National Video Festival
Presented by The American Film Institute  Sponsored by Sony Corporation of America

The State of the Art

At the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Washington, D.C.
June 3—7, 1981
National Video Festival
June 3 - 7, 1981 At the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts Washington, D.C.

Presented by
The American Film Institute
Sponsored by
Sony Corporation of America
Festival

Contents

At-a-glance Schedule 4

Introductions 9
by Jean Firstenberg, director, The American Film Institute
by Koichi Tsunoda, president, Sony Video Products, and
vice president, Sony Corporation of America

Production Notes 10
by Larry Kirkman, festival producer

Television Time 11
by James Hindman, festival director

Events: Wednesday, June 3
Screening: First Person Video 16
Screening: Informational Video 18
Screening: The Video Record 19
Symposium: The Video Landscape of Washington, DC 23
Screening: DC Video 24

Events: Thursday, June 4
Screening: Premiere: "I Don’t Matter: I Don’t Care" 27
by Michael Marton
Screening: Young Videomakers: Winners of the 1981
National Video Festival Student Competition 27
Keynote: by Eric Barnsou
Student Awards Presentation 33
Reception: Kennedy Center Theater Lab 34

Events: Friday, June 5
Screening & Symposium: EFX 35
Screening: Premiere: 38
A videotape by Brian Eno
Symposium: The Future of the Video Experience 38
Screening & Symposium: The Video Record 39

Events: Saturday, June 6
Screening: Premiere/Work-In-Progress:
"Some of These Stories are True"
A tape by Peter Adair, Gayle Peabody and Pat
Jackson, directed by Peter Adair 41
Screening: Premiere: "Savage/Love"
Written by Joseph Chaikin and Sam Shepard,
directed by Shirley Clarke, starring Joseph
Chaikin 42
Screening: Premiere: "The Lessons"
A videotape by Robert Ashley & John Sanborn
from Robert Ashley’s PERFECT LIVES
(PRIVATE PARTS), an opera for television 43
Screening & Symposium: They Speak For Themselves 44
Screening & Symposium: The Art of Information 47

Events: Sunday, June 7
Symposium: Untold Stories 50
Screening & Symposium: Original Programming for the
New Media 51
Screening: Festival Reprise 52

Installation: Nam June Paik 53

Ongoing Events
Retrospective Selections From:
Downtown Community Television (DCTV) 57
Top Value Television (TVTV) 60
Videospolis 61
Optic Nerve 62
Anti Farm 64
University Community Video 66
Global Village 68
New Orleans Video Access Center (NOVAC) 70
Media Bus, Inc./Lanesville TV 72
The Kitchen 74
Long Beach Museum of Art 76
Whitney Museum of American Art 78
University Art Museum 80
Museum of Modern Art 82
WNED/THIRTEEN TV Lab 84
## AFI Theater Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>10:30-Noon Screening: First Person Video</td>
<td>10:30 am Screening: Premiere &quot;I Don't Matter; I Don't Care&quot;</td>
<td>10:30-11:30 am Screening/ Presentation: &quot;Some of These Stories Are True&quot;</td>
<td>10:30-Noon Symposium: Untold Stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Noon-1:00 pm Screening/ Presentation: Premiere &quot;Savage Love&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>1:30-3:00 pm Screening: Informational Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>2:00-3:00 pm Screening: Student Competition Winners</td>
<td>2:30 pm Screening: Premiere &quot;Brian Eno&quot;</td>
<td>2:30-3:00 pm Screening: Premiere &quot;The Lessors&quot;</td>
<td>2:30-5:00 pm Symposium/ Screening: Original Programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>3:30-5:30 pm Screening: The Video Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>4:30-6:00 pm Symposium: The Future of the Video Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 pm</td>
<td>8:00-9:30 pm Symposium: The Video Landscape of Washington Keynote: Erik Barnouw</td>
<td>8:00-9:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 pm-Midnight</td>
<td>9:00-12:30 am Screening: DC Video</td>
<td>9:00-Noon Screening/ Symposium: The Art of Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Theater Lab

There are two video exhibition areas in the Theater Lab:
- **A** a 30-inch monitor;
- **B** a 72-inch projector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Registration (A) Downtown</td>
<td>Community Television (B) The Kitchen</td>
<td>(A) Videopolis (B) Museum of Modern Art</td>
<td>(A) Media Bus. Inc., Lanesville (B) Downtown Community Television</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) University Community Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>(A) Top Value</td>
<td>Television (B) Long Beach Museum of Art</td>
<td>(A) The Kitchen (B) Top Value Television</td>
<td>(A) University Art Museum (B) Videopolis</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Optic Nerve</td>
<td>(A) New Orleans Video Access Center (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Long Beach Museum of Art (B) Optic Nerve</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Museum of Modern Art</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) Art Lab</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Art Lab</td>
<td>(A) New Orleans Video Access Center (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Museum of Modern Art</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Whitney Museum of American Art (B) The TV Lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A) University Art Museum (B) New Orleans Museum of Art (C) National Museum of the American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 pm-Midnight</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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It “festival” is truly a “time of celebration marked by special observances,” then this first national event observing the achievement of our youngest and most accessible art form is indeed a festival. It celebrates, in a way no other event has done, the accomplishments, the possibilities, the creative genius of the entire field. It celebrates, as well, the institute’s strong new commitment to video and television. And, finally, it celebrates the successful partnership of private industry and public interest.

With the support, encouragement, and sponsorship of Sony Corporation of America, the institute is taking new steps to fulfill its mandate to preserve, promote, and improve television and video. Our involvement in television and video is now as broad as those fields—encompassing non-broadcast as well as broadcast television; informational, art, and documentary work; commercial and independent productions; and also viewers, critics, producers, artists, funders. The range of participants at this festival is indicative of that breadth. Where else can one find, in a single symposium, ABC’s president of broadcast operations and engineering, a founder of The Kitchen, an artist-professor from Chicago, the director of video for the New York State Council on the Arts, and the engineer responsible for “Live from the Met”?

Bringing together individuals and institutions with similar goals has been a major aspect of our work and a significant accomplishment of the festival. The Sundance Institute, the TV Lab, the Association of Independent Video and Film Makers, the International Federation of Local Cable Programmers, and dozens of other exhibitors, production centers, and membership groups have made substantial contributions to the “special observances” of the festival.

We want to welcome participants, exhibitors, students, and special guests and to thank each one for the interest and enthusiasm that have made the festival an exciting “first” for the institute. And we want to welcome the world of television and video to its proper place with The American Film Institute.
During the preparations for the festival, I would sometimes pause to question our working assumption that there exists an essential value in stringing together diverse producers and shows that contributed to the development of video production during the Seventies. But the needed assurance came in the contacts I made with the participants in the festival—from commercial broadcast, the new technologies, public television, community video, information video, and the art world. We share many common concerns about the future of television and video.

There is a common feeling that video criticism has to be developed and refined. Producers are looking for new production models. Everyone readily admits to having doubts about the influence of new technologies on the conventional aesthetics, crafts, and working methods of TV and film.

Many of the hard lines drawn between these diverse areas of production have blurred recently. As the video record develops, the music industry is turning to artists who have been experimenting with video and music for small audiences in galleries and alternative industrial sectors have experience in production for specialized audiences that has become invaluable for producers in the new consumer video technologies. Community television has been gaining ground in original program formats and its success in audience involvement contains many lessons for other information producers. Broadcasters and independent artists have found common ground in image manipulation and technical experimentation.

The work of Downtown Community Television (DCTV) has emerged as a highlight of this festival because it cuts across so many of these production areas. DCTV produces journalism for NBC and PBS documentaries. Last year in DCTV's video workshops, 2,000 participants from Chinatown community produced more than 200 video programs, DCTV has worked in targeted audience information and training production and has developed significant non-broadcast distribution. The latest venture is fiction film currently being prepared by Jon Alpert at the Sundance Institute. Some of this work, especially “Health Care: Your Money or Your Life,” demonstrates a new mix of techniques and purposes that reflects their total production experience. “Health Care” uses a complex narration with verite footage structured for dramatic effect, but the work is rooted in a respect for its subjects and audience. It is a rare achievement for a program to move an audience to tears and at the same time present complex information that demands an active judgment.

In maintaining a commitment to all facets of its work, DCTV provides a symbol for the festival. It forces us to confront the difficult questions that result from the juxtaposition of diverse areas of production. DCTV is also featured in a 30-hour retrospective of alternative video of the Seventies. The work of documentary collective, community video centers, and independent artists tested the limits of the medium by engaging new technology as it developed and by creating new TV formulas.

Portable video, a factor in most of the work shown here, changed the nature of television by entering the lives of its creators to record them as subjects and to offer a tool for their own use. Small format video has broken down the barriers between professional and amateur video. It is working conditions that will change the relationship between documentary and subject, director and actor, producer and audience. Many of the advances in the past ten years in broadcast news, in advertising, and workplace video can be traced to the battles that were fought for the acceptance of experimental and portable small-format production.

In some cases the success of the tapes in this retrospective can be measured by the speed with which their approaches were absorbed into commercial television. In other cases the success is measured in the development of an audience under adverse conditions, or in supportive critical response where the audience has been minimal. In many cases the support for these works has become legendary. They deserve, in institutional and historical context, a critical assessment not afforded them since their first reviews.

Providing an institutional and historical viewing context is a difficult problem. Broadcast journalists, artists, community producers—indeed, all with a tape in the festival—are concerned about the context for its presentation. A movie theatre or an open hall does not usually provide an adequate setting for viewing television. Very little of the work we are showing was designed for isolated theatrical viewing. However, theatrical projection is reasonable when the exhibition is seen as part of a forum, as a way to address issues in television/video with these tapes serving as models.

The primary purpose of this festival is to provide an opportunity to see video and talk about it. Many of the most active and creative producers watch very little tape even in their own production areas, much less in others which seem tangential to their own day-to-day work. Some of the context for the screenings is provided by the symposia and by the program notes. But it is in the informal gatherings, with the opportunity they provide for impromptu discussion, where we hope to establish the value of our diversity. Much of what unites the various interests in TV and video is an uncertainty about the future. There is a common feeling that new technologies have been delivered before society knows what they are good for. Producers as disparate as news broadcasters and gallery artists are asking, “What kind of electronic environment do we want to live in?” Video is demanding a consciously articulated effort by producers to see individual works in relation to the means of their distribution and the role of the audience. As Brecht said, audiences “sit not only in our theaters, but also in the world.”

A major purpose of this festival is to provide an opportunity to reflect on television: its diversity, its rich heritage of experimentation and innovation, its unrealized potential as a mode of connection to all parts of our lives. Television, however, does not lend itself to reflection. For most of us, the act of watching and listening to television is an immersion in a compelling flow of imagery and information. To be thoughtful during this process requires a conscious regimen of observation, choice and action: an unusually direct assertion in the usually passive process of watching television.

Developing this festival—choosing new work to premiere, for example—has forced me to think about television in entirely new ways. Although I have produced, taught and written about television for some years, my initial training and creative work occurred in the theatre. I entered television seeing it not so much as a discipline but rather as a creative outflow. Helping to structure this festival and to make choices about its purpose and content has given me a new relationship to the field as a whole, as a complex and disparate form. The television video works we screened were created for many different purposes, audiences and distribution modes, and many different formats. What are the common elements that connect these various forms of television and video?

The television experience is grounded in the circumstances in which it is usually watched: informally, in a lighted space, in the ongoing social flow of our daily lives. The conversational style of the talking TV head, present in our homes as an accepted family member, enhances the Bureau that we can talk back. Television seems to have much more in common experimentally with the telephone than with the formal beauty and power of the film, a fundamentally different mode of communication. Our phones, radios and TV sets connect us to a larger conversation, a bigger party for which we don’t have to get dressed up or go out.

The television experience is best ap-
proached as a process. Indeed the term “product” for scripts or programs seems like a misnomer — what is ever fixed or settled on television? Television is about now, this moment, the constant present tense: without a watch or a clock hardly we use the TV to find out what time it is. We spend time and we measure time with television (e.g., the program schedule, which most of us also use as a calendar). We watch it to see how other people spend their time. The one constant reference we have on television is time.

Critic David Antin points out that time is also the structural basis of television, from commercial placement to the sequence of shows. In fact, most of us don’t really watch programs; we watch television — a rich, complex flow of time that flickers and Changes but always keeps us in the present.

In helping to develop the retrospective section of this festival I have viewed many historically and critically important videotapes. This viewing made abundantly clear the time-bound nature of television programs. Tapes have dated quickly, not only in visual styles and technologies, but in deeper attitudes about the nature of television and of the society which it reproduces and from which it emerges. Needless to say, the most innovative work appears to be the most recent, no matter how dated its surface. On the other hand, the past is always part of the present, especially in television. The ubiquitous reruns of commercial broadcasts become the treasured snapshots of a family album — Lucy and Ethel are simply part of an extended family of dotty relatives and favorite memories.

In order to find a more systematic way to reflect on television, I have divided television into four categories: private time, public time, program time and viewing time.

The first of these television time experiences refers to the personal time of the viewer. Television programs help us dispose of our private moments in various ways: through the easy relaxation of entertainment; through the work of learning via training tapes, documentaries, news or information shows; through the illusion of companionship on talk shows; through generalized distraction while we do other things with the TV on.

Private time is involved in the television experience in two closely connected ways — in the attitudes about our time that programs implicitly and explicitly contain, and in the time-spending choices we make by the viewing we select. Television tells us, as we tell television, what to think about our time from one moment to the next. Full or empty, agitated or calm, dramatic or objective, fragment or extended, distracted or engaged, we share our time together through television.

Michael Morton’s sensitive document “I Don’t Matter, I Don’t Care” shares the private time of its characters in an intimate, verite style; its subject is how they spend personal time and time’s effect on their lives.

Through its presentation of larger events, television also mediates public time for us. Space shuttles and assassination coverage, big games and award ceremonies, news and public events are conveyed to us through the so-called window on the world. Broadcast and VTR records give us an opportunity to look without having to participate, feeling directly affected by public events. Our responsible citizenship cannot be called into question as long as we watch together the events of the mythic global village and some of the most effective video by artists (especially those working in the Nam June Paik tradition) comments wryly on the mediated nature of public time on television.

The other two categories of television time refer more directly to the experience of viewing. Program time focuses on the specific structural decisions that shape a particular television or video work. Although we seldom watch a single show without seeing something before or afterward, each program (and this is especially true of those made for informational uses, new markets, or home distribution) is designed as a distinct entity with its own time structure. The 30-second spot, the commonest and shortest form of program design, has a meticulously crafted progression and rhythm. Program time is a useful analytical tool to help us understand how to relate our attention process to internal structural devices in any format, for any program. Program time suggests how we view, listen and respond, reflected in a series of production decisions that reach from scripting through editing. This may be the most accessible way to think about television, because these time patterns are clear in the finished program. Clarke’s “Savage/Love,” Eno’s new work and Ashley’s “Lessons” are complex layers of duration patterns and visual rhythms. Time is the clue to structure and design in these programs.

Viewing time is a concept that gives a fuller context to the time experience of television. Watching broadcast television is usually a process of jumping into and ongoing current of sounds and images, only superficially distinguished from each other by designations of separate shows, commercials and spots, beginnings and endings. We tend to watch in chunks of varied attention that have little to do with the boundaries of the television schedule. The playback and search capabilities of newer video technologies make the reality of viewing time even more distinct from program time. We choose what and when we watch, thereby individually structuring our television experiences. Narrative forms and story-telling structures like those in Peter Adair’s tape “Some of These Stories are True” work differently in a viewing time approach that takes into account the attention patterns of the viewer.

Clearly, time is not the only way to approach television. For example, space issues (in the video image, in viewing circumstances, in visual information, and so on) also might provide an effective methodology. What is critical, however, is the necessity to develop approaches to television that include the personal reality of the viewer. Because it is a communications process, television exists as a direct relationship between image and viewer. Television audiences, however, exist in the abstract for most critics and producers. The assumptions we make about that absent audience and its involvement with the programs it watches will directly shape television’s future. These assumptions must be articulated and tested against the experience of watching television in all its forms. Only then will television generate a useful literature and criticism, something oddly absent from such a pervasive and powerful medium.

The most useful metaphor I have found in thinking about television is the act of conversation. It reflects the sharing of experiences, the rhythm of exchange, of rest and forward motion that I experience in making and viewing television. There are strategies in any conversation, things unsaid, moments of disengagement, a wider circle of attention. There are also two sides to conversation; sometimes we hear each other, sometimes we speak without listening. The television experience closely parallels conversation.

This festival provides an opportunity to reflect on the many forms our television conversations take. At our most involved we talk about, and listen to, the things that matter most to us. The television experience is at the heart of our lives. We must listen thoughtfully to what we are saying to ourselves.
**June 3 Wednesday**

10:00 a.m. **Registration**

10:30-Noon **Screening**

First Person Video: The Artist as Performer and Self-Documentarian

Personal narrative is both a tool and an expressive form for artists and writers. Journals, diaries, autobiographies and self-portraits give artists the opportunity to separate from themselves, to create a dialogue with facets of their experience and concerns. In personal narration and imagery the writer/creator is able to be free from any obligation to “objectivity.” At the same time, however, the very act of creating the diaristic work sets up a liberating distance between the artist and the subject/ self that can trigger astounding revelations and chilling personal honesty.

The evolution of an inexpensive video recording technology has created a remarkably versatile tool for diaristic works by artists. The particular characteristics of television (its sense of real time, of intimate space, of direct communication) enhance the power of the direct personal statement by the artist. Most importantly, the artist’s ability to confront the viewer in close-up direct address makes diaristic video an intensely intimate mode of expression. Who is the artist talking to—the viewer . . . the self? Is there a distinction? The most effective diaristic work blurs the line between artist and viewer, between the experience of the subject and the experience of viewing. Such works can become intensely involving: to watch, to listen, is somehow to participate.

Despite the brief history of the medium, artists working with video have already created an impressive body of material in the diaristic mode. The function of this screening is not to present any historically definitive exhibition of first-person video. Rather it is intended to demonstrate the diversity of video work currently being done as personal narrative. Several of the artists have taken subjective associations to create somewhat abstract video imagery (Copper Glotch). Others combine personal narrative with a manipulation of the conventions and formats of commercial broadcast television (Mitchell Kriegman). One of the most unusual approaches (Wendy Clarke) is to allow the viewers—using the surrogate of volunteers at a public production installation—to tell their own personal stories in a severely simple, straightforward presentation to the camera.

The pieces in First Person Video illustrate a common concern for one of the things television does best: tell individual stories with the intimacy of a shared conversation with the viewer. As illustrated by these screenings, the personal way each artist approaches this central concern has created some remarkable extensions of what we can expect from the medium itself.

“Laughing Alligator” by Juan Downey, 1979, color, 27:00.

Juan Downey spent eight months living among the Yanomani tribes in the Amazon rain forest while creating this subjective video art documentary.

---

Artist Downey was born in 1940. He studied architecture at the Catholic University in Chile and printmaking with S. W. Hayter at the “Atelier 17” in Paris. He is currently an associate professor at the Pratt Institute in New York.


Says Copper Glotch: “As a child, I decided to be an artist. How to go about it? Choosing a methodical approach, I looked at my parents’ college art history books, and determined that one had to make pictures of naked women and then age the drawings. So I did.” This tape is Glotch’s story of her childhood beliefs about becoming an artist.

Glotch is a Chicago-based video and computer artist who works out of the Science and Engineering Laboratory building at the University of Illinois Chicago Circle Campus. She is the first graduate of the school’s Department of Electronic Visualization, a graduate program combining art with hard engineering and computer science. She has exhibited at museums and galleries around the country.

“Someone’s Hiding in My Apartment” by Mitchell Kriegman, 1981, color, 2:00.

The clues are unmistakable. Or are they? It could be big-city paranoia.

Mitchell Kriegman is a writer/performer/director working in television live performance and on audiotape. His work is absurd and comic in nature and includes a variety of narrative forms ranging from soap operas to professionalism. He has been an artist-in-residence at WNET/THIRTEEN’S TV Lab in New York City, and appeared on NBC’s Saturday Night Live in 1980.

“Love Tapes (Series 15)” by Wendy Clarke, 1980, b&w, 30:00.

Wendy Clarke says: “In 1977 as part of my ongoing video journal I made a videotape entitled ‘Chapter One,’ in which I was alone in a room and discussed my feelings about love. I showed this tape to students at UCLA and to small groups of people who came to see the exhibition Interactive Video at the LAKGA Gallery in Los Angeles. After seeing my ‘Chapter One’ tape, the audience was invited to make their own ‘Love Tapes.’

“I set up a camera and monitor in a small room. Each person sat alone and was asked to talk about his/her own feelings about love for three minutes, while being videotaped. Each was asked to start talking when the music started, and to stop when the music ended. . .

Clarke is a former painter-actress-dancer who is now a video artist in New York. She has exhibited her work at museums and galleries around the country.

“The Seduction Scene” by Benjamin Bergery, 1980, b&w, 8:00.

“The Seduction Scene” is an excerpt from “Young August,” a work that explores everyday intimacy in the presence of a video camera.

Benjamin Bergery is a videomaker who teaches at MIT. His “intimate video” work has won video artist fellowships from the NEA and the Massachusetts Council for the Arts.
June 3

1:30-3:00 p.m.

Screening
Informational Video: A Selection of Non-broadcast Tapes Made for Specialized Audiences

Video is now established as a major tool for businesses, non-profit institutions and government agencies. It is not an indulgence but has become a cost-effective necessity used by entities as diverse as Philips Petroleum, AT&T, the USC Dental School, the Department of Labor, Sears and John Deere. From an estimated 13,000 tapes produced in 1974 to 46,000 in 1977 to over 104,000 in 1980, the field has grown to challenge traditional definitions of visual media which are based on the concept of mass distribution. These videotapes are made for specialized, preselected audiences, and they usually have specific, measurable objectives. Some tapes have such limited content that they are of interest only from a craft perspective. Others produce entire institutions or industries with the depth and finesse of a fine documentary made for general distribution.

Non-broadcast informational video is a category defined only by its purpose: to clearly and effectively communicate information to a specialized audience. Producers in industry and government use disparate methods to get their messages across. This makes informational video unique in its eclecticism. These tapes use entertainment genres, dramatic techniques, documentary, animation, news formats, advertising, computer art and other approaches, crossing most accepted stylistic barriers to produce a different kind of unity. These productions are becoming increasingly innovative. The following tapes were selected for what they could demonstrate to the rest of the video community. For that reason, those which use well-known broadcast formats were not included, although many were exceptionally effective.

Many experiments have been forced on producers who are trying to solve mundane information and training tasks. Such producers have stretched the medium in production techniques, performance, narrative structure and by using a bold mix of elements—graphics, dramatic vignettes, direct address, documentary and montage with voice-over often combined in the same tape. Because of their limited distribution, these innovations have gone largely unnoticed beyond their primary audiences except for occasional trade association recognition. Yet the sheer volume of industrial production ($1 billion in 1980) demands that everyone working or studying video begin to focus on the lessons that are emerging from this body of work. As producers begin to think about reaching specialized audiences through videocassette and videodisc technologies, the achievements and problems encountered by television in the workplace are of vital importance as precedents.


This tape was made to communicate the full extent of the damages incurred by a young woman when she was paralyzed in an amusement park ride accident. Her attorneys chose this method of

3:30-5:30 p.m.

Screening
The Video Record: Integrating Music and Video

Some of the most exciting creative efforts being made in television and video are occurring in the varied applications of music on videotape.
Applications have run the gamut from concert hall and nightclub recordings to synthesized images and sound in the abstract forms of video by artists.

Since production formats and economic issues are still very unsettled, video music production has no intrinsic support system or well-developed distribution patterns. The tapes being shown in this screening were researched and selected from a wide variety of recent works by Tom Bowes, video curator for The Kitchen in New York, and by independent videomaker John Hunt, who is heavily involved in the Los Angeles video music scene.

Tapes were chosen to reflect some of the most innovative and divergent approaches to realizing music, and musical performance, in video. Commercial and experimental modes are represented in a variety of formats: studio and location, dramatic, documentary, performance record, as well as manipulated and synthesized imagery. The music itself ranges from rock ’n’ roll to the new-music hoogie-wogie of Robert Ashley’s video opera. Tape descriptions below were provided by the curators; tape credits were provided by the producers or distributors.

Most of the tapes in this screening will be shown during the Video Record symposium on Friday evening, June 5 (see page 90). Many of these tapes will be played again by VJ (video jockey) John Hunt for the video record party at the festival reception on Thursday evening, June 6 (see page 60).

“Ashes to Ashes” by David Bowie, co-directed by David Mallet, 1981, color, 4:00.

Based on the song “Ashes to Ashes” from the album Scary Monsters.

David Bowie is a music performer/producer who uses theatrical elements to create unique performance productions. He is one of the first rock musicians to work with video.

Selections from the work of Ron Hays, 1981, color, 14:00.

A visual music-maker for over ten years, Hays uses computers, lasers and video and film techniques; these excerpts are from his album Odyssey which is in worldwide release. His work has been seen in motion pictures, in over 35 museums and galleries, and on national television. Segments shown include excerpts from Hays’ videodisc “Odyssey”; the Manhattan Transfer’s “Twilight Tone”; and sequences from motion pictures such as Sgt. Pepper’s Lonely Hearts Club Band, Demon Seed and Grease, and other electronic animated works.


Toni Basil has undertaken a creative involvement with all phases of the visual concepts in her work, from performance and choreography through directing and editing.

“Two Triple Cheese. Side Order of Fries,” performed by Commander Cody, from Video West, 1979, color, 2:30.

From the pioneer music video show from San Francisco, this short segment was directed by Joe Dea, produced by Erik Nelson. The series producer is Fabrice Florin.


In the genre of rock promos, there has been an effort to create narrative visual music. Suburban Lawns define their music as slightly chaotic, masked with heavy thematic undertones. Use of the video synthesizer, FLASH colorization, and quick tempo edits add to the subliminal effect. Produced by Ike Eichenkraut, directed by ZOX.


A romanticization of the transition from life to death, this piece uses audio and video synthesizers, starfields, computer graphics, and digital video effects to create a series of sounds/imagescapes. With “Silk Aurora,” Sofer has composed the music and visuals as a single entity.

“Frankie Teardrop,” by Paul Dougerty and Ed Dick, 1980, color, 10:00.

“He’s working in a factory, he’s working from 7:00 to 5:00 . . . Frankie, Frankie.” . . . window dolls, rats, baby pictures, load the trucks, pick up the gun, watch the water . . .


. . . fast action, maso men, game show women, a computer and a corporation, remix, re-edit, sound over . . .


. . . music below watch towers, borders, cranking barbed wire, East/West, lookouts . . .

“Nightclubbing,” by Advanced TV, Emily Armstrong and Pat Ivers, 1981, color, 15:00.

On location coverage of the best of rock ’n’ roll club bands.

“Single Camera Coverage,” including selections of Rhys Chatham and Glen Branca and The Contortions, by Tom Bowes and Shelley Lake, 1979-81, color, 15:00.

“Title Withdrawn,” by Robert Ashley 1976, color, 10:00 except.

Minimal gesture, minimal music.

Selections from Robert Ashley’s PERFECT LIVES (PRIVATE PARTS), 1981, color, 10:00.

“Snow Canon,”Synopsis, 1981, color, 4:00.

Denise Gallant provides the color processing and Brian Sarmuks adds the electronic graphics for a piece composed by Steve Roach. The sound effect reminds one of electronic snow, which was then realized as variations on a theme.
From a live performance by this unique group of musicians and
musicians, combining new musical and visual concepts. Paradigm Shift
is made up of Dennis Baglama, processed woodwind; Steve Roach,
synthesizers; Brian Samuels, image generation; Dan Schwartz,
electric basses and Chapman Stick; and Denise Gallant, video
synthesizers.
“Dialog,” 1981, color, 2:00, and “Episode,” 1981, color, 2:00, by Kit
Fitzgerald and John Sanborn.
Kit Fitzgerald describes the two pieces this way: “More clues in
the search for visual humming. Drama/music . . . a combination of
image and sound interdependent, employing a new visual language to
tell a story and create a new musical form. In ten years, people will
call this music.
“Six Blade Knife,” conceived and directed by Neil Smith, produced
by Rebo Associates, 1981, color, 6:00.
Although “Six Blade Knife” may at first glance seem to be a
conventional music video, it is really an experiment in the evolution
of the rock ‘n’ roll videodisc. Recognizing that the success of this
form depends on the ability of the music and the video to sustain the
repeated viewings, this piece relies on its stylized look and density of
imagery for continued impact and stimulation.
This is an excerpt from Michael Nesmith’s “Elephant Parts,” an
original musical comedy videotape shown here in its first public
presentation. It is the old Cinderella story with a Fifties setting and a
dream-like atmosphere.
Michael Nesmith was one of the original stars of the TV series The
Monkees. He has been a successful songwriter for Linda Ronstadt
and others, winning several gold records. He has worked in video for
five years. He is the Corporate Chairman of the California-based
Pacific Arts Foundation.
“Emotional Rescue,” a videotape by Adam Friedman and Doug
Canepa, performed by the Rolling Stones, 1980, color, 4:28.
A concept and performance tape, designed to make the audio and
visual elements equal components, rather than a visual advertisement
for the Rolling Stones. This tape is one of the first commercial
thermography experiments undertaken by an independent.
“Sandman,” performed by Emmylou Harris, Warner Records, 1981,
color, 2:26.
This is a selection from Harris’ album Evangeline. It is a performance
and concept tape produced by Ethan Allen Productions.
“Girl U Want,” performed by Devo, Warner Records, 1980,
color, 5:55.
From the album Freedom of Choice, this performance tape was
produced and directed by Chuck Statler.

“Freedom of Choice,” performed by Devo, Warner Records, 1980,
color, 3:27.
This is a dramatization of the title song from the Devo Freedom of
Choice album. Produced and directed by Chuck Statler.
“The Bar,” and “The Backyard,” by Robert Ashley; two excerpts
from the opera for television, Robert Ashley’s Perfect Lives
PRIVATE PARTS, 1981, color, 7:00.
The visual and musical designs emanate from the same basic
structure. The pictures comment on the story; the music is
inevitably bound to the pictures.

Symposium
The Video Landscape of Washington, D.C.: A Unique
Production Center
Television programs and non-broadcast video productions made in
Washington, D.C., reach an enormous national audience. However,
many of the ingredients found in a major production center are absent
here: large corporate sponsors, extensive network production
facilities, a major non-profit media center. Nevertheless, the peculiar
nature of Washington as a critical source of news and information has
helped to develop a complex television production environment in
the nation’s capital.
Politics, national news, public affairs and information all create a
common context for video production and distribution in D.C. In
addition, national interests have to be balanced against a variety of
local and community concerns. The function of this first festival panel
is to present the diverse sectors of D.C. television and video, and to
define the arena they share.

Moderator Elizabeth Monk Daley is a director, writer and a
professor at The American University in Washington, D.C. Her work
includes documentary and dramatic pieces. She has collaborated
recently on “Sara Watkins: Oboeist,” a video portrait, and on several
tapes for governmental agencies, including The National Institutes
of Health and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. She
coaauthored Television Acting: A Manual for Camera Performance
(Hastings House, 1979).

Tom Angell is President and founder of Interface Video Systems,
Inc., the first computer-managed video production facility in
Washington, D.C. He has been actively involved in exploring new
techniques of integrating film and video throughout the production
process. His company emphasizes a cinematic approach to tape.
The company is well-known for its work in political advertising and
documentary productions.

Stan Hankin is director of the Media Resource Center at the U.S.
Department of Labor and is President of the Washington-Baltimore
Chapter of the International Television Association. He has been an audio-visual producer in Washington for the past 20 years.

**Victoria Costello** is a Washington, D.C. independent producer whose work combines current affairs coverage with video portraiture. She is a veteran of the D.C. community video movement, a former editor of *Televisions* magazine, and has experimented with video process in a variety of educational and therapeutic environments. Her most recent work is "None of the Above," a documentary on the 1980 elections.

**Joyce Campbell**, Vice President for Programming at WETA/Channel 26, has been in Washington since 1978. A public broadcasting veteran, she was a producer/director at San Francisco's KQED, and program director and station manager at KUID in Idaho before coming to WETA. A frequent participant at Airden House and INPUT seminars, and a former Board member of Women in Film and Video, she is the primary contact for independent producers at WETA.

**Larry Bryant** is co-founder of Labero, Inc., a local communications company. He has been a news anchor and reporter for WTTG-TV in Washington, as well as host for "Black News," a half-hour weekly news magazine program. He has also produced news specials and documentaries for Metromedia, Inc. Mr. Bryant was a Washington correspondent for United Press International.

**Arnold D. Wallace, Sr.**, is General Manager of WHMM-TV, Channel 32, Howard University. He has had over 20 years of professional broadcast experience in a variety of related areas. He spent 16 years at WCAU-TV in Philadelphia as a news and engineering technician, as Manager of Community Affairs and as Director of Public Affairs. He has personally produced five films and a television series, and is a former President of the New Jersey Board of Education.

**Screening**

DC Video: A Selection of Washington-Produced Tapes

"Who Will Protect the Family," produced and directed by Victoria Costello, 1981, color. 28:00 (excerpt).

A work in progress with excerpts from "ERA: A Family Matter." "ERA: A Family Matter" was broadcast by DC and New York PBS stations in 1978 and features a Richmond woman on her first march and lobbying effort. The follow-up piece "Who Will Protect the Family" was recently awarded a competition grant for a Fall 1981 PBS broadcast. The rough edit excerpted here reflects the show's focus on movements for and against ERA, abortion and several accompanying issues in the state of North Carolina. The final 60-minute program will feature several grassroots portraits framed with an analysis of the national legislative outlook on women's rights and the family.

"We Dig Coal: A Portrait of Three Women," produced and edited by Gerardine Wurzburg and Thomas C. Goodwin, directed by Gerardine Wurzburg, 1981, color. 38:00 (15:00 except).

"We Dig Coal" is the story of Bernice, Mary Louise and Marilyn, three women who in 1975 took the Ruston Mining Company of Osceola, PA to federal court charging them with sex discrimination. Two years later in an out-of-court settlement, they won the coveted jobs of coal miners. The 15-minute segment shown here is an intimate look at the lives of the three women most involved with the struggle and their relationships with their families and community.

The program will be broadcast nationally by PBS in Fall 1981.

"Nuclear Power: The Public Reaction," produced by a group of Washington, DC independents under the name of Public Interest Video Network, 1979, color. 30:00 except.

This program marked the first time that independents had used the PBS satellite. The three-hour program combined live event coverage hosted by David Prokott with pre-taped segments. Coming in the wake of the Three Mile Island incident, the show drew significant attention.

"Mascaras," produced and directed by Virginia Quesada, 1981, color. 4:00.

"Mascaras" is a video poem of rhythmically linked images from Halloween events, costume parties and masquerade balls. Masks and costumes alter and reveal the individual personalities of the wearers.

*We Dig Coal: A Portrait of Three Women* Gerardine Wurzburg and Thomas Goodwin

The excerpt shown here includes two of the ten dramatic pieces written by Robert Perrine, Gerald Dugan, Zu Sears and Donna Yahnem. The piece was originally directed for the stage by Gerald Dugan and is performed by Robert Perrine. It has been seen on the DC stage at the Source Theatre and the National Theatre. The television adaptation employs direct address shot in single long takes. The viewer is forced to become the active collaborator in the work.

Compilation from Interface Video Services, 1981, color, 5:00.

Interface produces a variety of political announcement and advocacy spots. The short collection shown here includes a recent piece for AFSCME which is representative of the ever-increasing use of television to sell ideas as well as products.

“One to One,” produced by Larry Bryant, 1980, color, 10:00.

“One-to-One” is an attempt to create an upbeat magazine program on minority issues. The show is co-hosted by its producer and his nine-year-old son Vusi. The segment shown includes an interview with Bobby Seale. It aired October 15, 1980, on WETA-TV, Channel 26.


The program documents the initial stage of an experiment in welfare reform. Presented in “report” form, it shows the results of the experiment in three different cities to encourage other cities to undertake similar experiments. The producers have made excellent use of verite footage to carry information while offering statistical evidence to support their claims.

“Atlanta Special” (working title), a “special,” hosted by Ann Sawyer, to be aired on WHMM on May 20, 1981; Tredessa Dalton, producer. Francis Ward, executive producer, 1981, color, 60:00 (10:00 excerpt).

The program will consist of two segments: a series of taped interviews and commentaries shot on location in Atlanta, and a studio portion allowing audience members to ask questions of guests and Atlanta officials through a telephone hook-up.

Registration

Screening: Premiere

“I Don’t Matter, I Don’t Care,” by Michael Marton, 1981, color, 30:00.

A video documentary which deals with the lives of disadvantaged teenagers in a small town in rural New York. The program focuses on Scott, who is about to drop out of school, and his mother who supports his family by working the night shift in a factory six days a week. The program was funded by a grant from the New York State Council for the Humanities and the New York State Council on the Arts.

Michael Marton, who immigrated to the U.S. from Germany in 1970, has had programs shown on PBS and German and Swedish TV. His work has been exhibited in museums in America and Israel. He has received numerous awards including a Guggenheim Fellowship for video in 1980.

The National Video Festival Student Competition in Videotape Production

The Student Competition in videotape production is the centerpiece of the National Video Festival. It has provided the opportunity to give significant recognition to the achievements of young videomakers and to the programs that are training them.

The competition was open to video students enrolled in a post-secondary institution for at least one term of the 1980-81 academic year. Entries were coordinated on a regional basis in six geographic areas: Northeast, Central, Midwest, Southeast, Southwest and Northwest.

Entries for the Student Competition were invited through mailings to 800 video educators from around the country in January of 1981. The deadline for submission of entries was March 20. Regional judging occurred at the end of March. National judging, which drew from a pool of 23 regional winners, took place in New York City on April 4. Both regional and national judges were chosen on the basis of their professional achievements as critics, producers, curators and educators working in contemporary television and video. In all, the competition drew 330 entries representing 121 schools in 39 states.

More than $100,000 in video production equipment and tape was donated by Sony Corporation of America as competition prizes for regional and national winners. Winning tapes will be shown concurrently at the festival and on Washington’s WETA public television Channel 26.
Screening
Young Videomakers: Winners of 1981 National Video Festival Student Competition in Documentary, Drama, Information and Experimental Videotape Production

National Winners
Janice Tanaka, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, for: “Ontogenesis” 5:30. Category: experimental. A video poem with intense sound and visual imagery that meditates on the nature of contemporary American experience. Heavily layered with rhythmic repetitions and complex textures, this brief experimental work is a technically masterful exploration in the tradition of Nam June Paik.

Wai Chen, Downtown Community Television Center, New York, for: “Second Edition” 2:00. Category: informational. Coordinated and edited by media-access student Wai Chen, this delightful magazine show was collectively developed in a summer employment program for teenagers at New York’s Downtown Community Television Center. Segments mix styles and approaches to cover such diverse topics as Chinese cooking, an interview with Dick Cavett, the Guardian Angels’ subway protection gangs and T’ai Chi classes in Chinatown.

Peter Bull and Alex Gibney, University of California, San Diego, for: “The Ruling Classroom” 5:00. Category: documentary. Records the dynamics in a seventh grade class as students create a model country, complete with an economy, jobs, businesses and government. They rapidly come to face unemployment, corruption, inflation and the full host of contemporary social ills. Their responses are captured with sensitivity and understatement in this finely shot black and white documentary.

Thomas G. Musca, University of California, Los Angeles, for: “Highlights from the New Directors’ Film Festival” 6:00. Category: dramatic. This piece is a satiric dramatic comedy which chronicles the work of five competing student filmmakers forced to share their work and lives in an editing room. Images from their films are intercut with the slapstick soap opera of their relationships. The visual humor is broad but very witty.

Paul I. Meyers, Hampshire College, Amherst, Massachusetts, for: “The Back Killers” 15:00. Category: special achievement in audio-for-video. This piece is a short documentary which portrays the male rituals in a private deer-hunting club in North Carolina. This black and white study combines intimate hand-held camera work with remarkable verité sound portraits of the hunters, the woods and the hunt itself.

National Judges
The following panel viewed 23 regionally winning tapes on April 4, 1981, at Sony Corporation of America Headquarters in New York City to select the five nationally winning tapes:

Carol Brandenburg: director of the TV Lab at WNET/THIRTEEN in New York City, public television’s major access and support center for independent video and filmmakers.

Jaime Davidovich: video artist and director of the Artists Television Network, a non-profit organization that distributes video art on cable television in Manhattan and other cities.

Stan Hankin: director of the Media Resource Center at the U.S. Department of Labor and President of the Washington-Baltimore Chapter of the International Television Association.

Lillian Jimenez: program coordinator at the Film Fund; a board member of the National Alliance of Media Arts Centers; an independent producer and formerly an arts administrator with Young Filmmakers/Video Arts (TV Training Department), Third World Newsreel and the Foundation for Independent Video and Film.

Douglas Davis: an artist working in video, film and other media; a writer; a teacher and artistic director of the International Network for the Arts.

Barbara London: curator of the video program at the Museum of Modern Art; lecturer at New York University and writer about art.

Frank Marrero: Head of Network Production for the Spanish International Network.
**June 4**

**Northeast Regional Winners**
The northeast region included the following states: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York State, excluding New York City. Regional Coordinator: Jan Crockery, director, University Film Study Center, Cambridge, MA.

**Documentary:**
"Seizure" by Patricia E. Hearn, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 16:32. Benjamin Bergery, teacher.

**Drama:**
"Weeds" by Christopher John Graves, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT. 15:00. Robert White, teacher.

**Experimental:**
"Intaglio Fugue" by Ann Ross Marion, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 16:00. Benjamin Bergery, teacher.

**Information:**

**Special Achievement Award, Audio-For-Video:**
"The Back Killers" by Paul Meyers, Hampshire College, Amherst, MA. 15:00. Richard Muller, teacher.

**Regional Judges:**
Nancy Bicknell, director of programming, Arlington CableSystems, Arlington, MA.

**Betsy Connors**, video animator and fellow, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Visual Studies, Cambridge, MA.

**Moe Shore**, independent video editor, Boston, MA.

**Terry Lockhart**, independent video engineer, Boston, MA.

**Central Regional Winners**
Region includes: New York City, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia and West Virginia. Regional Coordinators: Ron Sutton, associate professor and Director of the Media Center, The American University, and Elizabeth Monk Daley, professor, Performing Arts Department, The American University.

**Documentary:**

**Drama:**

**Information:**

**Regional Judges:**
Christine Choy, director and producer, Third World Newsreel, New York.
Marie Torre, producer/reporter, WCBS-TV, New York.
Karen Ranucci, independent producer and assistant director, Downtown Community Television Center, New York.
Deidre Boyle, writer, teacher, critic and video editor for Sightlines magazine.
Tom Hayes, Acquisitions, CBS Productions, New York.
Tom Bowen, Video Program Director of The Kitchen Center in New York City.

**Midwest Regional Winners**
Region includes: Michigan, Indiana, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Ohio and Missouri. Regional Coordinator: Lilly Ollinger, projects coordinator, The Chicago Editing Center.

**Documentary:**

**Drama:**
"Adam" by Christopher John La Palm, Moorhead State University, Moorhead, MN. 31:00. Ted Larson, teacher.

**Experimental:**
"Ontogenesis" by Janice Tanaka, School of the Art Institute of Chicago. 5:30. John Manning, teacher.

**Information:**
"Waveguide—the Black and White Waveform" by Zouzanna Molner and Copper Gilsd, University of Illinois, Circle Campus, Chicago. 2:00. Dan Sandin, teacher.

**Special Achievement Award, Audio-For-Video:**
"Ontogenesis" by Janice Tanaka.

**Regional Judges:**
Jamie Cessar, coordinator, Program Operations, WTTW, Chicago.
Sallie Fischer, general manager, University Community Video, Minneapolis, MN.
Barbara Latham, head of the Video Area, The School of the Art Institute of Chicago.
John Teets, editorial director, The Chicago Sun Times.

**Southeast Regional Winners**
Region includes: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, Kentucky and Puerto Rico. Regional Coordinators: Anna Marie Piersimoni and Kevin McCarty of IMAGE Film and Video Center, Atlanta, GA.
June 4

Experimental:

Documentary:
“Scenes from KKK Footage” by Wayne Alexander Derrick, Rice University, Houston, TX. 17:00. Brian Huberman, teacher.

Regional Judges:
Kathleen Herman, director, Access Atlanta Media Group, Atlanta.
Jeffrey Hewitt, producer/director, Turner Broadcasting, Atlanta.
Martin Lafferty, director, Programming Services, Cox Communications, Atlanta.
Tom Luce, independent producer/director, Atlanta.
Guy Piercy, producer/director, Georgia public television.
Jarari Simana, director, public access programming, Cable Atlanta.
Karl Zimmerman, producer, PM Magazine, WAGA-TV, Atlanta.

Southwest Regional Winners
Region includes: Southern California (Santa Barbara and south), Hawaii, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico and Arizona. Regional Coordinator: Kathy Huffman, curator, Long Beach Museum of Art.

Experimental:
“California Freeze-Out” by Jan Peacock, University of California, San Diego. 10:00. Eleanor Azlin, teacher.

Documentary:
“The Ruling Classroom” by Peter Bull and Alex Gibney, University of California, San Diego. 58:00. Standish Lawlor, teacher.

Drama:
“Highlights from the New Directors’ Film Festival” by Thomas G. Musca, UCLA. 60:00. Shirley Clarke, teacher.

Information:
“Driving Under the Influence” by the Documentary Film Class (Spring 1981), Department of Technical Journalism, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. 15:00. Frederick Shook, teacher.

Regional Judges:
Juliette Mondot, independent producer, Meta Media Productions.
Jessica Fish, audio-visual coordinator, Department of Water and Power, Los Angeles.
Pamela Gach, director, Focus on Video training programs.
Peter Kirby, video editor, Video Transitions.
Allan Kaprow, video artist and teacher.

Northwest Regional Winners

Coordinator: Ronald Compsi, graduate coordinator, Broadcast Communication Arts Department, San Francisco State University.

Documentary:

Information:

Drama:
“The Loss of Innocence” by Cheryl Weiss, San Francisco State University. 40:00. Ronald Compsi, teacher.

Experimental:

Regional Judges:
Nancy Frank, curator and director of the International Video Archives at La Mamele Gallery, San Francisco.
David Rabinovitch, independent documentary producer, San Francisco.
George Behrman, director, Media Services, Fireman’s Fund Insurance Company, San Francisco.

Keynote and Student Awards Presentation
8:00-9:30 p.m.

Welcome
George Stevens, Jr., chairman, The American Film Institute

Remarks
Chadron Heston, Actor, former chairman of The American Film Institute.

Jean Firstenberg, director, The American Film Institute
Kenji Tamai, executive vice president, Sony Corporation of America
Koichi Tsunoda, president, Sony Video Products and vice president, Sony Corporation of America

Keynote Introduction
Les Brown, television writer and editor-in-chief of Channels magazine

Keynote: Erik Barnouw
“The Role, the Importance, and the Plight of Independents.”
Erik Barnouw, America’s foremost broadcasting historian, has been chief of the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress since July 1978. From 1946 to 1973 he was on the faculty of Columbia University, where he organized and chaired the Film Division. He is best known as the author of History of Broadcasting in the United States and Documentary: A History of the Non-Fiction Film. Other books he has written include Tube of Plutonium: The Evolution of American Television; The Sponsor: Notes on a Modern Potestate; Indian Film; and The Magician and Cinema.
Festival Overview and Student Tape Excerpts
Larry Kirkman, director, Television and Video Services, The American Film Institute
James Hindman, director, National Video Festival

Student Awards Presentation
Charlton Heston and Kenji Tamiya

Osmogenesis Janice Tanaka

Reception
Reception in the Theater Lab space for festival registrants and participants, to honor student winners in the festival videotape competition. Coffee, dessert and liquors are served at a video record party with videotape jockey John Hunt.

John Hunt is a video portrait artist and media activist, and as “Dr. Video,” he has “VJ’d” over 75 live video shows all over the country. He is currently producing video music groups, distributing independent programs and is a member of the steering committee of the Visual Music Alliance in Los Angeles.

Screening and Symposium
EFX: The Uses of Electronic Special Effects in Creating New Programs

The television medium is continually extended through experiments with its visual vocabulary. Artists working in video and the broadcast industry have extended the frontiers of image possibilities on the TV screen. Constant developments in video technology create new image possibilities as fast as we devise applications for them.

EFX are used for diverse purposes: to create unusual or specialized images, to focus on particular visual information, to solve particular problems in program design, to create uses of video that reach beyond our present sense of the medium. The panelists in this symposium have each helped to create new work for specialized applications of EFX in television and video. The two artists on the panel have pioneered work in video synthesis and computerized imagery that continues to be of immense importance to the field. ABC’s work in sports, news and public events represents some of the best efforts of the networks to create screen imagery suited to specific program needs.

The purpose of this symposium is to explore diverse uses of video EFX and to exchange views about their future impact on program design. Examples of representative works will be screened before the panel.

“A Video 5” by Dan Sandin, 1981, 7:00. Abstract computer-generated imagery, which Sandin calls, “Well beyond effects.” Computer graphics by Tom DeFanti, image processing by Dan Sandin, sound by Mimi Shevitz.

“A Short Surprise” by Dan Sandin, 1981, 3:00. An on-the-spot piece created just for the National Video Festival.


“Similar Nature” by Kit Fitzgerald and John Sanborn, 1980, color, 9:00. One of five pieces contained in the collection Resolution of the Eye. Each piece is concerned with the processes of seeking, receiving, retaining or recalling information. In “Similar Nature,” the luxurious nature of daily activities, scored and mixed in musical form, enrich the “everydayness” of our experience.

Kit Fitzgerald and John Sanborn are New York-based video artists who combine sound and video to produce tapes, installations and performances designed for museums, galleries and broadcast television. Their installations and tapes have been exhibited at the Museum of Modern Art and the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York, the Biennale de Paris, the Acme Gallery in London and others. They have been artists-in-residence at the Television Laboratory at WNET/THIRTEEN in New York.
"Urban Episodes" by Steina Vasulka, 1980, 3:00 (excerpt).
"Urban Episodes," shot in downtown Minneapolis, is the latest in a collection of works called *Machine Vision*, a series of installations and tapes all involving mechanical modes of camera control.

"Selected Treecuts" by Steina Vasulka, 1980, 3:00 (excerpt).
This work is composed of a rhythmical collage of images of trees, conceived either directly from a camera or from camera images held briefly in computer memory. Additional movement is produced by an automatic in/out zoom lens.

"Violin Power" by Steina Vasulka, 1970-78, 3:00 (excerpt).
"Violin Power" is a demo tape on how to play violin on the violin.

A demonstration of digitally generated images from the Computer Graphics Laboratory of the New York Institute of Technology. The first half of the tape was created with a computer tape system called "Images," an electronic palette devised for still picture composition. The second part gives examples of experimental and commissioned animated sequences using software devised by a number of artist/scientists at the laboratory.

The producer describes this tape as follows: "This videotape was produced with a thermal imaging system, consisting of a video compatible I.R. imager (camera); digital image processor and frame buffer (computer); and a color display screen (TV). The system produces a continuous slow scan (one second) video display; and the imagery was shot directly off the TV screen. Each color in the thermal image represents a discrete temperature level, with the range and base level determined and calibrated by the operator. There are ten color levels from white to black, indicating temperatures ranging from .02" to 101.1°F per level. Since this is a non-radiating technology, thermography indicates surface temperature only. The computer image processor allows one to analyze discrete temperature levels; store frames in memory; and compare thermal images over assigned time periods. The characteristics of this system make it a valuable creative tool."

"Union" by Stephen Beck, 1975, color, 8:00.
Created by the inventor of the Direct Video Synthesizer, this piece reflects processes of unification of material at psychological and spiritual levels. First broadcast in the WNET VTR series and on WGBH-TV, Boston.
Moderator, John Giancola is director of the VTV/Media Department of the New York State Council on the Arts. He teaches video at the Institute for Film and Television at New York University.

Julius Barnathan is president of Broadcast Operations and Engineering at ABC Television. He has been involved in video technology for 16 years. He was responsible for stimulating the manufacture of much new video effects equipment, including a slow motion machine and the Quantel 5000 Digital Reduction Effects system. Barnathan was a key figure in the development of the closed-captioning TV system for the hearing-impaired. He has worked on six ABC Olympics telecasts.

Dan Sandin, self-described as "electro-expert-mentor (better seen through electronics) and a video-it-toolmaker." He teaches video at the Department of Electronic Visualization, the University of Illinois, Circle Campus, Chicago. His pioneering work in video synthesis has received national recognition.

Steina Vasulka has been prominent in the development of the electronic arts since 1970, both as co-founder of The Kitchen, a major exhibition center in New York City, and as a continuing experimenter of the possibilities for the generation and manipulation of the electronic image through a broad range of technological tools and aesthetic concerns.

Two-time Emmy award winner Mark Schuh is responsible for a number of television technology "firsts" relating to satellites, video projection, stereo transmission and 3-D work. He is currently the technological consultant to the Metropolitan Opera, and is responsible for the technological development behind the *Live From Lincoln Center* and *Live From The Met* television series. He is technical editor for *VideoScope* magazine.
June 5

2:30 p.m.

Screening: Premiere
A videotape by Brian Eno, 1981, color.

This premiere of Brian Eno’s most recent piece has been especially created for the National Video Festival. In this piece, Eno continues his investigation of static images. The artist’s intention is to create a pictorial space rather than a narrative progression. In the same sense, the music that accompanies the tape is intended to construct a space rather than to occupy one. The resulting imagery is dramatically simple, yet subtly complex.

Brian Eno is well known for his music compositions and productions—he has produced records by the Talking Heads, David Bowie, Ambient Music and others. His video work has been exhibited at the Walker Art Center, the University Art Museum at Berkeley, The Kitchen Center, and in Tokyo, Genoa and Brussels. He also has created multi-monitor installations for LaGuardia Airport and Grand Central Station. Eno currently lives in New York.

4:30-6:00 p.m.

Symposium

The last ten years have been full of promise and hopeful anticipation for the extension of cable television and home video: eliminating scarcity; serving specialized audiences; escaping from the predominance of lowest common denominator programming; awaiting a golden age based on new technology able to serve everyone’s needs.

However, as those technologies become available, more issues are raised than are settled. The developments of new hardware have not been quickly followed by evolutions in software. Vehemence national and local debates have sprung from the conflicting solutions to a variety of expressed needs such as diversity in programming, methods of reaching smaller and more specialized audiences, and serving a multiplicity of cultural and informational requirements. Against these growing service demands are ranged profit-oriented mass marketing forces and public interest forces eager to employ the communication potential of the new technologies.

In contrast to fixed, primarily economic, realities of broadcast television, “video” has emerged as an extension of telecommunications possibilities. In part, this explosive growth and development is based on new technologies: cable, portable video production, cassette/disk, satellite, and so on. Only by understanding what these new technologies can accomplish can we grasp the enormous expansion of television’s roles in art, industry, government, entertainment, education, the community—in virtually every phase of our lives.

One popular image of the new video audience member is that of the home programmer, the active viewer, using self-paced learning cassettes, with quick review—variable speed control; sitting at a home terminal with teletext and direct satellite-to-home distribution; selecting special interest, individualized programs. Another image

reminiscent of Orwell’s 1984 is the home-bound drone-like distracted viewer whose life is controlled in a cocoon of media sensations.

As the sensory dimensions of TV are transformed by large screens, stereo sound, high resolution and improved color, what will happen to the conveniences of TV viewing? Will the quality of our electronic environment actually evolve to accommodate a media experience with the real potential for action, choice and reflection?

The function of this panel is to speculate on what the video experience of the future may be—what changes it will effect—and reflect—in our lives. How will television and video be expressed as processes and as products? How will we become engaged with them? What are the implications of the “activated” audience of the future?

Moderator Mark Schubin is a video writer and technology consultant, responsible for a number of television firsts relating to satellites, video projection, stereo transmission and 3-D work.

Jan Zimmerman is a writer and consultant in the areas of telecommunications, media production, arts and management and energy. She has degrees in physics, film and television. She has been a college media professor and an independent producer. Zimmerman is currently an Adjunct Faculty member of the Women’s Studies Department at San Diego State University.

Jaime Daviddovich is a video artist and director of the Artist’s Television Network, a non-profit organization that distributes video art on cable television in Manhattan and other cities.

Jim St. Lawrence is a producer at the New York Institute of Technology Video Center. He was formerly producer of the series Fast Forward, created at the Ontario Educational Communications Authority and seen on PBS stations in this country.

J. Philip Stack, vice president of Sony Video Products Company, is a leading authority on the video products field with over 20 years of experience in the video industry. Mr. Stack began his video career as an engineer at General Electric in Syracuse, New York, and worked with Conrac Corporation and Magnavox/North American Philips before joining Sony Corporation of America.

Screening and Symposium
The Video Record

The “video record” refers to an emerging fusion of video and music which is developing in a wide range of production and distribution modes. At present there is no literal video record on the market, since video music work is being done in nearly every distribution mode for nearly every form of consumer television and video. Nevertheless, producers and artists working in video music share a common concern for the remarkable growth and potential of music on video.

One context for video music work is the commercial music industry. Promotional pop clips, originally produced on film, can often be made less expensively and more imaginatively on video. Since they are