological fiction – a potent one. I want to explore the relationships between individual consciousness, family life, and culture under capitalism.” In addition to her work in photography, performance, and video, Rosler has published numerous critical essays.

Paul Ryan
Paul Ryan received a BA in English from New York University and he was Marshall McLuhan’s research assistant at Fordham University in the late ‘60s. Responding to the rapidly shifting technological and political climate of the era, Ryan gave up his ambition to become a ‘writer’ and instead used electronic technologies to work toward a society that could avoid Vietnams. Interested in the transformation of individual and global consciousness through video’s distinctive features, Ryan likened video, with its potential for feedback, to a moebius strip: “The moebius strip provides a model for dealing with the power videotape gives us to take in our own outside.” Influenced by McLuhan’s theories and emerging discourses around cybernetics, ecology, and information, Ryan’s early work evolved from free-form collaborations with members of Raindance to exercises in human behavior and relationships, and studies of urban and natural ecological systems. Working as a consultant to the New York State Council for the Arts in the early ‘70s, Ryan was an early advocate for the independent video movement. Ryan has authored an anthology of essays, Cybernetics of the Sacred (1974) and was a regular contributor to Radical Software, Raindance’s alternative media journal. Ryan recently published Video Mind, Earth Mind (1992).

Dan Sandin
Born in 1942, Dan Sandin studied physics and then became involved in video while teaching at the School of Art and Design at the University of Illinois in Chicago. Sandin’s early interest in computer graphics, video image processing, and interactive computing environments motivated his pioneering work developing video instruments for artists. “I was interested in light
shows and kinetic events, producing slides for those shows. I was involved in using optical and chemical processes to create images that I found interesting and it occurred to me that I could do it electronically." In 1973, Sandin successfully designed and built the Sandin Image Processor (IP), a modular, patch programmable, analog computer optimized for the manipulation of gray level information of input video signals. The IP provided many artists with their first opportunity to freely play with the color and composition of a video image. Designed to transform externally fed source material, the IP was also used as a performance instrument, generating images internally under the spontaneous improvisation of the controller. Sandin believed in a democratic approach to video technology, sharing plans for the IP free of charge to anyone who requested them and working to develop low-budget versions of advanced and costly tools. Sandin's ideal of accessible video technology helped to foster a Chicago community of video technician/producers.

Ilene Segalove
Ilene Segalove was born in 1950 in Los Angeles. She studied communication arts at Loyola University and received a degree in fine arts from the University of California in Santa Barbara. Working in video since 1972, when she bought a Portapak from Nam June Paik's girlfriend, Ilene Segalove was initially "offended by [video's] invasive quality and seduced by its power." A self-described "child of Beverly Hills," she began pointing the camera at "familiar things," producing quasi-documentaries about her family (The Mom Tapes, 1973-75) and American TV culture (TV is OK, 1976). Segalove was a member of the group Telethon, with Billy Adler, John Margolis, and Van Schley. Telethon designed installations featuring commercial TV collages and guest edited an issue of Radical Software, "The TV Environment" (2:2).

Richard Serra
Born in 1939, Richard Serra studied English literature at the University of California in Berkeley while working at a steel mill to earn a living. He went on to receive an MFA from Yale University where he studied with painter/theorist Joseph Albers. Living in New York, Paris, and Rome through the late '60s Serra became acquainted with artists of the New York School: Philip Guston, Robert Rauschenberg, Ad Reinhart, and Frank Stella, as well as avant-garde composer Philip Glass. Associated with the emergence of post-minimalism and process art, Serra's lead splashing sculptures were included in "The Warehouse Show" at the Leo Castelli Gallery in 1968, and "Anti-Illusion: Procedures Materials" at the Whitney Museum in 1968, both pivotal exhibitions which established a new discourse in the field. Serra produced several films before making videotapes in the early '70s. His early works, including Television Delivers People (1973), Prisoner's Dilemma (1974), and Boomerang (1974), are structural examinations of the medium as a vehicle for communication.

Eric Siegel
Born in 1944, Eric Siegel attended Samuel Gompers Vocational and Technical High School in Brooklyn, building his own TV set by age 14. In 1968 he designed and built the Siegel Colorizer and, in 1970, a video synthesizer. His Psychedelavision in Color was included in the groundbreaking "Television as a Creative Medium" exhibition at the Howard Wise Gallery in 1969. "Psychedelavision is my attempt at video mind expansion," Siegel explained. "A new science must be created which can reach the inner core of human beings. One of the most important tools in this new science will be television...The American Dream no longer is evolving. It's in a state of decay. Television must be liberated." In addition to producing his own work, Siegel collaborated with other video pioneers, among them Steina and Woody Vasulka and the Videofreex. He also contributed to the early issues of Radical Software. In 1972 Siegel traveled to India and produced "The Hindustan Tapes" (1973-1975), a series on Indian culture.

George Stoney
Born in 1916, George Stoney studied journalism at the University of North Carolina and at New York University. After working as a freelance journalist, an information officer for the Farm Security Administration, and a photo intelligence officer in World War II, he joined the Southern Educational Film Service as a writer and director in 1946. In 1950, he formed his own company, and by 1980 had made over 40 films, with subjects ranging from birth control, insurance, and the mentally ill to the nature of the Baha'i faith and the situation of indigenous people in Canada. An early advocate of video as a tool for social change, Stoney was the Executive Producer of the National Film Board of Canada's "Challenge for Change/Societe Nouvelle" from 1966-
In 1972, with Red Burns he co-founded the Alternate Media Center at New York University, which trained the first generation of public access producers/activists. In 1976 he was a founder of the National Federation of Local Cable Programmers. Since that time, he has produced and directed numerous social and educational works in video and film.

Skip Sweeney
Born in 1946, Skip Sweeney studied theater arts at Santa Clara University before becoming involved in the Bay Area video scene in the late ‘60s. In 1968, Sweeney was one of the founders of Electric Eye, an early media collective concerned with video performances and experiments. In 1970, with Arthur Ginsberg, Sweeney founded Video Free America, a San Francisco media arts center and communications nexus. Sweeney’s work in video included abstract image processing and synthesis, autobiographical documentaries and portraits, and video installations for theater including a version of Allen Ginsberg’s Kaddish (1977). Tuning and tinkering for hours to produce shimmering, interweaving video mandalas, Sweeney was one of a handful of people who mastered video feedback. Sweeney later worked in collaboration with Joanna Kelly, producing dance videos, video art, and documentaries.

Television Lab at WGBH
Established in 1968 with funding from the Rockefeller Foundation, the television lab at public television station WGBH in Boston was a major force in the production and dissemination of artists’ television. In 1969, Fred Barzyk, one of the station’s producers, organized the first broadcast program of video art, The Medium Is the Medium, which included work by Allan Kaprow, Otto Piene, Aldo Tambellini, James Seawright, Nam June Paik, and Thomas Tadlock. A larger document of the video movement, Video: The New Wave, was produced by Barzyk in 1973. The station’s artist-in-residence program sponsored the development of the first video synthesizer by Nam June Paik and Shuya Abe. Paik’s Video Commune, a four-hour blockbuster program employing the new imaging technology was broadcast in the summer of 1970. Another seminal program, Violence Sonata, was produced by Stan Vanderbeek in this same year. For the project, Vanderbeek made innovative use of the studio’s capacity for real time switching, integrating into the program a studio audience of militant political groups and karate experts. In 1974 the New Television Workshop was created and quickly became a leader in the growing effort to bring artists into a more direct relationship with the technical facilities and audience potential offered by broadcast. Managed by Dorothy Chiesa, the Workshop provided its one-inch editing facility to local Boston producers as well as visiting artists.

Television Laboratory at WNET
Directed by David Loxton, the Television Laboratory at WNET in New York City was established in 1972 with support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the New York State Council for the Arts. The most elaborate installation of its kind, the TV Lab also served during the ‘70s as the most consistent over-the-air outlet for experimental television, from special effects extravaganzas to nightly sign-off pieces about New York City by Nam June Paik, to new forms of documentary television. The TV Lab’s artist-in-residence program initially invited experienced video producers and artists and scholars in other disciplines who were interested in exploring the television medium for the first time. During the initial phase, which lasted until the spring of 1974, works produced through the TV Lab’s artist-in-residence program became classics. Ed Emshwiller’s Scape-mates (1972), Nam June Paik’s Global Groove (1973), and Bill Gwin’s Sweet Verticality (1973-1974) were all pivotal works in the evolving conceptual and technological investigation of the medium. By 1974, the TV Lab began to include in its focus non-fiction television projects such as Lord of the Universe (1974), TVTV’s documentary on the guru Maharaj Ji, the first independent documentary produced for national broadcast on public television. The advent of the stand-alone time base corrector in 1973 enabled groups like TVTV and Downtown Community Television to stabilize the half-inch video signal, allowing independents increased access to broadcast audience and influencing the future direction of the documentary genre. In 1975, WNET began broadcasting “Video and Television Review” (“VTR”), a magazine series hosted by Russell Conner that featured key figures in the alternative television movement including interviews and excerpted examples of their work. “VTR” and other programs produced through the TV Lab helped to establish an audience and a context for a wide spectrum of independent and experimental video work.
**Top Value Television (TVTV)**

TVTV was formed in 1972 by Michael Shamburg, Megan Williams, and Allen Rucker, who enlisted the support of media collectives including Raindance, Ant Farm, and the Videofreex to provide alternative coverage of the 1972 Presidential nominating conventions. The Democratic video, *The World’s Largest TV Studio* (1972), and its Republican companion piece, *Four More Years* (1972) were among the first video documentaries to be broadcast. The convention tapes provided candid interviews with delegates and protests alike while exposing the foibles of the media, showing viewers, “The underbelly of broadcast TV.” Influenced by New Journalism and the versatility and novelty of portable video equipment, TVTV created a critically acclaimed, graphically inventive, intimate style of documentary satire. TVTV’s success led to a contract with the TV Lab at WNET to produce documentaries on cult religion (*Lord of the Universe*, 1974), commercials (*Adland*, 1974), Washington politics (a four-part series, “Gerald Ford’s America,” 1975) and sports (*Superbowl*, 1976), among other topics. Frustrated by public television’s lack of commitment to independent documentary production, the group lost its shared purpose, moving from cable to public to network TV, finally producing an unsuccessful comedy pilot, *The TVTV Show*, for NBC in 1978. TVTV disbanded in 1979.

**University Community Video**

In 1973, student and community activists in Minneapolis joined forces to create University Community Video (UCV). Founders Miles Mogulescu, Ron McCoy, and Stephen Kulczycki, among others, offered courses in portable video production, supported by student fees from the University of Minnesota. At first UCV’s programs were shown over the University’s closed-circuit cable television system. Eager to reach a broader community, UCV staff succeeded in getting *Communitube*, a pilot magazine show, aired on the PBS affiliate KTCA. It was the forerunner of “Changing Channels,” UCV’s weekly alternative video magazine, which premiered on KTCA in 1974. “Changing Channels” ran for four years, winning numerous awards and establishing UCV as a Midwestern center for video documentary production. In January 1975, UCV began producing a companion program, “Everybody’s TV Time,” an open access program to accommodate community programming not included in their prime time series. UCV’s roots included an interest in the arts and in progressive politics, which resulted in a refreshing journalistic style of documentary that area videomakers are still known for. In 1978, overworked staff ceased production of “Changing Channels,” refocusing energies on video workshops for students and community producers. In the mid-’80s, UCV changed its name twice, finally becoming Intermedia Arts Minnesota, a regional media arts center. A selected collection of UCV videos is available to the public at the Minnesota Historical Society.

**T.R. Uthco**

T.R. Uthco was a San Francisco-based multi-media performance art collective that engaged in satirical critiques of the relation between mass media images and cultural myths, using irony, theatricality, and spectacle as its primary strategies. Founded by Doug Hall, Diane Andrews Hall, and Jody Procter in 1970, T.R. Uthco focused on the irreverent staging of fabricated events, also producing installations and video documents of its performances. They collaborated with Ant Farm to produce one of their most celebrated works, *The Eternal Frame* (1975). T.R. Uthco disbanded in 1978.

**Steina Vasulka**

Steina was born in Reykjavik, Iceland in 1940. While studying violin and music theory at the music conservatory in Prague in 1959, she met and married Woody Vasulka. They moved to New York City in 1965 where Steina initially worked as a freelance musician. In their early collaborative work, the Vasulkas examined the electronic nature of video and sound, developing specialized imaging tools and strategies while also using the medium to document the city’s expanding underground culture. “We were interested in certain decadent aspects of America, the phenomena of the time—underground rock and roll, homosexual theater, and the rest of the illegitimate culture. In the same way, we were curious about more puritanical concepts of art inspired by [Marshall] McLuhan and Buckminster Fuller. It seemed a strange and unified front—against the establishment.” In 1971, with Andreas Mannik, the Vasulkas founded The Kitchen as a media arts theater. In the same year, Steina and Woody organized “A Special Videotape Show” at the Whitney Museum and established the first annual video festival at The Kitchen. Working with skillful and innovative engineers, the Vasulkas invented and modified video production instruments for use in performances and installations as well as
single-channel tapes. They were among the first wave of artists to participate in the residency programs offered through the public television labs. Steina has explored the use of sound in creating and altering video signals (Violin Power, 1969-78) and the orchestration of video in an installation context. In 1975, while teaching at the Center for Media Study in Buffalo, NY, she began Machine Vision, a “continuing investigation of space via machine systems and electronic images.”

Woody Vasulka
Born in Brno, Czechoslovakia in 1937, Woody Vasulka studied metal technology and hydraulic mechanics at the School of Engineering in Brno and filmmaking at the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague. In 1965, he immigrated to New York City with his wife, Steina. Working as a multi-screen film editor and designer, he began experimenting with electronic sound, stroboscopic light, and video. “There are various motives for people who stumble into video. In some cases, it was pure accident; in some cases, it was hope. In my case, I had been in things I couldn’t work with. I was in film, and I couldn’t do anything with it…. When I first saw video feedback, I knew I had seen the cave fire. It had nothing to do with anything, just a perpetuation of some kind of energy…” Moving to Buffalo, New York in 1974, he taught at the Center for Media Study at the State University, and continued his investigation of the machinery behind the electronic signal. After working with the Rutt/Etra Scan Processor, Vasulka collaborated with Don MacArthur and Jeffrey Schier in 1976 to build a computer controlled personal imaging facility called The Digital Image Articulator. Vasulka wrote articles about video’s particular electronic vocabulary that were published in Afterimage.

Videofreex
Videofreex was one of the first U.S. video collectives, founded in 1969 by David Cort, Curtis Ratcliff, and Parry Teasdale. CBS executive Don West heard about the Videofreex and invited them to produce a pilot magazine show on the American scene. With the money provided by CBS for the project, Videofreex had acquired one of the most sophisticated editing systems in New York City, which they used in subsequent projects and made available to other independents. They traveled around the country, interviewing countercultural figures including Yippie Abbie Hoffman and Black Panther Fred Hampton, among others, finally producing an historic video-and-music “happening” in their Soho loft. CBS pulled the plug on “Subject to Change,” alternative videos’ first encounter with commercial TV. The Videofreex continued to produce videos and multimedia events, participating in the Rose Art Gallery show at Brandeis University in 1970. When the New York State Council on the Arts began targeting upstate media projects, the Videofreex incorporated Media Bus, traveling around the state with a mobile workshop program. In 1972 they moved to Maple Tree Farm in Lanesville, New York, where members Parry Teasdale, David Cort, Curtis Ratcliff, Davidson Gigliotti, Skip Blumberg, Nancy Cain, Bart Friedman, Carol Vontobel, Ann Woodward, and Chuck Kennedy lived and worked collectively. “We didn’t have any way of reaching out to the community,” Teasdale recalls, “There wasn’t any cable. There wasn’t any broadcast in the area, so we set up our own transmitter… It was pirate TV.” Lanesville TV began broadcasting on March 19, 1972 and continued on a weekly basis for five years, providing programming that ranged from artist’s videos and live performances to play-by-play coverage of the 1976 Democratic National Convention (Five Day Bicycle Race). Lanesville TV was committed to the two-way, interactive potential of broadcasting, using a live phone-ins whenever possible.

Video Free America
Electric Eye was a Bay Area production collective founded in 1968 by Skip Sweeney, Tim Barger, Lee Kominski, and Michelle Gallery. The group’s early projects involved taping rock ‘n roll bands and theater performances and programming video weekly at the Intersection Center for the Arts in San Francisco. In 1969, Arthur Ginsberg, a graduate of Yale University’s Drama School, joined the group, which had by then changed its name to Video Free America (VFA). In 1970, the group developed “The Philo T. Farnsworth Video Obelisk” at the Intersection Center, which featured a multi-channel, multi-monitor installation in the shape of a towering obelisk with Tim Barger as the video DJ, mixing pre-recorded material, live feedback, and a live camera. Around this time, VFA began documenting countercultural events such as the Sky River Festival in Washington State and the Equinox Celebration in Golden Gate Park. After settling in San Francisco, Video Free America offered regular screenings of video installations, including The Continuing Story of Carel and Ferd (1970-75), and sponsored a visiting artist series, which included
the Vasulkas and Stephen Beck among others. In the mid ’70s, through Ginsberg’s connections in New York, VFA worked with the Chelsea Theater Center on three plays (AC/DC, Kaddish, 1977, and Kaspar, 1974), all of which incorporated video as a vital element of the drama.

Bill Viola

Born in 1951, Bill Viola received a BFA from the College of Visual and Performing Arts at Syracuse University. A drummer in a rock and roll band from 1968-1972, he was interested in performance and in electronic music. Describing his concentration in video in the early ’70s, Viola states: “The crucial thing for me was the process of going through an electronic system, working with these standard kinds of circuits became a perfect introduction to a general electronic theory. It gave me a sense that the electronic signal was a material that could be worked with. This was another really important realization. Physical manipulation is fundamental to our thought processes -- just watch the way a baby learns. It’s why most people have so much trouble approaching electronic media. When electronic energies finally became concrete for me, like sounds are to a composer, I really began to learn. Soon I made what was for me an easy switch over to video. I never thought about [video] in terms of images so much as electronic processes, a signal.” Viola describes his early single channel videos both as “songs” and as “visual poems, allegories in the language of subjective perception.” His early investigations into the medium, including The Space Between the Teeth (1974) and Truth Through Mass Individuation (1976), employ formal strategies associated with structural film that also operate as metaphors for transcendent vision, creativity, and symbolic transformation/illumination -- themes that preoccupy Viola’s later work, including Sweet Light (1977) and Chott el Djerid (A Portrait in Light and Heat) (1979). Viola was one of a group of artists who founded Synapse Video/Cable TV Center in Syracuse, New York, one of the first alternative media centers in New York State. In 1973, Viola and several musicians formed the Composers Inside Electronics Group, which performed David Tudor’s Rainforest and other works internationally. In 1975 he worked as the director of Art/Tapes/22, an artist production facility in Florence, Italy. Viola was an artist-in-residence at the WNET’s Television Lab from 1976-80 and at Sony Corporation, Atsugi, Japan in 1980.

William Wegman

Born in 1943, William Wegman studied painting at Massachusetts College of Art and the University of Illinois, Urbana. He began producing short, performance-oriented videotapes in the early 1970s, which are considered classics. Many featured his canine companion, a Weimaraner named Man Ray. These videos are deadpan parodies of “high art” using sight gags, minimalist performance, and understated humor. Describing the process behind his work, Wegman states, “I present a situation and develop some kind of explanation around it. By the time the story is over you get to know why that particular prop or mannerism was displayed.” Recorded as single takes in real time, Wegman used portable video’s intimacy and low-tech immediacy to create idiosyncratic narrative comedy. Wegman was among a group of artists to produce work through WGBH’s Television Lab. Wegman has videotaped and photographed Man Ray’s successor, Fay Ray.

WGBH (See Television Lab at WGBH)

WNET-TV (See Television Laboratory at WNET)
Videographies

Compiled by Julia Dzwonkoski.

For each of the individual artists and collectives represented in the Survey collection, here is a list of video titles produced between 1965 and 1980, based on information supplied by the artists and supplemented by the distribution catalogs of Electronic Arts Intermix and the Video Data Bank. Arranged chronologically, the titles suggest the scope and diversity of early work. The videographies are selective rather than comprehensive lists; they do not include works in other media (such as 16mm film, publications, painting, etc.) produced by artists during this time span nor do they include the titles of works recycled (i.e. erased and taped over) by collectives when “process” not “product” ruled. Where possible running times have been given, however, reference to single, two- or multi-channel installations frequently do not have running times specified since many such works used delayed or circular loops or surveillance camera for continuous or live performance-style installations. Except where noted, all tapes have sound and works prior to 1974 were in black-and-white only; thereafter, tapes could be made in color and/or black-and-white. Some titles existed in both single-channel and multi-channel versions, and when multiple versions existed, this is noted. Collaborators are noted in parenthesis. For more information on archives that have taken on the responsibility of preserving and making such work accessible, see Resource Guide for Early Video. Some early works have been re-edited, often recently during the course of preservation activities; when revised versions of older works have been made, this has been indicated.

Vito Acconci

Corrections, 1970, 30:00, b&w.

Pryings, 1971, 17:10, b&w.

Centers, 1971, 22:28, b&w.

Association Area, 1971, 62:00, b&w.

Contacts, 1971, 29:47, b&w.

Pull, 1971, 32:37, b&w.

Focal Point, 1971, 32:47, b&w.

Filler, 1971, 29:16, b&w.


Two Track, 1971, 28:35, b&w.

Claim Excerpts, 1971, 62:11, b&w.

Remote Control, 1971, 62:30, b&w. (two channels)

Undertone, 1973, 34:12, b&w.

Face-Off, 1973, 32:57, b&w.

Recording Studio From Air Time, 1973, 36:49, b&w.

Home Movies, 1973, 32:19, b&w.

Theme Song, 1973, 33:15, b&w.

Stages, 1973, 30:00, b&w.

Full Circle, 1973, 30:00, b&w.

Indirect Approaches, 1973, 30:00, b&w.

Walk-Over, 1973, 30:00, b&w.

Command Performance, 1974, 56:40, b&w.

Shoot, 1974, 10:18, color.

Turn-On, 1974, 21:52, color.

Open Book, 1974, 10:09, color.

Face of the Earth, 1974, 22:18, color.

Pornography in the Classroom, 1975, b&w. (single channel installation)

Body-Building in the Great Northwest, 1975, b&w. (single channel installation)

The Red Tapes, 1976, 141:27, b&w.

The Object of it All (I) (II), 1977, b&w. (single channel installation)

VD Lives! TV Must Die, 1978, b&w. (two channel installation)

Nancy Angelo

Nun and Deviant, 1976, 20:25, b&w. (with Candace Compton)


Equal Time/Equal Space, 1979. (installation)
Ant Farm
Ant Farm’s Dirty Dishes, 1971, 14:00, b&w. (re-edited as From the Warehouse Tapes, 1971, 7:00, b&w)
Johnny Ramo in Performance, 1971, 4:00, b&w.
The Opening, 1972, 20:00, b&w.
Architectural Tapes, 1972, 30:00, b&w.
4’2” Maro, 1973, 25:00, color.
The Cadillac Ranch Show, 1974, 25:00, b&w and color.
Media Burn, 1975, 25:43, color.
The Eternal Frame, 1975, 23:50, b&w and color. (in collaboration with T.R. Uthco; also single channel installation, 1977)
“Off-Air” Australia, 1976, 30:45, b&w and color.
Game of the Week, 1977, 16:20, color. (with T.R. Uthco)
John Baldessari
Folding Hat, 1971, 29:48, b&w.
Some Words I Mispronounce, 1971, 2:20, b&w.
I Will Not Make Any More Boring Art, 1971, 13:06, b&w.
A Walking Forward-Running Past, 1971, 12:45, b&w.
I Am Making Art, 1971, 18:40, b&w.
Art Disaster, 1971, 32:40, b&w.
Baldessari Sings LeWitt, 1972, 15:00, b&w.
Inventory, 1972, 23:50, b&w.
Teaching a Plant the Alphabet, 1972, 18:40, b&w.
How We Do Art Now, 1973, 12:54, b&w.
The Meaning of Various News Photos to Ed Henderson, 1973, 15:00, b&w.
Three Feathers and Other Fairy Tales, 1973, 31:15, b&w.
The Way We Do Art Now and Other Sacred Tales, 1973, 28:28, b&w.
Ed Henderson Suggests Sound Tracks for Photographs, 1974, 27:51, b&w.
The Italian Tape, 1974, 8:33, b&w.
Four Minutes of Trying to Tune Two Glasses (for the Phil Glass Sextet), 1976, 4:09, b&w.
Six Colorful Tales: From the Emotional Spectrum
(Phil Glass Sextet), 1976, 13:06, color.
Two Colorful Melodies, 1977, 5:30, color.

Stephen Beck
Prextyphia, 1969, 16:30, color.
Point of Inflection, 1970, 23:45, color.
Methods, 1971, 10:44, color.
Undulations, 1971, 30:00, color, silent.
Ex, 1972, 30:00, color, silent.
Conception, 1972, 5:20, color.
Illuminated Music I, 1972, 8:50, color.
Shiva, 1972, 4:30, color.
Electric Concert - Metaphysical Circuit, 1972, 26:00, color.
Illuminated Music II-XIII, 1972-73, variable times, color.
Cycles, 1974, 10:12, color. (in collaboration with Jordan Belson)
Anima, 1974, 8:51, color.
Union, 1975, 8:23, color.
Video Weavings, 1976, 9:18, color.
Video Ecotopia, 1976, 7:50, color.
Video Games, 1977, 11:00, color.

Lynda Benglis
Noise, 1972, 7:15, b&w.
Home Tape Revised, 1972, 25:25, b&w.
On Screen, 1972, 7:12, b&w.
Document, 1972, 8:00, b&w.
Surface Soap, 1972, 8:00, b&w.
Face Tape, 1972, b&w.
Enclosure, 1973, 8:00, b&w.
The Grunions are Running, 1973, 5:00, b&w.
Now, 1973, 12:30, color.
Collage, 1973, 10:00, color.
Female Sensibility, 1973, 14:00, color.
How’s Tricks, 1976, 34:00, color.

Dara Birnbaum
(A)Drift of Politics (Laverne & Shirley), 1978, 3-minute loop, color. (video installation with 16mm kinescope projection)
Technology/Transformation: Wonder Woman, 1978-79, 5:50, color. (also 16mm kinescope)
Kiss The Girls: Make Them Cry, 1979, 6:50, color. (also 16mm kinescope)
Pop-Pop Video: Kojak/Wang, 1980, 3:00, color.
Pop-Pop Video: General Hospital/Olympic Women Speed Skating, 1980, 6:00, color.
Local Television News Program Analysis for Public Access Cable Television, 1980, 60:00, color. (with Dan Graham; edited version, 20)
Remy/Grand Central: Trains and Boats and Planes, 1980, 4:18, color.

Peer Bode
Network, 1974, 5:00. (with Meryl Blackman)
Window, 1974, 5:00. (with Meryl Blackman)
Blue, 1975, 4:50.
A Video Picturing, 1975, 10:00.
Rhada, 1975, 60:00. (with Arnie Zane)
Rhada Brockport, 1975, 60:00. (with Arnie Zane)
Matrix Dance, 1975, 20:00.
Broadcast TV, 1975. (installation)
17 -Minute Dance, 1975, 17:00.

Eyelines, 1976, 2:45.
1-87, 1976, 4:35.
Front Hand Back Hand, 1976, 4:00.
Point, Line, Field, Frame, 1976, 3:00.
Field, Frame, 1976, 3:00.
100 Sec. Luation (S.A.I.D.), 1976, 1:40.
Untitled Activity, 1976, 30:00
Movements for Video, Dance and Music, 1976, 60:00. (with Meryl Blackman, Bill T. Jones, Arnie Zane, Cara Brownell, Bob Warren, and Charlie Seltzer)
Couple 513, 1976, 60:00. (with Lois Welk and Arnie Zane)
Synergism, 1976, 15:00. (dance-audio-video synthesis performance with Walter Wright, Gary Hill, Meryl Blackman, and Sara Cook)
Image Field, 1977, 10:00.
The Image and Its Reproduction, 1977, 15:00.
Cup Mix, 1977, 10:47. (two channels)
Picture +/- Changes, 1977, 10:00.
Interface, 1977. (installation)
In Air TVs, 1977. (installation with Meryl Blackman)
Oscillator Frames, 1978, 10:00.
Activity 1, 2, and 3, 1978, 15:00.
Summer Mix, 1978. (four channels)
Apple(s), 1978, 4:19.
(Installation)
Counting and Remapping (partial disclosure), 1979, 7:16.
Flute with Shift, 1979, 3:39.
Lava Shifts, 1979, 3:55.
More Selections from Process Tapes, 1979, approx.
270 hours.
Site(s), 1980, 7:42.

Barbara Buckner
(all works silent)
Geography, 1973, 3:00, b&w.
Spectre, 1973, 4:00, b&w.
Starfish/Mouth at the River Nile, 1973, 3:30, b&w.
Bulk, 1973, 3:00, b&w.
Breast War/Erect, 1973, 2:00, b&w.
Pillar, 1973, 4:00, b&w.
Sapati, 1973, 3:00, b&w.
Scorpion, 1973, 2:00, b&w.
Century, 1973, 12:00, b&w.
Moebius, 1974, 5:00, b&w.
Tongue Line/Blood Linear, 1974, 2:30, b&w.
Red Ode, 1974, 3:00, b&w.
Arc Anthem, 1974, 5:00, b&w.
Mant-of-Way, 1974, 1:00, b&w.
China, 1975, 5:00, b&w.
Song of Eye-Shift, 1975, 5:00, b&w.
Lune, 1975, 5:00, b&w.
The Infant Birch, 1975, 3:00, b&w.
Tectonic Portrait, 1975, 5:00, b&w.
From Sleep, 1975, 1:30, b&w.
Fig’s Lay, 1975, 3:00, b&w.
Gentle Door, 1975, 7:30, b&w.
Duo Sanguie, 1975, 3:00, b&w.
Blindness, 1975, 7:00, b&w.
Ring Psalter, 1975, 14:00, b&w.
0 Rock, 1976, 3:00, color.
Breath, 1976, 7:00, color.
Tract, 1976, 7:00, color.

Peter Bull
The Ruling Classroom, 1980, 58:00, b&w. (with Alex Gibney)

Peter Campus
Dynamic Field Series, 1971, 23:42, b&w.
Double Vision, 1971, 14:45, b&w, silent.
Kiva, 1971. (Installation)
Mer, 1972. (Installation)
Inter-face, 1972. (Installation)
Stasis, 1973. (Installation)
Optical Sockets, 1973. (Installation)
Set of Co-incidence, 1974, 13:24, color, silent.
R-G-B, 1974, 11:30, color.
Shadow Projection, 1974. (Installation)
Negative Crossing, 1974. (Installation)
Amanesis, 1974. (Installation)
col, 1975. (Installation)
mem, 1975. (Installation)
dor, 1975. (Installation)
sev, 1975. (Installation)
Four Sided Tape, 1976, 3:20, color.
East Ended Tape, 1976, 6:46, color.
Third Tape, 1976, 5:06, color.
Six Fragments, 1976, 5:07, color.
cl, 1976. (Installation)
aen, 1977. (Installation)
um, 1977. (Installation)
lus, 1977. (Installation)
head of a man with death on his mind, 1978. (installation)
head of a sad young woman, 1978. (installation)

Candace Compton
Nun and Deviant, 1976, 20:25, b&w. (with Nancy Angelo)
My Friends Imitating their Favorite Animals, 1979, 17:30, color.

Tony Conrad
Cycles of 3’s and 7’s, 1977, 23:00.
Concord Ultimatum, 1977, 60:00.
Movie Show, 1977, 60:00.
Music and the Mind of the Word, 1979-81, ca. 50 hours unedited. (performance documentation tapes, video and audio formats)
Teddy Tells Jokes, 1980, 4:00.

David Cort
Supermarkets for Progress, (Food Line, Group Interaction, Group Games), 1968, b&w.
Woodstock Tapes with the Water Hats, 1969, b&w.
Subject To Change, 1969, 60:00, b&w. (with Videofreex)
Mayday Realtime, 1971, 59:45, b&w.
Geodesic Domes Tapes, 1970, b&w.
After the Bar with Tony and Michael #1 & #2, 1970, b&w.
And in the Process of Time, 1971, b&w.
David Himself #1, 1971, b&w.
David Himself #2, 1971, b&w.
Laughing and Crying Songs, 1971, b&w.
Jerusalem Tapes, 1971, b&w.
Video in Europe, 1971, b&w.
At Maple Tree Farm and Beyond, 1972-75, 27:09, b&w.
Cooperstown TV, 1972, 60:00, b&w.
Explorations in the Videospace, 1974, 30:00, color.
Focusing the Sun, 1977, 26:07, b&w.
David Cort’s Video Theater, 1978, 15:00, b&w.

Juan Downey
Plato Now, 1972, 30:00, b&w. (also nine channel installation)
Three-Way Communication by Light, 1972, 10:00, b&w. (two channel installation)
Yucatan, 1973, 27:00, b&w.
Zapoteca, 1973, 27:00, b&w.
Guatemala, 1973, 27:00, b&w.
Rumbo al Golfo, 1973, 27:00, b&w.
Monument to the Charles River, 1973, 27:00, b&w. (two channel installation)
Lima, 1974, 27:00, b&w.
Macchu-Picchu, 1974, 27:00, b&w, silent.
Publicness, 1974, 28:00, b&w.
Chile, June 1971, 1974, 13:00, color.
Moving, 1974, 27:00, b&w.
Nazca, 1974, 11:00, b&w. (two channel installation)
Video Trans Americas Debriefing Pyramid, 1974, 10:00, b&w. (four channel installation)
It Can Happen to You, 1975, 30:00, b&w.
Videodances, 1975, 30:00, b&w.
Las Meniñas (The Maidens of Honor), 1975, 20:34, color. (also single channel installation)
In the Beginning, 1975, 26:00, color.
Central Zone, 1975, 27:00, b&w.
Bi-Deo, 1976, 26:00, color.
Guahibos, 1976, 25:10, b&w and color.
Video Trans Americas, 1976, 20:00, b&w. (single channel installation)
La Frontera (The Frontier), 1976, 16:00, b&w.
Yanomami Healing I, 1977, 51:27, b&w.
Yanomami Healing II, 1977, 45:00, b&w.
The Abandoned Shabono, 1978, 27:00, color.
More Than Two, 1978, 30:00, color. (two channel installation)
The Circle of Fires, 1978, 6:00, color. (three channel installation)
The Laughing Alligator, 1979, 27:00, b&w and color.

Venus and Her Mirror, 1980, 6:00, color. (single channel installation)

Downtown Community Television Center (DCTV)
Cuba: The People, Part II, 1976, 25:00, color.
Chinatown: Immigrants in America, 1976, 57:55, color.
Health Care: Your Money or Your Life, 1977, 58:10, color.
Vietnam: Picking up the Pieces, 1978, 58:06, color.
Fidel Castro Comes to New York, 1979, 35:00, color.
War in Nicaragua, 1979, 30:00, color.
Southeast Asia: Cambodia-Vietnam-China, 1979, Parts I & II, 30:00 each, color.
Third Avenue: Only the Strong Survive, 1980, 58:10, color.

Ed Emshwiller
Images, 1971, 30:00, color.
Computer Graphics #1, 1972, 17:00, color.
Thermogenesis, 1972, 11:55, color.
Scape-mates, 1972, 28:16, color.
Positive Negative Electronic Faces, 1973, 30:00, b&w.
Plolobolus and Joan, 1974, 57:40, color.
Crossings and Meetings, 1974, 27:33, color.
Inside Edges, 1975, 16:00, b&w.
Family Focus, 1975, 57:53, color.
New England Visions Past and Future, 1976, 29:00, color. (with William Irwin Thompson)
Collisions, 1976, 4:00, color.
Self-Trio, 1976, 8:00, color.
Sur Faces, 1977, 58:00, color.
Silvers, 1977, 30:00, color and b&w. (two channel installation)
Dubs, 1978, 24:00, color.
Sunstone, 1979, 2:57, color.
Eclipse, 1980, 30:00, color. (three channel performance/video)
Removes, 1980, 25:00, color. (three channel performance/video)
Richard Foreman
Out of the Body Travel, 1976, 42:00, b&w.
City Archives, 1978, 28:16, color.

Terry Fox
Tonguing, 1970, 30:00, b&w.
The Rake’s Progress, 1971, 30:00, b&w.
Turgescent Sex, 1971, 40:00, b&w.
Clutch, 1971, 50:00, b&w.
The Fire in the Water, The Water in the Air, The Earth in the Sea and The Earth in the Sea, 1972, 30:00, color.
Incision, 1973, 15:00, b&w.
Children’s Tapes, 1974, 150:00, b&w. (edited version, 1974, 30:00, b&w)
Lunedi, 1975, 30:00, color.
Two Turns, 1975, 30:00, b&w.
Timbre, 1976, 30:00, b&w.
Lunar Rambles, 1976, 30:00, color.
Holes and Entrances, 1980, 30:00, b&w.
Flour Dumplings, 1980, 30:00, color.
Untitled installation, 1980, (single channel installation)
Untitled installation, 1980, b&w and color (two channel installation)
Untitled installation, 1980, b&w and color (two channel installation)

Hermine Freed
Barbara Zucker—Street Sculpture, 1971, 27:00, b&w.
Lee Krasner—A Conversation, 1972, 25:00, b&w.
Roy Lichtenstein—Still Life Paintings, 1972, 20:00, b&w.
Robert Morris—Observatory, 1972, 20:00, b&w.
Robert Morris—Land Project, 1972, 20:00, b&w.
James Rosenquist—Dirty Band-Aids, 1972, 27:00, b&w.
George Segal—Woman with Arms Folded, 1972, 30:00, b&w.
George Sugarman—Sculptural Complex, 1972, 20:00, b&w.
I Don’t Know What You Mean, 1973, 8:00, b&w.
Me-You, 1973, 6:00, b&w.
Water Glasses, 1973, 5:00, b&w.

Two Faces, 1973, 8:00, b&w.
Space Holes, 1973, 7:00, b&w.
360 degrees, 1973, 6:00, b&w.
360 degrees-2, 1973, 5:00, color.
Artists of the Hamptons, 1973, b&w.
John Baldessari—A Conversation, 1973, 40:00, b&w.
Perle Fine—A Conversation, 1973, 20:00, b&w.
Bruce Nauman—Whitney Retrospective, 1973, 25:00, b&w.
Miriam Shapiro—Fabric Paintings, 1973, 20:00, b&w.
Art Herstory, 1974, 20:00, color.
Show and Tell, 1974, 11:00, b&w.
Adolph Gottlieb—A Conversation, 1974, 20:00, b&w.
Family Album, 1975, 9:30, b&w.
Mirror Wall, 1975, 7:00, color.
Portrait of President Conway, 1975, 15:00, color.
New Reel, 1977, 12:00, color.
Beads and Marbles, 1980, 6:00, color. (four channel installation)

Alex Gibney
General College, 1978, 30 segments 15:00 each, b&w.
The Ruling Classroom, 1980, 58:00, b&w. (with Peter Bull)

Arthur Ginsberg (Also see Skip Sweeney)
The Continuing Story of Carel and Ferd, 1970-75, 58:45, b&w and color. (with John Reilly)
Home, 1979, 88:05, b&w and color. (with John Reilly)
Joe Albert’s Fox Hunt, 1980, 60:00, color. (with John Reilly and Karen Mooney)

Doug Hall
I Like My Television, 1972, 3:00, b&w.
The Real Lone Ranger, 1972, 4:30, b&w. (with Willie Walker)
I Like Supermarkets, 1974, 16:00, b&w.
The Eternal Frame, 1975, 23:50, b&w and color. (with T.R. Uthco in collaboration with Ant Farm)
Really, I’ve Never Done Anything Like That Before, He Said, 1975, 15:00, b&w. (two channels)
Game of the Week, 1977, 16:20, color. (with T.R. Uthco)
I Hardly Ever Leave This Room, 1979, 25:00, color. (with Diane Andrews Hall)
The Amarillo News Tapes, 1980, 25:52, color. (with Chip Lord and Jody Procter; also single channel installation)
Gary Hill
The Fall, 1973, 11:30, b&w.
Feathers, 1974, 12:00, b&w.
Air Raid, 1974, 6:00, color.
Hole in the Wall, 1974, b&w. (single channel installation)
Rock City Road, 1974-75, 12:00, color, silent.
Earth Pulse, 1975, 6:00, color.
Transportraition, 1975, 3:00, color, silent.
Embryonics II, 1976, 12:00, color, silent.
Sound/ Image, 1975, 7:00, b&w.
Continuum, 1976, 12:00, color.
Improvisation With Bluestone, 1976, 7:00, color.
Mirror Road, 1975-76, 6:26, color, silent.
Bits, 1977, 2:59, color, silent.
Bathing, 1977, 4:30, color.
Sums & Differences, 1978, 8:24, b&w.
Elements, 1978, 2:13, b&w.
Primary, 1978, 1:19, color.
Objects With Destinations, 1979, 3:57, color, silent.
Picture Story, 1979, 6:26, color.
Soundings, 1979, 18:03, color.
Equal Time, 1979, 4:39, color.
Mesh, 1979, b&w. (mixed media installation)
Mediations, 1979-86, 4:17, color.
Commentary, 1980, 1:00, color.
Around & About, 1980, 5:00, color.
War Zone, 1980, b&w. (mixed media installation)
Around & About, 1980, 5:00, color and b&w. (installation)
Processual Video, 1980, 11:13, b&w.
Videograms, 1980-81, 13:27, b&w.

Nancy Holt
East Coast-West Coast, 1969, 20:00, b&w. (with Robert Smithson)
Locating #1 and #2, 1972, 15:00 each, b&w.

Going Around in Circles, 1973, 15:00, b&w.
Zeroing In, 1973, 28:00, b&w.
Points of View, 1974, 44:00, b&w.
Points of View, 1974. (installation)
Underscan, 1974, 20:00, b&w.
Revolve, 1977, 75:00, b&w.

Joan Jonas
Duet, 1972, 4:00, b&w.
Left Side Right Side, 1972, 8:50, b&w.
Vertical Roll, 1972, 19:38, b&w.
Organic Honey’s Visual Telepathy, 1972, 17:24, b&w.
Two Women, 1973, 20:00, b&w, silent.
Barking, 1973, 2:20, b&w.
Disturbances, 1974, 11:00, b&w.
Merlo, 1974, 10:51, b&w.
Good Night Good Morning, 1976, 11:38, b&w.
May Windows, 1976, 13:58, b&w.
I Want to Live in the Country (And Other Romances), 1976, 24:06, color.
Upside Down and Backwards, 1980, 29:03, color.

Paul Kos
Roping Boar’s Tusk, 1970.
Walking Cat Fish, 1970.
Anthology, 1970.
Search: Olga/Gold, 1974, 19:00.
Battle Mountain, 1974.
Are Tinny Aren’t Any, 1974.
Riley Roiley River, 1974, 1:30.
Tokyo Rose, 1975.
Sirens, 1977, 6:30, color.
Lightening, 1977, 1:12, b&w.
Savik, 1980.

Shigeko Kubota
Duchampiana: Chess, 1968-75, 42:00, b&w and color.

Ginsberg, 1970, 5:46, b&w and color.
Europe on 1/2 Inch a Day, 1972, 30:48, b&w and color.
Marcel Duchamp and John Cage, 1972, 28:27, b&w and color.
Duchampiana: Marcel Duchamp’s Grave, 1972-75, b&w and color. (installation)
My Father, 1973-75, 15:24, b&w.
Duchampiana: Door, 1976, color. (installation)
Meta-Marcel: Window Snow, 1976, color. (installation)
Self-Portrait, 1976, 12:19, color.
Three Mountains, 1976-79, color. (four channel installation)
Duchampiana: Nude Descending Staircase, 1976, color. (installation)

Linda Montano
Handcuff, 1975. (with T. Marioni)
Jane Gooding, R.N. in “Learning to Talk”, 1976-78, 60:00, color.
Acupuncture, 1978, 60:00.
Mitchell’s Death, 1978, 22:00, b&w.
Where the Deer and the Antelope Play, 1979, 20:00.
Sex, 3 Kinds, 1980.
Primal Scenes, 1980, 10:00.
Pauline Oliveros, Voice and Music, 1980, 20:00. (with Media Bus)
Anorexia Nervosa, 1980, 60:00.

Robert Morris
Exchange, 1972, b&w, 36:00.

Bruce Nauman
Slow Angle Walk, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Stamping in the Studio, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Flesh to Black to White to Flesh, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Bouncing in the Corner, No. 1, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Wall Floor Positions, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Bouncing in the Corner, No. 2: Upside Down, 1969, 60:00, b&w.

Anorexia Nervosa, 1980, 60:00.

Pauline Oliveros, Voice and Music, 1980, 20:00. (with Media Bus)
Anorexia Nervosa, 1980, 60:00.

Robert Morris
Exchange, 1972, b&w, 36:00.

Bruce Nauman
Slow Angle Walk, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Stamping in the Studio, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Flesh to Black to White to Flesh, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Bouncing in the Corner, No. 1, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Wall Floor Positions, 1968, 60:00, b&w.
Bouncing in the Corner, No. 2: Upside Down, 1969,
Lip Sync, 1969, 60:00, b&w.

Pacing Upside Down, 1969, 60:00, b&w.

Walk with Contraposto, 1969, 60:00, b&w.

Rovelling Upside Down, 1969, 60:00, b&w.

Violin Tuned D.E.A.D., 1969, 60:00, b&w.

Manipulating a Fluorescent Tube, 1969, 60:00, b&w.

Pulling Mouth, 1969, 9:00, b&w, silent.

Studio Problems, No. 1, 1971, b&w.

Studio Problems, No. 2, 1971, b&w.

Elke Allowing the Floor to Rise Up Over Her, Face Up, 1973, 40:00, color.

Tony Sinking into the Floor, Face Up and Face Down, 1973, 40:00, color.

Elke Allowing the Floor to Rise Up Over Her, Face Up, 1973, 40:00, color.

Nam June Paik

Optic Nerve


Fifty Wonderful Years, 1973, 27:00, b&w.

Art Works, 1975.

Dead Action, 1976, 30:00, b&w.

Pushed Out for Profit, 1978, 28:00, color.

On the Boulevard, 1979, 28:40, color.

Nam June Paik

TV Clock, 1963-81. (installation)

Electronic Video Recorder, 1965, b&w.

Magnet TV, 1965. (installation)

Dieter Hot on Canal Street, 1966, b&w.


TV Cross, 1966. (installation)

Tänzende Muster, 1966. (installation)

Variations on George Ball on Meet the Press, 1967, b&w.

TV Chair, 1968. (installation)

Electronic Opera No. 1, 1969, 5:00, color.

9/23 Experiment With David Atwood, 1969, color.

Participation TV II, 1969. (installation)

TV Bra for Living Sculpture, 1969. (installation)

Video Commune, 1970, 4 hours, color.


Paik/Abe Video Synthesizer With Charlotte Moorman, 1971, 30:00, color.

Concerto for TV Cello and Video Tape, 1971. (installation)

TV Glasses, 1971. (installation)

The Selling of New York, 1972, 7:30, color.

Waiting For Commercial, 1972, color.

TV Bed, 1972. (installation)

TV Penis, 1972. (installation)

Global Groove, 1973, 28:30, color. (with John Godfrey)

A Tribute to John Cage, 1973, 60:00. (re-edited 1976, 29:02, color)

Train-Cello, 1973. (installation)

My Mix: A Composite Edit, 1974, 30:00, b&w and color.

Zenith—TV Looking Glass, 1974. (installation)

TV Buddha, 1974. (installation)

TV Garden, 1974. (installation)

TV Chair, 1974. (installation)

TV Sea, 1974. (installation)

Fish Flies on Sky, 1975. (installation)

Suite 212, 1975, 150:00. (re-edited 1977, 30:23, color)

Nam June Paik: Edited For Television, 1975, 28:14, b&w and color.

TV Rodin, 1975. (installation)

Video-Fish, 1975. (installation)

Candle-TV No. 1, 1975. (installation)

Moon is the Oldest TV, 1976. (installation)


(with Doug Davis and Joseph Beuys)


(with John Godfrey)

Guadalcanal Requiem, 1978, 28:11, b&w

People's Video Theater

Video Poll: Should cars be banned from Manhattan?, 1970.


Women's Liberation Day Luncheon with Construction Workers, 1970.

Women's Suffrage March, August 1970.

Tour of “El Barrio” by a Member of the Yound Lords Party, 1970.


Puerto Rican Independence Day at Plaza Borinquena,
The Bronx, 1970.
Young Lords Church Takeover—Death of Julio Roldan, 1970.
Opening of People’s Park in Lower East Side, 1970.
Tompkins Square Community Center Tour, 1970.
16th Street Squatters, 1970.
Confrontation, 1970.
1920 German Youth Movement, 1970.
Shoeshine Philosopher, 1970.

Raindance
The Rays, 1970, 23:08, b&w.
Proto Media Primer (Ryan), 1970, 16:05, b&w.
Interview with Buckminster Fuller, 1970, 33:49, color.
Media Primer (Schneider), 1970, 23:07, b&w.
Media Primer (Shambler), 1971, 16:29, b&w.
Woodstock Tapes, 1969.

Anthony Ramos
Identity, 1974, 23:41, b&w.
Cape Verdean Video Archives: Tapes #2, 1975, 22:30, color.
Black & White, 1975, 12:30, color.
About Media, 1977, 25:00, color.
Nor Was This All by Any Means, 1978, 24:00, color.

Martha Rosler
A Budding Gourmet, 1975, 10:00, b&w.
Semiotics of the Kitchen, 1975, 6:09, b&w.
From the PTA, the High School, and the City of Del Mar Charity, 1977, 10:00, color.

Traveling Garage Sale, 1977, 15:00, b&w.
Secrets From the Street: No Disclosure, 1980, 12:20, color.

Paul Ryan
Self Portraits, 1968, b&w.
Feedback for Children, 1968, b&w.
The Children’s Center, 1969, 20:00, b&w.
Experimentation: Center for Understanding Media, 1968-69, b&w.
Experimentation: Center for the Study of Social Change, 1969-70, b&w.
Tender is the Tape I, 1969, 30:00, b&w.
Everyman’s Moebius Strip, 1969, b&w.
Yes and No, 1970, b&w.
Tender is the Tape II, 1970, 30:00, b&w.
Media Primer, 1970, 30:00. (with Raindance)
The Rays, 1970, 20:00, b&w. (with Raindance)
Supermarket, 1970, 20:00, b&w. (with Raindance)
Earth Day in NYC, Uptight about Bushes, 1970, b&w.
(with Raindance)
Alternate Media Conference at Goddard, 1969-71, (with Raindance)
Interview with Buckminster Fuller, 1969-71, (with Raindance)
Year of the Mushroom, 1969-71. (with Raindance)
Warren Brodey—Interviews and Verite Video of Cuba, Phil Morton, Barbara Sykes, Bob Snyder, Drew Browning, and Guenther Tetz)
3rd View of Water, 1975, 6:08, color.
EVE II, 1976, 60:00, color. (with Tom DeFanti, Larry Cuba, Phil Morton, Barbara Sykes, Bob Snyder, Guenther Tetz, Drew Browning, and Michael Sterling)
How TV Works, 1977, 30:00, color. (with Phil Morton and Barbara Sykes)
The First DICE Tape, 1978, 14:00, color.
A in front of B in front of C in front of A (Triangle in front of Square in front of Circle in front of Triangle), 1974. (with Phil Morton and Natsuko Kihara)
Tapping on Water, 1975, 6:00, b&w.
Color TV, 1975, 5:30, color.
Water Chreods Catalog, 1976, 60:00, b&w.
Water Chreods, 1976, 10:00, b&w.
Video Wake for My Father, 1976, 165:57, b&w.

Dan Sandin
Five-Minute Romp Through the Image Processor, 1973, 6:00, color. (with Phil Morton)
Amplitude Classified Clouds, 1974.
Water Chreods Catalog, 1976, 60:00, b&w.
Water Chreods, 1976, 10:00, b&w.
Video Wake for My Father, 1976, 165:57, b&w.

Ilene Segalove
Coal Confession, 1972, 3:00.
Walking Tour of Rome, 1972, 8:00.
The Add On, 1973, 6:00.
Tortillas and Tuna, 1973, 25:00.
The Dive, 1974, 1:00.
The Dorm Room, 1974, 5:00.
God, 1974, 2:00.
Golden Crest Retirement Home, 1974, 8:00.
Joys of Yiddish, 1974, 3:00.
The Mom Tapes, 1974-1978, 30:00.
California Casual, 1976, 18:00.
The Cauliflower Alley Tapes, 1976, 60:00. (with Lowell Darling)
The Dad Tapes, 1976, 6:00, b&w.
China Girls, 1972, 11:00, b&w.
Television Delivers People, 1973, 6:00, color. (with Carlotta Schoolman)
Surprise Attack, 1973, 2:00, b&w.
Boomerang, 1974, 10:00, color. (with Nancy Holt)
Prisoner's Dilemma, 1974, 40:00, b&w.

Richard Serra
Anxious Automation, 1971, 4:30, b&w. (with Joan Jonas)
China Girls, 1972, 11:00, b&w.
Television Delivers People, 1973, 6:00, color. (with Carlotta Schoolman)
Surprise Attack, 1973, 2:00, b&w.
Boomerang, 1974, 10:00, color. (with Nancy Holt)
Prisoner's Dilemma, 1974, 40:00, b&w.

Eric Siegel
Psychedelivision, 1968, 27:00, b&w.
Einstein, 1968, 5:41, color.
Symphony of the Planets, 1968, 10:20, color.
Tomorrow Never Knows, 1968, 3:10, color.
Psychedelivision #2, 1969, 27:00, b&w and color.
Nineteenth Nervous Breakdown, 1969, 2:00, color.
San Francisco Cockettes, 1971, 45:00, color.
New York New York, 1971, 30:00, b&w.
Stockholm Visited, 1972, 30:00, b&w.
Healing #1 Spiritual, 1972, 30:00, b&w.
Healing #2 Homeopathy, 1972, 30:00, b&w.
Healing #3 Ayurvedic Medicine, 1972, 30:00, b&w.
The Hindustan Tapes, 1973-75, 3:30 hours, b&w:
Delhi, 30:00, b&w.

Taj Mahal, 30:00, b&w.
Bombay, 30:00, b&w.
Goa 1, 30:00, b&w.
Goa 2, 30:00, b&w.
Hampi, 30:00, b&w.
Afghanistan, 30:00, b&w.

Steina (Also see Steina and Woody Vasulka)
Violin Power, 1970-78, 10:04, b&w.
Let It Be, 1974, 4:00, b&w.
From Cheektowaga to Tonawanda, 1975, 36:00, color.
Signifying Nothing, 1975, 15:00, b&w.
Sound and Fury, 1975, 15:00, b&w.
Switch!Monitor!Drift!, 1976, 50:00, b&w. (reedited, 30:00)
Allvision, 1976, b&w. (two channel installation)
Snowed Tapes, 1977, 15:00, b&w, silent.
Land of Timoteus, 1977, 15:00, color.
Flux, 1977, 7:25, color.
Stasto, 1977, 7:00, b&w.
Bad, 1979, 2:14, color.
Selected Treecuts, 1980, 8:11, color.
Cantaloup, 1980, 27:54, b&w and color.
Urban Episodes, 1980, 8:50, color.
Exor, 1980, 4:00, color.

George Stoney
Acupuncture and Herbal Medicine, 1978, 22:07, b&w.

Skip Sweeney
Kate, 1968, 4:30, b&w.
Tommy, 1968, 3:00, b&w.
Dick Gregory, 1969, 90:00, b&w.
Jazz, 1969, 5:00, b&w.
Classical, 1969, 13:00, b&w.
Philo T. Farnsworth Video Obelisk, 1970, 90 hours, b&w. (two channel installation)
The Continuing Story of Carel and Ferd, 1970-75, 90:00, b&w. (multi-channel installation; also single channel version, 58:35; with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)

Jonas’ Favorite, 1970, 5:00, color.
Equinox, 1970, 20:00, b&w. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
It’s Gonna Rain, 1970-71, 10:00, b&w and color.
Fell Street Parade, 1970-72, 5:00, b&w and color.
Message to New York, 1971, 60:00, b&w. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
Moog Vidium Process, 1971, b&w.
Frisbee, 1971, 8:00, b&w. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
Provo Park Music Free 4th of July, Commander Cody and the Youngbloods, 1971, 60:00, color. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
Orgy, 1971, 10:00, b&w. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)

New Riders of the Purple Sage (with Jerry Garcia at the Dead Ranch), 1971, 20:00, color. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
My Father’s Funeral, 1971, 1:30, b&w.
Chopin Preludes with Julian White, 1972, 30:00, b&w. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
Kaspar, 1974, 90:00, b&w. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
Illuminatin’ Sweeney, 1975, 28:38, b&w and color.
Lob Electronic Feedback, 1975, 25:00, color, silent.
Paperback Television, 1975, 60:00, b&w and color. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)

Good Vibrations, 1977, 4:30, color.
Kaddish, 1977, 60:00, b&w. (with Arthur Ginsberg and Video Free America)
Cerberus, 1977, 30:00, color. (with Henry Smith)
Bay Jason and his Seventh Annual Street Performers Show, 1978, 30:00, color.
Abortion: The Divisive Issue, 1979, 30:00, color. (with Joanne Kelly)
Lake Tahoe: The Politics of Ecology, 1979, 30:00, color. (with Joanne Kelly)
Placenta Boys Meet Plutonium, 1980, 6:00, color. (with Joanne Kelly)
Top Value Television (TVTV)
The World's Largest TV Studio, 1972, 59:04, b&w.
Four More Years, 1972, 61:28, b&w.
Convention '72, 1972, 90:00, b&w.
TVTV Meets Rolling Stone, 1973, 17:00, b&w.
Lord of the Universe, 1974, 58:27, b&w and color.
Adland, 1974, 58:25, b&w and color.
Gerald Ford's America, 1975, 4 parts, 112:00, b&w and color:
WIN, 28:00.
Chic To Sheik, 28:00.
Secondhand News, 28:00.
The Hill, 28:00.
VTR: TVTV, 1975, 28:30:00, b&w and color.
Top Value Television (TVTV) by Andy Mann for WNET in New York)
VTR: TVTV, 1975, 28:30:00, b&w and color.
VTR: TVTV, 1975, 23:50, b&w and color.
Superbowl, 1976, 60:00, color.
Superbowl, 1976, 60:00, color.
Hard Rain, 1976, 60:00, color.
TVTV Looks at The Oscars, 1977, 60:00, color.
Worldwide: The VTR Revolution, 1977, 60:00, b&w and color.
(portrait of TVTV by KCET, Los Angeles)
The TVTV Show, 1977, 90:00, color.
TVTV Looks at The Oscars, 1977, 90:00, b&w and color.
The TVTV Show, 1977, 90:00, color.
TVTV's Greatest Hits 1972-1976, 1979, 90:00, b&w and color.
(portrait of TVTV by BBC/2, London)
The TVTV Show, 1977, 90:00, color.
TVTV's Greatest Hits 1972-1976, 1979, 90:00, b&w and color.
(portrait of TVTV by KCET, Los Angeles)

T.R. Uthco
The Eternal Frame, 1975, 23:50, b&w and color. (with Ant Farm)
Game of the Week, 1977, 16:20, color.
Really, I've Never Done Anything Like That Before, He Said, 1975, 15:00, b&w. (also two channel version)

Steina and Woody Vasulka (Also see Steina; Woody Vasulka)
Participation, 1969-1971, 60:00, b&w.
Sketches, 1970, 27:00, b&w.

Calligrams, 1970, 12:00, b&w.
Sexmachine, 1970, 6:00, b&w.
Tissues, 1970, 6:00, b&w.
Interface, 1970, 3:30, b&w.
Jackie Curlis' First Television Special, 1970, 45:00, b&w.
Don Cherry, 1970, 12:00, color. (with Elaine Miloah)
Decay #1, 1970, 7:00, color.
Decay #2, 1970, 7:00, color.
Evolution, 1970, 16:00, b&w.
Adagio, 1970, 10:00, color.
Matrix, 1970-72, b&w. (multi-channel installation)
Swan Lake, 1971, 7:00, b&w.
Discs, 1971, 6:00, b&w.
Shapes, 1971, 13:00, b&w.
Contrapoint, 1971, 3:00, b&w.
Black Sunrise, 1971, 21:00, color.
Keysnow, 1971, 12:00, color.
Elements, 1971, 9:00, color.
Continuous Video Environment, 1971, b&w. (multi-channel installation)
Spaces I, 1972, 15:00, b&w.
Distant Activities, 1972, 6:00, color.
Spaces II, 1972, 7:50, b&w.
Soundprints, 1972, endless loops, color.
The West, 1972, b&w. (three channel installation)
Noisefields, 1974, 12:05, color.
1-2-3-4, 1974, 7:46, color.
Solo For 3, 1974, 4:15, color.
Heraldic View, 1974, 4:21, color.
Telc, 1974, 5:10, color.
Reminiscence, 1974, 4:48, color.
Soundsize, 1974, 4:40, color.
Electronic Environment, 1974, b&w. (multi-channel installation)
Update, 1977, 30:00, color.
Update, 1978, 30:00, color.
Six Programs For Television, 1972-79, 174:00, color.
Matrix, 1972, 29:00, color.
Vocabulary, 1974, 29:00, color.
Transformations, 1975, 29:00, color.
Objects, 1977, 29:00, color.
Steina, 1977, 29:00, color.
Digital Images, 1979, 29:00, color.

Woody Vasulka (Also see Steina and Woody Vasulka)
Vocabulary, 1973, 4:17, color.
Explanation, 1974, 11:45, color.
C-Trend, 1974, 9:03, color.
The Matter, 1974, 3:56, color.

Bill Viola
Wild Horses, 1972, 15:00, b&w. (with Marge Monroe)
Tape I, 1972, 6:50, b&w.
Instant Replay, 1972, 20:00, b&w. (also installation)
Passage Series, 1973, 7:50, b&w.
Composition 'D', 1973, 9:42, b&w.
Vidicon Burns, 1973, 8:02, color.
Polaroid Video Stills, 1973, 2:36, color. (excerpts from 10:00 original)
Level, 1973, 8:28, b&w.
Cycles, 1973, 7:07, b&w.
Information, 1973, 30:00, color.
Walking into the Wall, 1973, b&w. (installation)
Localization, 1973, b&w. (video/sound installation)
Quadrants, 1973, b&w. (video/sound installation)
Bank Image Bank, 1974, b&w. (installation)
Decay Time, 1974, b&w. (installation)
Peep Hole, 1974, b&w. (installation)
Mock Turtles, 1974, b&w. (installation)
Eclipse, 1974, 22:00, b&w.
August '74, 1974, 11:00, color:
Instant Breakfast, 5:05.
Offaction, 2:34.
Recycle, 3:00.
The Amazing Colossal Man, 1974, b&w. (video/sound installation)
Separate Selves, 1974, b&w. (video/sound installation)
Trapped Moments, 1974, b&w. (installation)
Gravitational Pull, 1975, 10:00, b&w.
A Million Other Things, 1975, 8:00, b&w.
Il Vapore, 1975, b&w. (video and sound installation)
Red Tape—Collected Works, 1975, 30:00, color:
Playing Soul Music to My Freckles, 2:46.
A Non-Dairy Creamer, 5:19.
The Semi-Circular Canals, 8:51.
A Million Other Things (2), 4:35.
Return, 7:15.
Origins of Thought, 1975, b&w. (single channel instal-
lation)
Rain, 1975, b&w. (video/sound installation)
Migration, 1976, 7:00, color.
He Weeps for You, 1976, color. (video/sound installation)
Four Songs, 1976, 33:00, color.
Junkyard Levitation, 3:11.
Songs of Innocence, 9:34.
The Space Between the Teeth, 9:10.
Truth Through Mass Individuation, 10:13.
Olfaction, 1976, b&w. (video/ sound installation)
Memory Surfaces and Mental Prayers, 1977, 29:00,
color:
The Wheel of Becoming, 7:40.
The Morning After the Night of Power, 10:44.
Sweet Light, 9:08.
Memories of Ancestral Power (The Moro Movement in
the Solomon Islands), 1977, 35:19, color.
Palm Trees on the Moon, 1977, 26:06, color.
Chott el-Djerid (A Portrait in Light and Heat), 1979,
28:00, color.
Sodium Vapor (including Constellation and Oracle),
1979, 14:41, color.
Moving Stillness (Mt. Rainier 1979), 1979, color.
(video/sound installation)
The Reflecting Pool—Collected Work, 1977-80, 62:00,
color:
The Reflecting Pool, 1977-79, 7:00.


William Wegman
Spit Sandwich, 1970, 16:38, b&w.
Selected Works: Reel 1, 1970-72, 30:08, b&w.
Selected Works: Reel 2, 1972, 14:19, b&w.
Selected Works: Reel 5, 1974-75, 26:38, b&w.
Semi-Buffet (with the Two or Three Variations which
Could be Very Possible): A Televised Dinner, 1975,
20:18, color.
Selected Works: Reel 6, 1975, 18:35, b&w and color.
Gray Hairs, 1976, 5:10, color.
World History, 1976, 16:20. (audio only)
Selected Works: Reel 7 (Revised), 1976-77, 17:54,
color.
William Wegman: Selected Works 1970-78, compiled
1981, 19:11, b&w and color.
Accident, 1979, 4:17, color.
This bibliography was compiled by the editors of the 1995 edition of Rewind. It was based, in part, on the bibliographies of several individuals responding to a 1989 request from VDB. The editors have added to these lists from their own research. The bibliography is limited to U.S. publications.
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