New York State Council on the Arts

Transcript of the Whitney Video Conference sponsored by NYSCA on April 1 & 2, 1974.

Participants:

Peter Bradley, Director of Programs, Film, TV/Media & Literature, NYSCA
Gil Konishi, NYSCA
Michael Chase, Director, New York Network
John Reilly, Director, Global Village Video Resource Center
David Langdon, New York State Cable Commission
Carolyn Sachs, New York State Cable Commission
Mrs. Richard Rodgers, Council Member, NYSCA
David Davis/ Office in Charge of Public Broadcasting, Ford Foundation
Porter McCray, Director, Asian Cultural Programs, J.D.R. Ill Fund
Forest Chisman, Executive Assistant, Markle Foundation
Nancy Raine/ Assistant, Public Media, NBA
David Loxton, Director, TV Lab, Educational Broadcasting Corp.
Bob Civiello, Long Island Educational TV Council
Drew Rowland, Long Island Educational TV Council
Diane Hart, Collaborations in Art, Science and Technology
Jon Alpert, Downtown Community TV Center
George Cree, Experimental Intermedia Foundation
Ralph Flocking, Experimental TV Center
Sherry Miller, Experimental TV Center
Lance Wisniewski, Innervision Media Systems
Joe Seal, Ithaca Video Project
Skip Blumberg, Media Bus, Inc.
Bart Friedman,, Media Bus, Inc.
Nancy Caine, Media Bus, Inc.
Davidson Gigliotti, Media Bus, Inc.
Gerald O'Grady, Media Study, Inc.
Sandy Rockowitz, Portable Channel
Judy DeSisti, Portable Channel
Howie Gutstadt, Survival Arts Media
Ben Levine, Survival Arts Media
Alan Winer, Visual Studies Workshop
Margot Lewitin, Women's Interart Center
Ken Marsh, Woodstock Community Video
Dean Evenson, Woodstock Community Video
Jaime Barrios, Young Filmmaker's Foundation
Lydia Silman, NYSCA

LYDIA SILMAN. John Reilly has been coordinating this seminar for me and he has some remarks that ought to be quite interesting. Mr. Reilly.

JOHN REILLY. There is a copy of a paper, which is kind of long, but contains a few different parts. In the beginning, there is a brief discussion of funding from the New York State Council. Mainly what I did was assemble some statements by the Governor, John Hightower, Gerd Stern and Peter Bradley. I quoted you in here also, on general philosophy and feeling about funding, which is part of what I think we'll be talking about today. And, then I've gone into an area in here where I've spoken about objectives of what we might try to achieve today and the final part is simply some information about the Video Study Center of Global Village and to give an example of the type of workshops we do. I included two descriptions at the end of this list of workshops, one an intensive and one a new workshop that we'll be doing in intermedia. It seems to me that there is an opportunity for all of us to find ways of coordinating some of our activities and begin to work a little more closely together on certain areas. Now, I think it's happened kind of informally actually, and I think there's a chance, perhaps to do it with a little more planning, a little more thought. I've proposed some of those areas where I thought we might think of cooperating with each other. For instance, those of us who teach or offer workshops of some type or who have a facility open to the public can take people to certain skill levels. It's a very simple point. If I have somebody who's working in a studio, they can attain a certain skill level of work beyond the portapak- working in a small studio, working with one-inch editing facilities, etc. There are other facilities in the State where there are time-base error correctors, color equipment, or a Paik-Abe Video synthesizer, I mean resources beyond those that we have that perhaps can be made available to certain people so that - I don't want to use the word graduate but a person (artist) who completes a certain skill level in one of the facilities can go on to work in another facility. Now, we've been doing this informally and I just think this is one area that we can discuss to make it a little bit more formal, so that there would actually be places put aside so that someone could go to Buffalo, or someone could come to New York for a period of time. It doesn't really have to be a long time but who then has studio experience, can go on and work in a more sophisticated facility and can take that skill to another level. It seems like a minor point but what I'm trying to do is suggest concrete ways that I see as an area of cooperation, an area of really doing something together. I think that most of us have had discussions over the last, what has been, four or five years, in Video, where a lot of grandiose plans have been made and sometimes very little has happened, and I think that what we all need, and I think you probably would agree, is to begin to make things as concrete as possible, just something tangible, something real, some small level, let's say, of achieving something that we can really do. And part of, I suppose, what will come out today is the offering that each facility has and how we can begin to inter-relate those offerings by, for instance, beginning by having somebody on your own staff or yourself, that would like to work in another facility. And for our part, we would be
willing to do that and would find it a challenge, to find a way of inter-relating on that level. So, that's one area that I suggest that perhaps we talk about. Then, the whole question of distribution of tapes, networking, the idea that we probably have to find a way beyond our mailing and beyond what we're doing now. I suppose you could, describe how you show tapes and what you do. We are continuing to show tapes on the Cable, in New York City, on the public access channel. Sometimes it's very difficult to get a reaction, sometimes I can get a reaction. One way I've found of getting a reaction- it's a very minor point- is when I can find another organization to help

promote it. I did a taping with a major union in the city and the union circulated the information to 100,000 union members in New York State so that it was possible to actually get a reaction by showing the tapes simultaneously on both public access systems in New York and promoting it. And there was feedback, there was actually a response, which is usually the biggest problem, because we can show an infinite number of tapes and we just get no response whatsoever. So, that is one small way that we distribute. We also mail - we just simply mail out on the average of maybe between five and ten tapes a week to colleagues, to facilities, and all over the country. I suggest that with the "new access" to public television, that is at least technically through the time-base error corrector, most of our work now, theoretically, can be broadcast. We should begin to think of the stations in the State relating in some way (and I've suggested a New York State Experimental TV Hour or something along that line) where, for instance, the work being done at the Lab and at WLIW in Long Island can be shown on a regular basis on all the public television stations in the State. There could actually be established some kind of an hour-a-month as a modest beginning, to show the work around the State of the other groups and artists in the different regions of the State and begin to circulate their work in some way on the Public Television stations. I think that's an area we can talk about. Some of you may object. You can say, “I don't want to relate to that,” or whatever, but I think that's an area that we should talk about and try and find a way—if there is one- of doing it. I know some of you have thought about it and have other things to say about that, I mentioned that the Council has a number of the tapes that we produce and has been showing them. I don't know what policy actually is followed on that, and I suppose I would raise that question just out of a point of information. One of the discussions that we have gotten into- or at least I have gotten into at National Endowment was this whole question of: Do we distribute tapes that somebody makes that cost him a certain amount of money? Do we distribute them for nothing or should it be that a distribution agency such as the set-up that Howard Wise is now working with, charge a certain amount of money and return a certain amount to the artist? I think it's a whole question about revenue going back to the artist. (I use the word artist and some of you may object to "artist". I mean anyone who's making tapes. I try to be definitive about this.) There's a whole question about revenue from tapes and things like that. I think that is another area that some of you may have some thoughts about. I don't feel strongly one way or the other about it. I think there are times when it would be nice if we could have some revenue from the tapes and I think there are certain people and groups that can afford to pay for tapes and should. But I also think that there are a lot of people in this State, and a lot of groups and colleges and different people that probably can't, and we have to have policies for that, too. But anyway, the whole question of distribution, what happens with what? Is there a better way that we can begin to relate in terms of distributing tapes and putting this together? Is there anything we can suggest today, as a result of this meeting, to further this whole question of distribution? It's something that was raised in the very beginning. I remember at the first meeting that we ever attended relating to video- at that point Michael Shamberg had a plan for distribution of tapes. I think that it's still with us. What do we do about it, or do we do anything about it? That's another point. Okay, those were some of the areas that I hope we could go into the question of coordination of facilities. Can we begin to think about ways that after we describe what each of us has been doing and will plan on doing in the future, can we begin to better relate our facilities to each other so that we can exchange people, ideas, maybe reserve certain places for people to come work in different facilities. This whole question of having our work shown in different parts of the State- I suggested, perhaps through the public television stations, by setting aside some time. The question of tape distribution

- fees for tapes and things of that nature- those are, broadly speaking, some of the areas I hope we can go into a little bit.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Are you just discussing within the State or are you interested in talking about how we can relate to people outside the State in terms of distributing tapes?

JOHN REILLY. I think inevitably what's going to happen is we're going to talk about distributing outside of the State. The advantage we have right now is we probably have most of the active video groups in New York State in the room, or representatives, so that if we can work out a model or anything—really anything—every just recommendation out of this group, I think we have a real beginning. I'm sure you realize that what's happened in New York State, almost completely as a result of the Council, is that you have, in effect, the largest network of experimental Video artists and centers anywhere in the country. When I say that I mean you're virtually talking about anywhere in the world with the exception of the support the Canadian government has given to Cable - But, through my travels in Europe and Asia, I've learned that there just simply is no support for experimental Video of any kind. And really, what we have in New York State is a rather phenomenal situation and what I hope could come out of something like this would be that we can see a way of relating some of our activity and begin to show some models to other people so that when systems do develop - if California in fact, begins to fund video, as I've heard rumors that the State may- at least they'll have something to look to and some example of a system that's developed. Actually, a system that's developed over four years which, in terms of video and experimentation, is a long time- probably the oldest ongoing situation in the Country- I think with the exception of what the National Center for Experiments in Television, which was funded the year before or two years before the Council began to fund Video. This is probably the longest riding situation in terms of work with Video. Out of this, I think we've all gained a lot of experience and a lot of practical ways of simply surviving. You know there are a lot of groups that aren't here today for various reasons and I think we've learned, certainly, a lot in that period of time. Some of you are much newer at this and some of us have been around a long time.

PETER BRADLEY. I'd like to introduce Mrs. Dorothy Rogers, who's a member of the Council and sits on a specific panel that evaluates all the video and film grants before they are sent into the full Council. I'm delighted she was able to come for at least a while this morning.

(MRS. ROGERS ACKNOWLEDGES PERSONS PRESENT.)

Skip, if I can comment on your question, I would just say that just because we're all from New York State, there shouldn't be any things that would inhibit, or put boundaries on what we all want to talk about, if that's what you had in mind. I think we should talk about the national scene or any sort of universe not limit it to New York State.

GERRY O'GRADY. Although no one's prouder of the Council than I am, I think we have to be careful in saying that the New York State development has been totally—we made that mistake with Open Circuits.

JOHN REILLY. I'm sorry. I don't understand.

GERRY O'GRADY. Well, I'm just saying that the National Endowment and Markle and Rockefeller have given at least an equal amount, I mean together, if not more, than the New York State Council to the Alternate Media Center and Channel 13. And, so we shouldn't slight or cut off other sources of funding. I just think it's important we have that larger picture.

JOHN REILLY. I've mentioned that, in the beginning of this the distinction in my mind is that the Council has funded a wider range of groups. I think that has an enormous value by the very fact that we're all present in this room and we can offer different examples of how we've developed centers and teaching facilities and ways of working in a community. That very example- the fact that there are maybe 18 or 20 groups represented here- is a very exciting thing. I think that that's a difference in the approach to funding. For instance, Rockefeller has given more money to David's facility (Television Laboratory) because they need it to operate, but the Council has given wider. And, I think in that sense, I want to qualify what I said because you're quite correct. Actually, except for talking for a moment about some of the things that we do at our own facility, I want to go on and hear from some of you. What we're offering, mainly, at this point, are workshops of various types, in Video on varying degrees of sophistication from a one-day workshop for teachers and for other people-- kind of as a general introduction to an intensive video experience, which could be more than 20 hours a week in all kinds of aspects of production and work. We're also showing tapes, consulting, and again my commitment is to experimental use of video, and that can be defined in ten different ways—as far away as the government of Bangladesh which we're consultant to on the use of Video. And, developing nations—the whole aspect of developing nations using Video systems as opposed to broadcast systems in new ways—so that the experience we've gained in New York, interestingly enough, has much wider application than I would have first imagined. And, when we went to Bangladesh, we found out that actually, the need for the type of work we've been is very great. I mean, it was kind of a shock on one level. I believed it but I didn't really believe it. When I went there I found out it was actually true. Anyway, so we do a very wide range of things. We take people in terms of the experience of working in a facility to the point where they're handling a complete mobile studio. In other words, you can pack it all in a suitcase and go out with four cameras and do a whole set-up as we did on Saturday night with Ali Akbar Khan. I hope some of you will get a chance to see that tape at one point, I would really like to go on and maybe just return to some of these points as we go through the meeting. Because I know some of you have prepared notes and some of you haven't but many of you want, probably, to talk to a number of the points that we've raised . . . On our agenda, Ralph Hocking, who is heading a center in Binghamton, might want to say a few things. Do you Ralph?

RALPH HOCKING. I think I'm all for an interaction situation, but the thing I find that I'm not for would be a lock-in situation where each step became a step of the way to becoming something - undergraduate, graduate and that sort of thing. That would be a little dangerous. Distribution is something I can't cope with at all. I don't know what to do about it. I'm interested in it. I really have nothing to offer except that at our center - what we're doing is just giving people a place to work and not paying a hell of a lot of attention to what goes on as far as the tapes go. Most of the tapes that come out of our place I hardly ever see. They go out and go someplace else. Actually, we're trying to find ways to deal with distribution but we don't know what to do, so what we are doing is what we can do- making a place for people to work. We have a lot of equipment- synthesizers, things like that, which can be used. Generally, we're booked about two months ahead. People all over the State come in. It's a very open and small-time TV situation, which is the way

we're going to maintain it because it sort of tailors itself to the person who comes in and decides what they want to do. They can work all night, work all day for 2 or 3 days. They can do anything they want to in the confines of what we have to offer them, which includes the front door key. So, they can manage themselves pretty much. We want to keep going this way, I think. We don't particularly want to get involved in a system of distribution except maybe as participants,. But, we don't want to find definition and so far the definition that's been coming toward us isn't terribly interesting, including the latest proposal from Howard Wise. We're becoming unimpressed with that. I think the reason I'm unimpressed is I can't see a progress in it. I can't see an art chunk to hang on the wall as a video critic. There's no damn way to deal with that. I can't see the Video Center becoming part of business in that respect. I suppose we will. I suppose we'll become part of a large business. I want to discourage this somehow. I really don't want to get involved with getting paid for my art. I want to be paid for goods. That makes more sense. And, I think that's where it's vital that the Foundations and the various places that do give grants realize that it's necessary to do this to support the arts in this way. They have to. There's no other way to support yourself unless you teach which is also what I do. I think I'll just let it go at that.

JOHN REILLY. I had one question, Ralph. When you had originally spoken to me, you had said that you felt there was a strong need to have a small, independent center. Do you recall that?

RALPH HOCKING. Yeah. Well, I'm vain in the sense of what we're doing works and I'd like to see a lot more of them around. I'd like to see them operated in such a way that they maintain a sense of the idea. I think maybe one of those is good. But, you have certain restrictions that the artist can't cope with and that has to be opened up to a point where it's a little easier to operate which includes not getting equipment to a point where you have to have two or three engineers to operate and tweak up your PCP lines and that sort of thing. It's fascinating to have quad and it's fascinating to have big-time machines but every time I think about it I don't want that. I'd really like to have simple machines and if it breaks I'd like to get it fixed by Dave Jones. But, that's what we're doing. We're trying to develop equipment that's simple to operate, that's useful, and that's not available, and that can come out cheaply. Our latest thing is a 7-inch monitor-receiver. We're trying to build a monitor bank using these things. It's a monitor receiver and it scans everything and we figure we can sell it for about $150 to a non-profit organization. That's a simple thing. Now, the next thing, hopefully, will be some sort of a colorizer and grade-level colorizer control and keyers. You guys are doing this too. You've got some new pieces of equipment. Maybe that's a point where we might all get together. It should be explored, sitting down and seeing what pieces of equipment are the most flexible, that are least available and least expensive. And, how can we get these from each other? Other so-called facilities can get their technical people to have the time and budgets to put together a colorizer if that's what people want. That's an area of cooperation. This is one of the reasons that we exist, I think. We're giving them equipment that everybody can't afford. I feel very strongly that we're committed to making this available to everybody that wants it and giving them time to use it and they don’t have to come in with an "A" on their forehead to prove that they're an artist. I think we have to maintain that sort of openness. And, that's very small. We're three people operating this thing—or, 2 and 1/2. I count myself as half because I'm teaching full time. It works. In space and all, we don't want to get too big.

JOHN REILLY. Many of us are at that point. I think you stated the reason to have a small independent facility very well. That's why I asked. Ralph, why would you want to sell the 7-inch monitor only to non-profit organizations?

RALPH HOCKING. Well, at that price I'll sell it to anybody else who'll buy it. I figure if the AMA can do it why can't I?

JOHN REILLY. O.K. Lance.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. John, are we all gonna report and then talk or are we going to talk after each one?

JOHN REILLY. In this session I think Lance and Ken have some points they'd like to make and then we'll come back.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. The first point I'd like to make is to find out if anybody else is cold in here. I just wanted to mention a couple of things that you'll probably be getting from us. I think most of you received copies of the invitation to send proposals for the visiting artists program. Most of that has been pretty much dropped out for the year in terms of locking people in. Most of you have been there, and most of the rest of you have come so, I guess I don't have to say too much about that. We are involved right now in a very interesting project with the University of Georgia and their library system. That's what we've decided to talk about. We've had to confront the problem of tape distribution and electronic arts head on. We're designing, actually we've finished the design of a semi-random access half-inch cartridge retrieval for the library that we'll interface with cable television systems around the State. And, we just found out last week that we're gonna be coordinating the first software acquisition to submit tapes. Georgia will be paying for them and it will be a source of some kind of revenue for all o f you. I think, also, a very good opportunity to show what is going on in New York State and get it into another environment, such as Georgia, and to really have interface of 'retrieveability' and half-inch cable systems work on a very interesting project. What we want to do is what we did sort of with the CAPS program last year, which is to have people submit tapes that they want to have considered and we will screen them on the Cable System or a synapse system for feedback purposes so that we can get an idea of what people think of it. And, from that time for synchronicity or something like that, where everybody is getting on sort of the same wave lengths. We've begun preparations for a study that we're going to do this summer, with technical assistance support from the Council on more details of an interconnection experiment or study for the State and it's something that we really want to have be like a video resources directory. We might be coordinating it but we'll have as much input into that study as possible. We've already talked with many people in the State Government on different levels. There seems to be a lot happening very quickly, a lot of new things happening within other branches of the State government that I think we really need to get in touch with. Some of the key people are here right now, Carolyn Sachs from the Cable Commission, Michael Chase from the New York network. I have a paper that outlines this but the Ampex copying machine, actually it's a Xerox but it's as big as that, broke down this morning so I'll try to get that out tomorrow. We'll be looking at microwave networks around the State. I have some maps in there explaining where they're at right now, where they might be going and we'll be working quite closely with the Cable

Commission to look at how, electronically, tapes and other real-time video can get around the State. What-we have proposed as a kind of interim experiment, is something that might happen on a trial basis, is probably along the lines of what many of you have been thinking of for quite some time. I think with some of the new information we have, it may be very possible. And, that is the use of the networks and the use of the headquarters in Albany to either accept live requests from other centers in the State coming in on the microwave system where they could be mixed or switched and sent out again to the Public Television station or simply tape playback through time-base correctors at the head end of the New York network system to Public Television stations or some combination of all of them. And, I guess that's something that could really use a lot of discussion to see whether we're prepared to do that or not.

JOHN REILLY. Do you have any estimates of what something like that might cost? Have you gotten that far?

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. We started to see; I could break that down. I don't really have those broken down, because we do want to look into it a lot farther. It's all happened very fast. It's a considerable cost, I think Mr. Chase is talking about. When you're using the network facilities, I'm not talking about taking over the network, I'm talking about an experimental use of the system, because they have staff there that is responsible for originating programming for the Public Television stations. Most of that kind of expense, including the use of the studio, is sort of within their budget already. Perhaps you would be a good person to ask. What it comes back to inevitably is dealing with the public television stations themselves in each location. Although, if we originate in the local stations where they chop off 3/4 of the budget to go into their administrative costs.

JOHN REILLY. You're really talking about something on two levels: one is sending tapes in and using time-base error correctors, into Albany, into the network, and then having that distributed. And, the second one you mentioned, was microwave links to various facilities. Is that correct?

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. Right. That's one that I'm really interested in. That would be some kind of a real fine experiment between the different centers, getting to the Public Television stations and then over the network back to Albany or from one center to another on a smaller level. There's probably a lot more Mr. Chase could say about that.

JOHN ALPERT. Can I ask a simple question? When you talk about time - base correcting a tape, can you correct a tape that’s been edited on half-inch - in other words, a second-generation tape?

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. We've had success with that. David.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Perhaps you can correct me. It's said that there's a third-generation time-base corrector that's coming out now that would be able to handle second and third generation.

MIKE CHASE. Yes. Apparently Ampex has come out with a new machine which can do that. Whether that will be, I don't know. It's being tested.

JOHN REILLY. Maybe you could, Mr. Chase, give us an explanation of what the New York Network is and how it functions.

MIKE CHASE. It functions as a general service organization to all State agencies and public television stations in the State. It interconnects all but, I think, two public television stations in the State and one of those channels on Long Island will be connected as of September. It's a two-way interconnection, roughly along the Thru-way, which means that it's all synchronous. You can cut from one station to another without cutting between cameras. Its primary function is to distribute the set of programs that everybody shows on public television to the stations in the state of New York. There's 110 charge for origination. That's the good part. The bad part is that we originate just what the stations ask us to originate since they have the sole responsibility for the programming of their station. So, if any station in the state wants a program that we have, we would view it as our problem to see that they got it and require some sort of time-base corrector and there are disadvantages in that.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. But you have one, right?

MIKE CHASE. Yes. We got one when the Attica report was done in Albany and we took a lot of Sony stuff and pumped it up to quad and aired it on 13. We want to do that, but the big trip to getting into it really, to getting anyone there, is through the station itself. And, once there's a station that wants a product, then all our resources are available to whoever we find to make that product. We have a small studio with a couple IVC cameras. We have four cameras in all and a quad tape machine for the engineers. And, we believe we should support the sort of thing you're doing so if I leave something out, if you think of something that could be useful, we can always talk about it. Most clients that come to us for stuff that's not our origination. The only thing we ever charge is out-of-the-pocket costs to recover funds where we have no appropriation for it. The studio adds up to $200 or $300 a day instead of $700.

JOHN REILLY. In other words, there are two ways of originating on the network. One is for a local station to feed in and you can take that connection and then send it out to the rest of the state.

MIKE CHASE. Sure, most of the stations can originate. The one on Long Island won't be able to. The one in Watertown can't. But, that's generally not important, because if you should want to originate from either of those stations, you can buy a transmit loop or rent it for that length of time.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. Is this all microwave link?

MIKE CHASE. Yes.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Do you have production equipment available, too?

MIKE CHASE. Yes. We've got stuff you're probably likely to have seen. We did that Fisher-Spassky chess match. We produce stuff mostly for the University and for the governor and for the Senate- that sort of thing. Mostly, we do a lot of non-broadcast stuff. We've done broadcasts, too.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Do you ever give access to that equipment to people or have requests for the use of your equipment?

MIKE CHASE. We don't give the access but we've gotten requests. Well, we'll use pick-up camera men but we don't let anybody else work the tape machine.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Is there any union involved?

MIKE CHASE. No, well, there is a bargaining unit that represents all University employees. They're all professional service people there. Whether or not they've actually signed up, I don't know. There is not union restriction, per se. It's not like I.E.W.

GERRY O'GRADY. What's the reason for non-access? Are you too busy...?

MIKE CHASE. No. The reason for non-access is its terribly expensive equipment. It's run primarily not to teach, but as a professional service to local broadcast stations and. I can't hold the maintenance crew responsible if somebody else has the equipment.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Is it feasible, if a broadcast station wants to send out a tape to be time-base corrected, can it be sent down the microwave link, be time-base corrected and returned?

MIKE CHASE. If they could originate, we could probably just signal the crew. I'm guessing now, but we could probably take the incoming signal and just record it, period. Your problem is not a time-base problem. You'd end up with a quad recording at our plant, I would imagine.

BOB CIVIELLO. Theoretically, it is possible, but practically speaking it is not. Each individual stations, as well as their network, has different parts of their system which wouldn't necessarily be compatible. Idiosyncrasies exist at each station and the amount of tweaking that goes over a network has to be put against a time-base corrector. It would compound the problem. I don't know of any engineer who'd want to do it that way.

MIKE CHASE. Of course we have one nice thing which is a little bit different from some of the stations. You can certainly mail a tape in. If you have a problem with a tape. We've done that sort of thing for people. If you want to make it legal for broadcast, we'll work on it.

JOHN REILLY. In order for people working in half-inch and one-inch to have access basically to any broadcast facility they have to go through a time-base error corrector. That's my understanding.

MIKE CHASE. No, IVC has a one-inch machine that is used for direct origination in many stations, and we've used it.

JOHN REILLY. You'd have to record an original on the IVC then?

MIKE CHASE. Yes. You record on the IVC and you play it back on the IVC; for a long time all the governor press conferences were recorded on IVC and we'd bump them up, feed them over the

network. They'd be recorded at various stations and they were used by the commercial stations. And, this was all on a time-base corrector.

JOHN REILLY. Do you have any idea of the cost of the IVC unit?

BOB CIVIELLO. Roughly, $18,000. The time-base corrector for the equipment is about $20,000 to $21,000.

JOHN REILLY. I'm asking this because I'm wondering if everybody here knows how many time-base error correctors are in New York State and what their availability is.

MIKE CHASE. We just bought one today but we've been operating without one up until now. We borrowed one occasionally.

LYDIA SILMAN. Except yours is not really available to the public. The three that we have given as grants are available to anyone. But the artist has to include the cost of tape and the two-inch machine. They're at WNET in New York, in Rochester at WXXI, and they're going to be getting one—they have the grant—at WCNY in Syracuse.

MIKE CHASE. Well, my guess would be, if you went into, say, NET, and you wanted to use the time-base corrector with the idea of ending up on quad, you would have to rent the quad machine from them. And, that cost would be in the neighborhood of $100 an hour. Whereas, if we did it, and I'm not trying to do NET out of business, we'd do if for cost, which might end up to be $10.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. I think that it would be good to go a little bit deeper into what we might do as programmers of the public, or what we might do as part of the State Council on the Arts. Because, correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Chase, but I think when you refer to access by the public it means that one, generally anybody, who has kind of their own trip involved, would not have access. But, I think that if we're talking about doing something using the State Council as a vehicle, as a State Agency, organized somehow through the State Council, then, maybe not the entire public, but any of us who were funded by the State Council, working through the State Council, might have access. And, I think, that when we're talking about access it's a problem of degree. Chuck might not be able to run the VTR or something like that but that doesn't mean to say that we couldn't use the studio for a production.

MIKE CHASE. You're right. What I've talked about is what we have done and if some of you can come up with a situation that would arise that would be useful, we'll do something different. There's no reason not to. I don't think you'd ever have public access for two reasons: one, if it's your property that's not practical; and two, because it's probably a problem of public policy. After all, the public can go into Reed's and rent equipment. It would be very unfair to Reed's for us to make available, at a fraction of the cost, a similar operation. And so, anything that came through the Council would be a way around it.

BOB CIVIELLO. It's sort of a double standard, I think, that we're beginning to see. You have equipment, not in this case, but in the case of the Public Television stations, paid for by Council support which is given to a station, theoretically, for the use of any arts group that would like to

make use of it. That pays for the equipment but then there's other equipment that the Council has not bought which ties into the system and which costs the station to operate and therefore, other costs are put on top of that. I think the answer really is, if any kind of relationship, a viable one, a productive one, which all the arts groups can get involved in, the only answer is that equipment, an entire system, a centralized system, would have to be established somewhere and which may be housed in the stations that have the quarters. But, the entire system itself would be totally bought and paid for by an endowment of fund or grant or whatever and be open free of charge to anyone who wants to use it. But, as long as parts of equipment, parts of stations, parts of systems are owned by or paid for by the Council on the Arts, you still have other problems that exist within the problems the stations have as well.

MIKE CHASE. Wouldn't you have a problem if you set up a studio the way you described? I'd request to use it. The price is right; and so, would everybody else in this room and so would everyone else who heard about it. And soon, the amount of people serviced would be trivial. So, there has to be some device to limit access to anything worthwhile.

BOB CIVIELLO. The role of public television should be as an access for the work to be aired. The most viable asset at this time, that most of the stations can offer, is their airtime. And, I think the Video groups and the Council on the Arts should be putting their efforts into making equipment available to the Video artists so that they can produce the tapes, if we should desire, to be aired on Public Television. Now, it's coming back from both ends. We did a series, a number of programs, on half-inch video tape. We had to go into Channel 13 to use time, to get time-base correctors etc. And, the money's coming in from the Council on the Arts to produce programs which is costly to do. We're paying it out to another public television station. It's like going from one hand to another. I don't think it's an appropriate use of money and funds.

DAVID LOXTON. I think that's a little simplistic.

BOB CIVIELLO. A centralized facility would duplicate efforts in cost if we were able to centralize in the State.

DAVID LOXTON. The cost of, let's say, going to Channel 13 to get a tape make-up to be broadcast is the basic thing you're talking about. It's one thing to have hardware, the thing you have to remember. It is obviously the limitation of most public television stations. It's something you can't fight. Something you have to live with is that most of them are unionized which means you have union personnel that have to be involved with the process of work on the equipment. Particularly, we have, I think, got a very good relationship given the circumstances with the union at Channel 13 that we were able to get the union to waive its jurisdiction in terms of non-broadcast workers, experimentalists and things like that. But also, there is the question, of course, which came up: they're the same as any union. They say, "We do not want any of our people put out of work." You can double them up. You can let them stand by. There are all sorts of silly games you can play. You can let the artist do his own thing. But, you're talking about a time-base correction, and there's no question—if you come to Channel 13- they’re happy to offer you the personnel involved who are working with the equipment. And, they have to be paid from some source or other. So, I don't think it's a matter of saying funds are being paid double or they’re not. I mean, there's no charge for the time-base error corrector and I think some don't charge. I think, the charge

on the equipment would also be inappropriate, but somebody has to be paying for the engineering time for the engineering personnel who are there.

BOB CIVIELLO. Alright. The central point is that your costs may be heavier in some parts from other areas in the State.

DAVID LOXTON. That's what I'm saying, but the basic question is why do you need time-base error corrections? One assumes you need time-base error corrections when you're creating a tape for broadcast or if you've taken that step, and said, "I want to broadcast!" You must also accept the reality of what that is going to mean. It entails going to the public television station and realizing the union obligation which most stations have will become a part of that process. Obviously, who's doing time-base error correction, except with the intention of broadcasting?

MIKE CHASE. If that's the case, maybe we're putting the cart before the horse. The difficult thing is to get the airtime, right? If I were a program manager, I would view the thing before it was time-base corrected, and then once I decided I wanted to air it, I'd think it was my problem to get it bumped up.

DAVID LOXTON. Well, that's the ideal way because if you broadcast, you have to go to a programmatic level. But, all the time-base error correction is done by the programmer at a public television station. Now, when you go to him with your half-inch tape, he can turn to you and solve what actually may not be a programmatic problem by simply saying technically, "We can't handle it." It's a much simpler way of saying, "No, I don't want to have to deal with your program."

MIKE CHASE. Anybody who wants to put any of your programs on the air, the network would be glad to try to, at no cost, to get them on quad, if that's any help.

JOHN REILLY. Now, you mentioned before, $10 an hour.

MIKE CHASE. We wouldn't charge you that. If you've really got a situation where somebody says, "I want to air this?" And if we did charge anybody we'd charge the station. And, it would not be a major cost if you got air time. That's really, you know, where are you gonna get the gas for the Rolls Royce? It's not important.

RALPH HOCKING. What we should talk about in terms of distribution is broadcast which is somewhat alien to the half-inch product, and may not be in the near future because of all these machines. My situation in Binghamton is if I want to put something on the local station and I had it corrected, through the time-base corrector, and with a two-inch tape walked into the office and handed, to the guy, he'd tell me to go to hell because he doesn't want to put it on to begin with. So, I don't know. It's interesting to talk about all this, but I'm not sure. I'm obviously putting my own personal problems into it, but it is a problem. I don't know if anybody else has access to local broadcast or not. Hopefully, they do.

MIKE CHASE. You say most of your problem is with half-inch facilities?

RALPH HOCKING. Sure. I've offered them series.

JOHN REILLY. Gerry.

GERRY O'GRADY. How is it that you're not unionized?

MIKE CHASE. The state's not tied to any union contracts. Now, there has been exception within the University and we belong to the same union you do.

GERRY O'GRADY. I'm just wondering, if it looks clear, you could decentralize production facilities, you could decentralize time-base correctors. The broadcasters could just take it and put it on if they want. But, if these grow, say to Binghamton, to Buffalo, to other places, how soon would it be before the union, also, won't let us operate? In other words, just because we're tax-exempt doesn't obviously...

MIKE CHASE. I don't think that would be a problem.

GERRY O'GRADY. Why not? I'm just wondering.

DAVID LOXTON. Because, I don't think... The reason why Channel 13 is union, quite honestly, is because originally, it was a commercial station before it was a non-commercial station. I think that if it had started as a non-commercial station, it might be non-union.

GERRY O'GRADY. Channel 17 in Buffalo might not be unionized?

DAVID LOXTON. It may not.

GERRY O'GRADY. How?

JOHN REILLY. Does anyone know that? What's unionized and what isn't?

BOB CIVIELLO. 21 on Long Island's not gonna want to unionize.

MIKE CHASE. I think NET'S the only one.

DAVID LOXTON. I think we're one of the few stations in the state that is unionized. When the station goes to pass a union contract, even the management may change, the whole corporate structure may change.

MIKE CHASE. Not as many things change as you might think. All the time we exist, salaries have to be paid, equipment has to be refurbished and perhaps the station grows up. The problem still exists.

JOHN REILLY. I wanted to go back for a moment about this statement you made. In effect, if we had a n opportunity with a local public broadcasting station to air a tape that was originally made on half-inch, we could go to you and you would provide us with a time-base error corrector and quads to assemble the tape? Then, to either feed it directly to that local public television station

or to what, to physically take the tape down there—do you do that also or do you simply do microwave feed?

MIKE CHASE. Well, it varies. This is just a pragmatic problem. If you have a station that wants to air something, then we should make it happen if at all possible. If you want to show somebody something, you can get it on a cassette. Now, a lot of people view that. I don't know what Phil Jackson's done to pull it off. They like the convenience to shove a Sony cassette in a machine and view a program that way. David is coming back—David Loxton - to talk about his facility and their program and also any other questions you had before.

BOB CIVIELLO. I'd like to begin on a note that Peter made earlier today, and that is the real question. What is, if any, the out-look for half-inch video tape going to be? I think we've touched on that to some degree and I think it demands further exploration. Do you want your work to be put on public television? If so, how much, and, if so, there has to be some consideration given to "responsibilities" and "attitudes" of the individual stations that are involved. These will vary according to the, how should I put it, enlightenment of the general managers and the program directors of the various stations. But, I think, as a conference there should be some- I wouldn't say position - but some attitude that should come out of this, as to the use of broadcast mediums, particularly public television, for any kind of cooperative project that was mentioned. Now, it seems to us, having done a number of pilot programs in this area, that the most valuable asset a public television station in a community, and our community being Long Island and also metropolitan New York, has is the use of our airtime. And, the use of our airtime is something, which is very simple, to a degree, for a station that is licensed to serve a public and not have to worry about commercials to give. And, as was intended by someone, the program directors like to think of themselves as presenting coherent programming and things that are their own thoughts. Most public television stations particularly ours, would be willing to give as much time as the quality of the programming dictated. And, the quality of programming, in those terms, would be very loose. In other words, I think you'd find, particularly on Long Island, more than a willingness and an attitude to cooperate than perhaps you think you might. And, I think that in other parts of the State you'll find that as well. If you're dealing with an area that's new and you're dealing with a medium where most of the broadcast management executives have come from the old existing media, particularly commercial television, their attitudes towards half-inch turn out to be prejudices, especially in the engineering personnel. But normally we found that there is a certain resistance in the beginning but you find the resistance melting away as the approaches are made and as it's proven that it's feasible. And certainly, we've felt we've done that. As a matter of principle, I believe that our station would be against centralization of programming. I think that the trend clearly is that stations should try to serve particularly the community they exist in. In the pilot project that we did, called Reel to Reel, the people and the artists that were included in this program were restricted to Long Island, and in some cases to New York City. Although we were contracted and had access to areas outside of the metropolitan area we felt that our primary responsibility was simply to this community. I don't know how a network series or scheduling a network type of series would go over. Although I think that we're certainly very open-minded to it. I think the greatest value to the station and to the people that we serve is trying to make all the video artists or video art groups on Long Island, and there are quite a few, have our air time as a showcase for their products. We think this attitude should be followed by the various stations upstate. So, as a matter of principle we'd like to say again, we're against centralization in terms of

programming. But, we certainly would keep an open mind to a kind of series like this. From a pragmatic point of view, one hour per month seems not to be really very difficult to go over.. I think you'd have to be far more realistic in trying to determine how you would go about it. What we are in favor of is a centralization of facilities. And this centralization of facilities has very little to do with us, frankly. It's more for the various artist groups in the community that we serve. We're
constantly contacted by people who want to get use of studio time. I would adjust the physical studio with the lighting and they may even have their own equipment. Or, being able to use time-base correctors or be able to use two-inch quad machines for editing purposes. I think, it's necessary, throughout the state, for there to be established at - one possibility is in the various television stations, a number of production centers which would, have very good basic equipment, such as colorizers, time-base correctors, half-inch machines and portapaks for the various communities and artists in the community to be able to use. On Long Island there are 100 who obviously do not have access to their own equipment or are not able to get funding for equipment. To eliminate redundancies in the use of equipment would make us be in favor of a kind of pooling arrangement. Now, a grant which we've proposed to the State for this year has actually such an arrangement where the station would be able to borrow a certain amount of basic equipment and also have a video artists program, a video artist in residence who would have a two-fold responsibility: to, on some type of arrangement, have this equipment available to the station for a specific project but all the other time have the equipment available to any video artist or group on Long Island for them to produce programs either for broadcast use - or for non-broadcast use. They're not taking the attitude that anything that should be done for and by the station necessarily has to be put on the air. If nothing else, for the artistic and educational value of doing the program, that would be a purpose well served. So, we've asked for Council support and we're trying to get this equipment located on the Island because at the present time we don't have any of the basic facilities and find ourselves going to Channel 13 and spending good sums of money to use equipment under their conditions which are not conditions that are prevalent throughout the State. For example, any costs that are picked up at Channel 13, and I'm not trying to be anti-Channel 13 by any means or TV Lab, but such areas as unions and scheduling and other demands put upon a large metropolitan station, are totally different from a station outside of New York whether it be upstate or out on Long Island. So we are against the centralization of facilities on one specific station. Rather what we'd like to see would be that all the stations be able to get funding from a broad spectrum of support to enable all the artists in the various areas of the community served to be able to use equipment. And, there has been a good amount of headway made in this area from what I've heard today. I didn't realize Schenectady and Syracuse had some kind of system going and we'd like to see it in several of the other stations. Basically, our pilot program consisted of doing a survey of the level and the amount of activity, which was done on half-inch video tape on Long Island. We found out that there are varying amounts being done by institutions, colleges, and high schools. But, the best use of the medium, is being made by independent artists and independent groups and by far the most creative use of the medium is done by them. And, we found that the one-hour pilot program called Reel to Reel, which was broadcast on the air several times got a tremendous amount of feedback from other groups who we had contacted or who were not included in the program. The general desire on their part was to set up a pilot program. I'm trying to give a great amount of encouragement to the concept of each of the stations broadcasting video tape work done by artists. The community likes it. The response we got from the general viewer was encouraging and in particular it invigorated and encouraged other artists to contact us

for future programming. Drew produced that program and he might have a few words to say about it.

DREW HOWLAND. Well, just one thing that's amazing on Long Island - in the investigation that I did, I went around to the different video groups—is that no one is connected. No one knew who had equipment or who was doing what. I'd say about 60% of the equipment around Long Island, is on the shelf. Long Beach has a program where they received a grant to use half-inch video tape experimentally and the one person who was really gung-ho was either fired or left and all the machines go up on the shelf and no one knows what to do with it. Link, Inc. has a half-inch system and a one-inch system, which a fellow by the name of Michael Rothbard is trying to get together and create an access center so people can use the equipment. We would like to make a connection, eventually, through the program. In my investigations we tried to get people connected. The Port Washington library system and the Huntington library system have half-inch video equipment. It just seems, in Long Island that things are so loosely set up that if someone had the power to try to organize, half-inch video could become a power in Long Island. I've found most of the quality work I'm looking for is being done in the City. There's no central place in Long Island and I thing Channel 21 could be one possibility for making a central connection for half-inch video on Long Island.

BOB CIVIELLO. Also, there should be some kind of reference library made available to people who might have interest in seeing other people's work. In other words, there should be a library system, maybe at NYSCA, where the tapes should be on file which are made by various art groups which other people could look at. And this would be a basic resource tool for anybody doing investigation work in this area or research work for major foundations. And, at the present time, there isn't any at all.

DREW ROWLAND. I was going all around looking for tapes for the show and it would seem to make a lot of sense since right now we haven't got immediate access through all the various channels we've been talking about. There should be a library or some kind of meeting place for tapes where they could be catalogued so people could get to them.

LYDIA SILMAN. You're more than welcome to come into our office anytime and screen tapes. Everyone is.

DREW HOWLAND. I wasn't aware of that.

LYDIA SILMAN. Just call me and arrange to look at the tapes. And then, of course, if you want to use a tape you have to go beg to the producer of the tape. We don't just give you any tapes from the office, but you can certainly see any program.

DREW ROWLAND. Do you have releases already taken care of?

LYDIA SILMAN. We don't have them and I don't think that should be the role of the State Arts Council. We do not use the tapes that are on file without permission and we have copies of a lot of different programs. You can call me for suggestions of tapes or people to contact.

DREW HOWLAND. Hopefully, we're trying to get money for a 12-program series, one hour a month, on Reel to Reel. And, we encounter lots of problems; especially in selection of tapes and how to give out the chunks of time out of that one hour, which is precious because there are so many people doing video.

BOB CIVIELLO. There's still another problem. Theoretically, if you have an hour a week or an hour a day or an hour a month, you still have major contract decisions to be made as to cutting or selection of material, which are all going to lead inevitably to hassles. So, although we're encouraged by the idea of doing a series, there are very many problems ahead.

GIL KONISHI. In your experience with Reel to Reel, on the economic side, do you pay your artists?

BOB CIVIELLO. Yes, we do. We underwrote several productions, totally. And, we gave them a check and they billed us for whatever supplies and materials they commissioned which in some cases was original material.

DREW ROWLAND. They did the productions, and they let us know how much money they were going to spend, and then we allotted the money.

GIL KONISHI. Were these expenses or did you pay them fees?

DREW HOWLAND. Just expenses. We just covered their equipment. We didn't have that much tape. I worked with them. If I knew where there was equipment for free, I tried to get that equipment to them. They got equipment from the Huntington Library to save money. Equipment is available on Long Island. It's just the information of how people can get it that's not available.

LYDIA SILMAN. Later, Skip is going to be speaking about the Video Resource Directory that will be helpful to a lot of people in the State in terms of giving information about facilities and equipment. So I think that he'll answer a lot of your questions.

JOHN REILLY. Bob, were you program manager of the station?

BOB CIVIELLO. Production manager.

JOHN REILLY. Production manager. You've worked in a public television station for a few years, haven't you? And, you spoke before of prejudices that the stations would have against artists or the use of half-inch equipment. First of all, can you clarify what form you see that prejudice taking and secondly, what would be the best way of dealing with it, from our side?

BOB CIVIELLO. Well, I think it's, again, definitely an attitudinal prejudice. Nothing based upon any one sound philosophy, but more or less half-inch video for many years was considered to be something very experimental and very artsy-craftsy. And it's been something that many of the managers would say - coming from that professional commercial attitude—they would shy away from. Peter pointed out before, going all the way back to producing experimental programs for the Carousel Series with which I was involved, that any time something new was undertaken there was

a certain amount of resistance based upon old concepts and principles. And, this is essentially the attitude I was getting at, and I don't think it's anything more prevalent than that. The results that we achieved in Reel to Reel, technically, were encouraging, going through time-base correctors and shooting with monitors in some cases. So, although it's not network video, so to speak, as the engineers would say, it's certainly “airable”- it's certainly of broadcast quality.

DREW HOWLAND. Talking about color, we ran into problems at the lab. We did get around it. But when we wanted to do color, it wouldn't go through their time-base corrector. We had to shoot off a monitor, which required a camera and threats of having to deal with $500 a day to shoot an 8-minute tape. I'd like to find the kind of situation where if I have to do something that's out of the ordinary, I can just get access to a studio in the city and not have it cost about $500 more. And, what is necessary is some kind of center where we can do these things at a very practical and quick level, without running into unions.

JOHN REILLY. Your reference to unions is to the TV Lab?

BOB CIVIELLO. You can take $5,000 and give it to them, but I can buy $8,000 worth of services somewhere else or even double that in some cases. Now, I'm not trying to be anti-TV Lab. But part, I believe, of the role of the Council, and I'm sure the Council feels the same way, is to encourage with support the less privileged of us and also that way things can be done more viably and economically. I don't know if we should even be in a public television station, frankly. I have serious reservations in my mind that if the Council or if any endowment or funding source was to set up these centers, that these centers should have anything to do with public television. Seriously, there are definite problems to deal with like administrative problems and scheduling problems. Perhaps it should retain its own integrity and identity and be housed in a Global Village kind of situation where the final product is done on half-inch tape and it's brought to the station or to the New York Network to be dubbed up to two-inch. But one doesn't get involved with internal hassles of a public television station.

JOHN REILLY. But, of course, with Channel 13 you run into the union problem that if the program hasn't been produced with a union crew they wouldn't broadcast it.

BOB CIVIELLO. I'd find that very hard to take. They would use that excuse. Station managers will try to.

JOHN REILLY. Isn't there a 50-mile radius, though, for NET?

DREW HOWLAND. That's for shooting an original. If you're going to shoot something live within a fifty-mile radius, they're going to give you some shit. If you shot it here in New York and then dubbed it up away and brought it back, I don't think there'd be any problem.

BOB CIVIELLO. The idea is that as mentioned before, the integrity of the half-inch video tape artist is only maintained by himself. And the final part of it's done by using whatever editing and other tools he can. Then, the final product is taken and dubbed up to whatever broadcast format there is and I think that's probably another alternative to approach it.

JOHN REILLY. In approaching it that way what selectivity would you exercise? You talked about cutting, about fitting it into slots and all that. Will that problem be raised again?

BOB CIVIELLO. No, I don't think so. I think that's definitely a standards problem. Every station has its own standard. So, there has to be some headway made in that area. In terms of content, I'm not trying to over-simplify it, but if seven or eight hours of programming are submitted for a one-hour show, you run into those kinds of problems. So, Drew, in this case, had to make a representational choice by taking segments out of certain programs and sometimes inadvertently, you bother people by doing that. That's the kind of problem you've just got to understand.

JOHN REILLY. This is a hard question. Can you put in words what your criteria were in that case?

DREW HOWLAND. Dealing with the station, I had to think of administration and what they would be able to deal and cope with.

BOB CIVIELLO. The segments were very diverse. Of the two dance pieces, one was choreographed for the camera, the other one was colorized. A segment of a play, a documentary on a library at Stoneybrook, and the last piece was a tape made on a synthesizer up in Binghamton. We tried on half-inch videotape to represent art as well as some material of social value. We tried to be as representational as we possibly could be. We produced the program and it was all done and everything, and the day before it went on the air the program director said, "Bob, you're putting that program on tomorrow night, I should take a look at it, shouldn't I?" I said, "Yeah, you should." But, that's exactly where it's at. There's a lot more flexibility than you think you have.

DREW HOWLAND. There's also the politics. I knew that what I wanted to put on was not going to be received too well by the management so I used Bob as my buffer in trying to keep everything that I was doing away from the administration. About three days before we were going to go on they decided they had better take a look at it. And, they were really committed at that point. And, that was my own kind of political maneuvering. It's an oversimplification. The point that Drew is trying to make here is that in anything new they don't even know what their own standards are. So, sometimes they accept it, just on the fact that this must be really good, because it's different. That's where it's at. We should be doing this just because it's a minority art form with a value. Their approach is as I said before, they want real people that really exist. They kind of think it's like the newest experience to a degree. That's an attitude thing.

RALPH HOCKING. I think I would tend to agree with you that the production centers should not be located in the stations because there is this set of problems to be coped with.

JOHN REILLY. Can I ask a question about that? Will what you proposed be connected to Long Island?

DREW HOWLAND. Well, it would be connected through Channel 21, at this point.

BOB CIVIELLO. My position on that is that if the Council is to fund individual production centers, it should fund all the production centers. It should not be selective and say, "We're giving

money to Channel 13 and we're giving money to WMHT in Schenectady to buy a time-base corrector." - or to WXXI in Rochester and discriminate against the other stations. However, as a personal position, and I don't know if my general manager's going to love this, but I think that he probably would agree to a very large extent that if the Council re-evaluates its position perhaps the station should only serve in giving the air time and the production facilities for all these programs. Maybe it should be taken out of the hands of the individual public television stations and be given to the video artists in localized production centers. That's my proposal.

RALPH HOCKING. Another point. There's just no way in hell I'd give you a tape to chop up unless it happened to be a chopped-up tape.

BOB CIVIELLO. And, another point is, no one's asking you to do that. That's your choice.

RALPH HOCKING. I wonder, then, if that's gonna be somewhat a general rule.

BOB CIVIELLO. Yes, I do. That's a consideration for you to make. The first thing I wrote in my notes is: do they want public television as an outlet? I mean, that's a primary concern.

JOHN REILLY. Do you arrange your show and do you take a lot of time with all the productions?

DREW HOWLAND. I was working by myself on this. It took me four months of finding out, first of all, where half-inch video tape was. I was not familiar with it when I started. And, then, getting in touch with people and getting more and more involved with half-inch video tape. And in doing it all and the editing myself, I had more of an understanding of what it meant to be involved with half-inch video.

JOHN REILLY. Do you think it will take as much time to do the next one as it did to do the first?

DREW HOWLAND. No.

JOHN REILLY. Do you have plans to do another one?

DREW HOWLAND. I'm putting in a whole bunch of grants trying to get funded.

JOHN REILLY. Do you have any idea what the air date's gonna be? This summer, or the fall?

DREW HOWLAND. No. I have a proposal to try and get it out for a twenty-six-week production, 12 programs in 26 weeks.

JOHN REILLY. And, these would be mainly about Long Island or will they have more interest?

DREW HOWLAND. New York City and Long Island.

JOHN REILLY. Do you think any of the shows would be able to have wider distribution?

DREW HOWLAND. Sure.

GIL KONISHI. If you're a public television station, how can you possibly want to turn this from the public television's responsibility? How can you possibly want to turn it away and not have it as a part of public television? Its natural home is public television. Now, because of management and all this stuff it may never be. But, it just seems shameful somehow that it's not there and a very important part of public television.

DREW HOWLAND. One of the things that I had to consider, in doing the program was I didn't have the freedom to do exactly what I wanted to do. I had to exist within certain limits. What I really wanted from the program was to get a show that would get a good response. If I had a one-hour program that got a good response, I would hopefully get more freedom to do more programming. If people would see, or get involved in looking at, half-inch video tape and, or if, let's say, the Reel to Reel program became a success, then Channel 67, which is a commercial station, would say, "Look, Channel 21's got a program that is getting a good viewer response, maybe we should pick up on it." And, if Channel 67 picks up on it, they would be creating more outlets for half-inch video. And, that would, hopefully, be one of the goals and the gain from the program.

BOB CIVIELLO. We're not saying we're encouraging the airing of half-inch video tape shows and making as much air time as possible available for these shows. I'm not saying that, I'm saying that what I think is a possibility is to eliminate and get better dollar value and more artistic integrity for the artist by the production of these shows and the facilities that are used to produce them might be taken away from public television. That's my point. Definitely, I'm saying, we should be in the forefront of encouraging the use of it and promoting it as an art form, as we should in all art forms. But I'm very concerned when we start equipping television stations with equipment for video artists to use. That's what I'm a little skeptical about. And, I'm kind of divided between the stations' position and the artistic position on that, too.

JOHN REILLY. I think it is important that we all really make an effort to have an inroad into public television at this point. I think it's critical, in one sense, that there finally be technical break-throughs there with the time-base error corrector and quite frankly, of many of the tapes that I've seen that have been produced by people in this room, I would be far more interested in seeing that work than most of what I see on public television. So, I think it's really important, doubly now, and it's happened just now, as we see the time-base error corrector is literally arriving this day, to take almost an offensive at this point and go in and ask for the time to use it and if we are refused, at least say, well, we've made the effort, and come back, as Ralph has done, and go back again, and find another way of approaching it. I think this is a very important period that we're in.

RALPH HOCKING. I went to them.

LYDIA SILMAN. And now you're waiting for them to come back to you. But, you did go initially to them.

RALPH HOACKING. But I'm not going back to them.

LYDIA SILMAN. But now they've come back to you, which, I think is a significant thing.

RALPH HOCKING. But that's what I think is really the crux of the whole thing. What's going to happen, in terms of what Gil wants, is what I want, too. I think that it's terribly logical. I mean, damn it, they've got to do it, cause we can't do it. The Council has funded this, how many years running-- to get the things funded?

GIL KONISHI. I would like to see the public television stations set up a priority system whereby community video art is a part of their priority group.

BOB CIVIELLO. That's a very good point. We've been struggling on the Island, just to get back to priorities. The station sees itself as serving the need for community programming and community programming, unfortunately, does not cover artistic programming to a degree. They say, well, we should be in news, we should be in public affairs, we should be in town meetings, we should have done this, and what happens is you have what you call 10% in video art. And, I think, in some other areas of the State this situation also exists. So, you're telling public television, look, who's the audience you're trying to serve and more importantly, you better realize the audiences you're not trying to serve. But, this is a really broad-based problem and you're dealing with many, many ramifications, and as Peter here can tell you, it's very hard to tell a group of New York State station managers what to do or even make suggestions to them. God knows that's the truth.

GERRY O'GRADY. I agree with all this, but still, if it depends on the station coming to you, and you use that word "video art", it leaves the selection of the material in the hands of the public stations and you end up funding their programming which is what you've been doing all along. I don't see that you're going to change their programming, necessarily.

BOB CIVIELLO. There's no way to get around that because the law states that only the man who holds the license decides what goes on the air.

GERRY O'GRADY. I understand. I just am not so sanguine about it. We fund public broadcast systems and we don't have the selection to emphasize what art is.

PETER BRADLEY. I don't think you'd abdicate a position of doing nothing, Gerry.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I think our experience may speak to that, because in Rochester we are currently producing a program once a month on the public television station. They feed us outside producers and we make the programming decisions. If some question of equal time is raised, then I'll deal with it, but it's never come up. You can't write a contract that will in any way commit the station to extending a program a second longer than they want to. And, if something happens, if we put on something that takes a slam at somebody, we'll be sued. It's more obvious as I work with commercial television stations. The stations are paid to carry the programming, but there's no way the PBS television network can force anything. They don't even know how to carry a heavy program.

BOB CIVIELLO. I think in principle, there are only two ways of going about a project like this. You can do one of two things. You, the Arts group, through the Council or through an independent thing which would be established, could produce programming which would be submitted to the

public television stations through the State for airing. That's one viable approach. The other approach is that the stations themselves would take their own initiative to do a series like Reel to Reel. But, they maintain control all the way down the line. And, essentially, what they're doing then is contracting the artist on an individual basis for inclusions of programming. Maybe, the difference is the other way you're contracting them. This is a basis philosophical problem with a basic decision that has to be made.

PETER BRADLEY. Why not do both?

GERRY O'GRADY. Let's keep both open and reward them on how well they perform. This is the way to do it. If the public station takes your position, as it should, and goes out and seeks it, then give them more money. If they don't, don't give them money.

PETER BRADLEY. How do you define good performance?

BOB CIVIELLO. I think you have a panel of people in the field.

JOHN REILLY. Actually, Sandy, you were going to be next. So, why don't you explain what your programming is.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. There were a lot of questions raised about video and public television stations. And, for over a year now we've been producing a television show on Channel 21 in Rochester, which is a PBS member station. Maybe we could talk about what our experience has been in this area. I don't want to neglect our other activities because Portable Channel's involved in a whole range of video activities including training, equipment loans, cable education, production services to community groups as a way of earning money outside of homemade TV, as well as producing. And each of these elements works together. We keep coming up against the problem that there isn't enough money. So what are we going to cut? And we find it's very difficult to cut any one thing without detracting from all the rest. So, maybe I'd like first to talk about some of these other areas, and I can get more into what's happening with the public television stations. We began as simply an equipment pool in 1971 and equipment was given out and we were working with half-inch equipment, on this kind of first-come-first-serve basis. The emphasis was very unfiltered. And, what we found was that A, the equipment took an incredible battering and B, a tremendous quantity of videotape got produced that nobody wanted to watch. And so, it became clear that if we continued in that direction the resources would gradually be depleted and nothing much would come out of it. There were two needs. One was to train people to use the equipment, so they had the skills to go along with the equipment and that resulted in our training program. And, the other was that nobody really knew what this beast of half-inch video was. And, people needed to have models and examples of what community programming with half-inch could be. And that took a lot of forms; experimenting with using tapes, closed-circuit playbacks, and our current thrust in that area is the Homemade TV Series, which we do on Channel 21. Our training program consists currently of rounds of 8-week workshops which meet once a week, and bring together people not only who are interested in learning video, but also who are interested in a certain area like social issues. We try and put them in a workshop together. We put people who are concerned with artistic uses of video so they can rapidly go beyond simple production skills into actually working on tapes. And we also dedicate equipment to the use of these workshops

because people aren't going to learn how to use video equipment unless they have a portapak to work with. So, that's why a lot of our equipment resources are currently tied up. These workshops are also a useful way of us responding to the community's needs for video tapes. For example, a Spanish library in Rochester wanted a video tape made for the American Library Association Convention. And, if they had to hire staff to do it, it would have been prohibitively expensive. But, it became a class project for one of our workshops,, and the tape got made that way. There's much more demand on equipment than we can possibly meet, so what we've done recently is, we have kind of a two-tiered system for equipment loans. Non-profit organizations can rent equipment from us at a rate that reflects the real cost of maintaining the equipment, the overhead, depreciation, etc., because we feel that even though they're non-profit organizations, they tend to be a lot richer than we are. And, they ought to get into the notion that if they can find money in the budget for all sorts of other things they should be able to budget video. But, clearly this would exclude a lot of individuals in the community who want to produce tapes. So, what we do is that an individual can submit proposals to produce video tapes and then the limited amount of time that is available on equipment will be allocated. And, people are expected to put in a little bit of time at Portable Channel in return for getting the equipment to help keep it going.

PETER BRADLEY. Excuse me. Is this long-term?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Homemade TV, as I said, is important, both in its own right and how it interacts with our other activities. And programs can have a wide range. You look at an artist and his work through some social commentary on synthesized television. And, it's also important because it's produced, not simply by Portable Channel Staff, but also by members of our workshops, visiting artists, community groups, etc. It currently is being produced as a separate series, and Portable Channel creates it. During its first year it was sub-series within another series called Catch 21, where the station four nights a week gives a half an hour of air time to any group in the community that, wants it on a first-come-first-serve basis, with the only provision being that you don't libel, slander anyone, or promote a lottery. And, I think it's really significant in terms of developing community access to television.

PETER BRADLEY. Is it pre-taped?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. No. Generally live and generally, unfortunately, has a dreadful studio talk-show format. But, nonetheless it's important because it seems to be a much more viable way of doing what public access attempted to do in that it avoids many of the pitfalls of public access. There's an established audience and it's a channel people normally turn to. The very meager resources available for community programming are concentrated rather than being dissipated over an entire channel, so that when people turn to these programs they stand much more of a chance of sticking with it and coming back. And these two outlets in turn reinforce the existence of the audience.

LYDIA SILMAN. What kind of feedback have you gotten from people on Homemade TV?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Good. There's feedback in two ways. A channel 21 audience survey done last fall estimated that it had been surveyed at a time when there were three programs on the air and 13,000 households saw at least one. In a much more personal way it comes back to us

when the phones ring after a show and people say they like it—and, when you run into someone on the street, whom you don't even know, and they find out you're from Portable Channel, and they tell you about a show they saw three months ago that they liked. Documenting this response, and telling people to write a letter to the station when they give us a compliment has been very important in terms of establishing for the station the value of the series. Let me, by describing a few of the programs, give you a sense of what it is we put on and how it connects to our other activities. Because I think that getting access to broadcasting is the first step in that it gives you access to a real audience. But, that's only the first step and it has to be integrated with ongoing community processes.

PETER BRADLEY. I'm not sure I understood how you got on. Channel 21 has Catch 21 five nights a week?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Let me explain the chronology of it. About a year and a half ago we proposed to Channel 21 to produce a series twice a month, that would be an outlet for our work and the work of people in the community who were producing half-inch video as an outlet for community television production. We did a pilot and the response was good. After all the compliments, not much happened. At the same time Channel 21 was developing their idea of a public access series called Catch 21. And so at the time that that went on the air we became a sub-series within it. We weren't quite first-come-first-served in that we were on the first and third Thursdays of every month. So, we had two programs out of every 16. And, every other group was limited to one segment a year. It raised certain questions of what it was. I think our value to that series, though, was important in that Catch 21 and Homemade TV were working toward the same goal of community— access television. What Homemade TV did was in a sense provide examples of some more creative uses of air time than simply going into the studio and talking. And several groups in the community have indeed begun using half-inch video in their programs, often with our assistance. What's happened since the beginning of the year, however, is that because Catch 21 was cutting back from four nights a week to three and we'd just be taking up too much of the air time, we became a separate series which airs at a separate time. And it's also clarified some of the problems of identity that we had of being lost within that larger series.

PETER BRADLEY. How often do you air?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Currently, once a month. At the beginning of February, we cut back from twice a month to once and that was our decision simply because we did not have resources.

PETER BRADLEY. And who controls the program content?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Portable Channel.

PETER BRADLEY. And what time are you on, now?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Currently, 10:30, Thursday nights, the first Thursday of the month, which is a very good time, I think, because people that we want to reach and people who would be interested in what we're doing tend to be busy people and that is a good time to find them at home. It's good in that respect.

MIKE CHASE. Is this a completely isolated example of really a group producing an hour a month of programming and really having control of it and having it on a public station? Are there any other examples?

LYDIA SILMAN. No, it's the only one, the only station in the State that gives this type of access to any community group.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I think it's significant that it's not only artists that the access is going to. That's one way of giving access, but the other type is to throw it open so anyone in the community can come on and broadcast. And, one of the most interesting things is that the commitment of the station is to a series, not to a program. And, there are all sorts of implicit cultural pressures on us that we have to deal with. You have to avoid going too far.

JOHN REILLY. I may be asking a question that's obvious to others here, but I'm wondering why is it possible on your station and why isn't it with Bob or in Binghamton? Is it just purely the program manager?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I think part of it is the size of the market. I think it would be far more difficult to do that in Buffalo or to do that in New York City.

BOB CIVIELLO. I think it probably would be easy to do it in Binghamton or Watertown.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. You're saying one of the reasons is you've never been approached?

BOB CIVIELLO. Never been approached, never once. I think also that if we were approached, the management would be very skeptical about a video program.

LYDIA SILMAN. I think also, that there's a difference in the extent of your facilities as opposed to the facilities at WXXI.

BOB CIVIELLO. This is very true. It's one of the best stations and equipment centers in the State.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. The interesting thing, speaking of equipment, is you've been talking about a time-base corrector and we've been airing for over a year now by pointing a studio camera at an underscan monitor and the results have actually been quite good if the set-up is done correctly. So you don't always need a time-base corrector.

PETER BRADLEY. What kind of programs, you were interrupted when you were trying to describe the content.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. O.K. Well, our pilot program was about senior citizens and it included a lot of personal looks at senior citizens as people rather than a social statistic. There was a woman baking strudel in her apartment, a birthday party for a couple of 98-year olds, a nursing home, some people rehearsing for a variety show. And it grew out of our work in a senior citizens' apartment building which had, essentially, a master antenna system. It involved some cable. We'd gone in

there and worked with producing programming with senior citizens, getting them involved in video etc. And from out of that this program grew. And from this program has come the whole proposal that we have currently pending several places; to create a top video project with senior citizens in a high-rise that's currently under construction where we would work with them to help them create their own programming for the internal use of the building and document their interests throughout the city. And some of this programming in turn could appear on Homemade TV as a way of getting it out, as well as the closed circuit showing. Another program was Genesee Valley, which was produced by the Genesee Region Video Journal, which was a video project in Geneseo, a small town south of Rochester. The town was interested in documenting the history and problems of the region. And we supported that project through an extended loan of equipment and through technical assistance. And they produced a program on the Adirondack Park. Some of the fun was a video talk with artist Morton Subotnick. It recreated on television a work of what he called chamber art. And we set it up with the film loops and re-created it in the studio and sent that out over the air. And we also took a look at the Watkins Glen rock festival. Another program was produced by a black group with help from us which presented to people a perspective on public black organizations that no white group of people going in there would perceive. There was an informality to it. We try to do not only social issues and documentaries which is our personal thing, but also other areas as well. Woody and Steina Vasulka came to Rochester in January and we produced a program with them on synthesized television and we had the use of 21's studio. We were actually able to use their facilities for production and we put together a program there of them talking about their tools, demonstrating them, and then performing. And one of the interesting things, in terms of funding, is that Channel 21's production costs for that program were met out of their artists grant from the State Council. And currently we have a proposal to 21 for another more extensive program with the Vasulkas, that would take three days in the studio and which they would pay not only their production costs but artists' fees as well. Cable Report was a program that was integrated into the whole process of community organization around cable. And what we did is we took videotapes about cable television and held a kind of town meeting in 21's studio with people from the cable television information center, the mayor and lots of interested citizens. And we invited people to phone in their questions and people came down to the studio for a discussion about cable. Women on Women was a program produced by the Women's Television Project at Portable Channel and that looked at women's images. And part of that was a piece with actress Viveca Lindfors and parts of her show "I Am a Woman." And one other program, a program that's airing this week, is called Rape in Rochester.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. It isn't enough just to put programs on the air. You have to deal with the audience and do a lot of publicity. We expect that there are going to be previews of this program in each of the daily papers. There's going to be an interview on the FM stations with the people who are producing it. All the people in the very disparate parts of the community that have been touched by the production of this tape - doctors, police - are going to be activating their constituencies to watch the program. I guess what's really important about this is the openness and the flexibility with which the station has approached the series. They haven't perceived it as a threat, as a lot of stations apparently do. They've not gotten hung up on technical questions. And this group is important enough to produce on the scan converter. Channel 21, in addition to providing the studio time, the air time (and the studio time can be non-negligible because of that scan-convergence process), the use of the systems maintenance, graphics and publicity, also subsidized part of our video tape costs. We showed them we could do it. They didn't believe we

could do it, maybe we didn't even quite believe we could do it. But we've done it, and I think we're probably ready at this point to say we've established a track record at another level and maybe it's time to start thinking about some increased support for what we're doing, maybe in terms of donating some of their old equipment.

JOHN REILLY. Before we leave this area, I'm wondering if anyone else sees a way of using this as an example or learning something from it, to make an approach to other stations because of the fact you have been doing it successfully for, what, a year or more?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. It's over a year now.

JOHN REILLY. Over a year. And certainly, of the other stations in the State there must be more than one that would be open to this, don't you think?

MICHAEL CHASE. I think Channel 31 would be.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. In fact, what about broadcast-time?

MICHAEL CHASE. They don't have any money, but they've got more airtime.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I think there's a dual standard. I see us as being funded to work with the Rochester community, to work with control of video media. And so whatever help Channel 21 can give us in meeting our production costs is fair enough, and I would hope they could expand it. 21's our local station so we don't feel badly about giving them programming, because it's the community that we work in. But when our programming starts going out elsewhere and being broadcast nationally, then I think we feel we should be paid.

MICHAEL CHASE. When you described these programs, they all sounded very interesting, really great. How much do you think you should be paid? In terms of what you want to do, how much do you think it would cost you, if you worked in a more standard format of going to work in a station where you were made the producer and given a budget so you could go out and hire people and do all the traditional above-the-line duties but you didn't get involved in the below-the-line, except in a supervisory way? In other words having the hands-on relationship with the equipment, is that vital do you think, to the programming you're doing, or isn't it? That's a real question.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I'm not quite sure of the question.

MICHAEL CHASE. Well, in other words, the show you did with the old people, you said it grew out of a hands-on workshop idea, but as you described it, it could have also been produced in a traditional way where you were a producer who was varyingly associated with talent and with the writing and with the creative decisions but you didn't get involved in actually owning and operating equipment. Is the physical, intimate relationship with the equipment germane to the end product or not? There are a lot of producers who've never worked a camera.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Oh, I think that's very important. It's important both because there's an intimacy between the producer, his equipment, and his subject. I think something exciting comes

out of it. I think that what we did with the old people is very revealing and I'm not sure it could have happened with distance. We made a decision, I think, to focus our resources and maybe do less, but to do it well. We estimate we all work 60 and 70-hour weeks so programs come in costing $500, $600, $700. It's less because we don't get paid overtime and things like that. But still that's very cheap as documentaries go.

DREW HOWLAND. But see, he's not simply producing television programs over the air, he's producing community involvement. He's a functionary or a catalyst to bringing the involvement, which the program is the focus for. And there's no way to evaluate the cost.

MICHAEL CHASE. Oh, I wasn't talking about cost, I was thinking in terms of the end product.

DREW HOWLAND. But it's not just the end product; it's the community involvement.

MICHAEL CHASE. Well, you can get the community involved without the marriage to equipment too.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Let me try and talk about why Homemade TV is important in its relationship to our other activities. It's the thing that gives a lot of coherency to our other work. For example, in terms of training it's both an advanced training ground for people in workshops who want to go on to something more. It's also a forum for the community. Before Homemade TV, video was really an abstraction. We'd say, “Here's half-inch video and it will do all these wonderful things for you," and people would say, "Oh really, that's very interesting." Now people see it and say, "You really can produce a television show with that. I want to get involved with it." Conversely, the fact that there is a pool of people in workshops gives us people to produce the show. It could never be produced by staff alone. If we had to pay all the staff to produce the program, the cost would be enormous. It's a symbiotic relationship. Similarly, there's a relationship with the equipment pool, there's an outlet for equipment pool users. I could go on and on about how it interconnects, how it brings a viability to our whole program, I wonder if it was a question to Portable Channel or a general question.

PETER BRADLEY. Mike, could you ask your question in the form of a general statement that other people could respond to?

MICHAEL CHASE. Well, it was a general question, because there seem to be three or four different things. A lot of those goals are being pursued simultaneously; they're not mutually exclusive, but nevertheless they're different. You talked about producing a very interesting documentary. You run into less resistance if you go into a station and say, "I've got a marvelous idea for you: devote a certain amount of time to community programming," or "Let's do this kind of documentary in which I go out and involve the community in this way." You're avoiding a tremendous problem when you say my people are all going to be involved in working with the electronic gear and you have ten producers working at once and then they all come in and use a small body of equipment. If they must be involved with the equipment and you need at least ten bodies of equipment it becomes a capital investment as well as labor. It might be worth it, that's what I really wanted to know, do you gain something else, is there another dimension to it?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. It's not as if that equipment sits around idle.

MICHAEL CHASE. No, it would be just the opposite. What would sit around idle would be other producers like you who might want to be working simultaneously. If you've got a television factory you generally have many, many more times, many, many more production units working than you do studios.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. Most people who are involved with independent media, particularly those involved in running facilities, are part of an educational process, not production television. They're involved in the process of understanding how to use the media in relationship to what the needs are in each situation, in each environment. And I think that what's particularly interesting about Rochester and Channel 21, is the process of how access was created, why there was cooperation and this relative problem of market size and economic pressure. How far does money go in what structure? Would the same amount of money go further if just Sandy and three people produced a program? Would it die in a year? In other words, we've always found, through our experiences, that the more people we could involve in a meaningful way in the projects that we helped initiate, and I don't necessarily mean getting people to hold cameras, the more spin-off and the more energy that was eventually created wherever it happened to go. I mean the television thing is just one element of a larger group, which is the environmental community.

SKIP BLUMBERG. I was just saying that it's a question of getting involved in projects and the projects are more than just making a tape and showing it on TV, There are questions of utilizing the television medium and spreading utilization, inspiring people to use it in different ways and experimenting with it.

MICHAEL CHASE. It could be done theoretically with or without reference to hardware. You could spend $100,000 give it to Channel 21 with the idea that they're to pass all of it on but 10% to set up a group of production units that will go out and work with the community and inspire them to get involved in expressing themselves through television, etc. Then they'll come and use our facilities. Or I could say we'll take the $100,000 and set up one video unit. This speaks to the earlier question of whether this should be separated from the station or not.

SKIP BLUMBERG. I think this is a very good point. I think that equipment is accessible around the State and that $100,000 might be better spent promoting people to be producing tapes and doing projects than buying more equipment.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. But generally, the problem is not necessarily the purchasing expense of the equipment. The problem is getting access to expensive equipment. Along with the problem of getting access is the problem of the environment the equipment exists in. The administrative, economic, technical environment is supported a certain way, is run a certain way. One of the points I think everybody's making in their own sense, in terms of the difference between each facility and the general feeling of what producing independent media is about was to be able to create the kind of environment where people can work creatively together and let that grow. And that's not necessarily a television studio. You don't necessarily deal with those problems simply because you have a television studio.

MICHAEL CHASE. I see a communications problem because if you go into a commercial television station and you say so and so is producing, that doesn't mean any equipment. The big CBS production last year was a Papp thing, Much Ado About Nothing, that was their major effort, 2 and 1/2 hours of Shakespeare, and it was actually shot in NBC's studio. That was not considered really important, that was the trivial part. They thought they were doing all the real stuff when they picked the production and the director and the approach, and hired the set designer etc. The other extreme is when Roc talks about sending people out with the camera. I wondered, in the case of a specific show, do you feel a show was better, had another dimension, because it grew from this involvement with the equipment, where you didn't have a technician standing between you and the expression.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Let me respond to that in two ways. First of all our priority in spending our money has really been one of people over equipment. We could be amassing a great stock of hardware, but we feel that there has to be people.

MICHAEL CHASE. If you had free access to equipment, like Skip, would you feel that that would be fine and you wouldn't worry about it?

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Except that there are twelve of us and to the extent that we're producers, maybe it's wonderful that we're using other people's equipment. We also have a function of making equipment available to the community and that's very intimately connected with our rationale for being producers. The second thing, something other people have touched on, is what happens in the station. We're lucky enough not to have a union shop so that there's a lot of flexibility and at least out in the studio, if you touch a camera, no one shrieks. Nonetheless, we don't do our own switching. There's somebody sitting up with the director. We tell him what we want to happen; there's a certain amount of control that we use. When you do your own directing, it's indirect. We call the shots to the director. If we want to call specific shots, we make sure that certain things happen, but we really lose control once we get into that studio. There's also a tremendous amount of pressure to account with, to transform what we want to do into that traditional studio format. We sit around on a bunch of chairs, etc. And we've found that what comes across on tape may be very lively but what's done live is absolutely dreadful, and deadly. So we've moved in the direction of wanting to be less and less in the studio and have more and more on tape when we go in there. Also, because it doesn't create problems of execution, of having to rely on a formal series of things. So unless the program really calls for us working in the studio, we don't. And also we initially felt the need to break up all the black and white cathode-ray resolution segments with live and color.

JOHN REILLY. Let me just point out one thing, we have until six and we have a number of people yet to go to, so I think, probably, we should summarize this and go on to another thing.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I'd like to throw out one idea that's nascent, that has grown out of our work and experiences. I'm not ready to say that this is where I think it totally is but I want to throw it out. There's a lot of energy going into cable as an outlet for community television production and specialized programming and we're kind of at an impasse at this point. The question is- is there really that much programming available for it? Do you really need all those channels at this point? I want to suggest that maybe the general direction at this point should be the activation of UHF channels for low-cost community production. A lot of technological changes are happening right

now. You're seeing much lower cost equipment and relative to running a cable system. I'd estimate the transmitting system for a good solid UHF station in Rochester would be half a million dollars, whereas wiring the city would be something like 22 million.

JOHN REILLY. Who's going to put up half a million? That's another problem.

MICHAEL CHASE. I'll start.

GERRY O'GRADY. I want to raise kind of an ugly question, in a sense, that Mike Chase, who comes from, I think, a totally different point of view, raises for me. From my point of view, you see, I want to change society as much as any of you, but I just wonder if we're going about it in a way that will succeed. I would put forward, just for argument, the point of view that you're essentially being co-opted. In other words, there's a paradox for me that on the one hand you want to change society, but you're dependent on the State's agents. They can stop you at any point. You're almost all totally dependent. That's what put you here together today. So that's a problem for me. You make some documentary tape, a great tape, whatever. You're working for 16 or 17 hours a day so you're providing free labor. I guess that the question I'm asking is do you really think you're changing society in the long run?

HOWIE GUTSTADT. I didn't talk about changing society. I just talked about a living experience, a way of wanting to live and work as a very important thing to understand in regard to the way a lot of people produce television these days. It's technologically related because it didn't happen very much before the portapak.

GERRY O'GRADY. I just wondered because this is the New York State Council on the Arts and at some point the question should come up. . .

LYDIA SILMAN. Maybe we can continue this discussion this evening.

GERRY O'GRADY. . . . because it is an issue.

JOHN REILLY. I think maybe, it's a great question, Gerry, but maybe we should. . . Jon, could you tell us about your situation?

JON ALPERT. I brought a bunch of booklets, I hope everybody has them, they basically tell what our organization's been doing for the last two or three years. The book's a little bit out of date, so for example, the tape list that's in there, it's a really old tape list and there are about 70 or 80 other tapes that have been made since that list. But basically, a lot of the things we do seem to be similar to some of the stuff that's going on up in Rochester. We decided that we would select a particular community, the community that we lived in, which is the Chinatown- Lower East Side area, and devote ourselves to trying to serve that community with video tape. We were lucky. We were able to get some machines and one of the first things we did was we began holding regular workshops, training people to use the machines and allowing people to borrow the machines. So it's very similar to some of the things that are going on up there. We never charge anybody in our community for any of the services we give them. We decided on that about a year ago, at the time we had no money at all, and it got to be very hard within the community, because we were working

mostly with groups that didn't have any money, deciding that this one's going to be charged $10 and this one's going to be charged $20. We've never charged anyone for the workshops and we've trained 1500 people since we started. We never charge for loaning out the equipment and the equipment goes out every single day and it seems to be kept in pretty good repair, the people take good care of it. One of the things we've found in trying to get a little bit more independence as far as distribution of programs is we've concentrated very heavily on closed-circuit telecasts. Originally we thought that cable TV was going to be some help to everybody but in our community they never brought the cable in because they didn't think they were going to make any money. So one of the first things we did was to equip a truck with a power inverter. We've had a lot of success with this. This truck goes out into the community and because we work in this area and people know us, they're no longer surprised when they see it, and this is a good way of getting our programs out. Also, working in closed-circuit telecasts, we're able to get a lot more effect out of one program. If the program's about health, we show it in a hospital to people who are waiting to see a doctor. If the program's about the problems of senior citizens, we show it at a senior citizens' center. This seems to be working very well- We're very happy, people have begun to check out playback equipment as often as they're checking out production equipment because there is a large library of tapes that's been accumulating over the past three years. These are being seen, they're being shown around the community more and more frequently. If I could just give an example, maybe this is in answer to the question of whether a paid production crew from a TV station can get the same effect as a group that's working daily in the community - some of the people know this story but it's a good example of the kind of thing that we can do. In Chinatown, many, many people there don't speak English, especially the elderly people, and they get very, very poor health care. We were asked by people at the local hospital to try to do something to get these people into the clinic so they can get treated. We produced a tape about dental care in Chinese, for which we interviewed a lot of old people in Chinatown and they spoke about the problems they had and the fact that they hadn't gone to the dentist, that they had no money and they were scared. We also videotaped a person going to and getting these treatments at the clinic. The whole tape was done in Chinese and it was brought to the senior citizens' center where most of these people go every day for lunch. After playing the tape and having a dentist answer questions we signed everybody up to go to the dentist and we showed up next week with our truck and we took the people to the hospital. We took them every single week for a month until all the people who wanted to get treatment were treated. People who had never been to the dentist before were willing to go. This is the type of stuff that a group that's involved in the community, like most of the groups here, can do. I know, for example, the big issue in our community right now is District 1 and I know that I could go in and we could make a much better program than a group from a commercial TV station could make.

MICHAEL CHASE. But the question I have is if we gave you the equipment, if you used somebody else's equipment, could you make a better program?

JON ALPERT. The better quality the equipment that we have to work with the better the program will be.

MICHAEL CHASE. The important thing being your involvement with the community not your ownership of the equipment.

JON ALPERT. It's very, very important that the people making the tapes have roots in the community. We've seen very good programs being produced, especially by people that we've trained, who are working with an institution that they work in every single day, who know what that institution means to them. We're interested in some set up of a distribution system, people are talking about it here today. I know every month we get a telephone call from somebody who's setting up a distribution system and nothing's ever worked out so far. It would be nice if something could be worked out for distribution. That's really all I have to say. The other thing is that there is some pressure, every year, to produce a certain type of program and as you get a better working relationship with the State, you realize what the State's expecting you to produce and what the new funding sources are. So there is this type of pressure, if you're not financially independent, to produce a certain type of program. But there's a lot of flexibility in that too because basically our groups here don't have that much overhead, so if there are some guidelines set down I think everybody here has the possibility of sometime producing the kind of programs that they want to produce. I think everybody here retains their independence. I think this is the question you were asking, how do you become cooperative when you're dependent on basically a State organization? And of course we are dependent because there's no funding for the type of work we do other than the State. The State's our only resource.

JOHN REILLY. I don't think it's an indelicate question, but do you really feel very much pressured to produce certain types of programming?

JON ALPERT. The question is, because of guidelines that have been set down, are we pushed into producing a certain type of programming, that we feel we have to do something in order to earn that money? As Howard was saying because of the nature of the medium, we can still retain a tremendous amount of freedom, even if it was set down that I have to produce six programs. I had a contract once, the first one that we ever got from the city, which specified ten cultural programs, ten local news programs, and it was very specific. We had to train 500 people, and have so many shows in the street and what we did is we did all that because we wanted to, we asked for the type of things that we wanted to do within those guidelines and we did everything else we wanted to do besides that because we worked twice as hard. The City is an interesting story because I think it affects all of us. We were very proud at the end of the summer to go into them with a report of all the things we had done but the other two groups that they had funded stole all the money. It really looked very bad for video because of that. I think they've more or less gone out of the video business. They don't have that much room to work with, from what I understand. I don't know the people.

JOHN REILLY. Jaime, maybe you can follow because you work in a similar fashion.

JAIME BARRIOS. We work very much similarly to the way Downtown Community Center TV works. I want to talk about two things, the Community Action Newsreel and the Mere facility. The Community Newsreel works very much along the lines of Downtown Television. We took a program that was relevant to the Lower East Side to the Spanish community and it worked. We've been working about three years in the community producing both cultural programs and issue-oriented things that deal with schools and hospitals and housing and health and all that. The way we show our tapes has basically been- a monitor in a truck- on the street corners, in the laundro-mat, the supermarket, and at a lot of meetings. People call us up every day to go with some

particular tape to a meeting they're holding somewhere. We have an audience there that's discussing some aspect of the problem and we bring in the tape and further the discussion. We also do a lot of work with the artists and cultural programs not only in the Lower East Side but in the City, particularly the Spanish groups, theatre groups, dance groups, poets and singers. The outlet for those tapes has been basically through Puerto Rican studies in the universities and over Cable Television. A very important aspect that we have developed is the training of people, particularly minority people, for television production. Most of the people we deal with are very concerned with going on professionally. These are people who are not necessarily artists, but people who would really like to learn the trade, learn how to be a television director or a camera person or a sound person and maybe go on to work professionally, and have the power and the knowledge to say something that matters to them and to their community. We did two cooperative programs with the 51st State and, as I said before, we had to do it on film because 13 at that time couldn't deal with half-inch. One was about health service and the other was about housing/crime problems. They were produced entirely by us and they gave us free control, all control of the editing, total editorial control of the film. They paid us as well, all expenses plus a fee, because we didn't feel that we could go into business subsidizing Channel 13. They were very successful programs. We printed a lot of leaflets to make sure that people would see it, we printed leaflets in Spanish and Chinese for the studio on the Lower East Side. We got a lot of calls afterwards from people from other groups who wanted to do similar kinds of programs for closed-circuit distribution. Now we are working with the commercial station, NBC, doing a show about District 1. Strangely enough, it's been much easier to work with a commercial station than with 13, much more serious, much more business-like and the whole atmosphere is much easier. The relationship with Channel 13 had to do with their taking some sort of a liberal do-gooding attitude, “We’re letting you do this nice thing for the community,” quote unquote, “and it would be nice if you could do something." The relationship with NBC has been much more professional, "We need something and we think you can do it well, deliver it quickly," time schedules and all that. It's a much better, a much cleaner relationship and we're now trying to develop more of this kind of relationship with all commercial stations. So our area is basically still training and community programming, which I think all the groups, like Downtown Television and Howard, are not primarily producing artistic material but a lot of social material. A major provision is distribution, for the programs to be seen, and that's where we're making a push to cooperate and collaborate with television stations.

JOHN REILLY. Do you think that if you were working exclusively in video tape it would be as easy to have these programs aired?

JAIME BARRIOS. I think from what I've heard now, I don't see why not.

JOHN REILLY. But they specifically asked you, a year ago, to do it in film?

JAIME BARRIOS. Yes.

JOHN REILLY. And what about the most recent one?

JAIME BARRIOS. Well, NBC hasn't come around yet to dealing with half-inch.

JOHN REILLY. So it's all filmed?

JAIME.BARRIOS. But I think it probably would be exactly the same whether it's film or video tape, the medium doesn't really make much difference.

JOHN REILLY. But some of the facilities are not equipped to work with film.

JAIME BARRIOS. No. But as far as a project we're considering, we're not that much concerned with the medium, whether it's half-inch or one-inch or film, as long as we can do it cheaply and be attractive for programming. We'd rather work in video, it's cheaper. Particularly, everything we do in the community is done in video- you cannot do that in film. But we train people in both film and video so after a year of working with us, people can do camera work in video and film and sound.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. There's no difference between the work that you do on video and the work that you do on film?

JAIME BARRIOS. Not much. We work with Super-8 with young children; they make their own films, it's a much more educational problem there. But we haven't been able to utilize Super-8 successfully for showings the way we use video or 16mm. You can't get synch sound or color, and editing and prints are difficult to obtain.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. Do you see that happening within the next couple years? Do you think within the next couple of years it will be possible?

JAIME BARRIOS. With Super-8? I don't know, I don't have the knowledge of Super-8 to know. But some of them do a lot of work in video, particularly in the cultural aspects we do a lot of cultural programming. We do it in our own studio, we do it on video, and that could be easily done on film. It could be a much more exciting kind of product than on tape, it has more possibilities, it's much cheaper too.

JON ALPERT. I think we're talking about one specific need that our group has found and maybe other people are in the same situation. We've made many, many, many tapes. We tried to make a lot of innovations ourselves but we've been working just with portapaks and editing decks. This year Keiko, who was a judge on the CAPS panel, saw a lot of tapes coming in and people are doing a lot of very interesting things which we, having our nose to the ground, didn't think anybody was doing. She came back and said, "Boy, people are doing really good things technologically," in response to the quality of their tapes. "We should really start finding out about some of these things because we're so busy making tapes and doing all that other stuff that we didn't know anything about it." I'm so excited, coming here today, because I'm talking to some of these people and I know names but I never met anybody before and people know about this camera that I didn't know anything about and people know about, what is it, pumping stuff up to broadcast quality. And if there could be some kind of coordination, specifically about technical information, because I remember in the beginning, about two or three years ago, people were talking about that, but there was really very little communication between video groups. A lot of people were scared that everybody was going to rip them off, and I can tell horror stories about some things that happened to us, but I see mostly good people left in video tape now. They're all good people and I'd really like to work with people on getting some type of communication among the groups here, on the type of things that can help

us all like technological advances and getting stuff up to broadcast quality and perhaps working together as an organization would give this more push.

LYDIA SILMAN. Maybe we can talk about that more, later.

JOHN REILLY. That's a good suggestion, it really is.

LYDIA SILMAN. Why don't you go on and talk about Merc?

JAIME BARRIOS. Merc is something quite different, it's the Media Equipment Resource Center, which is another division of Young Filmmakers. Media Equipment Resource Center was set up in 1971 by the Council and administered by us with the idea of creating a pool of equipment, not only in video but in film - 16mm and Super 8 - and video. The way that Merc works is on a first-come first-serve basis. Anyone, any non-profit group or any individual artist in New York State can get the use of Merc equipment or facilities. We set up a system where, if you want to take equipment out, people have to leave a deposit, or provide insurance. The deposit initially was about 10% of the value on short-range loans, and up to 50% if an organization or a school wants to take it for six months.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. May I ask a question on that? Have you found that that, in any cases, has become prohibitive?

JAIME BARRIOS. No, not yet. I don't think we've turned down anyone yet, because they couldn't come up with the 10% value of the equipment or the insurance.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. Is it because they can't come up with it or the insurance is issued?

JAIME BARRIOS. No, if you are a non-profit organization, more than likely you get a cost insurance rate.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. It's refundable?

JAIME BARRIOS. Yes. Most non-profit organizations have insurance to begin with.

SANDY ROCKOWIT2. I mean when they leave a deposit.

JAIME BARRIOS. It's refundable but against damage or loss. But in terms of individuals, let's see, the portapak, I think is $185 deposit and that seems to be no problem for people to come up with, in most cases. And also the care that people give the equipment, how they bring it back, is extraordinary. We've lost very little equipment and very little equipment has been damaged and most of it comes back in time, and it's ready to use again. The portapak may go out, the average is now, about 16 times a month.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I'm not sure you understood what I meant. I didn't mean to imply, when I said the equipment got really worked over, that people were abusing it, but the fact that it's been constantly used. What I meant to say was machines really have to be able to take it and normal use

really wears it down. The question I want to ask is do you require that people have some technical experience with the equipment before they take it out?

JAIME BARRIOS. We assume people know, we don't ask people to pass a test. And usually people ask questions. Most of the time, if they don't know, they say what do I do for this particular tape. On the staff we have at least two persons who are very knowledgeable at answering technical questions. People ask, if they're going to use it for a particular use or if they're going to do something special with the equipment, they ask ahead of time, and they most likely have a planning session where they make a combination of equipment that will do the job that they want to get done. We have people on the staff just to do that, to help users. By now we have served close to 500 organizations and visual artists. We just finished doing a study where we found that the value, had the people gone and rented the stuff, is close to three-quarters of a million dollars. People not only take video equipment outside, they come inside and use it because we have editing facilities and a studio, an SEG studio, a four-camera studio. So I think half, no not quite, but a third of the people come and use in-house facilities. So far it's been working extraordinarily well. There isn't that much delay in equipment, you don't have to apply a year or a month before, we're booked up about two weeks ahead. However, it is the setup where you must write a letter, there is some paper work involved, you can't just walk in, ask for the equipment and then take it. You must write a letter, and then when we receive a letter we send the people back an application form. When that gets back, that application gets approved by us, as well as by the Council. We call up the Council twice a week and say we have that many applications to be approved and we describe who they are and any particular problems involved. When people come to pick it up or before they pick it up they send in a certified check and we write up a contract and the equipment goes out.

JON ALPERT. About how many people do you serve?

JAIME BARRIOS. 400 maybe, organizations, I don't know how many individual artists. But at each organization, the equipment is used for more than just one. Each organization takes out equipment three times a year, or three times in six months. So in terms of usage, we've served a couple thousand. I have a few copies of this report if somebody wants to see it. It's the exact number that's been used and how the whole thing with MERC works. By the way, MERC's entirely funded by the Council, 100%. That isn't necessarily wise but none of us at MERC want to be in the position of having to be responsible for funding it. I mean if the Council decided to give us half the money, I think the logical place to go would be the National Endowment or the city. We don't want to have the responsibility of having to raise all the money.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. Do you have an estimate of how much equipment costs?

JAIME BARRIOS. We use close to $100,000 worth of equipment but that includes one Auricon and two or three Magnas so that's $5,000 on transmit machines.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. You don't carry your own insurance?

JAIME BARRIOS. We do carry our own insurance, we carry double insurance just in case. Equipment has been seldom lost, but the problem is, if you have equipment, let's say you take it upstate somewhere, if you lose it or if it gets stolen from you, we would have a tremendous amount

of problems collecting insurance, but you wouldn't because it's under your name while you're using it.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. Are you talking about using a floater?

JAIME BARRIOS. No we haven't been able to work with the question of floaters, we would like to work with a system of floaters where we could dispense a floater to everyone but that's a very complicated problem of insurance. It's very, very difficult.

LYDIA SILMAN. Since somebody's mentioned insurance, let me tell you I don't know if everybody knows, I'm working on an insurance plan where the state or NYSCA will insure all of the equipment that is owned by us that you people have. I hope to have it worked out by the time the grants are given out next year so that you won't have to worry about the costs incurred when insuring your own equipment. I would think that you might be able to insure your own equipment, not under the same policy, but with the same company that's insuring our equipment. It might be much easier for you then.

JOHN REILLY. That would probably be very helpful.

LYDIA SILMAN. I think so. It will certainly help us in terms of keeping track of what equipment is out and just make it easier in terms of the paper work.

JOHN REILLY. Do we have any other questions for Jaime about MERC or Newsreel?

PETER BRADLEY. I have a question about, for instance if NBC is contracting you to deliver a program, the question of film vs. video. On location, for instance, it's much easier to shoot in color on film. Would they take black and white products?

JAIME BARRIOS. No not at all. NBC will not. But if we're discussing a studio production in our studio, which will be in color, then we can deliver tape. The main problem with NBC and it became a problem with NET, is the unions, because when you begin doing tape in New York, it's a very big problem. I don't know exactly what the solution is going to be to that.

PETER BRADLEY. What are your remarks to the message in the medium? In Community Newsreel, you don't care?

JAIME BARRIOS. We don't have a commitment to video, the art of it, because it's video, but we have developed the community video because it's much less expensive and flexible to work with.

PETER BRADLEY. You don't care that the message is . . .

JAIME BARRIOS. No, that's not so.

GERRY O'GRADY. In other words people are free to make their own message.

JAIME BARRIOS. What do you mean?

GERRY O'GRADY. Peter says your interest in message could be an implication of your personal message and philosophy. What I'm trying to say is what you do is let people. . .

JAIME BARRIOS. No, no, no, no. We are concerned with message. Usually we are very concerned with message because we act in a way as television producers, we have the crews and the students and members of the workshops. We together define what to do, and there hasn't been much problem, up to this time, because all the programming we have done has dealt with social problems, dealing with minorities, so really there's very little question about what to do, just how to do it best. But we also allow other people to do their own programming, so whenever we deal with channel 13 or NBC, we have to commit ourselves to some kind of specific program. Very much what we're developing with NBC or anybody like that is something very similar to the OP-ED page of the Times. They allow us to come in and present a different minority program.

JOHN REILLY. This is really a very exciting thing, because the traditional view, obviously, with the news or documentaries on television has been that the station has been responsible for the content. The fact that they're allowing you to do that under those circumstances is a real, in a sense, a breakthrough in their attitude.

JAIME BARRIOS. I think so, especially with channel 4, because when we approached them I wanted to know exactly what they were going to give us, exactly how much freedom, and they said do it exactly as you want and then we'll worry about balancing the point of view, we'll create another program later on about that.

JOHN REILLY. Well no, but they'll create another program, at least they won't interfere with the way he wants to present it. No obviously, they'll balance it.

GERRY O'GRADY. And they also have some selectivity with whom they ask.

PETER BRADLEY. But Jaime's set it up so it can be balanced.

JAIME BARRIOS. No, we made our own program.

PETER BRADLEY. So it won't be, no matter how hard they try.

JOHN REILLY. Skip.

SKIP BLUMBERG. My name is Skip Blumberg and I'm representing an organization called Media Bus, Inc. Davidson Gigliotti and Nancy Cain are also from the same group. Our name not withstanding, our main emphasis, I guess, is on the softer aspects of TV. We're an autonomous organization, we're video producers. The organization is maintained by producers for producers. We like to use the medium in lots of different ways. We're involved in the production of lots of different kinds of pieces. We have a lot of experience in using half-inch. We've also begun to use two-inch equipment as well. We produce books occasionally, publications. We have a technical shop and a couple of people who are very experienced in half-inch equipment and we're beginning to work on problems of interfacing half-inch with two-inch, although again, these things evolve.

Since we don't have two-inch equipment and we do have half-inch equipment, we have a lot of information on half-inch and anybody who would like access to it is more than welcome. We do workshops. About 200 people a year come up to our house and because we live in the country, sometimes they'll stay, sometimes they stay longer than we'd like, some people have stayed up to three months, but most people come up for a weekend.

LYDIA SILMAN. I think we're going to begin now. I'm Lydia Silman from the State Arts Council and let me introduce the representatives from foundations we have here today. Sitting across from me is Nancy Raine, who's the assistant to the director of public media at the National Endowment. To her left is Forest Chisman, who's the Executive's Assistant of the Markle Foundation. To his left is David Davis who is in charge of the Office of Public Broadcasting for the Ford Foundation. Over here we have Porter McCray from the J.D.R. III Fund. He's the director of Asian Cultural Programs. I think what we'll do is go around the table and introduce ourselves.

JAIME BARRIOS. Young Filmmaker's and Media Equipment Resource Center.

DAVID LOXTON. Television Lab at WNET, New York.

JOE SEAL. from Ithaca Video Project.

ALLEN WINER. Visual Studies Workshop in Rochester, New York.

I'm KEN MARSH from Woodstock Community Video.

LuRAYE CRANDALL. from New York State Council on the Arts.

DALE RIEHL. Cable Arts Foundation.

GEORGE CREE. Experimental Intermedia.

BOB CIVIELLO. Channel 21 on Long Island.

BOB BELL. WLIW TV, Garden City, New York.

MARGOT LEWITIN. Women's Interart Center, New York.

I'm GERRY O'GRADY from Media Study in Buffalo.

I'm CAROLYN SACHS from the New York State Cable Television Commission.

PETER BRADLEY from the Council on the Arts.

DIANE HART, Collaborations in Art, Science and Technology in Syracuse, New York.

JOHN REILLY, Video Studies Center of Global Village.

LYDIA SILMAN. Behind us we have Lucy Kostelanetz from the New York State Council on the Arts and Ellen Thurston from the State Council. I think Peter has something to say about yesterday. He'll give a brief summary of what happened.

PETER BRADLEY. Since some of the people who were here yesterday aren't here, we thought it would be perhaps helpful to some of you who weren't here yesterday who are here today to know a little bit about what happened because of course, we brought some of that in our minds today. The ones who aren't here today can't hit me if I misquote them and I will try to merely summarize points made by various speakers. The Council often sits between various groups, as the hub of a wheel of video activity, in which the individual video groups don't always compare notes and get together. We thought it would be helpful for them to come together in a room. Since video is coming of age as we all know, and since there is a geographic diversity and a diversity of activity, it seemed sensible for people to come and compare notes. At the same time the continuing problems that video groups face have a great many similarities, the foremost among them being lack of sufficient funds to do much of what they are committed to doing. The Council clearly is not able to do all it would like to do in support of their activities and we hoped today to introduce them and introduce those of you at foundations to them for a general discussion, both about the activities of the groups and your own policies and interests and where they might coincide. So we started yesterday. John Reilly, sitting in the chairman's seat, raised a couple of the issues which we talked about on and off throughout the day. There were two areas in particular. Foremost among them, I would say, was the felt need on the part of video groups to arrive at some kind of distribution system, which we've got to work out, since video is a communication form, obviously a great deal of the work done in it is intended to be seen, and as yet there are no fixed patterns of distribution whatsoever, for half-inch video particularly and independent video generally, whether it's done on a broadcast format or not. The need for linking the groups both in terms of tape distribution and shared expertise, thought, etc., was one that ran through most of the discussion. On the other hand and beyond that, was a great deal of talk about networking these various groups and a lot of groups, a lot of video activity that wasn't necessarily represented by a person here, but that is known to be going on throughout the State. We know that technologically it's possible to link up by microwave these various groups and interests. In fact O'Grady from Buffalo pointed out that there isn't enough copper in the world to cable New York State so that notion was dispensed with. But there is still a great deal of interest in linking all the groups. Lance Wisniewski from Syracuse presented a paper which we hope to be able to distribute a little later in the day, including maps, showing that they're atomic carrier or microwave, that cover most of New York State. There was a considerable amount of talk about reaching wide audiences with the products of video activity. On the other hand some resistance to that notion seemed to be manifesting itself which I attribute to a feeling that video is an alternative to conventional television, both commercial and public. Ralph Hocking from Experimental TV Center introduced a model for a kind of neo-primitive video and urged bringing back the glitsch. I think what Ralph was feeling was, now that a certain stability has been achieved in the video community, there are many instincts at work to save the world of video. My own feeling is that since commercial broadcasting, although it s trying very hard, hasn't destroyed the world, it's naive to think that video will save it. But it can provide us with pleasant moments at least. By presenting a model of a fairly happy alliance between a video group and a public television station. Sandy Rockowitz of Rochester created a great deal of interest. That is a situation in which a local video group introduced itself to the public television station in Rochester, and I don't think it was simply a question of personality but of taking a little time on both parts, so that

Portable Channel and the public television station came to understand what each other was about- that they were quite different yet they had common interests in serving a local area. We saw a tape from Portable Channel last night at Global Village. It didn't have a great deal of interest to me personally because I'm not from Rochester but I was reminded of something that Skip Blumberg from Videofreex said a few years ago, maybe only about a year ago. He suddenly realized that of all the video tapes he looked at none of them were very interesting unless he was in them or he'd shot them or his friends were in them. I know that's very true about the two video tapes I made. I love to look at them but nobody else does, except my wife and children. When Skip made the remark, I thought, well that's too bad but things will get better. Now I think that it is better already, that the compulsion of commercial broadcasting, which in part I think is shared by non-commercial broadcasting, is to cast out a very wide net to reach enormous audiences and that's how we measure success - by the number of people looking at it. But it was significant to me that the video tape that the Freex or rather the Media Bus, showed last night, was one that they're clearly very interested in, and very exhilarated by, one that they're very proud of. It was a tape about a boxing match held in Lanesville, New York where they live, that was a fund-raising event for the local rescue squad. I think Skip or Bart mentioned that although they've been in Lanesville almost three years the tape gave them a kind of legitimacy in the community because the community was in the video tape. Practically the whole town, there are only about 300 people there, appears in the tape. That tape again, seemed personally very long. I kept waiting for the fight and they didn't bring the reel with the fight on it. I kept impatiently waiting for it to be over and it did not have a great deal of interest to me until I realized, why the hell should it? Lanesville TV is a community video group and this is a video tape that has been seen with great pleasure and interest many times by the people in it. It's been playing in the bars there and in community rooms and churches since it was completed, and it will undoubtedly be seen again and again there over the years. The same thing was true of the Portable Channel tape. Their tapes mean a great deal to the Rochester community. Although it makes a great deal of sense, for practical reasons and technological reasons, to link up all the video groups in the State and all sorts of television agencies, I wonder now, as a result of what was said yesterday and as a result of a lot of things that weren't said, how we are going to define video achieving success. I think maybe it already has, because as we know from all of the video activities in the state, that is, it's everywhere - that is success of a kind already. We're still left with most of the problems, mainly that there's very little local support or private support for it, because again I think video is a mechanism whereby small areas come back in touch with themselves. That is a phenomenon that perhaps we haven't totally realized yet. And of course we live in a country where the compulsion is to think big and thinking small, which I think is what I'm advising, except in terms of support, may be what we should start beginning to do. I'd originally thought that I was going to present general remarks this morning and I've got them mixed up with a summary. I didn't mean to slip them in quite that way and they might have made more sense if I'd separated the two. But at any rate, going back to the meeting itself, essentially we had reports from a number of video groups, from the public television station on Long Island that recently broadcast one of its first programs on the half-inch video activity going on in its area. We had a presentation from Ken Marsh from Woodstock Community Video in which Ken proposed that the Council, since it is a principal and often a lonely supporter of video activity in the state, think in more long-range terms than just keeping video activity alive; think of it in terms that other speakers have raised, mainly a networking of facilities, a sharing of people with technological expertise, essentially a philosophical guideline to support of video activity. I think Ken is right in implicitly remarking, by that proposal, that the Council has not necessarily had that kind of coherent approach to video, and

I think it's time. On the other hand, time is, the concern about time, is also behind Ralph Hocking's thought, I think, when I refer again to his- sort of hold-it thing. There is a compulsion - we're wondering why, after six years (only four years really of concerted activity) there aren't any masterpieces. I think Ralph sensed that some people think there should be masterpieces. Many people think the great American novel still hasn't been written and I think I share Ralph's unease with a trend of thinking that the way things are moving today, four years is enough time for video going to take a lot more time, it's also going to take a lot more understanding and exploration of what video really can do. There's no way of any of us alleviating our impatience to get there, but on the other hand, I don't think we should be unduly pessimistic that we aren't there already. This relates in some way to concerns that were raised about the TV Lab. David Loxton spoke about concern in the video community about amassing very expensive equipment in a single location or very few locations that are associated with broadcasting. I think we'll probably hear more of those concerns today and in the weeks and years ahead because it reflects, it emanates from this schism between wanting to emulate the success of commercial broadcasting, success measured in terms of audience and the effectiveness of advertising on television vs. at the same time recognizing the insidious corruption of the media. The model of commercial television is so strong that it's very difficult to shake off what Gerry referred to as the broadcast psyche. It's very difficult to shake that off at the same time that one is engaged in battling it, it's not an easy battle to win. I'm not sure that that at all summarizes many of the concerns that were raised yesterday but it did for me and I'll stop there. I did say that the purpose of today's session was to give ourselves at the Council and the video groups we support a chance to be with foundation people so that both could tell each other where our interests lie. I'm not sure who comes next, Lydia.

LYDIA SILMAN. Nancy, do you want to begin?

NANCY RAINE. Sure. I think I want to start out by giving you some idea of how people go about applying to the Endowment. I decided that I would share with you a couple of observations, which probably are obvious, but nonetheless, come up so often. Before I get into some specifics - this is the Endowment's Public Media Program - I'll give you a brief outline of some of our major areas of support, and finally I'm going to focus on some of the projects we've funded in video. I think the first thing is that I'm aware in talking to people who seek funds from us of the difficulty of translating a creative idea into a program of real dollars, cents and people via the bureaucratic structure that's necessary for a federal agency like the Endowment to operate. The process, I've found, is often a frustrating one, and it's frustrating on both sides. In my role, which is basically an administrator to these programs, I'm often caught between people who need and want help on the one hand and the demands of the administrative context in which this help is to be offered on the other. Just an example of it, that happens to me often - do I take a phone call from an applicant who wants to know how things look so far in an application that's being reviewed or, do I continue with the task that I'm engaged in of trying to get their application ready to be reviewed? There's a real live person on one end and an abstraction called a deadline on the other. I've never found it an easy solution and basically the solution I've come up with is to try to consider what I think is in their best interest, to the best of my knowledge at the time. Sometimes it ends up with the person on the other end of the phone being told that once again we're not available. I don't know how many of you have had this particular experience of trying to get through to us a number of times. Yesterday, who came up to me and said, "Where's my money?" Just an example in terms of the time problem that we have at the Endowment. Our next deadline is June 3. If you submit an

application to us June 3, it would be reviewed by the panel in July, by the National Council on the Arts in September, you conceivably would be notified by October 15. That's all stated in the guidelines, which I'll pass around in a while. Your project would not be scheduled to begin until November 1. But that's the normal amount of time it takes for anything to happen. Now your planning time, before you can apply June 3, is a whole other matter. So those are very real things. The second point I wanted to make is that the Endowment really stresses being responsive to the needs and aims of the field, as well as to current developments in a given art form. I don't think that anyone is unaware of the fact that in responding to the needs of quote "the few," the Endowment or any foundation is also enlarging that field and in some sense determining its direction. The real direction must come, I think, in large part, from those currently working in the field. Unless we are made aware, through exchange that's done in a spirit of cooperation, it's very difficult for us to respond. If people feel that asking for funds isn't worth the effort, I really do think that we have failed to meet the challenge that government support for the arts entails. I think to some extent that the spirit of cooperation I've mentioned hinges on the willingness to consider a project within the context of what is possible. For example, what I was mentioning earlier about the lapse of time it takes to apply, taking the Endowment's legislation, budget, current guidelines and administrative procedures into account, however inadequate they may be to the task at hand. Now those are probably two very obvious points, but it does come up. I'd like to give an example of how the responsive process I'm trying to get at can work. Last year Ernest Callenbach, who's the editor of Film Quarterly, proposed to the Endowment in a letter a program of support for the development of young critics whereby existing film journals would receive funds earmarked for the commissioning of works for publication. He felt that support from the Endowment would increase activity in such areas as translations, studies of filmmakers, reassessment of old films and so on. In essence it would provide a much needed showcase for the work of young critics working in film. We presented this proposal to our advisory panel which suggested that since they really didn't have any expertise themselves that we bring together professional critics in the field, to discuss this idea and see how they felt about it. There was an exploratory meeting held last summer. Seven critics attended, including Ernest Callenbach, of course, Roger Ebert, Roger Greenspun, Pauline Kael and a few other people like that. It was a very interesting meeting just because they had all been brought together – you can sort of imagine some of the things that went back and forth. The final result of the meeting was the recommendation that grants up to $5,000 be made available to film journals to pay contributors. We then had to take back to our advisory panel and also to the National Council on the Arts and it was unanimously endorsed at that point. Funds will be available for that purpose in this coming fiscal year, and we expect to be receiving applications by June. So that's a case where we were made aware of a need and something happened. I think that we all felt a great deal of gratification in seeing that the discussions had been translated into a program of support, which was clearly responding to a need. It took a full year for this to happen and it probably took six months for Mr. Callenbach to work it out. On the other side the Endowment does act in a role as initiator and an example of this, I think, is a showcase for short films – a pilot program. I'll tell you a little bit about what a pilot is later. We felt that there was a need for American short films to be shown in theaters. Nothing seemed to be happening in this area. We pulled together five or six short films and Chloe went down to a meeting of the National Association of Theater Owners and showed them this reel of basically experimental short films to see if they'd be interested in having them at their theaters, and they were. I don't think they understood what they were seeing in a way, but they liked it. We've now interested three major distributors in dealing with these films. The Endowment's going to provide funds for the blow-up

costs of the prints from 16mm to 35mm and provide a fellowship for the filmmakers who will be chosen for this program. There are several committees outside of the Endowment who are doing this. And again this is something, in terms of getting something that's already done into outlets. This is what we call a pilot program in the sense that we initiate it. So that's a two-way process, two ways in which new things can happen within the context of the Endowment, both by responding to things and by being made aware of needs, for example, that there were these really marvelous short films that really weren't being seen by as broad a group as we would have liked. Anyway, those are some things I wanted to mention. In terms of some specifics I suppose the first place to start with the Endowment is with their guidelines. We more or less give birth to these things every year and for all the midwifery involved in them, I don't think that's an unwarranted verb. You can just pass these around. Essentially they set forth the current deadline dates, our eligibility requirements and basically the scope of our areas of funding; and they change from year to year. We do not always have the same deadline dates. The guidelines are a place to begin investigating support from us. I really can't stress the importance of being familiar with them. They're basically available from our office at the Endowment, called Program Information. If you call and ask for them you can get them. You can also call the program. This year there's a press release that gives you an idea of what we have in fact funded in each of what we call basic categories of support I've found that it's very useful for people because the language in here is very broad. That, unfortunately, is not back from the printers yet. Again there are 15 steps that all of these things go through after you've done them, before they appear. I don't really want to go into the basic information that you can read in the guidelines, but I would like to point out a couple of mechanics of applications. I feel that this is a very petty thing, but it is something that is very real in terms of the administration of these things. There are all sorts of warnings in here, they're all in italics, saying this and that deadline will be caused by incomplete information or late submission or failure to submit certain kinds of sample works and certain kinds of forms. That's a difference from the way they were last year, and that's because it's been such hell with receiving material that, we had basically four people on the staff and now we have five people. It's really not uncommon for us to get an application where amount requested is left blank or an application where the figures in the budget summary on the first page don't match the breakdowns on the inside. It's really an incredible thing when you're getting 350 applications within a two-week period to try to get back to everybody and say, "Well, now exactly how much do you want from us?" So I just urge that they be taken as serious written documents and get a certain kind of attention. I suppose the worst one that I've ever seen was three 3X5 cards scotch-taped together that had a one-sentence project description and it requested $100,000. These things have to be xeroxed and put in a book so that they can be reviewed by the panel and so forth. I wrote the man a very long letter and said basically what is in the guidelines, but I felt that somehow they were intimidated so perhaps if I said it in a very nice letter, "Hi, just wanted to let you know..." that I would get more information back. I got another 3X5 card with a second sentence that was to be added by someone to the first sentence. This little presentation I'm calling "how to get a coke out of the damn machine." But more substantially perhaps, it is important to note that we provide funds on a specific project basis. What that really means is that we do not provide general support, that is we cannot cover costs of general operating expenses. If the total cost of the given project represents a substantial portion of the organization's total fiscal activity, the application stands very little chance, if any, of being recommended for support. This is basically an Endowment policy. I realize that that presents a lot of problems because it's really hard for anybody to get general support money, but nevertheless that's where things stand and sometimes you might see a request that's for a very large amount of

money, basically for general operating expenses, and there's an aspect of it, maybe only $5,000 that could be a specific project, an honorarium fee for artists coming in or something like that. That could be pulled out and developed as a $10,000 project, $5,000 from us and $5,000 matched. It's very important, and this year that also appears in the guidelines along with all the extra warnings. I'm very amused at the warnings in there, because we just went nuts getting films, even 35mm films, to be reviewed.

MICHAEL CHASE. I'm not sure if I'm correct, but I think I remember reading in the guidelines that all the funding for the Public Media Program is matching funds.

NANCY RAINE. Yeah, I was going to get to that. Yes, they are. And that's my next point. They're a 50-50 matching basis. The exception to this being the few grants that we have given to individuals. I'm sure you'll ask about that and I'll do it later, but I wanted to set this out. Matching can consist of contributed goods and services or other grants, gifts or an anticipated income from the project. You can over-match but to any grant to an organization that is a requirement and that is a problem to a lot of people. Finally, one of the areas we are not able to help with is the purchase of equipment. This is really basically because our funds have been fairly limited and we have a national demand on those funds from all over the country. It's just, the National Council on the Arts has not felt that our budget is large enough at this time to get into funding purchase of permanent equipment, although, occasionally there will be $200 in the budget for the purchase of something that's essential to the project that we will waive on with a great deal of paper work and 15 different people in the Endowment we've talked to. But that is basically the case. I just want to give you an idea of the kinds of demands on the program in this fiscal year, which is fiscal year 1974. We provided '99 grants for a total of $1,130,000, in our four major areas of support - Programs in the Arts, which is a production category; they're film, television and radio productions, Regional Development, Media Studies and General Programs. I should just say that General Programs is the category we have that permits us the greatest flexibility of funding. These $5,000 grants I mentioned earlier that are going to be available to film journals, they will come out of General Program money. In other words we didn't add another category. Anyway, for these 99 grants, we received over 250 applications in these same four areas requesting $4,300,000. So we really are not able to fund all the projects of merit. Again, I just want to stress the fact that we are an agency concerned with what is happening across the nation. I'd like to go on to give the rationale behind the areas of support I just mentioned. I don't often get a chance to do that. When we began the program, there were a number of clear needs and endless possibilities for programs and projects and so forth. The question faced by the Endowment at that time was how do we enter into a new field, not traditionally regarded as part of the arts, especially by the Congressmen who give us our money, you one which has a potential which is so clearly evident to fulfill what was set forth in our Congressional Act in 1965, in our mandate, "to create the material conditions for the release of creative talent." That's very broad, as you can see. It was clear that in a country as diverse and complex as ours, media in the arts could not be dealt with by a single institution. In the early days of the program there were already many struggling organizations working in different aspects of the medium, including film preservation, training and production. The issue was not so available, for example, we could have spent all of our budget and more, $80,000,000 in film preservation alone. There's still an $80,000,000 need right now to preserve just the nitrate films that are deteriorating. Films are being lost every day and so forth. The Endowment could have allocated all of its funds to support filmmakers and video artists, for example, in the form of

fellowships. I will get back to you on what kind of fellowships are available for video artists specifically, in a minute. Another alternative would have been to concentrate exclusively on independent production. But in addition to the high cost of filmmaking more independent production did not seem to make sense when there were really not enough outlets for the independent films that were already being produced. Again that's a problem I saw being talked about yesterday. There's lots of programming, now where are the outlets for video? Finally we could have turned to the possibility in this area, and given our resources at that time, we could have spent all of our money on two series a season and not been able to help in any of the areas of need. So the first basic question that was asked at the newly formed advisory panel three years ago was how do you break this vicious circle. There were hundreds of superb films deteriorating, little outlets to show them, very little support for filmmakers and video artists, which meant that no encouragement was being given to experimentation and new work; there really wasn't any broad-based film study or media study in the schools which would create an informed generation. The program that has evolved is one that tried to turn this circle into a self-reinforcing program by setting itself basically five related objectives. These are like the ones that were stated three years ago: support of new work, creation of new outlets, support of filmmakers and video artists and support of film study. I just wanted to focus on two of these basically; support of new work and support of artists, as they specifically relate to video. Support of new work comes principally in what we call the Joint Endowment - Corporation for Public Broadcasting Pilot Program which places artists-in-residence at Public Television stations. I'll get back to that in a minute. It picks up a couple of points you were making yesterday about Super 8 and also how you get the stations interesting and innovative programming. The other category that new work is put under is Programming in the Arts and also General Programs. This is the one I mentioned that has the most flexibility. At this point I'd like to say that we do not have a fellowship program for the support of individual video artists. The reason why we don't have a fellowship program is really not quite clear to me except that I think, basically it's an administrative nightmare. We would have to at least double the staff. The Visual Arts Program at the Endowment exclusively deals with fellowships. They have a small area that provides grants for services in that area but they have a staff of six people just to handle that. That's where you get into the whole problem of Congress only giving us enough money for a certain amount of staff. However, the Visual Arts Program does offer fellowships, up to $3,000, to assist artists engaged in painting sculpture, printmaking, as well as artists working in conceptual art, performance and video work, in a visual art context. This year, just to give you some statistics so you can see that they are giving this some attention, and this is the first year they've done it, out of a total of 652 requests, 57 were for video and 14 were for video combined with other art forms. Twenty of these 57 are currently being recommended for support six from New York City and State. So you know that is a program. The person that you would want to contact is Julie Moore Jackson at the Visual Arts Program at the Endowment. The address is the same as you'll see it here for the Public Media Program. This sort of ties in with two points that were also made yesterday; Super 8 and how you interest stations in innovative programming. The pilot that I was talking about which is jointly sponsored by the Corporation where we placed basically filmmakers-in-residence at four public television stations across the country that had expressed an interest in doing this. Although it's still on a pilot basis we are going to continue it into the next fiscal year. We found that the stations don't like to be told by a national government agency who is going to go into their station and do some innovative programming for them. It's sort of an insult. So we designed the guidelines for the program so that the station would nominate the person, the filmmaker, that they wanted to work at the station. Coupling with this was the use

of Super 8mm synch-sound equipment which was lent to the stations, in trust, by the Endowment and the Corporation The equipment would move from station to station. They were going to use this equipment in doing innovative programming at the station. Just to give you an example of how something like this works successfully, there were a lot of problems with it, but one of the filmmakers was a young woman, who's 19 years old, who'd come out of the Yellow Ball Workshop. She went down to South Carolina and the equipment, as usual didn't arrive when it was supposed to, or it came in pieces. She spent her first two months sitting on the floor in an empty office making cutouts for animation work that they then used to fill in spots in the program. The program staff said, "What is this person doing here, this is an artist-in-residence, right, cutting out little fish." It's been very well received and she's done programs for them on women linesmen for the phone company and community affairs and things like this and she's really taken in there because in a way it was a really non-threatening situation for them, perhaps. At any rate this pilot, I think, will probably continue on a pilot's line for two or three years until some of the kinks get worked out. Another one, similar to this, is one where young filmmakers and video artists with an interest in local programming are placed in collaboration with cable facilities where there's an interest in this. You probably all know about this, I don't know whether some of you are involved in it yourselves but the nine apprentices were placed in systems where they can join in active production teams and with managers of cable systems. In that case the apprentices found the station, the cable system, the documentary station before they actually applied for participating in this program. So again that's a case of, where you interest them in what you're doing. By the end of the first year they will have assembled on video tape, samples of programs that they helped produce that can be distributed throughout the industry as an example of the kinds or programming that can happen on cable. Again this is a pilot program which means that we want to see how it works. Now the other category which supports new works is Programming in the Arts, which is basically film, television and radio production. If you're interested, I can give you a very brief breakdown of what we have funded this year under that category not just in cable but in film and television production. We've provided support for the public television stations that is basically designed to improve the quality of arts programming, that is basically the traditional arts on television. Along with the Mellon Foundation and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, we helped support WNET's special on the American Ballet Theatre, which some of you may have seen, "Close-Up in Time." This year we're providing funds for the completion of a one-hour color television special on the Alvin Ailey Dance Company, which will be broadcast in May. In addition to the traditional arts on television, we have also committed ourselves to encouraging the development of television as an art form. This is something that David mentioned yesterday. I think we included in this the support of Ed Emshwiller's residency at the Lab that resulted in "Scape Mates." Also a similar grant was made this year for a full month's residency for Stan Vanderbeek at the Lab to produce a new work specifically for broadcast. Other grants in this area include a $20,000 grant that was made to WGBH in fiscal year '72 to support Ron Hayes' work there. In the same year a $5,000 grant was made to Gene Youngblood to assist him in the completion of his book, The Videosphere. Again, these are all partial assistance grants or matching grants. Small grants were made in fiscal year '72
to the Vasulkas to assist them with travel expenses to the National Center for Experiments in Television for an artist-in-residence project there. Another grant, which again, I think would be of interest, is a grant that was made to WGBH in the last fiscal year, '73, for a one-hour television special, entitled "Video: the New Wave." I think it's going to be used to open a public television series this summer. I should also mention here that the National Center for Experiments in

Television has been receiving support from us as early as 1967. I'd like to bring up at this time that we are concerned about the fact that the experimental labs need funds for general support. Although we cannot grant funds for this purpose, but rather only for specific projects that come out of the work at the labs, we do hope that cooperation will continue, with the Endowment funding specific projects and the help that the Rockefeller Foundation and other private foundations have given to the support of the Lab. Now I want to get into General Programs, which is the flexible area. A lot of grants that have been given in video have come out of this little kitty of money.

NANCY RAINE. This year we provided a $10,000 grant to Electronic Arts Intermix for partial support of a survey to determine the feasibility and scope of distributing the work of video artists, feeling again that this was sort of a pilot, and is not necessarily going to be ultimately successful but is a way of seeing how useful it will be nationally, whether it is something that would be helpful to solve a real problem that we are aware of, distribution. We also provided $10,000 for the Open Circuits Conference, which again is something that the Endowment is the proper sphere for - conferences which bring people together to share information. As early as fiscal year '72 we provided funds for the Black Arts Center in Houston, Texas for a community media development project. This was funded jointly with the Endowment's Expansion Arts Program, which is specifically concerned about community projects, training and so forth. We've given very small grants, as small as $750 to the April Video Cooperative to edit tapes of State Fair, the Crafts Fair and a $2,400 grant for half the cost of video taping, documenting, Robert Wilson's opera, The Life and Times of Joseph Stalin, which is a 12-hour piece. On film it would have been ridiculous. So there are things like that. As I say it's very flexible. We've also provided assistance to Open Channel for their cultural program on the New York State Prisons and to Global Village, of course, for workshops. Another thing I'd like to mention in terms of video artists is that in our category, "Media Studies," which I haven't gone into at this point, we've worked language into the guidelines so that funds can be requested from the Endowment specifically to bring filmmakers and video artists to summer conferences that are basically designed to train teachers. We feel in that way we are in some way directly helping the artist make some money and bringing artists and educators together. So that's sort of a. change in the guidelines from last year. I've gone into this at some length, basically to demonstrate policy instead of just stating it. We are funding this kind of video project and not that kind of video project. I really think that the best way to state what the policy is is simply to state an attitude, which is that the Endowment is aware that we are living in a society with an increasing number of unfolding technologies and that the rate of development is staggering. The Endowment has to consider the artist and how he or she uses these technologies in this context. Certainly I think video is one of the tools that an artist has at his or her disposal. One last point that I just want to make is that it seems to me that video has collapsed the distinction that we've traditionally had between the artist and the subject. That therefore it does represent the growing age of something that no one knows quite what. I think it does change the idea of an artist and what an "artist" does. Our basic tendency, I think, has been in general to support experimental work on a pilot basis. I'll be happy to answer any questions. There are a lot of things going on in the program and I've just wanted to pick out things that I thought would be most helpful. One last thing, basically the Endowment generally feels that money that it gives is basically seed money, that is, money to help get something to become self-sustaining. This discussion goes on at various levels, but there is a proverb about feeling that we're going to continually support an institution that cannot survive without this support, because it is the United States Government that is providing this money. That's a problem because we have provided, maybe, a grant for two or three years in a

row for something. But at the same time there's that awareness that hopefully, the percentage of our support will decrease as the percentage of support coming in from the community or the State will increase.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. Do you take the same view toward individual artists who are on grants and need to continue getting grants, to continue the high level of technological, aesthetic experimentation with certain types of facilities?

NANCY RAINE. I don't know if I understand your question.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. When you give a grant for an artist to work in a facility there's no other way that he can afford to work in that facility unless he gets grants. Do you consider that the same problem that you consider with the institution, when there's no other means of supporting its functions, its basic function?

NANCY RAINE. You mean would we continue to support the same artist, over a period of time?

HOWIE GUTSTADT. Does that happen? Do you find that you do?

NANCY RAINE. No, basically no. There are so many people that need support, even once, to have the time to produce one thing, that we really haven't been able to. For example, the few individual grants that we've given come out of all of those program areas I mentioned: Programming in the Arts, Regional Development, Media Studies and General Programs. We feel that we really don't have a specific category of support for individuals directly from the Endowment that when exceptions are made it's basically a one-time thing. We tell people that when we reject their application. We say we just cannot do that with all the demands of the program, "I'm sorry, but we can't continue the support."

RALPH HOCKING. Do you feel that the Endowment and the Endowment Panel and the people involved in this whole process have a real firm understanding of what's happening in New York State in video?

NANCY RAINE. I think that basically they are acquainted with it.

RALPH HOCKING. We went through a whole lot of things yesterday and this says a pilot program for filmmakers at public television stations, for filmmakers at cable television.

NANCY RAINE. But it's not just film. The cable television thing is for filmmakers and video artists.

RALPH HOCKING. Oh, I see. I was confused there. What I'm trying to find out, I guess, is whether our message is coming through.

NANCY RAINE. No, there has been, the primary emphasis, in a way, has been on filmmakers.

RALPH HOCKING. Isn't the largest part of your money involved in funding the Filmmaking Institute?

NANCY RAINE. Well, that's for film preservation and for the individual filmmaker grant program, which does help a lot of individual artists. I'm pleased that the Visual Arts Program is beginning to have a fellowship program for video artists. I think that's extremely important. I think it indicates that they recognize video as an art form and that individual artists working in video need support. Since these are pilots we may get two stations who say, "Well, look, there are these two terrific kids who are video artists who we feel could really work with the station, we like what they do, how would you feel about that?" Since it's a pilot, it's not locked in, we can keep modulating it to fit what seems to be, if it works, if people respond to it, stations are interested in it, then I think there is some flexibility.

SHERRY MILLER. Would you say that in general there's an emphasis on programming with an end product, a result that is distributed?

NANCY RAINE. Well, I think in programs in the arts, when you think of money that goes into films, to a folk art or to a dance company or something like that, one of the reasons that the program was enacted by Congress was the feeling that it is a wonderful way for everyone in the country to see things that they couldn't see otherwise. So there is a design for distribution on public television. But a lot of them aren't shown. A lot of things that are basically experimental work, that are exploring concepts, may not end up on public television. The distribution is important for us, in terms of our relationship to Congress and to the public as a whole who get our press releases. The famous example of this is someone who wrote a poem on a literature fellowship grant that insisted on one word, L-I-G-H-G-H-T. And there were literally 15 or 20 letters that had to go directly from the deputy chairman's office to this particular congressional committee, trying to explain, is this art? He could have at least spelled it right.

MARGOT LEWITIN. If I understood what you said this morning, and from our conversations in Washington, I think it's accurate to say that the public media, as it's understood by the National Endowment, really only supports half-inch video to groups working in the medium as opposed to individual artists, out of General Programs. You don't define public media in the same way, for example, as the Council does in its Film, Video and Literature area. So I might add to it and say that the Visual Arts program at the Endowment which supports video workshops for visual artists in addition to giving individual grants, perhaps comes closer to offering the kind of support that the Council does for groups such as the groups that are here today than the Public Media Program.

NANCY RAINE. Yes, as I say our stress has basically been on the kinds of things that we can justify to our Council as experimental work in a medium. I think Ed Emshwiller's residency with Scape-Mates was a good example because I don't know whether many people at the Council would know what they were looking at if they looked at that.

MARGOT LEWITIN. The thing is this, the question I have is we can perhaps, for convenience, separate the kind of work that's being done in video into experimental work exploring the medium, like some of the work of the Video Freex which they put on at the conference, and the production of tapes, which has its own legitimacy quite apart from filmmaking because it is a different

medium, but uses essentially a filmmaking technique. What I don't see really, in terms of what your scope is, is a possibility for the Endowment to support groups that were making tapes, which in their own ways were innovative tapes, tapes that other people weren't making, tapes that the public broadcasting stations are not making, tapes that commercial television isn't making and provide some kind of funding to have those tapes boosted for distribution either through public television or even through commercial television because there's a different point of view. Video is expensive, I mean it's expensive for an individual artist, you have to have a lot of equipment and in order to be able to do what you can do within the medium you have to have access to that equipment. Unless you have a lot of personal resources, your access to that equipment is through groups such as the one I represent. But if those groups cannot get the funding which is necessary for allowing the individual artist to come in and experiment and make this work then you're automatically cutting out a whole area of exploration for people within the medium. I feel, perhaps unfairly, that the Endowment is not very responsive and should be. Just in terms of the guidelines.

NANCY RAINE. Well, again, as I've mentioned, I think that when we review a specific application, very often it immediately leaps into the dimension of policy - this application presents something that is seen as being needed out there. It leads to other kinds of discussions. Nancy Hanks has specifically stressed that we make our General Program category visible, and it has been in the guidelines before this year, so that we can be open to that. I would just urge people who feel that they have something to read the guidelines, and know that the Endowment has to be concerned with not just video but all these other problems that are there; radio, film, public television and video and various support organizations and service organizations and also education. I can only urge you to apply to us.

MARGOT LEWITIN. I guess what I was trying to edge in under the table was that from what I can gather, your General Programs category is limited in terms of its funding capabilities. In other words, that you're not really reviewing applications of more than a total cost of $7,000. Therefore, we're talking about grants of $10,000 or less: What I guess I would be like to see happen is that the Endowment become aware that half-inch video falls into the area of public Media as a legitimate area that could consider grants of $50,000. So that more than a small particle, what I'm doing essentially is suggesting to you, that perhaps that process that you described earlier, as being applied to film critics, go back and start being considered in the area of video because I feel, in a sense, that this is what you were raising also.

LYDIA SILMAN. Also, I think most of the people here do receive basic support from us and that's what they're used to getting. And although they service individual artists they receive their basic support money, which is a totally different approach than the National Endowment has, because they only support projects. They wouldn't give your organization basic support.

MARGOT LEWITIN. At the risk of jeopardizing our position in relation to the National Endowment, I had a very long conversation with James Hanas, the fiscal officer there, in terms of the way in which we make our presentation, our proposes for support, because we have not been supported by your program, we have been supported by Visual Arts Programs. In actuality, what we were able to do was make a proposal where we were able to allocate administrative and support costs across the program lines so that he could prove to the fiscal officers that this amount of administrative costs and overhead and rent and everything else was necessary to support that

particular program and thereby got basic support essentially from the Endowment. Unless this was an exception, and I didn't get the impression that it was, I think it was just a question of arriving at a viable system of cost allocation, which can then be charged as direct costs as opposed to indirect costs. This is something that all of us in this room should be advised of, because otherwise it becomes virtually impossible to support a given program, unless you're a very large organization and your basic support is coming from private foundations. So I don t think it's entirely accurate to say it's not acceptable. You just have to come up with a cost allocation system that makes sense.

NANCY RAINE. That's right.

KEN MARSH. Can I just follow up on that? It's coming at us in a little different way. On, say the individual artists' application, are those matching grants also?

NANCY RAINE. No.

KEN MARSH. Are they applied for by the individual artist or a group that he or she might be affiliated with?

NANCY RAINE. Well, it depends basically on the cost of the project. An example of individual support would be a filmmaker who needed $5,000 to complete a work that's cost him $30,000. These are exceptions. In a way, this is an area that I feel a little bit uncomfortable with because I see that there are these 12 out of the 99 grants that went to individuals, either for completion costs for film or in Media Studies for specific research projects by people who are well known and respected in the field.

KEN MARSH. As you saw yesterday when we discussed video Margot pointed out that the hardware involved in this medium, with this art form, is expensive. It's not only paints and canvas. So it's handled in groups and even when individual artists form themselves as a working production unit, they seem to set up a non-profit corporation and get into that status. So, in a sense, what I'm asking you is, as an individual artist, do I apply as Woodstock Community Video or do I apply as Ken Marsh? Other artists are in Woodstock that are being supported by the State Council, they're going to use some of those resources. Is there any advice you can give on a different approach because of that combination of factors?

NANCY RAINE. I see what you're saying. Well, again I don't know whether this will answer your question, but when I see people that come in and have a specific project that they want to do as an individual artist, we work out which would be the best way to apply. We develop a $10,000 project on an individual application form with the understanding that you're going to be able to get the equipment out of this group and so forth. But rather than presenting it as money to an organization, it actually might be better in a specific case to come in as an individual. These things get worked out as you meet with people and we do that. Once somebody's read the guidelines, it can be anything from a two-hour conversation on the phone to somebody actually coming in, because they're in town anyway. I myself hate to see people spend money to travel to do that, but you may come in, and we'd try to work it out and talk about it and try to be as candid as possible about, given this year's guidelines and certain things that have happened this year, what the chances

would be. I very often have told people to go ahead and apply and bring it before the panel so they can have it before them and see.

KEN MARSH. One of the questions on a whole other subject which came to mind – it was a little bit of a surprise to me yesterday that within New York State there's been kind of a turning away from cable and its potential and looking more toward broadcast- I'm wondering if a similar kind of thing is happening nationwide that you're aware of and could you respond to that kind of thing. Could one say that if this continued and cable continued to be in the morass it's in, that you would not fund similar programs to those you suggested?

NANCY RAINE. You mean with the Cable, the artist-in-residency with the Cable?

KEM HARSH. Yes, right.

NAKCT RAINE. Well, that's a pilot. That's part of the definition of a pilot that it can be discontinued or maybe a similar program to the filmmakers-in-residence at public television stations could be worked out for video artists involved with public television stations. If some concrete plan or program is presented to us.

KEN MARSH. Would there be any other kind of influence on the Endowment, say from Congress, say with the Whitehead Report on Cable? I'm pursuing this because it's my language, would you be a little more stubborn with it and pursue some cable experiments?

NANCY RAINE. Because of that report?

KEN MARSH. Yes. The last I heard was that legislation might emerge as a result of it.

NANCY RAINE. I don't really know how to answer that.

KEN MARSH. It's difficult. I'm asking if there are influences form that direction. I think you mentioned yesterday, maybe I overheard you talking about it, for instance, the possibility of the President's aesthetic distorting . . .

NANCY RAINE. Well, that was just a rap off the top of my own head. No, again, this is just the way it seems to me and my experience at the Endowment. If we're presented with a concrete need and it's clearly a need, well look, there is more happening with public television stations, with video programming, and there is a way to develop a program of support on which the Endowment and these people can work together. I think we're very open to that. I think it's really, as I said in the beginning, it's a matter of being made aware of it.

KEN MARSH. What I'm concerned with is the reaction at this moment of time, of pushing a little further with the possibility of something developing and not turning away from a difficult situation because of any reason.

NANCY RAINE. Well, again, in the case of a pilot like the cable thing I mentioned - what kind of feedback happens from that, what kind of programming has come out, how have these different

people in different situations with their own different ambience, what have their problems been, how has it worked out? This information is going to be shared, hopefully nationally, what happens as a result of that?

HOWIE GUTSTADT. Do you envision directing more time and energy to developing a multiplicity of pilot programs in media? Do you envision an expansion of your program in that direction?

NANCY RAINE. In terms of more pilots, like the short-film showcase pilot and so forth?

HOWIE GUSTADT. In other words, do you have a working philosophy that you're developing the media program further at this point other than just some pilots you have right now?

NANCY RAINE. Again, these pilots have come up because given the way the program was set up, there were a lot of things that were not getting enough attention, not getting developed. The field really is extremely flexible and changes so radically that I think that in terms of a mechanism that the Endowment has, and some that Nancy Hanks encourages, is start up a pilot and see. Then it can become integrated into the established program areas.

GERRY O'GRADY. I think what Nancy's saying is, I don't think we realize that they are different from the Council in the sense that they have to publish guidelines and they have to make them up a year ahead of the action, sometimes two years ahead of the action itself.

NANCY RAINE. Sometimes they may be for two years as well.

GERRY O'GRADY. In fact they've instituted more guidelines than any other program at the Endowment over the last two years. So I mean there's two ways we can operate, one is to send in any grant, even though it doesn't seem that general and then it comes up. The other is to do a Callenbach, in that it's up to us to get a proposal and send it in and say we need a new guideline, the kind that Margot is suggesting, and I don't think my feeling would be that there'd be no problem in doing that.

NANCY RAINE. With a specific program of support.

GERRY O'GRADY. Let's change the guidelines because what they want is to make the guidelines responsive. I think our approach is to see the guidelines and not apply at all - and I think we can change the guidelines.

NANCY RAINE. In the case with the film critics, that was a particularly interesting thing for me to observe because it was the first time I'd seen that. There was a letter and somebody said we just don't have enough money to pay people to do this kind of writing, it takes time and energy, there are new things happening and there are areas of film and media that are getting left out. Here's what I see, on the basis of my experience, as a solution. Now, how do you feel about it? It took a little over a year for the whole thing to get reviewed by this group and that group and setting it all up in terms of other administrative things. But there was a specific suggestion there and that was

presented to people who have worked their way up and fought through all those problems. And they said yes, that is a problem.

KEN MARSH. And that was based on one individual?

NANCY RAINE. One individual, Ernest Callenbach.

KEN MARSH. But, if it came from a group, would it have carried more weight?

JOHN REILLY. Ken, in partial response to what you're saying, I think what we saw yesterday was the tip of an iceberg that really has not become visible at this point. We've seen a certain shift in the room, an emphasis away from cable experimentation to a new awareness of broadcast for our level of work. That came about for a number of reasons, which I'm sure you're aware of; the recent work of David's Lab with Lord of the Universe and a lot of other things. Also this really good attitude of the New York Network, which was also a surprise to me. I don't think that it necessarily would reflect a shift with the Endowment or for that matter a shift of anyone else, because at this point it's a very subtle shift of the people that are assembled in the room and really doesn't reflect much more than our awareness of these things. So I'm sure that a policy of working with artists and cable stations would continue and that interest in cable would continue. That would be my guess.

LYDIA SILMAN. We're going to have to move on. We'll take more questions later in an open discussion. Next we're going to move to Forest Chisman from the Markle Foundation.

FOREST CHISMAN. Nancy's a hard act to follow because she has all these programs and guidelines and things like that and we don't have any of that. Basically, I was asked to tell you how to approach our foundation and it's very easy. You write us a two or three page letter and tell us what you'd like to do, tell us a little bit about yourself and tell us what it would cost and then we'll determine whether we'd like to talk to you further about whatever it is that you would like to talk about. Having said that, however, I have to say that if most of the people in this room wrote a letter of that sort to the Markle Foundation, they would get a letter back saying that we don't do what you do. So, I'm not quite sure why I'm here. We do not generally provide funds for the production of films or videotapes of any sort. The reasons are various. We don't provide funding for local activities because we feel that they should be and inevitably will be, supported locally or regionally. We feel that looking at national level, large-scale productions of one sort or another that the amount of money required to make things go on a national level is so large that our small foundation, with a lot of other priorities, would only make a drop in the bucket. So it's really not worth getting involved in it. Finally we do not come at the mass media business from the artistic point of view as Nancy does, we come at it from the public policy point of view. That's our primary interest. So supporting productions is a little bit outside of what we're generally trying to do. We have made exceptions in the past. We've done things both in video and in filmmaking. I was sitting here trying to characterize to myself exactly what the characteristics of the exceptions were to give you maybe a little bit of guidance. All I can say is they have to be damned exceptional. You have to have something that really is very, very innovative and has a very good chance of bringing about some kind of new development. Just to give you an example of something like this, we supported program at the University of California at San Francisco Medical School

that produced spot messages for health care. The idea was to get the spot messages run on the local news broadcasts of television stations and eventually to get the television stations to pay for them so it would become a self-supporting project. Well, the idea of having a self-supporting project of that sort, we thought, was damned unusual. So we tried it out with them. It didn't work. The Ford Foundation always knows best, like Father. We have supported the Alternate Media Center at N.Y.U., that's the main thing we've done in the video field. We felt that there was a need for a catalyst at the time the support was originally given, to get this movement going in other areas. I think, as you know. New York State is unusually rich in the amount of its video development, thanks largely, in part, to the New York State Council people. We felt that there was a need for a catalyst to develop these things elsewhere and to try to put them on a self-supporting basis in conjunction with cable systems. The Alternate Media Center is not a producing organization but it is somewhat involved in this. So basically, I can't be very encouraging to you at the moment. There is, however one development at the Markle Foundation that may, conceivably in the future, put us in a position to be helpful to some of you. Although we don't support your kind of work, we're not dumb, we read our mail, and we know that there are a lot of you out there, both in the video field and in the film field, that there's obviously a need that has to be met in some way or other. As a result, we've been trying to think of ways that we, and other foundations, can meet this need, short of actually going out and funding individual productions. We've thought that there may well be a couple of things that could be done having to do with distribution, marketing and loans as opposed to grants. We will have to know a lot more about- the independent film and video tape field before we can decide what to do. We commissioned a very ambitious study conducted by Herman Land Associates, and I know that Herman's contacted a number of people in this room, emphasizing primarily the independent filmmaker, I must say, rather than the independent video producer, but also with some emphasis on video. We expect to have the results of that study in several weeks time. We will be taking it around and discussing it with as many people as we possibly can. It will make specific recommendations as to what foundations might do in this area. If we find these recommendations interesting and our colleagues at other foundations find the recommendations interesting, we may in the fall, or perhaps a little later, emerge with some kind of program in this area at the Markle Foundation, possibly in conjunction with other foundations or if we can afford it, by ourselves. But at the moment, I have to be very discouraging. Sorry.

DIANE HART. May we ask out of curiosity what you do fund? You told us what you don't fund.

FOREST CHISMAN. Do you really want to know? Well, we're very interested in cable television and all of its ramifications. We're interested in public policy studies that were aimed at the Federal Government. We're interested in the Alternate Media Center and its kind of work. We've been interested in the technology and engineering of the field. We've also together with our colleagues at Ford, set up a thing called the rational Cable Information Center that provides technical assistance to municipal governments about cable franchising. Cable is one big area of interest. Another area of interest is the journalism profession and its professional problems. Media criticism is an interest here, media reviews, various kinds of studies and action groups within the profession are of interest. Children and television is another interest. We support Action for Children's Television and a number of other groups across the country. We're instrumental in some of the work that's been done by Children's Television Workshop, various activities having to do with children and television. Research on the effect of mass communications, social science research, is an interest. We support a lot of that. Communication Law, as an area in itself, is something we're

interested in. Obviously law overlaps all these areas to some extent and we've supported a couple of projects there. What else do we do? Oh, yes, there's a kind of thing that we do that's kind of hard to pin down and I can only describe it by saying we're interested in the development of public policy institutes or resources for public policy analysis in different settings. Some of these resources have been developed at universities, others have been developed at the Rand Corporation, the Aspen Institute. We support about four or five of these at the present time. Some of them will continue to receive support over a long period of time, others will not, others will have to either find other areas of support or else will die. That's what we do,

LYDIA SILMAN. Thank you. Are there any other questions?

DALE RIEHL. Yes, does your foundation work in areas other than television, video?

FOREST CHISMAN. Oh, yes. As I said, we're interested in the journalism profession, generally, as one area of interest.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Are you interested in broadcast television journalism?

FOREST CHISMAN. Oh, yes.

GEORGE CREE. One of the things that keeps haunting me, by the way I'm in this for profit, is that all of the pilot projects, which in a sense I think are investments in something foundations and endowments believe in, or of someone or a specific project, some of them work, some of them don't. But those that do work, how then can we, out of the big world, find out about them? For example, last year I had some video work and filming to be done in a very specialized area, and I, as a producer, did not know where to go to plug into what hopefully were the most creative people working in a non-slick professional kind of way, which is really what I'm especially interested in. Is there any agency, set up in any way, that can then say, “Yes, here are the successful pilot projects. Where are we going to help them go now?”

FOREST CHISMAN. The closest thing to it for foundations, I don't think Nancy's programs would be involved here, is the Foundation Center, which has a computerized listing of all foundation grants. It's accessible through a reasonably precise code. You'll probably get more information than you want, but sooner or later you'll find what you want on that computer, I think.

LYDIA SILMAN. In terms of the Foundation Center, there's some information at the end of the table from the Center on how to go about accessing information from the Center itself. I had a printout done just recently of foundations that gave grants in the area of video - non-broadcast grants, and it was maybe four pages long. That's it. But in terms or finding out where to go for assistance, the kind of assistance you are really looking for, we are publishing a video resource directory for New York State which would give you that kind of information - where to go to get help in producing anything that you want to produce.

JOHN REILLY. Also, I think what Howard Wise is doing for NEA will be along that line too. He hopefully will be compiling a directory and actually distributing funds on a regular basis for costs.

SKIP BLUMBERG. You might read Radical Software or Challenge for Change Newsletter. There are a lot of print-outs of people reporting what the results of their projects were. The Alternate Media Center is going to come out with a whole book.

GEORGE CREE. But the normal, the average, independent producer is not being reached at all by all these circulations.

MARGOT LEWITIN. Lydia, is it possible for him to call the New York State Council on the Arts?

LYDIA SILMAN. Sure.

SKIP BLUMBERG. That's an interesting question too because going on what Ralph said before about how do people at foundations find what's really going on in our world. You say out in the "big world." I don't know if I discriminate between what's happening in the big world from what we're all doing. There are actually publications reporting to people and if any foundation is interested in video at all they're available. Besides a lot of video people are aware of this information as well as the Council. I think it is an important thing, because I think it is important that people that are giving support to people really find out what's going on not only from the people to whom they are giving support at the moment, but elsewhere as well.

GERRY O'GRADY. GBH, for example, has a tracking service for their own use of every group, every project, every community, just from their own station. If you call Fred Barzyk, he'll help you to some extent, he's very well informed. I think the best informed people are probably the panelists of the two groups, the Endowment and the Council, who have to work that way because of governmental regulations. I don't know if foundations like Ford would be as well informed.

DAVID DAVIS. Well, we're a small staff and we subscribe to all that and keep informed. I think most foundations are more than willing to share with somebody what we know, what has worked and what's been a disaster.

JON ALPERT. I'd like to express a small sense of frustration, because I'm hearing about all these studies being undertaken, and personally I know that we get telephone calls on a regular basis from somebody doing a study for such and such a foundation, and these people seem to be regularly coming all the time. Our group doesn't have international visibility but it seems like we're being studied to death. A tremendous amount of money gets expended on these programs and I know for a small fraction of that any group here in this room can be undertaking programs in the streets with people with very capable results. We've proven it; we've proven it year after year. I think that the time for study should be coming to an end and some topics should be undertaken.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. I would like to go a little further and say, I would somehow find a way of beginning to sow support into the kind of independent studies taking place in the field. This is a problem the State Council has, this is a problem that other foundations have, in this area. I know for a fact we published probably the most synthesized analysis of public access from a multiple point of view, about a year ago. But we had to publish this out of our own funds. We had to get $500 together, we spent six months putting this together, this is a real analysis. We went to Ford and a number of other places, and there were just all sorts of criteria and conditions for $500 to get

six months work out. It's absurd. I think, to some extent, this is a similar kind of frustration to what Jon Alpert feels, because we're producing a lot of print information that should be gotten out and it takes a minimal amount of support and it's being created all the time.

LYDIA SILMAN. Are there any more questions of Mr. Chisman before we go on? I guess we'll move next to the Ford Foundation.

DAVID DAVIS. I brought two folders with us - a new one called Current Interests and a little folder on how to apply for a grant. I'll just pass these around. I didn't know how many people were going to be here. I probably should have brought more. But they're easily available from the foundation. I have to really almost echo what Forest said. As many of you know we are finally going to phase out of support of public broadcasting in a major sense. That has really occupied all of our staff time and the greater portion of our budget for quite a while. That phase-out is a slow one and it's a four or five year proposition beginning in the next month really. We have not been able to put our attention to any way to make sensible grants to individual artists in the video field. We've looked at cable, we've looked at public access and we haven't done anything yet. We've had an in-house group for a little over a year looking into the whole element of the new technologies and foundation activity proper and we have begun a small program in that area but with very little money to start with - we'll slowly build. It's described on the last page of this booklet, pages 20 and 21, as to what we expect to be doing in the next two or three years. You know our arts division; I call your attention to page 18 of this book. I'll read one sentence, "During the next two years the division will be on the lookout for a pilot project aimed at developing a study of literacy and heightened perception among young people." That's the kind of an area where there is a little bit of an open door. The next paragraph on that page refers to looking for experiments in film, television, cassettes and other media. In that case you would write directly to MacNeal Lowery, who's the vice-president for the Humanities and Arts Division. Let me footnote that. As you may have seen in the press in the fall, Mac is resigning from the Ford Foundation to start a totally new foundation in the early summer. Experience would say that the new vice-president for that division will begin to restructure, after a year or two, along the lines that he is particularly interested in. Our Arts Division has been Mr. Lowery's for many years and it reflects him and what his interests are. That's true of any institution, any organization. So it's a little hard to say how that division will shift but it's one to keep an eye on as to what the Foundation does in the arts. We've sort of separated our two roles in that we handle Public Broadcasting, Mass Media in that sense, with an ongoing commitment, a long one, 25 years long, in non-commercial television, with the Arts Division more into the experimental kinds of things. I should say that our Arts Division hasn't caught up with the National Endowment in terms of putting film or video into the Visual Arts category. When you read this booklet you'll see that in terms of individual grants, the current interest will be in the visual arts but that does not include video or film in the current structure of that division. They have, over the years, gone through cycles of who they give to in the individual artists grants and they did filmmakers a few years ago, and then they'll go into some other area for a while, and so on in that pattern. I should also caution you - the statistic is on the back page of this little book - in 1973, 1,116 grants were made against some 30,000 proposals received by the Ford Foundation. Everybody really thinks we have more money than the U.S. Government, which we decided we do not. But the easiest thing to do is a very short letter or pick up the telephone and say, "Is this anything you'll consider?" and not even waste your time on Forest's three-page letter but get a quick answer. Is it worth it to try to look into this kind of thing. I hope four or five years

from now we will be able to do some individual things, structure it and come up with what to do with video. We're keeping our eye on whether some of this video can make it technically on over-the-air broadcasts and there have been some good breakthroughs lately, such as that piece that David's lab helped to put together that was on the air a month or two ago. It was a lot of hard work to get that up to broadcast standards. We've been watching Super 8 and particularly Ricky Leacock's system in that area. But we've been unable to cope with it, having had to support the institution of public broadcasting with big institutional grants all these years. I see the end in sight. But it does take a big step to handle individual grants, setting up a structure that can do that. Our arts division does that and they have one of the largest staffs per size of budget at the Ford Foundation.

GERRY O'GRADY. I'd just like to make a plea for an educational fund. We're not getting help from any educational establishments, not to my knowledge. I think we've got to define what it is we're doing and get it on paper; no one has. In other words, we've been defined in terms of film and drama. If we move to the visual arts, there's a barrier of continuity. I don't think that's where we belong, not that video isn't visual, but it's much more. It's always been perceived in terms of the medium - as broadcast. Except for Brice Howard's book no one in the movement has come forward to define the variety and modulations. The reason I think we're not getting funded is partly that we ourselves haven't defined what it is we're doing. Those reports are useful, they're signs of activity, but no one knows what the activity is yet.

RALPH HOCKING. I don't see how we could help but know what the activity is. It's self-apparent.

GERRY O'GRADY. There are just thousands of books and articles...

RALPH HOCKING. Every application we've ever made, we've supported with all our activities. Do you want a catch phrase?

GERRY O'GRADY. No, I'm talking about defining it in an academic way? No, I wouldn't say academic. I'd say social.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. I think there's been a pretty high percentage of print that's paralleled development of video. Almost every group that I know has produced print simultaneously. People are producing things.

GERRY O'GRADY. I guess what I'm talking about is even newspapers, magazines, books.

FOREST CHISMAN. Well, I think the more the better. But I don't know if any one group has a very definitive perception that can be an equitable one right now. I think there's still a lot of experimentation to be done.

DAVID DAVIS. This is where APB was in 1952. A lot of this is very familiar. This kind of trying to define and getting the attention and so on. The tape is playing in my head.

JOHN REILLY. How did that evolve? Maybe you can help us.

DAVID DAVIS. Very slowly, and it's still not there. It's just beginning to get some impact in this country. A lot of dedicated people have stuck with it, believed in something for years and years and years with a lot of money from the Ford Foundation, with the objective of creating an alternative broadcast system in this country. I mean there was a goal at the outset, which was just that. The trustees in '52 decided to try that. $250,000,000 later and they're seeing a way out, not having to stay with something forever. In pro football they call it staying power. The trustees are very proud of it, that that investment "is really going to pay off," it was worth it.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. I think there's a real distinction on that level in thinking about what the problems are, what the goals are. I'm not and I know other people working in what is called independent media – video - are not interested necessarily in creating an alternative network. I think, to some extent, people are just beginning to perceive that this network is going to be created not by us, by the generation and technology that takes place within our own environment. All we simply have to do is use as much as we can use and work in as meaningful a way as we can. We can't own it and we can't really direct it in those kinds of goals anymore. It's much too complex. I think that people are beginning to realize that.

DAVID DAVIS. But I hear three things being talked about. One I hear in terms of individual artists who create something. Simultaneously I hear the work as an art form itself and/or very local communication. They are three things and a lot of what's gone on, from the reporting you gave yesterday, is a high degree of localism and that kind of thing, which all of us think cable can do if it doesn't turn out to be the SST. But the medium, as an art form in and of itself, is to me a separate question that needs to be continually addressed and is being addressed by Brice, and by David's thing and some of the people at GBH and individuals around. And some interesting things have come out. The use of half-inch technique for local communications is, to me, the most exciting possibility. That's my personal interest. The kind of thing that George Stoney does so well, that's going on in some of the cable systems, is an area that we have expressed an interest in and one day, hopefully we'll be able to find the right pilot or demonstration to fund a project, to see what really is possible. We can't do it yet but we keep looking and listening and trying to keep up with the field as we look for it. But it's a pure financial problem right now; we just don't have the money. You can read our annual report and find out that we're in debt.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Is there something peculiar at this time that makes Ford, that puts you in that position, is it a matter of management?

DAVID DAVIS. No, the capital, the market has been so bad the last few years and inflation. Something will have to give. We have to give away less money or we'll spend the place out of business. The trustees have decided not to spend the place out of business so that we have shrinking budgets in our various programs.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Do you think any budgets will be expanding at any point?

DAVID DAVIS. You tell me what the stock market's going to do.

SKIP BLUMBERG. In the next five years? How far ahead do you plan?

DAVID DAVIS. We do five-year planning and two-year budgets. And for a guy that went to music school, that's playing with time.

LYDIA SILMAN. Are there any other questions?

GERRY O'GRADY. Isn't there a parallel between funding video and the funding of electronic media?

DAVID DAVIS. I think so. I think partly, during the early days of television, particularly commercial television, some dreadful things were done to artists by some network producers. Balanchine was one, he got done-in by CBS on a ballet with Stravinsky. People in the Ford Foundation were responsible for this area, and a lot of artists really got turned off by television and we really couldn't work with them. I think that's reflected in Mac Lowery's attitude about media. We've shifted in the last couple of years. Also, I think, we have to realize that the policy at the Ford Foundation has been to support professionals. We try to do something to keep key theatre groups alive. Where will you have national impact? It's a national foundation. It's not our business to support local activities unless they are clearly replicable, a model for something that other people can do.

GERRY O'GRADY. Can you say what the two projects are that you're funding now?

DAVID DAVIS. One is the Rosen Center in Binghamton, which really supports two musicians, one of whom used to run Young People's Music in New York, and the other is at the Metropolitan Museum. Ed Burnham, who in finding a better way to do those Young People's Concerts a couple years ago up there, had a half-inch set-up just simply to document and to show the groups he was talking to, the kids, what they were doing and how they were doing it. And the guy at the commercial television station next door, the program manager, got interested and helped put some of their stuff on tape in the studio. We all looked at it and I remember because I've been subjected to three different music history courses in my life, and these guys had something that was indicating a new way. This was reportage we were looking at, with the kids in the studio with them when we were observing this thing. The question was, can you do that right to the students? So they've had a couple of grants now. Experiment, find out, work with some animators, work with some filmmakers and so on. They've turned out one pilot, which has been subjected to a lot of testing and Ed Palmer from Film & Television Workshop's helped with it aesthetically and they've been refining their ideas and so on. That may go forward. It's referred to in here. It has the potential of being very exciting. In other words, it's one of those things, let's try to find out whether anything is possible. The objective being a national series on public television. There's also been under consideration, some kind of a dramatic workshop on public television, an experimental situation. We don't want to put Playhouse 90 on. We will have a commitment for 12 plays the first season and 24 the second. That's not exactly R and D.

DIANE HART. Mr. Davis, you said in terms of applying one should make a phone call or a one-page letter. At the present time, in the Arts Division, would it be MacNeal Lowery that one calls, is that the name to go by?

DAVID DAVIS. Yes.

LYDIA SILMAN. Any other questions? Mr. McCray, would you like to say anything?

PORTER McCRAY. Well, I'll say just a few words. The J.D.R. III fund, is at the complete opposite end of the spectrum, of resources certainly, to the last speaker. We operate with an infinitesimal fund, which is given to us annually. We are not an endowment. The benefactor gave these funds, which are very broadly described, for visual and performing arts between Asia and the United States. We've been in business for 11 years and during that time the character of the program has shifted. Nam June Paik was brought here seven years ago. During the two-year period that he was working with electronic music, he became involved with the development of Sony's first video machine. Apart from that we had no further direct involvement with the development of the hardware for video. But there have been occasional gifts made to Asian institutions, primarily in a documentation sense and as teaching devices, video equipment has been supplied to them generally after they have been here for a year or two years and sometimes as much as four years. Through a regular fellowship procedure they have been trained in ethnomusicology or anthropology, areas of this sort. Their institutions are supplied with the equipment. We have the same problem giving equipment to individuals, particularly as a private and very small foundation. We really do have difficulty with the IRS even, with the donation of equipment to individuals, so that it's always placed in the hands of institutions. At least one of the staff has been trained in the operation of the equipment before it is provided. We have tried providing Super 8 equipment in Asia but this has so far proven almost totally impossible because of the problem of the availability and development of film abroad. Also video equipment has presented a number of headaches in Asia because of maintenance. Singapore, for example, is the nearest place repairs can be made from all of Indonesia. A similar situation exists throughout all of Asia. We have supported a very small project, a couple of years ago with John Reilly and Louise Stern. We went to Bangla Desh, hoping to demonstrate the immense potential of video as an information medium, particularly in a country where the total communication system had literally been obliterated at the time they went, which was very shortly after the end of the war. John may have reported to you about the discouraging results so far. But Bangla Desh moves very slowly and we still have hope that they will see the potential and realize and apply the potential of this medium to their infinite number of problems. I might add generally outside of visual and performing arts we can be rather freewheeling about interpretation and application of the guidelines we must operate within. We have no program for supporting fellowships in this country unless they're in some way related to Asia. As I say we have participated in very few instances in sending an American "to the field." We've observed that most foundations who have been working in Asia, in the third world, have found the Asians or the Africans or the Latin American peoples prefer to do their own thing if possible. It's useful for them to have a degree of confidence which they may have learned from a visiting Westerner, but more particularly useful, to have been taught by the recognized individual himself and taken those qualifications back to their own country to apply in their own way. There are desperate limitations to this procedure but in the long run we still feel very strongly that this is the direction that we must follow. It is interpreted with various degrees of acceptance by different countries. With the Indian government we were just discussing sending a person to assist them with some of the work that a U.N. team is conducting in Delhi with the Leacock system of video equipment. It has lately appeared that they do not want assistance and they have not granted the visas to the person who was going. But India is quite difficult right now.

If you mention film, it has immediate associations with the C.I.A. Almost anything you can think of in terms of information gathering has a perversity in character. But I'm afraid that very little of what I have to say is applicable to your meeting today except the potential of the medium itself. I wish we had greater funds because we do feel, especially in other areas of the world where other media have not been extensively established and new equipment has to be provided, that this medium is perhaps the most promising answer for immense areas of communication in third world areas.

JOHN REILLY. Just as a footnote to what Porter said, we are doing a follow-up to the Bangla Desh project with the Rockefeller Foundation on a very limited basis, and some time, possibly next spring, we'll have a conference, possibly in Europe, concerning many of the initial steps we took and other people have taken in using video in a developing nation. The object of the conference will be to introduce concepts and the technology to other countries who might see a potential, particularly countries that do not have a normal broadcast or video structure.

LYDIA SILMAN. Are there any other foundations that you know of that are interested in supporting video?

PORTER McCRAY. Well, it's quite hard finding who's here in this room. I find the potential, I say this in great ignorance I suppose, but I do feel the potential of interpreting video to a number of foundations is a problem with which you're really presented. I think potentially certain foundations that do not have support of video in their records at present can be incited to accept it as a medium, which is awfully general. Again, going back to the Foundation Center, I think the Center is working in the direction of qualifying and even encouraging certain foundations to apply their funds to new areas. This takes time. I think that gatherings such as this are very important in at least bringing together a unified point of view among the professionals involved. But going down the list and checking off the foundations that will respond is really rather difficult I would think, in this area.

FOREST CHISMAN. I think another thing that should be pointed out is the potential of local foundations and local industries for supporting this kind of work. A lot of cities, not necessarily New York City, but other cities in New York State that have some civic pride, are interested in the development of arts within their cities. I have thought for a long time that just as they support the local symphony, the local art museum and places like that, they might be persuaded to support the local video program. Anyway that could be tried; it has been tried in places around the United States with a moderate degree of success. I personally feel that the real insurance for video in this country is when you come from that kind of local support and industrial support and local foundation support.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I'd like to comment on that because we, during the last year, having been directing most of our funding efforts at the local foundations and local industry, have had real difficulty with them.. One of the major problems we've had has been an association, people say, "Well, this is public television and we already support public television through our public television station, therefore, there's no reason to be supporting community video." So to whatever extent he has an interest, it has not been in supporting artists but possibly supporting service or

community groups. So you could say for every fairly moderate degree of success there has been a financial failure that outweighs it, at least in New York State.

MARGOT LEWITIN. I have a sense that we're drawing to a close at least in this phase and I'd just like to make a couple of comments directed at what you had summarized as to what our concerns were in this room. I think that the delineations that you made of the individual artists and video, as an art form in itself does not include support of groups which are trying to enable the development of artists. It goes back to what I was saying before, that especially in this particular medium, since it's an expensive one, for artists to be able to explore the medium they have to have a facility in which the hardware is available and the resources are available. Just as an ancillary comment, my organization, the Women's Inter-art Center has applied to the Ford Foundation and gotten that wonderful letter. We did not apply in the area of video. We submitted four separate proposals, because we are essentially a conglomerate of women artists who seek resources by coming together. One of the phrases that caught my attention and I guess upset me more than anything else in the response of the Ford Foundation was that it does not support small arts centers. We do not view ourselves as a small arts center. We view ourselves as a conglomerate of professional women artists that come together for the purpose of showing their work and being able to work together on certain projects. I don't know. I just have a sense that we've gone off someplace, perhaps because your foundations at this time are not in a position to offer support for the kinds of projects that we represent. I think there is a tendency to throw the artist back into isolation and into competition. We came together because we felt, especially as women, that we were isolated within the art structure itself. The woman artist was the exception to the rule with an identity as an artist and incidentally as a woman. I have a sense that to the extent that you are giving money to individual artists to work in cable stations, to work in public broadcast stations, you're throwing artists again into competition with each other, for a very small amount of money, to achieve an individual project. I really think there has to be something along the lines of what Peter summarized yesterday, of sharing resources that do exist, of funding us in a way in which we can pool our own resources, share our resources and get the maximum utilization of what we have available in terms of the way in which we're approaching the medium. The New York State Council gave funds to the Videofreex to conduct a conference up in Clinton, which I was very happy to be able to attend so that I could learn a new way of exploring the medium. I think that that kind of thing is very important. You're interested in national impact. The only way that we, at least the people that are sitting here in this room, would be able at this stage of the game to discuss national impact or create national impact would be if we were in a position to share our resources and pool them and be funded in some way to get that out to the rest of the country. In that case I wouldn't have the sense of frustration when I leave the room, that in a polite and very friendly way we're once again being confronted with a blank wall. I don't know how many foundations we've written to, we've been funded by private foundations always because somebody knew somebody on the Board, always very small grants. But there's got to be a lever.

PORTER McCRAY. I don't agree with your despair. I think that, in fairness, Mr. Davis has just pointed out that the Ford Foundation is changing its program. Mac is leaving in June, is he not? There is a very good possibility, I am not prognosticating, but I think there is a good chance to reopen your argument with Ford with a new person. I think that Nancy here has encouraged you to broaden the interpretation of their program. These are two promising sources, shall we say.

MARGOT LEWITIN. I didn't mean to imply that there was no hope, but I do think, perhaps we should be thinking in terms of some kind of conglomeration and pointing out the fact that really getting money to the individual artist is only going to be done in some kind of intelligent way, if the resources of all the artist groups are pooled, and not for the television stations, to pick their artist.

DAVID DAVIS. It's a very complicated kind of circle. I'd be glad to spend some time with you on it if you want to come and see me another time. You should also read this book very carefully with the references to the Foundation's concern for the role of women and that whole area. We're looking at it in terms of media as well, right now.

KEN MARSH. I would like to pick up on that local support suggestion. Probably all of you share the problem - there is cutting back, there is no capital. Is it possible, this is coming off the top of my head right now, I don't know too much about your situation but local support would obviously come from industry in the area. If there's a Ford plant in a given area, they have no allocation of money?

DAVID DAVIS. We have no connection to the Ford Motor Company, we just sold the last of our stock in it. But the dealers still get the big bats from people who complain about what the Ford Foundation does, all those liberal pinko causes.

KEN MARSH. Let me use it to demonstrate a point, because I think there's a question here. I too think that local support should be developed and that's where the basis of community video, that's where the existence of it should come from. But that thought would be more convenient if Ford products and the Ford Foundation were connected. But for the situation, let's assume they are. There seems to be a national view about distribution of funding. Is there any way, possibly, of any of these funding organizations working to develop local support with local industry or local sites of national-based industry? It seems like local support is going to have to come that way. Do you understand the dilemma? It should be supported locally but the industry that could contribute considerably is usually connected to larger, national distribution mechanisms as far as their foundation or non-profit sides. And they're saying we have to see national visibility in terms of the things we do.

FOREST CHISMAN. It's true of some companies, not of others.

NANCY RAINE. There must be a lot of very small foundations, local foundations, that need to be made aware and interested in feasibilities that could happen on a local level.

FOREST CHISMAN. And also large ones. I mean I know, for example IBM contributes a great deal to the civic betterment of White Plains, which God knows needs it. And if one were working in White Plains, even a large national company like that could be approached, I would think.

KEN MARSH. Woodstock is close to an IBM site, also Roadtron. We've made approaches to both of them, with some success in Roadtron, something in the fire as far as IBM goes. I guess the difficulty is, you think there are problems in approaching people that work on a national level, who have their misgivings about community localized operations - when you go to the local person,

although they have a sense of commitment to the local area, they have an even greater resistance and often a provincial view of the arts. It can be tougher. They'll come across with a polite $300 or $400 maybe even yearly, regularly, but . . .

DAVID DAVIS. We had that trouble at Public Broadcasting for years too. In terms of any kind of general support from corporations across the country, it's been very low. I'm talking about locally. It's very hard going and slow going and you occasionally get a breakthrough with some company. They were more interested, particularly as we began to get some audience, in a particular show. Hood Milk Companies gave a grant for the children's show, something like that, on that basis. But there were, in the Boston area, a lot of small foundations and we generally did pretty well there. We got our very first mobile unit from a local foundation.

PORTER McCRAY. It seems to me too that if all the people here and their associates could really galvanize their strength that you could go to the organization that seeks large money such as "Business in the Arts" and try to get some of those rather large grants that go from time to time. You know $60,000 or $75,000 a whack goes into the decor of one production of the Metropolitan Opera Company. I think that you have to accept the fact that this medium is a relatively new one and is unknown and that is one of your problems. Has any video project represented here ever approached that?

LYDIA SILMAN. I don't think so.

DAVID DAVIS. The "Business Committee for the Arts" group, you mean?

LYDIA SILMAN. This committee does not give grants.

PORTER McCRAY. Well, they seek grants from corporations.

NANCY RAINE. I think they don't even go that far. Isn't this from the "Business Committee for the Arts?" "The Business Committee for the Arts" will <u>not</u> help in any actual fundraising, supply a list of names to the arts organization, contact or act as a conduit."

PORTER McCRAY. Well, how do they seek funds that they report in their annual report?

NANCY RAINE. That's a good question. I don't know, because they will not help with fundraising.

PORTER McCRAY. Well, I would investigate the way that it does operate because it does report that it assisted in funding certain projects.

NANCY RAINE. They help with advice.

LYDIA SILMAN. Well, we were planning on having Sheila Loomis from the Xerox Corporation with us today. She couldn't make it, but maybe we can set up another meeting in the near future where we can have a representative from the Business Committee for the Arts. Maybe Sheila

Loomis will be able to make it and David Stewart from the Corporation and Howard Klein who couldn't make it today. Gerry.

GERRY O'GRADY. Speaking of despair, one of the problems is that even when the Foundations are funding experimental things in medicine or health or science or whatever, they usually have a body of experts who they think can carry it out. We're five years old, there's no general agreement, there isn't in film even, as to whom can carry something out. So we found that essentially they were saying get your own house in order, establish five or six people who can say yes, he or she or that group can carry it out. As a result there's been founded a National Committee on Television, Film and Video Resources and Services that grew out of a meeting that was funded by the Endowment for the Arts and I think the Markle Foundation. There have been ten meetings initially sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and what we've been trying to do is prepare that report that starts with funding and goes through funding. You can have productions. You can have product. You can have preservation and preservation, distribution and distribution. You can have exhibition. You can have some kind of study or understanding, How should they all fit together and who should get funds? Reasonably soon, there'll be a report that will be sent out, broadcast and then there'll be meetings all over the country, democratic meetings, and I hope eventually we'll be able to prepare some kind of common report and say this is the total media ecology, and this is how it must be funded and this is important and so forth and so on. I think that's what I was coming back to earlier that unless we get something established so they can get a consensus of who might do something then no one's going to fund it because there are too many other priorities in medical, etc. I think it's up to us. We're only four years old. For example, I was over at Merc yesterday and there were six portapaks and in Buffalo we have one. We call it Regional Access. It would be like trying to develop the automobile by putting four cars in Buffalo and saying that anyone who could drive could come by and rent or borrow it for the day.

DAVID DAVIS. There aren't that many portapaks in the country, are there?

GERRY O'GRADY. No, there are really very few. It's like three automobiles in all of Buffalo. Since we're only four years old, that the Council should consider us is one of great optimism not despair. But $100,000 to video is really very little, we need enormous funds and I think that's what we have to develop, enormous funding, because $100,000 or $200,000 grants are really very small.

LYDIA SILMAN. David.

DAVID LOXTON. Yes, I was going to pick up something that Gerry had mentioned yesterday at one point. He had used the word investment. He was saying, as a foundation you're looking at a grant as some form of investment. That is of course something else, but what I think we should be aware of, what all of you talked about today and what David was talking about the Ford Foundation being involved in Public Television. I'm sure in 1952, when they started to be involved they didn't think it was going to take 20 years. The New York State Council on the Arts seems to be on a fairly good sort of sustaining basis. Once a group is established by the New York State Council, they seem to be very good about sustaining it for several years. Most of the other foundations we're talking about here, Nancy said earlier we like to keep changing, you said that in a better way, but you said we do not like to commit ourselves to supporting you. We had our own experience. I was trying to get some refunding for Ed Emshwiller, who is one of my artists-in-residence at the

Lab and his grant was turned down. I think on his second round or third round it was turned down. I may be misquoting the NEA here, but the reason I was given was that it was felt that it was time for somebody else to have a go, that he had his turn, it's somebody else's turn now, which is a difficult attitude to accept if you consider the person a serious artist. It's like kids in camp, o.k. He's had his turn, now it's this kid's turn. I think some people should address themselves very seriously to some alternate forms of funding. If what I hear all of you saying is correct, none of you tend to sustain any kind of funding level. All these operations are on a year to year basis and what Porter was talking about, investigating the business community and areas like that, I think is a very important aspect.

DAVID DAVIS. You're right. There's really no way for anyone to make a living, to stay alive, there's no market for this material.

PETER BRADLEY. But that's true of all the arts.

DAVID DAVIS. At the beginning. If a painter makes it, he sells. If a filmmaker makes it, he sells.

PETER BRADLEY. I think the State Council on the Arts, in its earlier years, had a somewhat similar philosophy to the one Nancy described, that there are limited resources and tremendous needs. The Council in its early years had a policy that no organization would be funded beyond three years and that the grant each year would be reduced. Then they grew, as it attained a certain amount of maturity the Council realized that that was silly, that arts will never pay for themselves whether it's video or ballet or symphonic music. I think even now the legislature has recognized that there has to be, if not perpetual, continual support for the arts, however new or venerable the form. In fact the Council's budget has gone up, practically speaking, increased somewhat in the last few years and the amount of money available to its various departments has increased. In terms of video it isn't necessarily true that applicants have received increased funds from year to year, primarily because there have been more applications every year and we are forced to, it's continually being re-thought, as a matter of course we've tried to give smaller grants to more groups rather than larger grants to fewer groups. But I think it's hopelessly unrealistic to think that any of the arts will ever be self-supporting. I think that the Council has recognized this for a long time. It was simply a political fear to ever state it because it was problematical whether or not the legislature would continue to fund us from year to year. Now under a brand new governor the legislature has increased our budget from the previous year, although again there was a certain amount of apprehension that the Council would face possible dismantlement. Government support of the arts by state and national agencies is now approaching given status and we can begin thinking in longer range terms and one of the realities we happily recognize is that there will be continuing support. It doesn't mean it's any easier for the groups because we can't make three-year grants or three-year commitments but I do think it's reasonable on the part of applying organizations to consider that sustaining funds from the Council over a long period of time is not a hopelessly optimistic thought.

BEN LEVINE. I just had a thought. There's another aspect of funding which we're trying to work on and that is we are not receiving money to actually support what we're doing but receiving funds and using them in connection with what we're doing so that those funds will be able to generate future funds for ourselves. By working in areas, which are very connected to what we're doing here,

those areas are basically supporting what we actually want to do. That's the program we're heading towards. The other thought was that there was some talk about defining exactly what some people are doing and that's something that disturbs me when you put limitations and define anything that any of us are doing in this sort of field. But certainly to say, this is what we do, just may limit ourselves and then again find a limitation in the funding sources when something else breaks out from that.

GERRY O'GRADY. I would argue that we need to clarify. I don't think define means to limit and you can re-define. Everyone does that all the time,

BEN LEVINE. But that re-defining may become as difficult as the initial definition.

GERRY O'GRADY. What I'm saying is we do know what we're doing. We just have to be more articulate.

DAVID DAVIS. You're saying that we need some collective, some corporate definition of what we're doing.

GERRY O'GRADY. No, not at all. I'm saying that I don't think people are aware that Shirley Clarke is doing environmental video or that people are doing electronic image and people are doing community or two-way communication. It's there, it's happening and it's a shame that it's not being funded when it's happening anyway. No one seems to realize the plurality of it.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. That's why I get a little bit of a twitch when you talk about national impact and broadcast television. I just somehow feel that that's part of a certain way of viewing things that may become increasingly unrealistic, because there are more and more independent people really doing creative and experimental work, whether you want to call it community, social interaction or visual arts or experimenting with TV stations or whatever, that this is really the base of any large scale kind of change. I don't think that anybody can realistically say that the broadcast medium at this point represents any real alternative, because of the economy involved and the structure, to changing any of the priorities in this country. You want to talk about national impact. I would go from that point and say the kind of work, broad-based experimentation, that's taking place on all these other levels with this kind of technology, which is rather open-ended and difficult to define in any one particular way right now, will have the kind of national impact that is necessary in regard to the use of the medium. So I just question that there's a basic statement at this point. I think in that respect that's the real validity of the State Council funding. I don't think it has anything to do with artists.

GERRY O'GRADY. I think it's very difficult. I see another thing. Every other kind of art form has had a long time to develop, most of you know the history of drama. The film medium, you look at how long it took, 1900, 1920 really. And suddenly with video, along it came and everyone pursued it and all the art is already there. We have Scape-Mates and three or four others. You know the Guru tape; it's only five years old. By the time it came everyone, because they're acquainted with other arts, film or drama, could move in. This is incredible to the corporation. They usually think of art developing over 25 years.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. I think the thing that's the least perceived in relationship to that whole is people in relation to the equipment and the hardware. I don't see too much distinction between calling a video artist a video artist because of the particular kind of work he makes as opposed to someone working on a community level. As far as I'm concerned what the Media Bus does in Lanesville is art.

DAVID DAVIS. I didn't mean to imply that it wasn't.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. I'm bringing it up as a point of discussion because I think it's relevant in terms of this general working philosophy of how you get funding and why you get funding. I feel that that's the kind of area of understanding that will be most fruitful. And what are you going to do when the computer terminals are accessed by all these kids and they're generating all this creative energy? How long is it going to take the State Council and the Ford Foundation to say this is a valid area to fund? I'm just talking about the degree of responsiveness to an environment.

GERRY O'GRADY. To me, though, that's part of definition because our one source of funding has been the Council and they've been very pluralistic and let the definitions of art shift radically. I think, for example the Ford Foundation with the Endowment is trying to put us in the category of visual arts. And I think it might be an error to call what we're doing "art," because that means we keep going to "arts" groups and maybe we should broaden it and go to humanities and social foundations and if we're really going to do all the things that we want to do we should widen it.

DAVID DAVIS. Communications generally.

GERRY O'GRADY. So we can hit all of the possible sources. Maybe calling it all “art” would be an error because there's only so much money for art at the foundations.

NANCY RAINE. And it does spill over into so much more than is traditionally defined as art.

GERRY O'GRADY. It certainly does.

DALE RIEHL. The notion that Cable Arts is working on and we find it very prevalent that the analogy is always made to broadcasting and over-the-air broadcasting, that is what we're talking about in terms of the presentation of the arts in communities, is more of a notion that funders of museums are familiar with, that is talking about a cumulative audience rather than an instantaneous audience. We don't begrudge Public Broadcasting for being interested in an instantaneous audience but we believe there are certain characteristics of art, the presentation of art, which distinguishes it from, for example, even public affairs presentations. That is with regard to certain art, maybe all art, depending on who you are and how you define it, but there should be an occasion for re-experiencing, for going back to something. Our experiment in New York was a very limited experiment in this regard but insofar as making it viable, we think it's viable, financially viable in certain terms, pay TV maybe. But when you've got an open channel and there is a great deal of all kinds of material that's really fine. The problem is, and in regard to some other people's comments, that Aspen-like funding is important, it has its place, but read Les Brown's article. There has to be real things put on and tested. And you do have the possibility of being burned, but I think that in this new area there's more to be gained by just assuming that we're going to do our best to

experiment and doing more experimentation rather than being burned and withdrawing. In New York, for instance, we were really surprised that we had a cumulative audience of 11.2% of the Manhattan Cable subscribers for the series. Now, with the multiple channels that there were and the limited advertising, we think that's really a strong case, not for Cable Arts per se, but for this kind of experimentation, of getting out and really getting things on.

GERRY O'GRADY. I just want to say I think one thing that's really interesting. They've done a study at the Endowment on preservation of videotape, how long it will last, which will be out in another couple of months. Before they could fund certain projects they wanted to know how long the tape would be there, how long it would have the possibility of generating image. And that's going to create problems because it doesn't last that long.

JOHN REILLY. Allan, do you want to talk a little bit about your facility?

ALLAN WINER. I'm from Visual Studies Workshop and our problems are similar to yours with the exception being the video equipment is in the mail right now, we ordered it last week. I guess what I'll do is explain to you what our place is about and what it's like, our approach to funding and our finances. We basically run workshops in photography, whether they're conventional or non-conventional, and film. We've had experience with video in the past, a lot of that's been done with Videofreex or Portable Channel. This will be the first equipment of our own that we have in video. We run a graduate program in conjunction with the State University of New York at Buffalo, which offers a master's degree. We also run a workshop, just working in the field of your choice. People stay for six months to two or three years, completing what they have to complete. Part of our structure is what we call work-study and that means that everybody spends at least eight hours of the week supporting some function of the workshop, whether it be maintaining it, organizing new ideas or just getting a certain amount of projects finished. We have about 14,000 square feet, we have the research center, a library of over 6,000 volumes, we're starting a rare book collection, we have conventional darkrooms for black-and-white and for color, we have copy rooms, we have a print shop which all of us work in, we have offset for stone lithography, there is some hand drawing on grain plates, it covers the whole range of printmaking. Part of our idea of working up there is that involvement with the community, which we found to be very essential to whatever we get done. The Council sponsored a film series last summer which set up a program of films which we had shown outside in the parking lot for a period of ten weeks. This started a good response in the community for our workshop in Rochester. Some of that response carried off through the last year. We also ran a session of children's classes, which was sponsored by the Council, in perceptual awareness, and the result of that was in-service training for elementary school teachers which is now in progress. We also have a plan of visiting artists that attend the Workshop and usually cover anywhere from a two-week intensive workshop to just a couple nights of lecturing or various visits within a period of six or seven months working with a group of people. Basically our objective in grant funding is to use grant money in order to set up projects that we can receive a benefit from, just past that project. Most of our money comes in from tuitions. We run the regular workshop program, we run evening workshops and we run a full summer workshop. Most of our finances that are self-supporting come in from a newspaper we publish that is called "After Image." At the beginning of last year we had about 600 members, we're up to about 1,500 members. We also have a reprint series where we're reprinting out-of-date books, which are almost unavailable and we're starting to distribute them through a book distributor in Rochester. We're also in the

process of a print sale, and we're having a catalogue printed up. There's also an extensive traveling exhibitions program and we have exhibitions by single artists or print-makers, which travel throughout the country and we're adding eight new traveling exhibitions to that. All this has helped us over the past two years to go from a pretty dependent stage upon outside funding to a fairly good level of self-support. I'd say we're down to about 50% self-support at this time and we're trying to get down to 30% by the end of next year. That doesn't mean that we're trying to get rid of grant money but we are trying to establish ourselves so that we can support ourselves and use grant money to set up additional programs or additional attitudes that we may want to put across. That's pretty much what the Workshop's about and I have some information that I'd like to pass around. It's a print sale catalogue that we just finished publishing and some information on the re-print series, which we're just starting and a few copies of the newspaper. There's one pamphlet on our traveling exhibitions program. I guess we have a wider area to cover and most of these publications and re-print series are known nationally. So we do have a larger area we can cover perhaps than somebody doing video, who just has that local community response. I think that's pretty much it.

LYDIA SILMAN. Are there any questions?

GERRY O'GRADY. Could I just ask one thing, could you just be more explicit on what you do in video?

ALLAN WINER. I guess our idea is more one's personal exploration of the media. I can't foresee any of the problems you're having right now as being very immediate to us, as far as getting broadcast time and as far as other concerns that you have. It would be more of allowing people to get an introduction to video, allowing people to use the medium, see what happens by using it and deciding what they want to do with it from there.

SKIP BLUMBERG. They're getting a multi-camera system, I guess.

LYDIA SILMAN. Yes, let me point out that Visual Studies Workshop was funded for the first time last year, by our department at least, to set up a media center. Everyone thinks because we're all involved in video here that we're only a television program, but we're television and media. So the Visual Studies Workshop is certainly a very important facility for us to support and have an input into.

ALLAN WINER. Well, our connection with video would also be its connection with other media. One of the emphases of the Workshop is for people to work across a group of media and perhaps not in just one.

PETER BRADLEY. Allan, what Nathan Lyons used to say, and maybe the phraseology has evolved, is Visual Studies Workshop is interested in image-transmission. And so whatever the needs for that, still photography, printmaking, television, xerography and all that sort of thing image transmission includes simply as one technical means.

ALLAN WINER. That's partly what I meant, in fact most of our thesis presentations now are being done across two or three different types of media, usually in combination with each other. Basically

for someone entering the Workshop for two years, the first year they're encouraged to at least get acquainted with as many possibilities as we have there, and in their final year to select one or two areas and work intensively in that area. That's a requirement for the M.F.A. The workshop runs exactly along the same lines, the only difference is that there is no degree being granted and there is no thesis requirement. There are quite a lot of people working and combining actual media and we're hoping that video fits into that pattern out of the media center which also works in film, slide-tape presentations and various other media.

RALPH HOCKING. What's your connection with Buffalo? Are some of the Center people on the faculty?

ALLAN WINER. Nathan Lyons is a professor from the State University at Buffalo. The connection with Buffalo mainly is that they are the people granting the M.F.A. degree and there is some financial support.

RALPH HOCKING. What department is that from?

ALLAN WINER. It's the graduate department of photography.

MARGOT LEWITIN. How long have you been in existence?

ALLAN WINER. The Workshop was started in 1969, I think with Nathan and about 20 or 30 other people. It was incorporated in 1971 and there are about 70 to 100 active people in the Workshop and probably another 70 people out doing their internship and preparing their thesis. Before the presentation of the thesis students are required to spend at least six months in some related field to what they're doing. The idea of that is that there is a fear of people staying in one area and being totally influenced by that one area and we would like to get outside influence into the Workshop, which part of the Council's visiting artist program is doing. By people getting out into other areas and returning to the workshop, you constantly have a source of stimulus and ideas.

MARGOT LEWITIN. Are your main constituents college students then? I'm a little confused.

ALLAN WINER. Well, no. It is a workshop but there is a graduate program that's running at the same time with that workshop. There is no difference except that the people in the graduate program get a degree and do have to present a thesis. But as the place is run there's no distinction between the workshop person and the M.F.A. candidate. Does that clear it up?

MARGOT LEWTTIN. I'm just curious. What is your tuition situation? I'm very interested in the areas in which you've been able to achieve self-support. I mean if you've achieved 50% self-support, we are closer to 15-18% in our organization, and I was just wondering how you have managed to do that in such a short amount of time, because that really is a short amount of time.

ALLAN WINER. O.K. Probably the major factor is the work-study program. The newspaper is put out by students. The only cost we have is sending the paper out to be printed and folded. All the work for the re-print series is done at the workshop by students, all the maintenance, all the construction, all the typing, every aspect of the place that doesn't require a licensed electrician or

plumber is done by the students. That's cut down our costs very considerably. The tuition situation is one of the major factors. Those people attending the graduate program do pay Buffalo their tuition so we don't see that. We do see that in return of some teaching assistants and of course some very good salaries.

PETER BRADLEY. Do the non-Buffalo students pay a tuition?

ALLAN WINER. The workshop tuition is $500 a semester plus that one day of work-study. A graduate's tuition would be Buffalo's tuition, which depends on whether they're a New York State resident or not plus $100 to the Workshop. And the summer workshop, the evening workshop, any other small aspect of the place does bring in most of our finances.

LYDIA SILMAN. There's free access, I know Nathan hasn't purchased the equipment yet and really set up the media center but there would be free access, I would think, to all of that equipment.

ALLAN WINER. It's never closed to anyone who walks in.

LYDIA SILMAN. Right, that's what I meant.

ALLAN WINER. Everything we have is for the community and we try to have them participate in as much as we can. We set up programs just to bring people in to explore and see what we're doing. I think I'd just call it the free media center.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I would just like to say the presence of the Visual Studies Workshop, as well as all the other photographic activity that goes on in Rochester, has really contributed a lot to what we've been doing at Portable Channel and indeed made much of it possible.

ALLAN WINER. I guess, too, that we have the availability of a much larger audience in that we can go way outside our local community. The paper circulates nationally, the summer workshop brings in people from all over, so we do have a broader audience.

JOHN REILLY. Listen, what I thought we would do is leave some time at the end of this to have some kind of summary of some of the things that were said and a discussion of how we all might follow up with whatever can be followed up, so our discussions are not completely lost. Some things we'll be doing individually, but some of us who have a like interest might consider some informal coordination as a follow-up. You might think about that between now and the next hour and a half. We have three or four more people to finish up with and then we can get into kind of an open discussion of some of the other points. And I think, Joe, you have to leave so maybe you should go next…

JOE SEAL. O.K. Very briefly, I'm sitting in, in a sense, for Phil Jones, who presented this paper from the Ithaca Video Project. I tend to describe us as sitting in the valley between two big giants playing sort of a Goliath role with our half-inch video equipment. We've got Cornell University on one hill, very much interested in broadcast television and I.C. on the other hill doing the same. So half-inch video is, like I said, sort of the Goliath in town. We have a lot of local groups who come

to work with us. Mainly, again, the video is being used in that area to document a lot of shows and programs that art groups are doing there. There have been a few ideas that I don't think are novel after hearing and reading much of the material here, such as Blue Buses where people will take video equipment on buses and go from community to community and share information, these kinds of activities. I'm going to try not to mention things that people have talked about already. I won't go into the fact that we have a storefront operating at the Ithaca Video Project. Again the store-front idea is similar to what the people at Rochester and other places talked about where it's an open access situation where people can come in, mention a project that they have to do and get equipment to go out. I remember a point was made yesterday about equipment and whether or not people had to have their hands on it in order to have really effective participation. I think we would have to say yes because we go by a quotation we have in our brochure that we want to see video in the hands of people who have been traditionally denied the access. That means, if we go in and do all the shooting, if we bring in professional crews or more professional video producers to do the work, we're creating a situation where a lot of people feel like they're on trial or they're just being photographed. They have to act in some way, and they're not being given an opportunity to just express themselves. The equipment is there, if somebody wants to pick it up they can, and we go from there. I think this is our attitude, you let people bring in their creative ideas as they come. A couple of things we're doing to support ourselves, we have what we call a visual massage program that's pretty successful, where we've hooked up with some people who have slides and do slide shows, films and video tapes. We combine those three, graphics and photographs and we go, we'd like to travel more with this show. It's sort of a show-and-tell situation where we have people bring in their own video tapes and we have our equipment set up so they can play their tapes, bring in their films. So it's a free-for-all situation that goes over very big in a high school or college setting. But anyway, it's a participatory kind of activity that people really get into and we'd like to travel much more with this show. Again, along with that, we have the video festival concept that we like to push, again popularizing half-inch video because it certainly is a basket of fear in Ithaca. We seem to be the last outpost all the way to the western part of the State. Let's see, in terms of the local cable, our situation isn't positive, we've had very little on the cable and we're told that if we just got into a little more athletic programming we'd be fine - do some football games. We have one fellow on the staff who's really interested in that, so we're going to maybe get on the cable with some football games and local basketball games. One of the things in terms of the people we have, everyone comes to the program, to our project, with a different interest. We have writers, poetry people who want to mix the poetry with video, people who are interested in social science who just want to use video as a social organizing device and just communicators. We feel that this is the most healthy approach since no one seems to know what the direction is, what it really means. I think having all these different people on the staff helps us stay in the game. Once people start chopping off the social aspect, we still have our art aspect going. When people decide that video art isn't the thing and they think of it as broadcast, we've also got a fellow from an ETV center who likes to work with us and so there's a broadcast possibility. So, again, we perceive ourselves as new kids on the block and we're trying to deal with all these different aspects. I think one of the most exciting things to me and to a couple of other people on the Project staff, is that we're moving to an international level. We started out with what we called Videomation. This was a concept of tracing African music, the survival of African music in this continent. From there we began to realize that to do it effectively we would need to spend some time in Africa and in Haiti and follow that survival right now, follow that path again. This is something we're excited about. We've made contact with people in Haiti to spend some time there, bring in a little video equipment and maybe

set up a video project there. I think this goes along with something John was talking about, sort of that international sense, seeing where that might go - video in developing countries. This is something we certainly want to look at. The African cultural festival in Lagos is something that's exciting to us also as something we might bring back over here and share with a lot of community people. I guess in a nutshell, that's where we come from at the Ithaca Video Project.

JOHN REILLY. O.K. On that point, Joe spoke to me before about giving some follow-up information on this video conference on developing nations that I mentioned before, and I said I would keep him informed and in fact anyone else who has any interest in that area and would be interested in getting a follow-up on what we're doing and how we're planning it and would maybe like to contribute something, I will make a point of giving you the information too. It's in a very early stage at this point, just a planning stage. O.K. Any questions for Joe? Howie.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. I'm going to drop back from the nation to the home. One of the things that's been really important for us, just in terms of the environment we work in is that we are living and working together in the same environment. As a result we've really had to struggle through and evolve some kind of organic way of doing meaningful work on a community and aesthetic level, and doing projects that continue to evolve us as a group through the various levels of working with interactive media. I think a good place to begin with would be with some reflection on what we did over a year ago - the public access celebration. Essentially what happened was that we and many other people working in Manhattan and programming the cable, the public access channels, were becoming increasingly frustrated in our ability to see any reason to program other than they existed. We germinated the idea of creating a feedback project one night with John Sanfertello. The project grew by itself way beyond what we had anticipated. We had anticipated a relatively simple involvement but we opened up a series of workshops, with people from many different institutions, libraries, museums, Bellvue Hospital, as well as independent video organizations. They were structured in an open-ended way so that those people with specific resources and interests could direct input into the total working idea of the project. That was continually re-coordinated and re-designed over three months of negotiations with the cable companies and interactions between all these institutions and video resources. As a result we explored the New York City cable environment for three days and three nights. We felt we really opened up the door to seeing what possibilities could exist with this kind of technology. It so happened that one of the results of this exposure and this interaction was that we decided to withdraw from programming cable as it was designed and existed in Manhattan at that time. As part of that withdrawal we helped organize a public access report, which analyzed the growth of cable and concluded with a series of recommendations which we felt were a pretty broad look at what could make public access successful for this kind of technology. There were a lot of important spin-offs out of this kind of project and the reason I'm really talking about it this way is we've found it's really important for us to find a creative way of working with different kinds of institutions and other media facilities. There's really no pre-described path for it and we just found that this kind of way produced a certain level of energy over a certain period of time that was totally unanticipated. As a result of the celebration the public library set up a media library at 42nd Street. The library up at Inwood now has a media facility, which is pretty well tied into the neighborhood action program up there. What has happened is that we took a jump in time and exposed a lot of possibilities that were in the works but because people had an intensive interaction with each other they were able to really conceptualize and begin to get these things on in a much quicker way. Now, I'm not saying

that that's necessarily good but that's what happened. Personally, for Survival Arts Media, we began a relationship with Bellevue Hospital during the celebration, since they did have the remnants of the Sterling system and about 114 monitors in the hospital, which were not being used at all. As a result of that three-day experiment we have developed a rather long-range working relationship with them where we're re-designing and integrating the cable system in some of the old Bellevue buildings with a new M.A.T.V. system in new buildings. What has happened is we've gained support from a number of departments within the hospital institution, such as the recreation department which has a staff of 125 people, and a budget to create a facility at the psychiatric department and so on. What we intend to do there is to help them organize a facility within a hospital that can begin to explore the multiple uses of a locally originated system that is controlled by the hospital, that is not controlled by corporate cable management. We view this kind of working relationship with an institution as most valuable in terms of that kind of technology, cable or M.A.T.V., where we don't have to worry about corporate structure. So we're looking forward to instituting some kind of meaningful cultural interaction through that system by having the inputs of these various departments. I really can't say too much more about it at this point because it's been a slow process of getting the kind of support we feel is necessary so when the thing really begins to happen it can be maintained and used in a realistic way. I would assume that we would basically back off and act as a consultant for a while until they can take over the system. The other area, which I think is important in terms of our development lately, is we have been feeling a very strong need and a desire to conceptualize and create all our projects in terms of cooperative working relationships with different kinds of media facilities or environments, because we feel that we can identify much more quickly the problems and the more constructive ways of using any particular technological environment. We spent part of the time over the last couple of months traveling around New York State. We did some work at Binghamton and we did a project with the Visiting Artists Program in Syracuse, which we felt very good about. Now we are beginning to define the details for a project this September at the Strasenburg Planetarium, which we view basically as a potential video environment existing but not really developing. The planetarium is probably one of the most sophisticated in the country. It's a little bit too long to go into all the detail, but the system is rather enormous. It's a huge dome with about 300 slide projectors, 16 film loops and a four-track mini-computer, which controls the system. They also envision some kind of possibility of extending the audience, through Channel 21, over the air, and we are evolving the project in such a way that we want to explore some relatively advanced video projection and synthesizing systems within the planetarium. We're envisioning it as a three-day and three-night workshop event in which live music will be inter-faced with the video projection and the planetarium systems. We hope that we can organize it in such a way that people all across the State who are interested in this level of experimentation, for whatever reason it may be, can have some kind of relatively meaningful interaction during that event. So that's kind of an example of the kind of project we're beginning to feel is really important for us, personally and creatively, and the kind of project we feel can create meaningful interaction with other facilities across the State. On the other hand, I think we're facing basically the same kind of problems that are nagging everybody else, technical staff - wouldn't it be great if, like you just mentioned the Council could really somehow organize a way of training some people to become available as technicians? We had a working relationship with a young kid who was from Long Island, his name's Danny Cuciano, and he really hadn't done much video until he came to our place, he was involved mostly with audio. He worked in an audio repair shop out in Long Island. He came into our situation, this is another example of the living-

working relationship which is somehow all tied in with the evolution of things, and began to live and work with us. Now he is in the process of designing equipment for many different people, relatively sophisticated equipment. He represents the kind of resource that's invaluable at this time for people who are operating facilities across the State. I think that that's an area that somehow the Council could really encourage in some way, to get young people who are really interested in exposing themselves to this kind of learning process, who have a real interest in this kind of technical trip, and bring them into environments. The other thing is to continue that idea of interaction. I think mobility is really important and I think that some meaningful way for people to interact with each other is really important. I don't know how one would organize that more than it is already happening because people are doing it. I know nothing about Ithaca Video, but what you're talking about - some of the things you're talking about are very similar things to what we're talking about - how to move an environment through a series of situations to expose people to something, how to interact with other facilities, and how to be really in a position to work with any level of technology from broadcast to half-inch. So I would envision that these kinds of concerns are mutual concerns and I would look forward to any kind of programs that could be though about that would encourage this kind of interaction as a basic way of thinking about how to evolve and use the resources that exist in the State. I think essentially that's the kind of thing that's been taking place for us and I'll just leave it there.

JOHN REILLY. Any questions? Let's see. Who haven't we heard from? Gerry, but I think somebody else too. Just Gerry, Gerry you're up.

GERRY O'GRADY. O.K. Media Study at Buffalo. I promised first to clarify what seem to be misperceptions and it's easy to do that with relation to Nathan Lyons' program, which does have a relation with the State University of New York at Buffalo. I teach at Buffalo, at the State University, but my program at Media Study has absolutely nothing to do with the State University at all. In the first year that we started they provided us with a facility, free, in which we operated. And this year we've allowed them to use our facilities to begin a program, which is going to move on campus in September and which they pay us for. We have, in other words, no degrees at all and we have no tuition and no charges. Basically what we've done in the two years is have workshops, usually eight to twelve a week, for people from all over the city and the region, and they're done in video and film. We've taught now about 200 people. We also have a small access center with a first-come first-serve basis but no deposit and no charge, which makes us slightly different from Merc. We haven't lost any equipment at any point. Nothing's been stolen or even seriously damaged. We've served about 2,000 people and we've also been doing screenings and video environments and so forth, and about 5,000 people have attended those. We've cooperated with various groups in Buffalo, like the University, on funds that have not come from the Council. In other words, contracts from the Council have been for overhead, basically, and to do workshops. Each year we do two or three of these four-week workshops in either film or video or both. We've cooperated with the University on some conferences and some visitors, for which the University has let us use their facilities. There's another probably misperception because I do also run a thing called Center for Media Study at the University, which is an academic program. But again Media Study, this group I'm talking about, has nothing to do with that, except in terms of concept. One of course serves the student and the other serves the community. "Media," for me, is just all in codes. I mean we haven't been out specializing in what I call the electronic code, it's a silly name, it includes photography, film and video. But for me it includes all the codes including gestures and

speech and includes the person. Because the traditional name for the person who's the intercept between the unknown is the medium. So it includes that as far as I'm concerned. I think that definition between person and message and medium is all up for re-exploration. "Study," I chose that, my concept of that is simply concentration. That's the way I mean, "study," not in terms of book knowledge. It's a medieval word, I was a medievalist before I went into media. And in medieval terms, in Early English, it just means zeal. And so that's the concept I have of the statement, of media code, zeal. Buffalo is interesting in that connection because the word "buff" comes from Buffalo. It comes from the animal and that means the skin of the animal, the buff, to be in the buff, streaking. And so to be a buff about something is to be nakedly enthusiastic etc. etc. I just mention that. And so I take it for granted, since we're here on grants, that the impulse is there. I think that's what I share with you, the impulse toward change and what I try to do is develop a very flexible and catalytic arrangement in which I can do that. But then I think I've probably gotten more abstract because of three experiences: 1. I've been on the Council panel with Ralph for the last four years so I've had the opportunity to view all of your grants and hear all the arguments and so forth. And I think it's important to have someone, we're no longer on it, but Rodger Larson is on it now. I think it's important that someone from the peer group be involved in those decisions because they're people doing it and they're closer to it and so forth and so on. Then I was on a review panel for the Council when they went from two million dollars to eighteen. There was some concern about whether they were doing things properly. This was the whole Council, all the panels, not just Film/Media but Visual Arts, Performing Arts and Special Programs. Could they demonstrate to the legislature that they were effective and so forth? So I was having to get a larger overview all the time of how to improve that. Then I was on that committee, which I'm still on. It's taken a year to get started and now it'll be another year to collect material before it releases the report that will go to everyone for discussion, a thing called the National Committee for Film and Television Resources and Services. It includes 10 people from around the country with regional representation. I suppose I'm partly the New York representation, although it also includes film with Jonas Mekas as secretary. My concern has been to look at how all the pieces fit together and to think in terms of how we can get very large scale national, local and regional funding. I wouldn't call it systems planning or ecological thinking. I'd just call it seeing how they fit together. So the model I developed to look at it is to look at funding and if you have that you can have the making. If you have the making you can have the preservation. If you have the preservation you can have distribution. If you have distribution you can have exhibition or screening and transmission kind of falls between the two, because that's distribution and exhibition simultaneously. Then if you have that you can have study, by which I would again mean the restructuring of the medium of consciousness, call it understanding. So what I'm going to do is just review what I've done or am doing in terms of those areas. In terms of funding, what I've tried to do is to evolve for ourselves a three-year budget that would be kind of a model, an itemized three-year budget, which we've now done, because I found that I went to foundations, they wanted to know where I was going, what I'd lost etc. etc. To my surprise, because we started with $30,000 the first year from the Council and that was almost our total funding, then about $100,000. This year we have projected a budget of $500,000 and I found we' re going to need $3,000,000 just to have that small, modest growth to even do part of these things. So I think that's the kind of funding that we have to go after, otherwise we're putting in an enormous amount of energy, I'm doing it too, 16 or 17 hours a day, with very little purpose, because I think our heads are in our stomach essentially. We're all trying to get the meal on the table rather than think of how to finance a restaurant. That's been a problem. The other thing we're concerned with in that area is legal

problems so we can advise visual artists and groups in the community how to incorporate and make sure their rights are protected and so forth. I'm kind of worried about people giving stuff to cable and Public TV. I can see that we're somehow too anxious to give away material. I'm interested in being a conduit for other groups and we've been a conduit for eight or ten other projects for filmmakers and so forth. We just receive the money with no overhead and we pass it on to them because there are a lot of agencies that can only give money to institutions and can't give it to the individuals directly. So if any of you have a project and that's a problem, none of you here do I think, we serve as a conduit and announce that and are perfectly willing to handle it free. The making is probably where we concentrate most and it's a strange thing. When I went to Buffalo, as far as I know, there never had been a filmmaker who lived there, except Andy Perell, who had made about two films and was a kid of about 21 or 22 when I arrived. There had never been anyone, obviously in video. The whole video movement had just passed over, and Skip's from Buffalo, I think. It's the second largest city in the Nature State and there was virtually no activity of any kind, zero. That's still the case for the most part except for our Center. There's one group just starting called the Center for Perceptual and Experimental Studies which a student of Nathan Lyons is starting. It's concentrating on photography at the moment. That's kind of a mystery but it somehow makes it easy because there's not 80 competing organizations there trying to do the same thing. It's left us a clear field. What we mainly do is workshops, those eight to twelve-week workshops and they're taught by the Vasulkas in video, Peter Campus is more concerned with simply interacting with the images produced, Tom DeWitt,
when he taught for five weeks, was more concerned with a two-way communication system at that time. Ken was there for awhile, Ken Marsh. On the other hand, we have the Vasulkas, who are more concerned with the electronic image or Ed Emshwiller, who was more concerned, at that time at least, with a film composition type thing. The second thing we've done is access. Once those people are trained they have access to the equipment on a first-come first-serve. The third ambition is to develop a laboratory type situation, like Channel 13's but more accessible etc., but not connected to a broadcast facility. I would hope that it would be a national facility for anyone to come and use it because I think that's necessary. As I say, it would be open and support any kind of video material. Then the other is the use of other facilities. What we've been trying to do is find out how we can open other facilities to the community, the cable, which I'll come back to in a minute, the cable and Channel 17 and the University, which will be an important facility, which again I'll come back to later. In terms of preservation, we're not doing anything at the moment and we probably never will. I think if the Library of Congress and Eastman House do the preservation in film, they can do it in video too. Re may get involved at some point in some regional reservation should we become a regional center. We might get into storage for use or have a film collection but not for preservation and not for archival. But I think preservation's important. Distribution, we've helped Skip and Iris do their Video Resources Directory and we've done our own study of 1,000 independent filmmakers, a 35-question questionnaire trying to determine their livelihood and resources. We cooperated on a report that Forest Chisman mentioned this morning, the Land report, but we ourselves aren't engaged at the moment in distribution. Exhibition, we do a lot of screening, a lot of viewing of works of all kinds. I think almost everyone has been hearing David's material, George Stoney's, Stephen Beck, Joan Jonas, Tom Johnston from Videosphere. We had a series last year called Visiting Televisionary in which we just tried to bring in a whole array because we think it's important that people see a lot of what's being done. In terms of study or understanding we're sponsoring an oral history, this is on funds that don't come from the Council, that is trying to get all of the 200 independent filmmakers of some stature, in other words Brakhage, Ian Hugo, Ken

Jacobs, James Broughton and so forth. We've done 27, so far, to tell what it was like to come into film from somewhere. They were all sculptors or painters and they suddenly confronted a new technology and that's a whole history that's completely unwritten. So we've been having interviews from four to fourteen hours just to document that. We've done 27 and we're trying to get funding to finish that up and then we can go into the video. Many of them already include video because Vanderbeek's been done and Emshwiller and they chart their careers, the changeover from film into video etc. Then we try to serve as an information center - how to buy equipment, how to make films, what type of video tape's the best, where to get it etc. We try to have conferences on emerging national problems or state problems or whatever. We applied to the National Endowment for the Arts and to the Council to make a collection of 150 hours of experimental, electronic material for teaching. We're asking to pay $80 an hour to the artist, that includes the transfer cost. That material wouldn't be for distribution, only for our use as a teaching device in the workshops. Woody Vasulka's in charge of that project to collect the 150 hours from the various centers and some of you people who have done it. We're interested in the last ten years of what has been interesting electronic material of various kinds. It won't be an anthology, just a lot of cut-up pieces, but it will depend on duration and so forth. On the other hand, we're not only concerned with finished work, little skimpets are fine if they're interesting as a teaching device. In January we're going to have an equipment conference. That's funded. We're getting a six-man team to visit Utah, California and various other places - Ohio, Missouri and so forth. What we think is a burning need now is democratization and minisculization of equipment. We're trying to get the 50 people, people like Hector and Ross together, and the people from Chicago, who will try to find out how they can design and what it would cost to set up a total video studio, experimental lab in a sense, on a minor scale.

LYDIA SILMAN. Who funded that project?

GERRY O'GRADY. Local funding. That will take place in January and what we'll try to come up with is a price of what that would cost. Can they do it if we got funding, could they develop that system for $25,000 per unit or $50,000 depending on how many people buy it and so forth and so on. We're starting a journal, which I've applied to the Markle Foundation to fund, because that's more the kind of thing they're interested in, called Media Study, which would just allow people to write 25 or 50-page essays. There's no place even in film today you can publish more than ten pages and there are no common places in video, there's no outlet except "Radical Software." There's no place anyone can write a serious essay defining anything. And by defining I just mean making strong. I think you define yourself when you make a tape and that's the way I'm using defining. So there's no way of getting any material out. There's no place that, in a sense, gets what we're trying to do into people's consciousness. It would be a kind of a wide thing, it would be open to all kinds of material: film, video, all media, pedagogy, we might publish the oral history there, publish results from conferences, equipment things, whatever it happened to be. I think the thing we won't do is book reviews or any of that kind of material. We now have a cable artist-in-residence who's a video maker, Andy Veecher, who I think was at one time connected with Portable Channel in Rochester. That's funded from the National Endowment for the Arts through George Stoney's Alternate Media Center and then to Media Study and to Comax Cable. What he's doing is going out to libraries and to BOCES trying to get high school students interested in video. The cable company that he's working for has written off the older people and he's trying to develop a high school program, which will be a late late show like 11:00 or 12:00 at night when the high

school kids come home after being out for the evening. They'll make a program, which they'll show to each other in this Lackawanna area. We did a program, the Vasulkas did, with the other arts organizations here. We gave the museums, the Langston-Hughes Center for Performing Arts, all the cultural organizations, a twelve-week workshop to get them using video to document what they're doing so they can show people on cable and also use it in their own place to tape people, tape rehearsals, tape interviews with visiting artists. That kind of thing has to build up because we've interpreted our mandate, since our funding has come mainly from the Council on the Arts and the Endowment for the Arts, as being more related to the arts than to the social issues. But you can't go very far in video at the moment unless you can get access to more expensive keyers and synthesizers and so forth. There's a limit to your exploration with a portapak, it's a problem. You can't go very far. Then with Channel 17, the local educational station, we've just applied to put two people in residence. That's another National Endowment for the Arts - Corporation for Public Broadcasting grant and they would use the Leacock Sound Synch Super 8. They would make six programs. They're people who have graduated, they've taken Ed Emshwiller's and the Vasulkas' courses and have graduated from the workshop. If they get the grant we've asked the Endowment also to pay them and we'd buy Sound Synch Super 8 equipment and they'd teach two workshops, 15 weeks each, with 20 to 40 people, who would also then generate more material and test out the Sound Synch Super 8 equipment rather than just using it for the public stations. At the University right now we're trying to hire an experimental video maker to teach classes. I'm also head of the Instructional Communications Center there and we're hiring a producer-director. That's an interesting model, there are five people, there's someone at the cable, someone at the educational station, someone at Media Study if we continue to get funds to have the workshops there, plus someone in an academic program and they all know each other and are merging. So you see all those distinctions are disappearing, hopefully. It's a control model in other words. The University I'll just mention briefly. It's enormously important to me to keep the University open to the community because what's being built there is the largest, most expensive University in world history, 650 million dollars. The building that's being built for my center, the Instructional Communications Center, will have two 2400 foot color studios, with the satellite connected, with the cable connected to every other University. And every room has a two-way system. And so it's essential. It's been people like Judy Pappas who's at the University in Black Studies and also runs the Langston-Hughes Center and Ed Smith in the Drama Department, black drama, he also runs the African Center in the community. So there's that inter-relation there, already. The University is large and it will be the largest single employer in the area and it will be probably the last dinosaur to be built in academic history. So that's an important facility to keep open. I'm also in charge of the Health Communication Center there and we're developing a project now through the Office of Education in Philadelphia. You probably know Pennsylvania's the most cabled territory in the United States because of the hilly terrain plus a rural population, which includes migrants and Indians. They wanted a high-density cable to transmit basically health information, then environmental information, then continuing education in high school. But of course it can also carry everything else. So we're trying to develop the model for that with our Medical School which will serve that area. So the concerns you mentioned aren't foreign to me but I'm dealing in, not the Media Study which is fairly small as you can see, it's an organization in the community, but I'm doing some of these things you're doing in another capacity as it were. The idea is, I think to merge everything right now while it's the right scale. And community I guess, people wonder sometimes if we're a community center because some of the communities define themselves almost as communes and grew up that way in fact, others have a certain space in a certain city where they

have a community, or a certain ethnic group. Since we're the only group in that whole western region around Buffalo, community for us simply means everyone. And that's how we have to define community, regional, just being open to all citizens to do whatever they want and we don't care what they do once they learn the basic equipment. I mean it's none of our business. I have my own interests but no interest, it seems to me, in constructing this kind of facility. And we see it also in a micro-macro and I myself have a real allegiance to MacLuhan and I think everyone's part of the human community. And so we, because the University's there, we can have an enormous number of international and national visitors there and that's always there in the environment. I think that's essential because that's what video means essentially, more than any other medium. So I think it's important, as Jon Alpert said yesterday, to preserve your freedom. We're cooperating with any of these, we're perfectly willing to cooperate with cable, we're just not anxious that people give their tapes to the cable stations. We think they should be paid. And we think each person should determine what they want to do and how far he wants to go and what limitations, psychic or whatever, that he wants to accept. I think it's important, as Ralph said, not to get locked in to one system so we're trying to keep an open model. I think what Ken was saying, Ken Marsh, was that there's a difference between urban and rural, there are very different problems. And I think the Buffalo thing is neither, and it's a whole different problem and I'm very anxious to have the freedom, you see, to interact with the cable system or whoever and that's interaction with people, not with institutions, because they keep changing and they're very different and so it's a very organic kind of synergistic process.

JOHN REILLY. We've just had a lesson in creating the first media conglomerate. Actually I'm sort of fascinated every time I hear Gerry explain how he does it. He convinces everybody of the inevitability of everything he says and then it happens. We had a number of areas that were covered in the last two days and I don't know quite how to go back over it except to ask you. For those of you who have some thoughts now I think this is the time to begin to think of how we might do some follow-up on many of the points that have been raised in the last two days. Do you have any thoughts, Bob, I know you have some things you'd like to say.

BOB CIVIELLO. What we've been able to do in the last two days is largely amplify a lot of problems and items and things that many people knew existed and to get some clarification as to everyone's feeling on certain issues regarding half-inch video. I think that the thing I've seen so far is that there's a genuine need in this State for an organization to deal with half-inch video artists and half-inch video tape and in three areas: into finding out what resources are available, where the resources are available, and to dispense information regarding funding; and the third and very important area, and it goes along with the other two, is to serve a general informational purpose into getting out the word about what half-inch video tape is, what a video artist is, it's a whole new art form which is now understood by the people who are in it but largely ignored or misunderstood by the people in the various communities that have not come in contact with it. Now some organization is going to have to take the impetus in organizing such a project and it's going to have to be done, much the same as in many other areas. A.F.I. serves the needs of film people, to a degree, and many other organizations have been established. But certainly I feel where, in the case of the New York State Council on the Arts have taken the initiative to hold a meeting like this, perhaps the roots for such an organization should be undertaken by them. I think one of the first things this organization should do is survey, survey the needs and the desires and the extent of the people they are serving. Here we have a broad-based representational group. However, there are

many more video artist groups and video artists out in the community who also need to have some input into what's going on. So one of the most important things, I think, would be some kind of a structure made up of people who are working in this on a day-to-day basis to be set up in the state to try to serve as some driving force. Now I have some comments on the possibilities of an outlet for your work. I think a basic decision has to be made and the consensus of opinion as I read it, is there are a number of outlets for the work done by video artists. One of them is public television, one is cable, and we talked about some other distribution systems as well. I think there has to be some idea in the survey given to what the priority is, and to what extent everyone wants to have it done. And if indeed the decision is made that public television should serve and continue to serve and be in the forefront, as was mentioned yesterday, as a showcase for video art, if this is the case a number of decisions have to be made then. And these decisions are decisions to be made in the state regarding funding for equipment and in terms of production centers throughout the State. The decisions come in three areas: Should the New York State Council on the Arts, as well as other funding sources, continue to fund production centers located throughout the State as they exist now or should they indeed fund independent production centers that have nothing to do with public television or possibly should they extend funding, wherever possible, to include all the individual public television stations throughout the State? I think these are three very clear choices to be made in this area. Of course, although the centers that are now operating are doing, quite frankly, brilliant work and outstanding work and there's certainly a genuine need that many other people don't have access to it and need the access to it and the only way they're going to get it is if it's done on a regional approach. But nevertheless, the system cannot be ignored any longer. It has to be dealt with. Because the longer it's put off, the more the problems are going to compound themselves and the more isolation, that is felt already in this room, is going to be increased. There has to be some kind of mandate given to many of the organizations, and I think that has to be done rather soon, while we are in the stage now, as a concept, it's in its infancy and things can be done to make it grow. If they're not done in a short period of time, many of the problems that are plaguing us will continue to stay with us. Now I have some general observations on the issue of funding since I, in my job at the station in the last four years I've been involved in every grant proposal that they've put out. I should mention that with these observations I'm not complaining because we've been very successful in getting grants, but I think that it might be of some help. I've detected some basic attitudes that everyone, to a degree, is afraid of saying. I think one of the basic problems in applying for money is that the applicant takes the position that he's in an adversary relationship with the person he's getting the funding from. This is a very subtle kind of thing that goes on, which is not very constructive and not very profitable for either of the two organizations. We see that quite often and I think we all have to keep in mind that that is really not the case but sometimes because of certain perceptual problems this gets in the way of anything getting done. Generally speaking, the accusation has been made, and I don't know if I subscribe to it, that foundations tend to follow primarily established programs in institutions. They're slow to innovate. This is one of the major slants against the Ford Foundation. Occasionally they'll find something new like they did in '52 that everybody's excited about called public television, put massive sums of money into it, but unless it's something inspirational they're not likely to do that. Well, I think this is a problem that has to be seriously dealt with. Small community video groups such as are represented here have an especially big problem and that is to gain attention and also to gain adequate support from major foundations who may not seek to do so in any kind of massive amounts aside from, obviously what is being done in New York by the Council on the Arts. In terms of other funding from other sources there's a real question in everyone's mind of whether it will be forthcoming

realistically or not. Quite often people turn to local industry, we turn to local sources of funding, we also find out that they as well have a tendency to say, “O.K. what's your track record? Where have you gotten support from in the past?” as if that's to be expected. So there’s a definite need to cope with this problem and the only way to cope with it is some kind of organization or structure that can represent or, I hate to use the word, lobby, to a degree the desires and needs of the video artists. Gerry mentioned earlier a point that almost slipped by and the final one I have to make. Sometimes you apply to what you think are the most obvious sources for your project. National Council on the Arts, New York State Council on the Arts and we've found from many experiences that we've applied to them for something that didn't meet whatever they felt the categories were necessary for. For example, just recently we applied for a grant from the National Council on the Arts to do a program on the American Indian as a problem in New York State and also on Puerto Rican culture and migration up into New York. They couldn't fund us for various reasons and we felt we were stymied. We really weren't. We decided to look into it a little further and we ended up going to the National Foundation on the Humanities, which is another organization which is closely affiliated with the National Council on the Arts, and they gave us a very large grant to do a program this summer. Not only that but they gave us a tip and it helped us get funding from the White House Council on Youth for additional funding for this program. So often you get turned down by one organization and the concept is ok, we've had it, but that's really not the case at all. It takes a lot of staying in there and a lot of misinformation. There's a lot of lack of information, there's a genuine need in this state, as well as other states but particularly in New York, for someone to represent and try to collate resources, funding and information in terms of video. And I think the time has arrived for this to happen.

JOHN REILLY. Do we have anyone who would like to react to that? I think, in effect, Bob might be suggesting something more permanent to come out of our meeting, which is really basically a very informal meeting.

LYDIA SILMAN. I have one comment to make in terms of the Arts Council. We initiate some programs, but very few. We're generally a responsive agency. I mean we give advice about information, about facilities, and we do small projects like the Video Resource Directory and setting up this conference. Three years ago when I first came to the Council, I started a newsletter, which of course everyone wrote papers for, we did it once and that was it. And nobody after that spoke to anyone so we thought that this conference might facilitate that. But really a proposal like you're talking about should come from outside the Council and it should be administered outside the Council and you should apply to us. An organization should take that responsibility and come to us for the funds. I don't think we should administer or we can administer a program like you're talking about.

JOHN REILLY. Were you suggesting the Council undertake forming and administering such a project?

LYDIA SILMAN. I'm more than willing to set up anything for you. I know one thing that was mentioned, that there was a need for technical people to come together and collaborate. I will certainly set up another meeting for the video community. I will facilitate that or any other meeting that you feel is necessary to bring you together, but the need has to grow from you. I can't continually set these things up. It's true that very often we have an overview of what's going on and

we see the need and we take the initiative on our own, like for this conference. But now, it's time, after the past two days, that you people began to approach us more and ask us to do it.

JOHN REILLY. I think what he was asking was that partly, in effect an ad hoc meeting, which is what we've formed, take on a more permanent form. And I don't think that's Radical Software. I think we're talking about really what we have in the room, Skip and Ken and some of us who have come through four years of various types of meetings and attempts. We had a regional meeting upstate, we had endless meetings in the beginning when we first started working. Most of it did not lead to anything beyond that particular meeting, which sometimes is helpful, sometimes it's not. But I had a certain reluctance to get into a larger organization, but I think it's a very legitimate question and I think it should be put forth, we should think about it.

MARGOT LEWITIN. I'm not quite sure but perhaps what we're talking about is trying to set up something for video similar to the Off-Off Broadway Alliance for Off-Off Broadway Theatre. And I think that the organization in order to, I mean if such an organization were to form, in order for it to be effective, it would really have to be an independent organization like that because all of us I think, with the possible exception of you, are in a situation where our resources are being spread so thin as it is that we would have to, I mean they have a staff of four or five people but they're really doing an enormous amount of work in terms of trying to find funding for Off-Off Broadway theatre and somehow they're doing it.

BOB CIVIELLO. That's what I'm getting at. What I meant is that the seed money for such an organization should come from within the state, which would be the Council on the Arts.

MARGOT LEWITIN. I mean, perhaps another meeting like this where we could begin to find people who were interested and capable of administering such an organization. I mean I really do think that's important, because I think that whatever our reluctance is to deal with large foundations on their own terms, in the long run if we're going to get that money we have to be able to talk their language, whether we have to do what they have in mind or not. And one of the ways to talk their language is to have a large group of people so that the impact is quite clear to them.

JOHN REILLY. My original feeling about having, or thinking about having a meeting like this, came out of a realization at one point that it was necessary for the National Endowment and the Council and umpteen other foundations who, such as Ford, and you had a perfect example of that today, who are beginning to think possibly of working in video or expanding programs, to have simply more information about what we've all so painfully constructed working in these areas over the last few years. Now sometimes the information they get is second-hand, sometimes Gerry's on a commission and he can give them some information, sometimes he's not on a commission, sometimes it's a survey which you may or may not have input into. I mean the phone calls were bothering, Jon, where are you? You spoke of those endless phone calls for surveys, but that's exactly how many of these people get the information and sometimes you don't get the phone call and then you're not even included in that report, interestingly enough. So there is a case for, maybe the word is lobbying, there is a case for the fact that we have views, we do exist, we have needs, and some of the needs coincide, some of them don't. But there is a legitimate case, and I think the very fact that we had this meeting establishes the case, that something in the way of a follow-up may be in our best interest. And I think if it's in our best interest, it's a reason to do it. If it's not, it

won't happen. But that's how I feel about it. I don't feel so much that we'll be any better off if we go collectively to Ford. But I do feel that if the organization, even if it's in a loose grouping, at least has information about everyone in it, and has a listing that Ford, when they write the report, will have to contact that organization. Do you understand what I'm saying?

SKIP BLUMBERG. In a way we're talking about visibility and I think that's real important that people at these foundations are educated and they know what we're doing. But in a way I don't think you can force something like that. I think we're all trying and I think occasionally someone will do a project that's big enough, that in some way makes an impact so a lot of people find out about it, it gets press and in a form that people can understand it.

JOHN REILLY. Interestingly enough, it's probably easier for those of us operating in New York City to get press than it would be for you to get press.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Right. Or for something like TVTV, which is shown...

JOHN REILLY. ...nationally, where they get ten reviews.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Right. And I think it's important for us to cooperate on doing these projects together. And I appreciate where Bob would be interested in having something that could help us all, but like you said these meetings, we all have at least one organization, and in Gerry's case there are endless organizations to deal with at the present time. And I'm bothered by the amount of administration and the amount of business I'm doing that takes away from my productions. So I realize its importance, and I guess that's why I realize it's important to do the Directory. And I understand the importance of a meeting like this, to meet people that I haven't met before, to see people whom I haven't seen in a while, and the people that I see all the time, alright, I'll see them again too. But I'd rather meet with something more pragmatic and practical. And I think that, in terms of future relationships, is much more important.

JOHN REILLY. I think that's a valid point, Skip.

SKIP BLUMBERG. I think something that interconnects, something like Survival did in New York City, shows where people are at and what their interests are and you make an impact on a particular region or location or whatever, you interact with your audience by doing something like that. I think, perhaps through Lance's research and doing some kind of microwave interconnect between different artists around the state, I think that would be an interesting thing to meet about. The notion of TVTV, I think if something comes out of that, I think that would be something.

JOHN REILLY. Well, I think what you're saying is we all have projects that are worthy of following up on and worthy of meeting on, but the question is are there enough common interests so that we should think of something in any form of a follow-up to this meeting. And I'd like really just to address ourselves to that one question just for a moment. I'm really curious to hear what the rest of you have to say. Jon.

JON ALPERT. I think the most important thing, just as far as I could see, at this meeting besides meeting everybody and finding out what they could do, and this includes the people from

foundations and organizations who have come here, would be to move beyond the stage of experimentation, and people talking at the Ford Foundation about experimental projects, everybody's been doing these things for a number of years now. When I got the listing from the state of all the projects that had been funded, when I opened up the video section and compared it to all the others, it's the best one. The stuff that we do really affects our community and brings about a tremendous amount of changes in our communities and I think that collectively, we're rendering a great service to the state and video art as a whole is really, I think it's the most important part of the programs that are going on now. And I just feel that the opportunity to tell people who can help us in this work is very, very important and at a minimum I would like to see this type of meeting on a regular basis, not every month, but I would right now like to propose at least that we get together again.

JOHN REILLY. I think that's one proposal that at least we have one follow-up meeting in the near future to this as a possibility. Why don't we just go around the room? Ralph, what do you think about it?

RALPH HOCKING. I'm tired. And it's been a long year and I don't want to do a damn thing until next fall.

JOHN REILLY. One vote for next fall. Dean, you haven't said too much, what do you think about this?

DEAN EVENSON. We had a little experience with April Video Co-op, which is supposed to be a national, organization, of getting people together. And for one reason or another, it wasn't self-supporting, and it didn't continue and it didn't connect with enough groups. And I think it's a good service, if it comes out of itself. And I don't know exactly how it happens. I think the point about getting information about funding together is a very good one because that's a place where I think we all need some help. As far as meeting together, I agree with Skip, I think that working together on projects is the best way to learn about each other. I think that's a good thing if it could happen all over the state and in different parts of the state. I guess that goes along with what Howie's talking about too. There is one other thing, a publication would be nice. We did a publication, People Vision, and it did have a directory and it was of service to some people. That kind of thing, with very loose-form flyers, I could envision it continuing, maybe not in People Vision, but a publication like that, which would continue to print out technical information, modification information, what different people are doing in different areas. That seems to be a vital service and that's a centralized service.

JOHN REILLY. O.K. Jaime.

JAIME BARRIOS. I think we should meet at least once more, at least twice a year, to have an overview of these things. I think, as far as I'm concerned, this would be extremely helpful to understanding what everybody else is doing. But more practically I would rather meet in groups according to the needs people had, around specific issues, technical issues or things connecting whatever.

JOHN REILLY. You see no need for a New York State Association of Video Somethings or whatever? David, what do you think?

DAVID LOXTON. I don't think there are any initials left to create another organization. I think we should all look very carefully at what we're all doing here. I appreciate this meeting for the fact that I realize, do you understand what I'm saying, their goals and ambitions. And the one thing I learned from it is the diversity and the change and the absolute range of things people are doing, which I think are being arbitrarily lumped, either because the Council is simply funding them all or because the word "video" or the word "art" is slapped on this range of activities which goes, as far as I can see, from media consultants to setting up a hospital closed-circuit television system for therapeutic reasons, to this community video system, to the kind of work that I'm involved in, which is video art, high technology video art, broadcast-oriented works and things like that, to the kind of educational work that Gerry is doing. This is such a diversity that I think, with the exception of the fact that it's all got common funding from the Council, there's very little in a lot of cases which links any of us together at all.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. Out of my experience, I disagree with that. This is why I think real-time projects interact with projects that are really meaningful.

DAVID LOXTON. I think I'd be very careful about this use of these various interactive projects and things like that. I mean I think if we're going to have another meeting it should be for specific people who have a specific common goal of something they can jointly work on. I think it's a tendency to have these self-generating, self-perpetuating meetings simply for the sake of another meeting, we all got together and we discussed. But I'm not so sure in a lot of cases what comes out of it. I mean the best things usually happen at meetings when you get together in the corridor during lunch break and discuss something and then go off and do it. I found, for instance, I was excluded from the discussion with Bob when he was talking about the half-inch. Now I don't know, did he really mean half-inch? I think we should talk about technology. I don't work in half-inch, a lot of people here don't work in half-inch. There are people working in one-inch, three-quarter inch. But the word "half-inch" was used blandly to describe something, which I don't think actually relates to a lot of what we're doing. There are a lot of terminologies and technologies, which are generally just thrown around.

GERRY O'GRADY. Definitions, definitions.

DAVID LOXTON. I think it's up to the funding sources. I mean I think most people look blankly when you come in with the range of the people here and they say, "I am a video artist," and they say, "What kind?" I mean there's such a range of things being proposed here and goals and aims. I think everybody should clearly try and classify their own projects and goals.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. People do particular projects for certain reasons on certain levels. Like I know personally that I'd like to get access to your studio when I really feel I have something to do there. And this is based on direct experience of going to other facilities across the state. I could see a hierarchy of facilities becoming more sophisticated or less sophisticated. I think that the range of activities, contrary to being problematic in terms of separating us, really represents an educational facility, for lack of a better word, an experimental facility, a social facility, existing in

the State, that those people who want to interact with each other, work with each other in some kind of creative way, should be encouraged to do that. And I think that's important.

DAVID LOXTON. I disagree with that, but as Bob said earlier, he said that he found out that once he re-classified what his project was, going to the National Endowment for the Arts, going to the New York State Council on the Arts, he said that was not actually where his project was going at all. He was in a whole different area, suddenly a whole different range of funding potential opened up. And I think quite honestly in terms of what a lot of the people here have been describing, a good lot of the work which we do at the Lab, which is not supported by the Council, has nothing to do with the word, in the purest sense of the word "art" in terms of how particular the funding is, money is a big area, how the foundations define what is a work of art. I mean a lot of what we're doing is very sociological, community-oriented kind of work. I think it's totally different from that. I do think it is also valuable because of our facility level, yes. If somebody took some knowledge back and forth between what people are doing, I think it would be very valuable and I would be very happy to be part of the newsletter system, or something like that. I don't think it needs a lot of meetings. I'm really not sure, unless they relate very specifically to projects which a group of people put together with some kind of commonality of goals that they're going to work towards. Just let me say one other thing, I do think that visibility, whatever your project area, is very important, and I do think there should be some serious investigation. I hear conflicting things here about whether people are interested in public television or not interested in public television as either an outlet or a place for work. It is obviously, for all of you, if nothing else, the most obvious place for high visibility. For certain people's work it's obviously inappropriate, but I do think it would be possible, maybe next year, I think the Council should seriously think about the possibility of trying to get a showcase for the works of the various groups supported by the Council, coordinated through a station or something like that. I think that you have to remember with public television stations, a one-shot special is very hard to deal with because one gets lost in the shuffle, one doesn't get the kind of attention that builds up, the kind of publicity which is needed. I mean we're not talking about a cable system, we're not talking about A for Art where over a third of a week word of mouth generates possible interest for this same program. It's going to happen once, maybe twice, and that's the way broadcast television is. So I think it seriously should be done, a serious investigation of a series of the collected sampling of the works, which would be appropriate, and I can't believe you couldn't get 13 or 16 or however many weeks of fascinating programming, which should be available to all the public television stations throughout the State.

SKIP BLUMBERG. How do you think a show like that should be produced? Would you take the responsibility of being producer of it or would you need help?

DAVID LOXTON. I think one public television station would have to take the responsibility simply, whether it's Channel 13, whether it's the Lab, whoever it is, I think for the rest of the station managers, as long as it seems to have that stamp of approval from a director of programming from one of the stations.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Would you be interested in producing a show like that?

DAVID LOXTON. I don't say I would or wouldn't. I just say it should be done. But where it should be done from is a political consideration.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Well, you and the people from Long Island probably know best, in terms of producing a show like that, what the process would be involved, in terms of really taking a look at tapes...

JOHN REILLY. I think we're talking about a whole series of shows, not one show.

SKIP BLUMBERG. What would the next step be involved with? Would a meeting be necessary, would a collection of tapes be necessary, would finding the people that would be involved in producing the show be necessary?

LYDIA SILMAN. I would think that the next step would be for you to approach the station managers or the stations and get them interested enough to, in their proposal next year or the year after to the State Arts Council, to put it in. Because we can't do anything with any type of proposal, unless it comes to us through the normal channels of applying for a grant. And otherwise we cannot give funds at all.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Would you say to get some backing of an individual or a group of individuals to actually produce, to actually sit down and spend, because if you have a 16-week show it's probably going to take 32 weeks.

BOB CIVIELLO. It's going to take major funding too, not major funds but it'll take funding to do it.

LYDIA SILMAN. But Skip, those stations won't listen to you. I mean if you approach a station, if you come to David, David's going to say, "O.K. fine, I'm very interested, but what are you going to do about it? We're not going to pay for it." Channel 13 won't pay for the production of it and neither will WLIW, And so it's a matter of you interesting a station enough so that they will, in their application to the Arts Council, include it.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Well, we all don't want to go around the State and interest them, barrage them and have six stations approached.

JOHN REILLY. Why not? It's a process of all of us should go to these stations and we should talk to them, it's a process of education.

BOB CIVIELLO. It's even simpler than that. They have regular meetings in New York of all the station managers about common problems. Just get into one of those meetings. It's as simple as that.

SKIP BLUMBERG. Maybe the way to do it is not to suggest that any particular one of them produces the show but just to find out whether they'd be interested to have the air time and what are their facilities, what are other local funding sources?

JOHN REILLY. What I was going to suggest in terms of having another meeting is that we have it prior to the next Council deadline with enough time so that we can start off with serious

discussions along these lines. In the meantime many of us will have gone out and contacted stations. You would have looked into the network situation in terms of microwaving and other links between facilities etc. etc. and there should be, logically, if we sat down in a room again, there should be a lot more concrete things that we all could talk about, perhaps put together a series or put together a series with different stations and really do something about it. I mean that would be I think, a possible, logical follow-up to what we're doing now, without having any organization, without having anything, simply having one other meeting prior to the funding period. Next year, that's what I'm talking about, for the next series, because this one's already in. Gerry.

GERRY O'GRADY. Yeah. I'd like to keep meeting like once every six months.

JOHN REILLY. It would be roughly six months.

GERRY O'GRADY. I wouldn't tie it to funding myself particularly and I'd also like to see...

JOHN REILLY. It sounds like you tie everything to funding. That was unfair.

GERRY O'GRADY. But I'd like to see it also include other people, in other words I think George Stoney's part of the picture. He happens to be not funded by the Council but he is in fact even in New York State and there are many others. Foundations tend to look at things very ecologically and they want to know what the Education Department's doing and so it's important that Mike Chase be here. We have to see the whole picture. And if you're going to start a video association to find out what your national and regional needs are and really get them funded, I think the Council is really too small a group. And I don't think it should be related to the funding in any sense.

BOB CIVIELLO. But you relate it to the common interests of the group and that's what has to be determined next. What are the common interests?

GERRY O'GRADY. I think after a couple more of these meetings, my feeling would be you're going to be tied to starting associations. I think it would be very important to have a name. But I think it should be more inclusive. It might even be part of a national organization.

JOHN REILLY. I think that one point that Gerry is raising is good in that we kind of arbitrarily decided the limits just so we could have a room full of people who would or wouldn't be here and we didn't invite George because we defined a certain... But your point is quite correct, I mean there are a lot of other facilities and other places in the State that could be represented in the room and we should consider that. So what I'm going to suggest, before we now try and solidify this thing too quickly, let's think about this a little bit and try and involve some of these people and go talk to them, those of us who know them and find out how we could broaden it a little bit and then perhaps get something together. And I'm being very unspecific about it because the history of video, in terms of meetings, has always been that we jump too quickly and try and do something. And we've all succeeded to a degree by building our own organizations and by cooperating as best we can. And what has never succeeded and again I can only point to a history of four years, which is very little, is we've never had a super-structure that actually worked, beyond the quick meeting. And I think there have been reasons for that and perhaps, at this point, let's not be too hasty about making

a super-structure. I would suggest, since it has just really come up, that we think about it a little bit and try to include other people, broaden the base a little bit of who we have here.

JOE SEAL. Well, I would just like to say that I like this idea of having a steering committee, rather than, you know a mini-structure rather than the super-structure that you're concerned about, and they would do some of the leg work between now and September, over the summertime and get to people about their specific concerns for the conference. And then you can set up special workshops where you get a lot of technical people coming in to talk about innovations and things they've been doing because I think that would be an important common concern that I see. And then also one of the things, it looks like everyone's shying away from the lobbying aspect but maybe if the Council would be able to use some of these fund-raisers. Don't you have fund-raisers that you pay or consultants that you pay?

LYDIA SILMAN. There's nobody who's experienced in the area of fund-raising for video.

JOE SEAL. As part of that program, though, can you get a "grantsman" who could?

LYDIA SILMAN. Do you mean to hire somebody? Any non-profit organization could approach me and ask for technical assistance to pay a fund-raiser. Now in the past we've done this and I don't know that anybody's turned up any funds. They haven't in fact.

RALPH HOCKING. Can I come back for a minute? One of the mistakes I think we made on this is I think the funding organizations got a dimmer view of us than they would have had they been here yesterday. I think this can probably be remedied, Gerry's got an idea, a short descriptive understanding of what's going on, maybe that's what's coming out in the things you guys are working on.

SHERRY MILLER. I think it's a little unfair to expect people from foundations to sit here, how long did we sit here yesterday and today? It's just too much, but it's possible and everybody is beginning to develop a concise statement about what their interests are and what they're concerned with and what they've done. And I think this is the kind of information that I think these people need because I think quite a lot of them didn't have any idea even which group we were from let alone what we're trying to do.

LYDIA SILMAN. I'll explain to you what happened. First of all the purpose of today's meeting with foundations wasn't to educate them to what video's about, which might be a next meeting that I might set up, it was more to bring them here as experts on fund-raising and how to approach foundations. They were invited, everybody was invited to yesterday's meeting. Now we have taped both days and it will be typed up and sent to then, so they will have copies of everything. I hope to set up another meeting, possibly with David Stewart from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, who might set up a seminar with me, with the orientation to be what's going on in video in New York State as an educational process for them.

RALPH HOCKING. Do you think that's going to be useful?

LYDIA SILMAN. I think it will. I think that with David's help that we will get, let's say a larger number of foundation representatives to a meeting like that. And I think that would be helpful. But the reasons for them not being here yesterday were because they couldn't attend at all.

JOHN REILLY. With the exception of Nancy. We're delighted.

NANCY RAINE. I've certainly enjoyed it a lot. It's an education for myself as much as anything else and I also wanted to meet you all. But I'm not taking back any kind of nasty messages about us.

JOHN REILLY. I have a feeling we should continue around the room and get everybody's reaction to what the future might be of our meeting, the group, planning, whatever. Ken, I think you're next.

KEN MARSH. I guess I'm not at a level, in terms of the project I'm involved with, to be secure enough to begin to talk about working with other people. I think it's important. I think what I'm trying to deliver as my idea, I see it as necessary and certainly the right time for a general meeting about the workings of the State. But I find it hard, for me personally at this time to talk about more meetings or more paper. What was valuable to me here was valuable because it hasn't happened in a long time and I think whatever went down would have been useful to all of us. Six months, I'm not sure enough is going to change individually in what people are doing to make it valuable for people to listen to each other. So I favor getting together on a work-oriented thing but I have to go back over my own idea and that was some sort of overview, handled by the Council in terms of its funding. I don't know how it should manifest this, it's up to Gil, Peter and Lydia, it's also up to the legal limitations of the Council and how much they can manage affairs, it's also up to us in terms of our responsiveness and that kind of thing. I think if there are some people who want to, like Howie's talking about traveling and working together throughout the State. I think that should be supported. I also think there might be some other focuses for people to work together even by staying in their own relative areas or within specific interests. But I do think some kind of overview and some kind of directed control coming from the State Council would be the greatest contribution for myself, for where I'm at. By the way, and I said this to a few people, I was surprised that there is as much interest in broadcast as there is. I'm impressed with almost what everybody is doing. I was in the city myself and working with Jon and Jaime and left the city because I didn't have my community, there was no white middle-class community that was in the Village that really clicked with that kind of thing. But I found it up in Woodstock and it's kind of a minority situation unlike many of the others we talked about, a white upper middle-class suburban area, it's not like where most of you are working. And there are unique problems. The only potential there is cable, not broadcast. But a lot of my interests are different and what you were talking about in terms of getting together can't be my highest priority at this time. But I don't want to put a thing out and say this shouldn't be done, I don't want to take that stance. I just have to be cool and see where things go. I think that the steering committee's a good idea and as the months go on maybe things will develop in Woodstock that could relate to things. I think it should be open.

JOHN REILLY. O.K. I think that's a good summary. Allan.

ALLAN WINER. Well, I just think there should be some form of communication and exchange of ideas with most everyone here. It need not be at this conference type session, and it need not be

sponsored by the Council. The alternative might be the emergence of video tribes throughout the State.

JOHN REILLY. Video tribes?

ALLAN WINER. You know, people sort of working without having any contact with the outside.

JOHN REILLY. I'm getting a sense so far that many of you are saying working together in areas of common interest and having that more as a logical follow-up rather than trying to unite a large, diverse group in an artificial situation. And Skip is nodding very strongly to that. No, he's rocking. Well, why don't you rock into a comment about this?

SKIP BLUMBERG. Alright. I guess what I said before is pretty much how I feel. I feel in touch with a lot of projects around the State, so I don't feel it's necessary in a way to have other meetings. Although if there were another meeting I'm sure I would be here or somebody else from my farm. I can say something concrete and that's this: we produce a show every Saturday night at 7:00 called Lanesville Television and it goes to anywhere from 10 to 150 people in our community, it's a small rural, mountain community and we appreciate getting any kind of information for this show. We have half-inch equipment and one-inch IVC and we'd love to see any interesting tapes, with very little restrictions. Plus if anyone would like to come up and participate they're welcome if they call up. Or if something is happening, if they're at some news event, if they'll call around 7:00 on Saturday night, if they're interested at all in being on TV live in a small community, we appreciate that. All these things happen generally and we're very open to this and usually we serve dinner after the show. And we have a place to stay if you'd like to stay over, although that's getting more and more dear to us as we live with each other more. Also this spring we'll be having the second annual Why Don't We Do It in the Road. Last year was the first annual Why Don't We Do It in the Road. I don't know if we'll exactly do it in the road this year, it might be in the field, but Sandy came over and Ken was there. There were 7 portapaks, we just asked the people to bring a portapak, a battery charger and a deck and a camera and a monitor. And we just went out and made a half-hour, actually it was only about a 15-minute tape. It took the whole afternoon to get it together and we played it back and it was kind of fun. And I think it would work with three or four packs and the fantasy is to get 50 or 60 all together at the same time. So we'll be sending word around about it soon. Again we'll put up as many people as we can, particularly for this event and I think it will be fun. And I guess so we travel around and we do events around the State and we travel to communities throughout the year. And if you hear that we're going to be nearby, again please come by. The way we work, we've been working with each other an awful lot and when somebody else comes up, we try to suck out whatever inspiration and energy that we possibly can. And we find that when you open up a situation like that, not only to people in the community, but to other people who are working in the field, that it always makes the event better. We never have problems with it being too disorganized or anything like that so again if you hear about anybody doing anything like that just come by.

JOHN REILLY. O.K. Good.

RALPH HOCKING. It seems to be that one of the joys and pleasures of half-inch is avoiding bureaucracies and structures, feeling your own independence and not having to answer to higher-

ups. Forming a definite structure of meetings and trying to form a superstructure of half-inch, I think it might become frightening and a little bit dangerous.

JOHN REILLY. Then we'd all have to quit and join another group. Form a counter-group. That's a good point. Lance.

LANCE WISNIEWSKI. I guess that out of this meeting the video inter-connection and networking study will continue throughout the see it as a big question of publicity and making the local groups, wherever possible, aware of us and what we do. And I think the more we do in this respect the better it is. And I don't know. I'd like to see another meeting in the next six months. I wouldn't want to make a formal commitment as far as a formal structure is concerned. But again I think we still are lacking this expertise around the area of fund-raising. I think we've got artists galore, but fund-raisers, administrators, we don't have in many cases. And I think we need more of them. We have to educate, it has to be a reverse process, we have to educate foundations and industry about ourselves as well as us educating ourselves about them.

JOHN REILLY. Howie.

HOWIE GUTSTADT. Well, I guess personally I feel the process of finding a meaningful way to work with each other is really well along its way. And I'd like to see that continue in ways that really help us deal with this kind of economic quality by trading off skills and energy and hardware in a little bit more planned fashion, in the next year to come. And I guess I'll be notifying a lot of people as plans become finalized for the Rochester event so that people from different facilities can offer crews and personnel and stuff like that so we can have a real-time project together that we can just do at the time.

SANDY ROCKOWITZ. I've got to echo what Ralph said. I'm tired. It's been an exhausting couple of days. Just a few kind of random reactions. I think the value for me has come in terms of meeting several people who went out of their way, the pressure of trying to pack everything into two days. And also the talking about what we're doing because I think the way we really get to know each other is by looking at tape and by working together. I would very much want to see it opened up. I think that's very important. There was a newspaper review recently, which referred to us as the local video establishment. Portable Channel - and that's a little frightening to become the establishment in a couple years. And I think there's a lot of other video energy in the State and people who aren't in groups, you mentioned George Stoney. It's a geographic process in which we're including everybody. Also there have been a lot of people who have said, let the Council do it. And I think that it's very good that the Council brings everybody together. But I think if we want to speak, we should be doing it ourselves, that it's not the Council's role to be acting as a spokesman. As Lydia said, its role is primarily responsive. If it takes on the spokesman role then it might create real contradictions. Also I think the need is not for a formal superstructure. I get a few cringes at the thought of somebody setting State policy for us and deciding what we would be. One last thought, I'd really like to explore the possibility of programming on public broadcast. It's something that we've been interested in and there may be things that could be done. We may even see what we can do with WXXI in Rochester. And that's it.

JOHN REILLY. I think the very strength of the room is the diversity and the fact that many of you have gone to the trouble of creating your own groups and getting them a non-profit status and making and building things, which is an exciting thing to do. And I think that the trend of trying to force it into another direction is a mistake and I think that is the consensus of feeling, thus far in going around the room, we're almost done, is that we should not go into a structure and that the energies, the good energies, that have emerged from your activities have been that very strength, everyone in the room has it to one degree or another. And it is not a pulling together, in a sense, but a healthy structuring and a lot of good examples. I think that to me is what I'm picturing, you may see it differently. But alright, let's continue. I didn't mean to interject that. Bob.

BOB CIVIELLO. I want to agree with that, John. I really think that whatever common interest we share, if any, and whatever they are, we should work together on. And that's basically the point that I brought up in the beginning. As far as our station, the pilot that we produced. Reel to Reel, is being submitted to PBS and we've had some encouraging remarks from them about it. Hopefully we'll be able to get it on the network, and if so it would be a real breakthrough for the entire concept of video art. We're planning to do a series in the fall and if anyone would like to speak to us when we're done about possibly working together on it, I'd be more than happy to speak to anyone and everyone.

GERRY O'GRADY. I speak to two unpopular causes, I guess, one administration and the other structure or organization. As you can probably see, I don't make tapes so my aesthetic is more looking at social structures. And last year at one point there were six major foundations looking for skilled executives, one at the Endowment, one at the Endowment for the Humanities, etc. So there's enormous, there are no administrators that have any concept, I think, or very little concept of what's going on, outside of the Council. To give you some example, the National Endowment for the Arts, I recognized their problem and asked the National Endowment and the Council to give me Andy Beecher. It takes quite a while, he's the one that prepared our itemized $3,000,000 budget and so forth. It's just a beginning, we've now approached some foundations. He's now the assistant director for the National Endowment for the Arts. They essentially self-financed the grant and he's there, you see, and I've now got to find someone else. And it's really difficult. Three major foundations, including Rockefeller for example, are looking for a person just to administer the grants. So all those jobs are open. They're all $25,000 or $30,000 jobs. But there's no one even able to do them, no one trained at all. So that's a problem and that's something to get into. Then I think the funding, you have to realize that the people are immersed, if you're in Chloe Aaron's office, she works seven days a week, she gets not a terribly high salary for what she's doing. She doesn't have time to respond to the 400 grants, not to mention trying to keep up. So there's simply a problem of keeping up. I mean, they're human just like we are, working just as many hours as you are. They're not getting enormously well paid for what they're trying to do. And then I think there's a problem of, I think they have very little power. My own feeling is that at the Council the power largely resides in the panelists. I mean all that Gil and Lydia do is advise and put forward. But then the panel, it's not the final decision they make, but pretty much the start. The National Endowment's the same way. I think there's a reluctance when they meet you to promise very much because they really don't have power, they can just suggest to their 15-man panel at the Endowment and often things that they think are terrific their panel votes down. The officers at the private foundations are frustrated and that's why they're all resigning, because they have no power. I mean they can't even bring their grants up to a group of trustees who have no concept of what we're doing

whatsoever. So if Howard meets with you and helps you re-write your proposal to get it through a group that has absolutely no knowledge and no relation to the arts and very little relation to social structure. They're a group of trustees. They get enormous pressure from you psychically and they're your champions but they have very little power. So they're very reluctant to commit anything to you because they can't. And they're terribly frustrated you see. And so I think that's part of it. And I think without funding you can do nothing else so then I'd speak to structure and I've just written a paper on structure for this national group, because I think you have to have some organization eventually. But I don't think it should be connected with funding. I feel like they should declare the need and broadcast the needs but some foundation shouldn't have to go to some national group to say, "Are they O.K.?" You shouldn't put anyone in between you and the foundation. But there should be a group that gets together and specifies the needs and what the resources are and all of that. And I think unless we have that, the problem that foundations have now is that, when you send in a grant they have to send out the peer judgment to ten other groups, ten people, and they can never get anyone to agree. And so in a sense, until we all strengthen ourselves, each program, we won't make an impact, so that the foundation officer can then send out, and ten people can write in and say what you're doing is terrific, there's not going to be funding. So what I suggest is you get a steering group, meet again in six months, and then eventually move toward forming organizations and organizing would include all the parties in the state and I also would think, as Skip said in the beginning, it's not a state phenomenon, I'm much more beginning to think there's a national group.

KEN MARSH. Gerry, would you go back to your first part about administration? Lydia said that her job is to be responsive to what we, the applicants, the grant recipients, think. The idea which I keep putting out that is not popular, obviously, is people mostly see it coming from the top down and I see the potential for it to come from us, to the Policy decision makers, and then to come back down to us in some kind of way that's probably going to be a similar compromise but some kind of compromise we can all live with because we've seen it coming, we've seen what working together has done in conceiving the program. But do you see this organization getting together and relating to the Council as a funder in that way or to any Council or funding organization that could bring pressure to bear?

GERRY O'GRADY. It's a form of psychic influence.

KEN MARSH. On the basis of an organization saying it's responsive, I've got to question any kind of coercion or psychic influence.

GERRY O'GRADY. The response of a foundation to us should be a quality, whatever it is we're doing, is it being done well? And I think what a group can do is say these are the reasons why these things are important, why they have to be done and so forth. And then create interchange, communication journals, tapes, all of that to keep us all informed.

KEN MARSH. But you sat on the Council, you were one of those who made the decisions, right? What I'm trying to suggest is some other mechanism, in other words your responsibility and your responses and even more direct contact between you and the decision-maker. Say that if a number of the Council panel were here today and they saw what went on these couple of days and they

saw, well, broadcast is a consensus interest. And now going into April or May and looking over funding if they directed that towards broadcast.

GERRY O'GRADY. I don't think that has been the consensus.

KEN MARSH. Again, I'm just making a case of something.

GERRY O'GRADY. Yeah, I agree. You see the problem is, and everyone's aware of this, I mean the panels are questioning because the Endowment meets and they went through 200 grants and they arrive on the plane with three big notebooks of material that they're supposed to have read everything you've written. And they all openly admit that they don't know. They can't possibly have time, any more than we can, to keep in touch with it all. And so that's the problem. They can only be as responsive as possible, it's the worst of a bad system, I think. In other words, the Council's understaffed, if more money goes into administration, there's less for grants. They try to get peer groups, which I think is the best way. I think the Council and the Endowment are better than the private foundations in that sense. And then what I fought for when I did that sub deal, that super-panel, was that they must openly announce who's on the panel, and that's now public information. All of you should know that it's perfectly proper to request and find out who it is on the panel and send them information and so forth.

LYDIA SILMAN. Gerry, let me clarify something. Our grant money has nothing to do with our administrative money. It comes out of two separate budgets. And if our administrative budget goes up, it doesn't mean that our grant money goes down, in the state. Now I don't know if it's true on a national level. Our administrative budget does not come out of that thirty million.

GERRY O'GRADY. The thing is, no one knows very much. There's very little print material. There's more print material here than I've seen in a long time. And we have done more basic things like Howie's thing with access and video resource center. We've got a lot of factual material but there's very little other kinds of material. The foundations, I think, are completely uninformed. But it's partly because of the burden of work. They're working seven days a week and they can't possibly respond to it all. And then they get together and they fight, I'm just talking about Chloe Aaron's situation, she fought for a line just to get an assistant for eight months and then she couldn't fill it because she couldn't find someone qualified. I mean that's the situation up there and they're probably more responsive than any other group.

LYDIA SILMAN. It's awfully hard on a national basis. I think it's easier for the Council to be responsive. I don't think we're all that understaffed.

GERRY O'GRADY. I agree. I'm talking about other foundations.

GIL KONISHI. But NEA has an almost impossible job.

GERRY O'GRADY. I mean it comes up to giving video grants and the reason is they have to get five person staff to administer. And that's a tragedy. The A.F.I, because of a crazy history, gets a million dollars to give out to filmmakers, to individuals, up to ten grand each, and there's nothing for video. And they've been reluctant to enable any organization to do it. And I think there's a lot

of danger being connected with the visual arts thing because we're just a little appendage there. There's a little money, like $3,000 for ten people, but what you need is like $3,000,000.

JOHN REILLY. I think we've reached the point of exhaustion. It's been two full days and an evening. I think we're going to have to leave it fairly open in terms of what will happen next. And we'll all have to pursue the specific areas that interest us. I mean I'll certainly pursue with Bob and others the question of public television stations. I know Lance will pursue the networking thing. You're going to look more into some of the questions you've raised, I'm sure. And I have a feeling that that's a good healthy way of leaving this and not attempting to force something on the meeting. The consensus obviously isn't there right now and I think you'd agree with that. At some future point it may be and we may find willingness, or a desire, or a need, to form more of a structure. I think at this point we really don't have that. But I think that what happened is, in a sense, very historic. It's the first meeting of its type in New York State, encompassing all of the range of activity. I think a lot was accomplished, I feel that. I think it was great that we could get together. I think a lot of things were brought up and discussed that really hadn't been dealt with before. I think most of us learned a great deal about the other groups which we hadn't had a chance to really find out about and learned about interests that are common. And I know for a fact that I will have areas of cooperation with other people now that I can work out simply by knowing what they're doing and how we can begin to work together. And I think in that sense we've really accomplished something and created something. And I think that is a great deal to have accomplished as a result of the first meeting of its type. I think that the fact that the Council was willing to undertake getting us all here and arranging the building and doing all the things that Lydia and Gil and Peter did; we really owe them a debt of thanks. And hope in the future that we'll be at a point that we can start doing some of these things, it may happen. It may happen.