REWIND | Artists' Video in the 70s & 80s
Interview with David Curtis

Interview by Dr Jackie Hatfield

DC: I came to London in the early 60's and cinema in London at the time was an incredibly rich experience. I worked out the other day there were something like 15 maybe 20 cinemas in London that were showing subtitled films on a regular basis. There was a new Godard movie appearing every second month, there were Truffaut movies, Antonioni and all the rest of them. It was a very, very rich period. On top of that at the Slade, Thorold Dickenson who was the professor of film at the Slade, set up this department and was bringing in two or three screenings a week of classics, from Russian cinema from the 20's to the wonderful early films of Renoir and so on. He knew all these people who'd been involved in the film society in the 1920's and 30's himself. He had connections with all these people. He could actually get prints from Renoir of things that hadn't been seen for ages like Boudu Saved from Drowning, which is a wonderful film. So we saw all these things. There were people like Ray Durgnat who were notionally students there, Peter Whitehead and Don Levi were other students there at the time. They would lead seminars and they brought their enthusiasms to the whole process of looking at films. I was suddenly thrown in the deep end and realised that cinema was this wonderful thing. The moving image was this extraordinary thing. I actually kept a diary briefly during that period and I remember the prime purpose of the diary was to write the names of all the films that I'd seen. It was 10 films a week. It was something extraordinary. It was absolutely extraordinary.I was doing painting. Painting and Etching were my two subjects. I was taught etching by Anthony Gross, who I later discovered, not during that period at all, was a filmmaker in the 1930's. He did raise rather whimsical, quite charming etchings. It was an interesting moment to be doing painting because the Slade was still full of people like William Coldstream, yet another filmmaker, who were members of the Euston Road School. They were very anally retentive, realistic, conscientious, but hardly joyful image-makers. And along came Harold Cohen and then Bernard Cohen who had been in America and knew what was going on in America. They alerted us to the fact that there were all this extraordinary new painting going on and so there was actually quite a battle going on in the Slade at the time between the Euston Road leftovers and the bright young things associated with new American painting. So it was an interesting moment altogether. But significantly for me in addition to seeing these classics of cinema, I was beginning to read about what Andy Warhol was doing. There had actually been a screening, in fact there was a screening during my period at the Slade of one of Warhol films, I don't remember which, that Sitney had brought over. It was shown at London School of Film Technique, which was in Charlotte Street at the time. I didn't go famously so I missed out on that. There'd been a screening of films I think probably the same occasion at the ICA

introduced by Sitney but I didn't see any of those. It really wasn't until I think the summer of 1966 when I went to New York almost specifically to see Andy Warhol's films. I actually went in mid August and nobody was around. The Filmmakers Co-op, Cinema tech was open and I went to some screenings there, but actually one of the most important things that I encountered that I went to see was an English film, though can't remember it. It was The Servant or something like that in a Bleak Street cinema. With it was showing, astonishingly, Bruce Connor's A Movie. That was just an eye opener to the fact that you could use found footage in that way and make something, which was such a wonderful collage. So I was interested in the notion of artists making cinema from that. When I got back to London, I realised that Bruce Connor was a sculptor as well as a filmmaker and that he had a show at the Robert Fraser Gallery and showed his other films at the time. I think I actually bought a Super 8 copy of his Looking for Mushrooms off him at that time. So I began to get interested in that way. Then I went to the beginnings of the Filmmakers Co-op in Better Books in London, just because it was a place where screenings were happening. Mostly what they showed was American work. Robert Pike had brought a whole collection of stuff from the Creative Film Society, which Bob Cobbing showed. There were things like Whitney Brothers films, some Kenneth Anger, though I think there were actually some Kenneth Anger in distribution in England at that time, because he'd been living in England and France in the early 60's and left prints here and there. There was a very a small number of films in circulation at the time. There was a first festival of Experimental Film or something at the Cochrane Theatre in 1966 or 1967 and it showed everything that was in circulation in Britain at the time, all the contents of the BFI library, which amounted to 20 or 30 films plus all the things that the Filmmakers Co-op brought in. Altogether the full weeklong season amounted to maybe 40 films that were shown and that was it. That was the avant-garde work in distribution in Britain at the time. But it got me hooked and when I left the Slade I started teaching painting in Birmingham College of Art and I showed films there as a part of what one did: this is what artists do. They are making films. I wasn't actually interested that much in making them, but I was interested in the licence that it was a different kind of cinema that I'd discovered during my Slade period. It was a cinema of individuals, first person singular cinema. That was to me really interesting.

JH: So were you showing British work as well as the American work?

DC: There wasn't any British work

JH: Even though they had this thing at *Better Books*? No one was making anything?

DC: Steve Dwoskin was here and he'd brought American film with him, which he finished here with soundtracks by Ron Geeson so they became English films, *Alone* and *Chinese Chequers* and all these things. He shot them all in New York. Simon Hartog was working at the BBC at the time, he was another Co-op member and he had one or two things but there was nothing really, there really wasn't. This was 1967 I guess, something like that. Malcolm was beginning to do things but it wasn't until I started working at the Arts Lab, which was the end of 1967, beginning of '68. I think the Arts Lab opened in September/October 1967. Then I went to the Knokke-le-Zoute Film Festival with some of

the Co-op people, Bob Cobbing went and Jeffrey Shaw, who was Australian living in London at the time. He was making things and actually he showed installations in the Kingly Street Gallery, 26 Kingly Street. He did his big inflatable things that you projected into. One saw those things around but I wouldn't have said he was a filmmaker as such at that time. But at Knokke-le-Zoute he showed, Steve Dwoskin showed as English. John Latham was there and showed *Speak,* which I'd never seen before, even though I daresay he did show it in the Better Books space. Jeff Keen didn't go. He did actually show work in Better Books so he would have been an English person there who I saw and showed in Birmingham when I was teaching, but there was incredibly little. Knokke-le-Zoute was where one got exposed to the fact that what had come through into distribution in England was such a tiny sampling. At Knokke-le-Zoute there was a Markopoulos retrospective, Paul Sharits showed a huge amount of work, Mike Snow showed *Wavelength* for the first time plus other things that he'd made, *New York Eye and Ear Control*. I can't remember who else showed, but it was a major exposure to American work and the beginnings of European work. I saw work by Wilhelm and Birgit Hein there. I remember coming back and telling Malcolm (Le Grice) about it and actually saying "This is work rather like your *Castle 1*" which he had by then shown at the Drury Lane Arts Lab. Fairly soon after, I went to New York in 1966. By then I'd obviously heard of Jonas Mekas, and Sheldon Renan's first book about the underground had come out. He made a hero out of Jonas in there and when I was in New York I read the *Village Voice* and realised that Jonas had a regular column there. I actually subscribed to the *Village Voice* from then on for about two or three years and got this kind of weekly dose of Americano which is very corrupting and very invigorating in many ways. Jonas was something which I think I've often regretted that we've not really had here, consistently anyway, which is just an enthusiast who had a column and who could just write enthusiastically, not throwing high theory at you, not through beating you head open with the dogma but just saying "These are extraordinary and wonderful things" and giving you some sense of what they were, even though all you are doing is reading about them. Obviously at the time you had no chance of seeing them. Absolutely none unless you went to New York or went to festivals and there were only two festivals every two three-years in those days.

JH: Why do you think it is that we haven't had somebody like that? Is it the politics of the place would you say?

DC: It could be because life has been so tough here. This is very miserableist to say, but I think it has been pretty tough on the whole. Peter Gidal wrote, when he was programming the Co-op cinema in the early seventies, very regularly for *Timeout* and he and John became, another filmmaker, Box and Cox. Peter would write caption reviews for the week's programme and his style was actually pretty good. It was very Peter, it was sort of "This is disgraceful and this is wonderful, this is whatever." He laid down the law very clearly about what was good and what was bad while trying to persuade you to come and see the bad because he was trying to keep the Co-op cinema going. John Du Cane wrote more sort of reflective stuff and actually wrote the first good piece on David Larcher for example. It was the early years of *Timeout* when *Timeout* was much more radical and much more indulgent.

JH: But didn't David Hall write for Timeout as well? I also think he had a column as well didn't he for a while?

DC: He had a column in *Studio International*

JH: Yes, but I think he also wrote for *Timeout* regularly. He did little reviews and things. And I think Tamara (Krikorian), as well, but I suppose that was much later. Maybe it was intermittent.

DC: I thought Tamara and Mick Hartney and Michael O'Pray who did quite a good job for Art Monthly, but it wasn't quite the same. It wasn't a kind of daily newspaper so to speak. The underground film as it was at the time, the avant-garde film, began in the context of Better Books and the arts approaches where it was in a kind of mixed economy, a kind of media venue. Cobbing was basically a poet and half of the things that one went to at Better Books were poetry readings. But, he knew through Burrows and people like that, who was actually somebody else who was making interesting work in Britain and had his work showed in Better Books at that time, there was a strong sense of cross-fertilisation between literature and the moving image, and even painting, though Jeff Nuttall did wonderful installations in the Better Books basement and went on during the Arts Lab's period to do sets for the People Show. So, there was that sense of a wider community being involved. Jim Ballard did a crashed cars exhibition, which actually prompted his book about crashed cars at Robert Street Arts Lab. Annabel Nicholson who got involved with the Co-op when it was in the second Arts Lab in Robert Street, felt very strongly that it was important to link film back into music, partly because she was in partnership with Paul Burwell. Burwell at the time was setting up a musicians collective but it was just a sense that her own practice was related to performance as much as to the moving image. There was no distinction in her mind between performance, still image or moving image. I think in a way when the Co-op in the Prince of Wales, the dairy period, became self-contained it lost a lot of its following. Funnily enough it was its most effective period in terms of self promotion and so on with Gidal.

JH: As pure film?

DC: As pure film**.** Gidal and Du Cane were a terrific team in terms of talking it up. They did bring people in and all the rest of it but it became very much just film. And actually a lot of conceptual artists who had been interested in moving image at that time. I'm thinking people like John Hilliard, David Lamelas, people like that who had been significant makers of moving images in the seventies, felt quite alienated by the film specificity that happened at the Filmmakers Co-op. In a way, I think that fuelled David Hall's feeling that video had to have something distinct and separate because the Filmmakers Co-op, despite the fact that it said it was about moving image, was actually terrifically film specific. I think the Co-op during the early seventies period became very much associated with one school, even though I don't think the reality of the case was exactly that, but that's how it became seen in the popular minds. Inasmuch as anyone was aware of it they thought of it as being that kind of particular school of filmmakers.

JH: Did you initiate any community or collective organisation for the production of works?

DC: No. I don't think so.

JH: But you were part of that early Co-op period?

DC: I was. I went to the meetings at the Drury Lane Arts Laboratory, which was 1967 into 1968 basically, maybe early 1969. I can't remember the dates. I programmed the cinema. There still wasn't very much happening but what I suppose significantly happened there, was that Malcolm (Le Grice) got involved and through talking with him the notion of making some kind of a workshop emerged and he actually did all that: the practical workshop. He literally built film processing, developing, printing machine and all the rest of it. And a number of filmmakers accumulated and gathered around him. Some of them significantly came from the London School of Film Technique which had moved from Charlotte Street to Covent Garden. So it was right next to the Drury Lane Arts Lab. There were a number of people who came from there. I remember one American guy called Ben Yaya who was quite a political filmmaker. He'd got involved in the workshop development because he saw it as being a way of developing your own films free from censorship. Censorship was still a big thing. Laboratories did actually see it as their job to alert the police to anything nefarious. Certainly that was one of the attractions of Malcolm's collection of stuff was that it was you could do it yourself and obviously it was incredibly cheap. So I encouraged that I suppose. During that first year in Drury Lane Arts Lab the cinema was basically the thing that kept the place open so we actually showed endless through the night movies and things like that. So I learnt an awful lot about film programming. By the time we got to the second Arts Lab which was 1969 just into 1971, again I was programming the cinema there, but by then there was a lot more material in circulation. Carla Liss had come from New York bringing the New American Cinema collection that P. Adams said he had toured with it before, so that was 40 or 50 classic works of American Cinema. I had all that stuff to programme so in a way that's when I took off as a programmer. Jim Haynes, who opened the Drury Lane Arts Lab and I'd met through I think Biddy, we used to go to the UFO Club. In fact I used to show films at the UFO Club hiring from Bob Cobbing at the New Co-op and all the rest of them hiring from the BFI. I shared a platform with Mark Boyle who did the light shows there for Soft Machine, So I met Hoppy that way. I met Jim Haynes and Jack Moore, he was his sort of side kick who basically was the theatre programmer for the Arts Lab. When the Arts Lab opened I was the cinema organiser. Biddy was the gallery director.

JH: Was there a gallery space as well?

DC: We had a gallery, yes. John and Yoko showed stuff there and Takis showed *Signals* there. Biddy did the first ever multiple show there too, but Robert Street was the more ambitious cinema programme. It was seven days a week virtually and two shows a night. That's when I started *Cinema.* In between the two Arts Labs I'd worked for Jimmy Vaughan.

JH: Who is Jimmy Vaughan?

DC: Jimmy Vaughan had been Andy Warhol's film distributor and Jonas Mekas's and Kenneth Anger's. He was the producer of Kenneth Anger's films. Kenneth Anger was still living in

London at that time and Jimmy, astonishingly, managed to get money out of the National Film Finance Corporation for *Lucifer Rising* or something or other. It was so bizarre, but that contact was useful in that at Robert Street we were able to show the first release Warhol films, *Lonesome Cowboys*, *Bike Boy*, *I, a Man*. I can't remember the other ones we did, but that kept the place afloat basically.

JH: How long did that go on for?

DC: Nearly two years. It was a short life building in Camden.

JH: So what happened after that then? It moved?

DC: It moved to Prince of Wales Crescent. Space Studios had come into being by then and were providing spaces for artist studios and the Dairy in Prince of Wales Crescent I think was a Space Studio, certainly Space was involved in negotiating its lease from Camden. Again it was another short-life building but I think it was about another two years or three years. So the Co-op moved there and I withdrew at that time. I was absolutely exhausted. That was when I went and started teaching at Croydon College of Arts where I taught video.

JH: When you taught video, it was around about 1975?

DC: 1973/4

JH And they had video equipment at Croydon?

DC: They had studio equipment only. I remember the very first day I went there I thought "God this studio is grim. Let's open the windows and let some daylight in here" I mean the technician threw a fit because the cameras were calibrated and were completely incapable of dealing with daylight.

JH: That's interesting. Actually, I though it was the other way round with video, that you had to have the lights full on.

DC: Well you did but not daylight for some reason.

JH: When did you start working at the Arts Council and what initiated that? Because that was a big move presumably?

DC: Rodney started working at the Arts Council. To go back one step, my first encounters with the Arts Council were when at Drury Lane, Malcolm and I wrote to Willie Coldstream, who we obviously knew through the Slade. He'd been a Slade professor there, and because of his old film connections, was both chairman of the BFI Board of Governors and on the Council of the Arts Council. I'm pretty sure this is correct. He was actually the kind of go-between. He was the sort of link between these two government-funded quangos. So we wrote to him and Stanley Reid, who was director with BFI saying, "What are you going to do about filmmaking artists?" and we got classic prevaricating replies. Willy Coldstream

was very sympathetic but, no money. I think he offered Malcolm a bit of teaching at the Slade. The Arts Council, I don't know whether in response to us but in response to the circumstances in general, set up a new activities committee, which was to look at all these new activities like performance art, like moving images, like photography, all these things that they didn't have committees for. To cut a long story short I got involved in the New Activities Committee from 1969 for a while. I resigned after a while partly because I was working at the Robert Street Arts Lab, which was just so demanding and partly because I was so pissed off with the fact that to me, at the end of two years deliberations of £15000 of funding they'd divided it equally between every applicant who'd applied. So nobody got any money at all. But by 1972 the Arts Council visual arts department had set up a film committee, primarily to deal with documentaries. That in a way has its own funny history because David Sylvester who'd been chairman of the Art Panel for ages was keen on documenting things. Right at the beginning, when he was organising exhibitions for the Arts Council, he'd insisted that some of them be documented. So, I think the Matisse film which the Arts Council made of an Arts Council Exhibition at the Tate, because the Hayward Gallery didn't exist in those days, was documented on film at David Sylvester's request. It was done by the BFI, I think, Bruce Beresford and his chums. The BFI Production Board, I think actually did it, but this had become the beginning of a bit of a problem of how do we deal with documenting exhibitions? Then somebody had said, "Shouldn't we be making films about artists as well?" So all this had turned into a committee by 1972. Actually it was earlier than that, it was maybe even 1969 or 1970 that the Documentaries Committee was set up but by 1972 Rodney was in position and had made the argument for an Artist Film and Video Committee, which was set up in 1972 or 1973, I cant remember which. The Documentaries Committee was the parent committee and it was the arts films committee and then there was an artists' film sub-committee, sub-committee of the documentary. To be a sub-committee member you had to be on the main committee as well. So I was invited on to that because Rodney knew what I'd been doing at the Arts Lab and so on. So I was invited on to that though it was a very odd committee with people like Ben Brewster, Tony Raynes later on and the Scottish guy who was the head of the Royal College of Art at the time. I can't remember his name. To be honest there were very few people. Rodney knew about the artists' film and video and I knew about it, but I don't think there was anyone else at that time. David Hall and Tony Sinden and somebody else got money out of the BFI before the Arts Council put money into anything and that's a historical fact that one must acknowledge. The BFI was in there first but that little batch of films had led to the notion of artists being given money to make films. From that very quickly came the demand that filmmaking artists should be given money as well. I think Annabel Nicholson and somebody else were the very first people to get artists' filmmaking grants. That was in the early seventies. Very quickly the committee lost the Documentaries members, so to speak, and became much more a committee of artists and writers about film and video art. It became much more of the specialist thing and later obviously, arguments were made that it needed to include video. It hadn't excluded it. It simply had to include it in its name, fortunately. I think Hoppy got some money but not out of that committee. He got some money very early on for some equipment. Originally the Arts Council retained the copyright of the work as did the BFI, notoriously, and it took a while before the principle that it was funding for artists not an Arts Council Production. It got established and it became much more simply a subsidy. There is an interesting history of the way in which exhibition got added in. I can't remember who

it was but somebody said, "Can I actually have money to show this work as well as to make it?" There was the odd film tour, which works were included in, which was a tour of documentaries basically. Three vans went around the country for six months of the year showing work, taking a collection of stuff with them and Rodney used to buy work for that. Actually one of my first jobs for the Arts Council was buying stuff for the film tour. But artists' films that had been made would semi-automatically get included in there and were toured around. The Arts Council I think just said, "Well we funded this thing so we have the right to show it" But then applications came into the committee for equipment and then for publications and so on, and slowly the area grew. Something that we didn't do, though there wasn't ever anything written down to say that we shouldn't, was revenue funding for workshops. That became the sort of de facto, one of the things that the BFI looked after or Regional Arts Boards looked after. But, the Arts Council itself didn't. There's something which I think is terribly important to remember in terms of the peculiar behaviour of the Arts Council, is that the visual arts department in which film took root was an exhibition organising department primarily and it programmed the Hayward. It directly programmed the Serpentine. It funded other regional galleries, but its main activity was its big collection of national touring programmes that it would do each year where they curated programmes. They had a whole team of curators and so on, so that was very much the model that there was to draw on. When I applied for my job at the Arts Council in 1977, my pitch then was that I would develop exhibition, but that was something that I was really keen to do and it's obviously Rodney was keen for me to apply because that's what he wanted done. But funnily enough, the job that I was applying for, was that of his assistant who fundamentally put together the catalogue of the film tour and wrote publicity things for all the documentaries as they were produced and press released and shown and all the rest of it. So that was my job and it wasn't till much, much later that I took over full time the running of the artists film and video committee, which I suppose was probably in the mid eighties or somewhere around that time.

JH: Was it tough to get money for artists do you think? Did you find that a difficult job in that organisation?

DC: To get money out of the organisation for its activity?

JH: For the artists

DC: Yes. To cause any deviation in the notion of simply a percentage increase or standstill, depending what the government gave you, was very, very difficult. Rodney was pretty good at arguing for increases and so on, whenever there was a specific fund that came along. Much later on there was a national touring fund that came along and I helped put together a bid for that, which is I think how he funded the Mite's exhibition equipment pool and things like that. It was out kind of a big national touring fund that came along at that point. But yes, fundamentally everyone assumed that you simply worked within the budget that you were given and that you would be content with that. One could moan but it was difficult to shift it.

JH: But their remit was quite fixed so basically did you have to work hard to change or to extend the funding to workshops or exhibitions like Biddick Farm and places like that?

DC: On the whole if the committee have the time honoured Arts Council practice of having specialist committees, which they don't have anymore, by the way, but at the time if a committee said it wanted to do something it knew how much money was on the table. If it said it was prepared to spend the money on this rather than that well so be it. It was very rare. Occasionally I remember that finance department, which thought it controlled everything, would kick up rough about something. They'd say "how do you intend to do this you know! This activity spills over four years and we don't have a guarantee of funding for more than one, so how are you going to do it?" But on the whole if you wanted to change the remit you could. I think it was actually one of the things that made the committee meetings entertaining and sometimes quite fractious was that there were very lively debates about "is this art or isn't this art? Is this community art? Is this real art? Shouldn't this be dealt with by somebody else? Is this experimental film? In which case it perhaps ought to be funded by the BFI. What's this terrible television stuff? Shouldn't television be doing this alone?" Those sorts of arguments were really, really interesting and continuous.

JH: How do you remember the emergence of video technologies and the use of it by artists? What was your first experience of it apart from the Croydon?

DC: Well my first experience was quite a bit before that which was sometime around 1969 when I'd got to know Hoppy. Hoppy showed me his little reel-to-reel, half-inch recorder and he lent it to me for a couple of days. And I did what everybody did when they got that technology, they kind of plonked the camera in front of themselves and they sat and they kind of looked at it. Of course I'd never seen my own image moving in that way before and it was a terrible shock. I was deeply traumatised by this experience but also incredibly struck by it. It was very, very extraordinary. So I think I instantly knew about video and its relationship with introspection and the confessional mode and all that. In a way I was probably rather surprised that that wasn't what one saw straight away when people started using it. I don't think I saw video again until my encounter with video in Croydon. Now that wasn't terribly interesting. The liveness of it was something that I remember playing with, with students at Croydon, and we did close circuit things and all the rest of it. It struck me with its own capacity for introspection. That kind of reflexivity of video was fairly limited. Though I remember being incredibly impressed and strikingly, even moved by Steve Partridge's *Monitor* and things like that, simply because they were so elegant and so pure in a way. That struck me as saying something incredibly vital and simple and actually engaging and all the rest of it. Later I saw some American videos, William Wegman and people like that, which was quite a bit later, it was probably concurrent with seeing Tamara's (Krikorian) early installations. I think Tamara's early installations rang a deep chord with me and were very video specific. I remember particularly her mirror ones, the *Vanitas* ones, which appealed to me partly because of their painterly pictorial resonances, but partly again because they addressed this introspection and reflex from this in a very direct way. Again, the one that she made, *Breeze,* which has planets floating through, it was working with the very limited exhibition technology of monitors, when she did something, which completely transformed them and removed them from the plonked-monitor-on-a-plinth phenomenon.

JH: Did you go to the Video Show?

DC: Yes

JH: Was there anything there that stood out that you remember, that you saw? I remember that was a massive show, wasn't it?

DC: I remember it was wonderfully chaotic. I can't remember where I saw David Hall's work.

JH: *Progressive Recession*?

DC: I saw that there for sure.

JH: Did you see *Videvent* by Brian Hoey? I think that was at the Tate. It was at the same show as Tamara's. I don't know if he did it at the Video Show but I know he did it at Tate. There are some great images of that for the project, but did you ever see it?

DC: I can't remember it to be honest

JH It was a participatory piece with a camera but it was time delayed so it would switch. It was very clever for its time it was only in 1973/74. What about Peter Donebauer because you saw his things?

DC: I saw his things at that time. , I saw Roger Barnard's odd merged faces pieces and things like that.

JH: But did you see it as a continuation of experimental film works, or did you see it as completely distinct from that as a practice? Did you see any crossovers?

DC: The medium specificity was something which was new to me about film, because medium specificity is not something that when you are studying classic art cinema it is not something that is in the foreground. Medium Specificity with film was something that I'd experienced very much through Malcolm and his peers at the Co-op and American and German and other examples. As I realised that the moving image had that capacity, in a way it wasn't surprising that video had turned up with its own specificity.

JH: When you say that David I'm just trying to understand because at the time, when you look at the work, actually there are so many crossovers between performance, sound, painting and film activity at that period, that the specificity issue, where was that coming from? There was no real critical theory or philosophy dealing with that until David Hall started writing about it, was there? Was that inherent in the work do you think or was it just something that came from film and so therefore you applied it to the video art works as well?

DC: I suspect that in my case it came from film and I applied it to the video art works. I recognised that they were in a kind of brotherly fashion so to speak, or sisterly fashion. It really is interesting looking back on this period now. I have a much wider understanding

now of just how diverse the early seventies were, the breadth of practices there were. At the time I think I was pretty blinkered. I think because of my particular route into it and my association with the Filmmakers Co-op group as they emerged, I was pretty clear about what the moving image was and what was appropriate and inappropriate and all the rest of it. Although, having said that, even then I was always slightly beyond the pale as far as Malcolm and Peter (Gidal) were concerned, because I liked people like Warren Sonbert who became a friend in the sixties, he was an American artist who was actually about as un-co-op as you could possibly be. And I like Markopoulos's films, which are like an anathema to somebody like Gidal. I thought they were extraordinary works of art, I still do. In terms of recognising what was going on in the local scene, my recognition was limited. I saw Prince of Wales Crescent as where it was all happening and then I recognised that actually, and it was quite a bit later, Prince of Wales Crescent was 1971/'72/'73, The Piano Factory in Gloucester Avenue was the next venue for the Co-op and I got back involved. Lis Rhodes and I programmed the cinema in 1975/6. I did early stuff and she did contemporary work and I guess by then I was beginning to look around again and see what was going on. That's probably when I started acknowledging video. That's actually when the Video Show was happening and so on. So by then I was beginning to kind of look around and see what else was happening. But, in the crucial period of the early seventies, I was fairly blind to what was going on in the galleries at that time to the conceptual artists who were doing stuff with film. I don't think I saw a Gilbert and George tape at that time for example, not that they were shown very often.

JH: So how do you remember that period in terms of LVA and that set up and that workshop?

DC: Well I'm talking about 1976 maybe. To be honest I don't have a clear recollection, exactly. I do remember David being passionate at the Arts Council about the need for a separate space, a workshop, a catalogue and so on. I think the catalogue was the first thing that we did fund via the Arts Council and some equipment. I don't know. I do remember going to early shows but whether these were the very first LVA shows. They were at the AIR gallery as far as I remember before it moved to Rosebery Avenue. It was in Shaftesbury Avenue and I remember things there.

JH: Why do you think that it evolved, because now everything is indistinct. There is a merge of technologies and convergence of technologies that anything is possible. One doesn't have to be medium specific and so trying to understand that very, obviously very fecund period of production, certainly around the Co-op and the philosophies around film were obviously very energetic. I just wonder why it didn't absorb the video technologies as well as the film technologies? Why do you think that was? Why do you think that they were so distinct?

DC: I think probably, the Co-op was going through quite a defensive period. I say that even though the Co-op's real attrition period was probably the Dairy, which is Prince of Wales Crescent and the Gidal period. But the Co-op was also struggling to get its first funding, almost in parallel I think. Actually it would be really interesting to work out exactly when it did, but I think it was very much making its argument for funding from the BFI at the same time that LVA was making its arguments with the Arts Council. It was interesting. It's something I commented on in my book. The video artists actually used the word "artist" very clearly and in a sense were making of their address to the Arts Council and so it was

art. It was something that the Arts Council was doing. The Co-op was much less clear about what it was. They were basically filmmakers and I would have classified them all probably as artists at that time, and certainly have done more recently, but it wasn't a term that they wanted to use. I think this is partly Malcolm's influence. Malcolm had been on the Production Board and had been doing his Groups research that he did for the Production Board, and he thought very definitely that the funding body for the moving image should be the BFI, and he'd been busy constructing that argument. Funnily enough, one of the blocks of research that Malcolm had done was about video groups as well as simply groups and that wasn't followed through particularly as far as I can see by the BFI. Partly I think, because there was a change of regime. Peter Sainsbury came on board being an assistant before but he took over from Mamoun Hassam, and he had his own very distinct agenda. Video I don't think was part of it, in any shape or form. So, probably it's possible that David was reading the book in a completely different way to Malcolm, and was saying to himself "The Arts Council is the way that we should go". But I do think that the notion of "We are video artists" was quite a strong thing in all that. It was a kind of statement of who you were and I think that kept the two apart in some way.

JH: That's fair to say. Even just from looking at the arguments retrospectively. At the time there was very little funding so it was arguing for autonomy. It was a late modernist idea then but I can understand why that seemed quite strong and dogmatic and probably had to be really in a way so that funding could be got.

DC: Yes, but the politics of representation etc. were obviously of interest to Gidal and LeGrice. I think they were of interest in a very different way to David.

JH: There were different arguments going on basically. I wasn't there so I can only say from reading the texts, because things have happened since then and technologies have changed and different practices have evolved. I think the arguments are equal but clearly at the time they served a philosophical purpose. Part of the research for REWIND is to somehow excavate some of the dialogues that were taking place because they weren't written down.

DC: No, they weren't, which is actually why they are so hard to recall. I do think the other thing, which obviously is very simple but I think incredibly significant, is that video was very quickly associating itself with the gallery space rather than the cinema space and although in the early seventies, the cinema filmmakers had been expanding cinema and all the rest of it, I think they pretty quickly retreated back to seeing the cinema space as being their primary location. But it was a darkened room and it had seats facing forward. It was unidirectional and for somebody like Gidal, I actually think that, in a sense, you can't have Gidal without having mainstream cinema. In a way a lot of his position is a fundamental critique of the mainstream and that obviously has no relevance to video as practice at all. It was more limited.

JH: It does though. I don't agree with that because I don't see them as distinct in the same way.

DC: But, we are talking about the seventies and I think they were at that time. I do think that was significant for video artists.

JH: But you don't see the televisual as part of the cinematic.

DC: The televisual is, but I think the majority of video artists at the time were addressing the gallery space and not the televisual.

JH: Yes, I totally agree with that and the discussions that have come out would point to that. But video was also partly to do with the technology, which was the monitor. They didn't have projection and projection wasn't very good anyway. I think it was a short-lived period maybe, maybe over the ten years from that sort of mid-seventies.

DC: But that was crucially to when the LVA was being set up. Going back to your question, "why was it separate?" I think it was separate for that amongst a number of other reasons.

JH: How did the film and video umbrella come about as a separate organisation from LVA? I'm not sure about the timing of that, so what was the reason for creating it?

DC: Well it goes back to the fact that the art department was an exhibitions organising department, and it did organise exhibitions you know such as the *Video Show* funnily enough, such as the *Identifications* Show, which happened between the Hayward and The Car Showroom in Piccadilly. This was the Gerry Schum Collection, and I think it was actually Nick Serota. This was before I was involved in the Arts Council, but he was working at the Arts Council. He brought it over and installed it in the Hayward. I don't think I saw it on that occasion but that was when that Gerry Schum stuff was first shown in its entirety in Britain. I think that was 1972, maybe 1973. There was the New Art Show in the Hayward, which was one of the first things to really grapple with the avant-garde stuff, which had installations in it. I think David Dye's installation of *Unsigning For Eight Projectors* was running for the duration of that show, so it was probably the first installation shown in the Hayward Gallery at length. That was 1972 I think. Later obviously there was *Film as Film* and then there were the tours and things we organised as public perspective, which was something that I worked on with Rodney before I joined. I can't remember what the date was, 1976 or 1977. Anyway, I began to organise small touring exhibitions curated by other people, the Mark Nash's *Serene American Video Show* which he did for the Serpentine, but was something that I organised and we toured it around. There was a programme called *Frame by Frame,* which was a collection of animated things that we toured. Out of that developed the idea of doing regular touring programmes and, simply, I think Rodney complained about me being distracted from doing other things and somehow or other we latched on to the idea of setting up this quasi autonomous thing within the department which would be a touring function. There was an example given by the dance department, which did the Dance Umbrella over a year. I think there was also a Music Umbrella, I can't remember which, but again they were quasi-autonomous things organised by staff in the department plus outsiders, so we brought in Michael O'Pray to work as an independent. He didn't have a desk in the department but he came in and used all the department facilities to do things. I got to know him through the committee. I think he'd ended up on the committee because we'd noticed him via somebody who was

involved in *Undercut* at the Co-op. He was *Undercut* editor so we knew he could write and he was a critic, a useful critic. Pretty quickly the BFI said they wanted to join in, I think partly because one of the first shows that he did was of Svankmajer and the BFI held the rights to all that stuff. I think Ian Christie was head of distribution at the time and he said, "if you are doing this we'll put some money into it." And that in a way gave us the opportunity to make him an out-of-house client. So technically that's how it happened and why in a sense there wasn't any problem with it happening. But, it was not a popular thing. It was not a popular move as far as the Co-op were concerned or LVA. Both of them were fairly antagonistic towards us setting up. They saw it as muscling in on their ground. It didn't take away funding from them at all and we were fairly good about insuring that they'd booked things. They block booked works from the LVA and the Co-op where appropriate as *Filmmakers on Tour* had also involved a mechanism for booking stuff from the Co-op and LVA so that the distributors wouldn't loose out. But *Filmmakers on Tour* was equally something that the artist distributors had mixed feelings about because they saw it as muscling in on their territory.

JH: They didn't see it as an extra thing that would promote the works?

DC: They could have done. Sometimes they did, but there was a basic antagonism about it. I was always fairly unapologetic about doing it simply because I thought that both the Co-op and LVA, in a sense, very rightly distributed the work of their own membership and that was it. I totally supported that, but they didn't have a historical library. So in terms of building audiences there was a bigger project in my view always. You had to contextualise that by putting it in its historical context, by showing it in its international context, by developing different curatorial voices so you've got that sense of a variety of views. None of which was music to the Co-op or LVA's ears. But in my view, it was essential if one was going to build an audience. To me the most important thing that we could do in addition to funding artists themselves was to develop an audience for them. They are different jobs. Fund the artists because they are artists and they deserve to be funded even though very often what they do is not wonderful or not going to please everybody. But, your second responsibility is to develop audiences for the work and it's a different one. They overlap and they complement each other but they are not the same. It's become something totally different now. It's now a commissioning agency and promotes a small number of people. Actually I would say that the fundamental work of developing the audience is still not being done. It's being done more because there are a lot more people who've seen a lot of work. There are a lot of young curators around these days whereas in the seventies and eighties there were very, very few. Another thing that we did, which equally annoyed some artists and certainly annoyed their distributors, was something we did in the mid-eighties at the Arts Council. We set up this thing called the *Venue Based Commissioning Scheme* where we gave money to regional galleries, in particular, for them to commission artists to make works. They saw this and I remember Jeremy Welsh wrote a very angry thing in the Independent Media about it, that we were delegating our responsibility, and neglecting our duties by doing this. But, we saw it as almost buying the interest of a group of intelligent curators who hadn't been interested in video art and the moving image before. Nearly all the beneficiaries, incidentally, were video because it was so much easier to commission video than it was to commission a film. But from that period, I think, dates the interest of places like the ICON and so on when they began to commission on a regular basis. They

commissioned new artists in their regions and so on and took an interest in what was going on but actually they learnt about film very early in the direct way, which they hadn't before. I think that thing of sharing ownership of the medium is incredibly important and has been neglected all the way through. One of the really fundamental things that held back film and video since the very beginning has been the absence of a commercial market for it. Whatever one thinks about commercial artists and markets, they are what drive art basically.

JH: And the other way round of course.

DC: And the way round, absolutely, but there's been no commercial market for the moving image at all until very recently and even now it's pretty limited. So in the absence of a commercial market one has to intervene in various ways to try and stimulate the range of interests and so on that a commercial market might have done. That means encouraging curators to be interested, encouraging cinema programmes to be interested and all the rest of it and it's a long uphill struggle basically, and it's far from complete. But, it's a really interesting challenge and it's something we did talk about quite a lot in the committee at the Arts Council. I don't think artists, who hadn't been committee members, were very often aware of the way in which we were trying to look more long term, more strategically about how you develop the field. We did try and develop the academic market here and in a way, it was the easiest one to do and it worked. Artists naturally gravitated to art schools to teach. The Arts Council helped a bit by doing those video bursaries and so on which, enabled some artists to go back in later and have access to equipment and things like that, Maidstone, Brighton, Sheffield, Bristol and other places I can't remember all the places that we did. But that in a sense was the easy bit, and in a sense it was even slightly incestuous that sometimes the loop was a bit too tight, a bit too closed. I think people went too quickly back into the college out of which they just emerged and so on, so there was a slightly inbred feeling to the whole thing. The market for exhibition of contemporary art expanded, which was I think one of the Arts Council's achievements, opening up places like the ICON, the Arnolfini, MOMA in Oxford, and more recently, the Baltic and places like that, which were heavily subsidy driven, but they were creating places where you could show contemporary art from around the world and doing what the commercial market wouldn't do. The important thing was to try and build the moving image into that and I think we had some success.

JH: Do you think that everyone was supported?

DC: In the late sixties there were incredibly few artists actively involved with the moving image: 10, 15 perhaps. By the mid seventies you know there are a hundred or two. It was still a pretty small sector and of those 100 or so, a good proportion did get funded, not often, not regularly but they did. If one includes indirect funding like they benefited from publicly funded facilities and things like that, which again is part of the route that we decided to go down, then I think an awful lot more did. I think the lean period was probably the end of the eighties and into the early nineties when public funding wasn't growing by anything like the speed at which the sector was growing, so an awful lot of people didn't get funded in those days. You can argue about the criteria, which resulted in people who did get funded

getting funded but it was juries of their peers that decided those things. But, it was clearly inadequate. It clearly wasn't enough to go round.

JH: From my perspective I'm seeing that there seemed to have been a lack of funding for experimental ideas like a laboratory or places like ZKM or places like MIT. That probably would have required a huge amount of funding or at least the connection with an academic organisation of some kind. The infrastructure didn't seem to be there.

DC: No. And when the lottery came along, which was our big opportunity, in theory, we were all subject to the viable business plan. The notion that you could build in a 100% revenue funding was impossible. FACT just about got away with it, though it was only because North West Art, didn't seem to have other huge demands on their part of revenue funding. North West Arts coughed up the money basically and has continued to revenue funded very, very generously. As far as I can see, it has very little income stream but the LUX obviously was the opposite story. There wasn't the huge part of revenue funding for it to draw on even though its revenue funding was more than doubled when it moved into that building. It seriously more than doubled, nearer tripled, but it still was woefully inadequate and there wasn't a viable way of earning. Actually, they'd built their business plan on a fairly substantial income coming in from workshop facilities and nobody wanted the workshop's facilities that they put in. I think we did at the time have interesting discussions about how many PC based edit suites could we have scattered around the countryside for the amount of money that we put into this thing. We could have given every practicing artist, their brother, and their sister an edit suite, an iMac and so on and that would have been it.

JH: Why was that set up like that?

DC: The history was that the BFI had undertaken to help find the Co-op a new premises when their Gloucester Avenue building gave up, whenever that was, mid-nineties, before the lottery came on board. So, they were busy looking for places in Camden and so on and looking for partners that the Co-op could go in with that would allow them to share a building and share costs and things. At some stage the LVA kind of opted to go into the same building. The lottery came along, a business partner was found, and the BFI, I have to say, was leading on all this with LFVDA Steve McIntyre, nominally the negotiating body that put the whole thing together, but the BFI recklessly undertook to underwrite the lease and things like that. I blame the Arts Council lottery capital department for not having seen the fatal flaw in the business plan, which was that the lease on the ground, unlike most lottery developments, was maintained by the property developer and there was no clause that said that there would be a limit to what he could put his rent up to. So he put up the rent astronomically and there was nothing anybody could do about it basically. It was extraordinary. Mind you, one does have to wonder how long it would have lasted anyway given the failure of its income stream.

JH: With television, in terms of that period, the eighties period in particular, a lot of the artists I haven't interviewed yet would have got funding from the televisual. Was your role in the Arts Council to expand the remit into joint funding between Channel 4 and the Arts Council? Where did that come from?

DC: No, I took an initiative there. When Channel 4 was set up, Rodney had set up this relationship with Jeremy Isaacs, which resulted in a block of money coming to the Arts Council. It didn't actually come, Rodney had to pitch something in, but it was an earmarked pocket of money that in a sense was available to him to co-fund documentaries. Jeremy Isaacs had also endowed the production board with a great dollop of money on an annual basis, so he was kind of committed in that way. But that meant there were beginnings of a dialogue with Channel 4. My first involvement with Channel 4 was the profiles, which we did almost in the second year. In the first year or the second year of the channel's existence, where I went down, and said, "Lets do some documentaries about artists and perhaps show some work". So there was the profile of Margaret Tait, the profile of Malcolm, the profile of the women who'd set up Circles and Jeff Keen, which was actually the best of the lot. There were four of them. They were shot by Margaret Williams, and they were shot on film. Then John Wyver showed *Ghosts In The Machine* and I talked to him about the possibility of including some British work in *Ghosts II* and that happened. The Arts Council funded some pilots, where 11 people got money to do a pilot which was going to test out their ideas for a 10 minute / 11 minute piece. I think a number of those did end up in *Ghosts II*. But through that I got to know John and revived something that I'd pitched to the Channel absolutely at the beginning, which was the idea that the Channel should buy in very short pieces made by artists. Existing pieces, and just drop them into the schedules. Alan Fountain was my intermediary there. I initially talked to Jeremy Isaacs but he passed on my message to Alan when Alan was appointed. And, Alan actually paid for a whole number of short pieces, *Oscar Fischinger* and *Circles* or something like that and lots of different bits and pieces. There was Paul Sharits's *Word Movie,* Kurt Kren's *TV* and things like that. All of which I thought would be fantastic, just the little things that blitzed in. So Alan had those transferred, and apparently they contemplated them for a while. Nothing came of that but I revived that idea.

JH: They didn't broadcast them?

DC: No, they didn't. But I revived that idea with John Wyver when I got to know John and out of that came *Midnight Underground* and the notion of buying in a lot of classic of avant-garde stuff and programming it. By now, Rod Stoneman was there, so he said we should include some British work that he'd commissioned and so on. So the majority of *Midnight Underground* was international work, and indeed film, in fact it was almost entirely film, but there were some contemporary pieces put in.

JH: And that was different to David Hall and Anna Ridley's productions that were specifically, apart from Ian Breakwell's works, specifically interventionist.

DC: Exactly, I was seeing television as a broadcast medium, as a distributor, as a very effective distributor. A distributor to parts that our means of circulating film and video didn't reach. I remember being delighted when *Midnight Underground* first went out when fan mail came into Channel 4 from people on Stornoway and places like that saying, "We had no idea this sort of stuff existed, this is wonderful!" If you get good quality things and if your set's properly tuned and you watched it in a semi-darkened room and all the rest of it, I don't think it's far off the original experience. I've seen some very crappy prints in very cold

dense spaces. So, it can be a good means of distributing things. Most of the art cinema that I see these days is through the medium of video boxes, videos that I rent, DVDs that I rent or occasional things that they show on BBC 4. It's developing the audience. It's back to the thing of developing the audience for the art form, which is absolutely fundamental.

JH: I think there's an interesting philosophical argument between the remit of David Hall who very specifically was interested in the televisual as a medium in itself, in the same way that he was interested in video at that time, as conceptual and contextual. But, this is different. This is distinct work. I suppose it was very different from what you were doing.

DC: But I would disagree with David to the extent that I would agree with John Wyver, who has said there are lots of other ways in which the televisual can be addressed. He would say that the dramatist who died not so long ago, who made extraordinary works, *The Singing Detective* and all that, Dennis Potter actually engaged with the televisual in ways, which other people haven't. And it's true too, but, going back to your question, the commissioning work for television. We got involved because it seemed that this was a way of broadening the audience but also bringing in additional money. We got additional money within the Arts Council to launch a television related scheme where we partnered Channel 4 and later the BBC in commissioning things. That benefited a certain number of artists, perhaps certain kinds of artists, but it certainly contributed to the "king of general ecology" one way or another. It was by no means the only story and we never cut other funding in order to do the television schemes, which is one of the popular misapprehensions.

JH: How do you believe that funding enabled the ambitions of artists using video in the UK?

DC: Well I think it was helpful at certain points. It helped with little bits of encouraging money earlier on when staking out an identity was important. It has consistently helped with exhibition and you mentioned Biddick Farm a while ago. Biddick Farm was something that we funded on a regular basis. Independent Media we funded. We funded all sorts of video-ish related things. But I don't know whether funding fundamentally altered the development of video or would it have developed without it? I think it would have been slower, much more probably, but I don't think it would have been that different. I think funding is an amplification method. I do think it was probably all, worthwhile and that it did make a difference. I think artistic practice always runs ahead of everything else basically. Theory runs behind it and funding runs behind it. That very simple fact gives you the strong impression that even if there'd been no funding at all, some artists would have won through. As far as I am aware John Latham never got any money for any of his moving image practice at all until Anna Ridley came and funded his latest thing. But, actually, his early really mad radical things that he did were completely off his own back. Jeff Keen did get a little bit of funding from the Arts Council from time to time, but 90% of his practice is self-funded and I think that's true of nearly all the important artists. More than 90% of their practice is self-funded. Certainly film and video could have survived without funding as long as it did develop in the Art Schools in the way that it did, going back to your Salon discussion. Clearly that was an absolutely crucial thing, and again, I don't think funding had much to do with the growth of contemporary art practice in art schools and its liveness to that. It happened. It was encouraged by things that the Arts Council did like funding magazines and so on which, I think were rather important in terms of stirring up the sense of awareness of what was going on, but it would have happened anyway. Then I think

what the Arts Council's funding, and the BFI's funding to a certain extent, did was simply make more happen and make it happen a little bit faster possibly and hopefully disseminated it quite a bit more than it would have done otherwise. You can go to something like the kind of current LUX Salon or the Film Co-op screenings in the sixties and Beta Books and they were enjoyed by a total audience of a few hundred and that audience is absolutely vital to the artists who were there because they are your one means of knowing whether your works communicate at all. It remains an incredibly small constituency and it's important that the art form is known outside that, particularly if artists are going to ever survive by their own art, by making art, then the public's actually got to be alert to it, responsive to it, to want it and to want to reward the artists in some way. Whether it's paying a rental or buying the work or buying a video of it or whatever, actually developing the audience is incredibly important and matters. I think it's something that the Arts Council did a bit towards, not as much as one could have done probably, but we did a bit.

JH: Were there specific facilitators or curators who were important to the exhibition or the broadcast of works?

DC: We've talked an awful lot of the kind of key facilitators: Anna Ridley, John Wyver, Rod Stoneman who commissioned those Video 1, 2, 3. It's a series, which people often forget and the European video series as well, as far as I remember. I think of people like Mike Tooby who, when I first met him was running the Mapping Gallery in Sheffield. He seemed intuitively to like the moving image. He then went to the Tate Gallery and St Ives and he is now running the National Museum in Cardiff.

JH: Are there any of the works that you consider to be the most memorable?

DC: I think David's sculptures, his installations, move me more than his single screen pieces. I could see David (Hall) moving from his actual sculptures to *Vertical,* which I think is really quite an interesting transitional work. It's both sculpture and film and then on into his big installation pieces. Whereas the things he made in between, which are his seminal pieces in some ways, strike me as being a bit didactic.

JH: The televisual pieces?

DC: Yes. Didacticism is a killer in a lot of avant-garde work, when people think, "Oh no, I can't let you see that. I think I am going to have to sensor myself" There are a number of artists I think who have been blighted. Their work has been self-blighted by their determined didacticism. My father was a Church of Scotland minister and I associate the Church of Scotland Ministry with teaching you how to walk down the proper road and there is too much of that in the British avant-garde. It definitely needs to be stamped out. There are things of Derek Jarman's, particularly the Super 8 ones, which are just so lightly made, but they are life enhancing. Liz Rhodes has made some wonderful films. Tina (Keane)'s Demolition Escape installation I absolutely love. Tina's best at her simplest in a way and again sometimes the television piece she made, Neon Diver.

JH: It didn't get broadcast though.

DC: I don't know, I can't remember whether it did or not.

JH: No it didn't.

DC: No, but she was one of the few people who seriously fell foul of Rod Stoneman. We ended up agreeing to disagree over that piece but, probably, he punished her for her refusal to give ground. Incidentally, put this on the record. I used to go to the Rough Cut meetings, going back to the relationship with television and with Rod Stoneman, we would have one Rough Cut meeting with Rod, which was his only intervention in the whole process apart from that, it was the artist and the productions advisor and occasionally me, who were involved, but there were only two occasions when we had a meeting with the artist out of all the 80, maybe 90, works that were funded through those various schemes that we ran. Where there was any antagonism between the artists and the commissioning editor. Tina was one, and actually it was unfortunate because I think Tina had problems in her personal life at the time that made her a bit unwilling to be flexible in any way at all. The other was John Maybury. John Maybury was horrified at the notion. Rod and I looked at *Remembrance of Things Fast* and said, "Well actually, this is phenomenal, absolutely astonishing, mind boggling, but don't you think it's a little relentless? How many of these repetitions can you do?" because he loops the loop, and I think Rod, did utter the phrase, "This is television" and John was just flabbergasted that anyone should be critical at all so we both shut up and that was that, and it went out as he did it.

JH: Oh so it did go out?

DC: Of course it did yes, but Rod got his revenge and just never scheduled it. There was a lot of stuff backed up at the time that hadn't been scheduled, which again was a cause of another grumpy letter from dear old Jez Welsh in *Independent Media* saying, "Channel 4 is commissioning all this stuff directly with the Arts Council and never broadcasting it!" Well it did broadcast all but one or two: Breda and Horvje.

Arts & Humanities Research Council
UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE
VRC Visual Research Centre UNIVERSITY OF DUNDEE
carte
DUNCAN OF JORDANSTONE COLLEGE OF ART AND DESIGN