

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND THOUGHTS ON INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS INTERVIEW

1. Brief history ^{born:}
worked in Europe: (where + doing what)
when (computer/video work began)
when - came to America
when - moved to Santa Fe.

2. how might one arrange a screening (viewing of your tapes)?
what tapes have you done in New Mexico (perhaps this is unimportant)

3. mention Stevia's award at 1980 Army Show / has date been set for your exhibit?
— give some information or feedback on video workshops that are part of
new music series in April.
is Woody still scheduled to give a tape concert?

④ PLEASE CONSIDER THIS INTERVIEW AS SPACE IN PRINT, are there any
areas that were not covered you feel should appear in an article on you + your
work - thoughts, information etc.

⑤ CAN WE HAVE SOME STILLS FROM TAPES OR COMPUTER GENERATED IMAGES
TO USE AS VISUALS IN THIS ARTICLE.

scheduled publication date: May 1, 81 - to press @ April 15th.

eg: want to talk at all about machine controlled images - like the
camera device shown at the Army, many people were fascinated
by it, why you use it, who built it etc. would you like to mention
the names of any person(s) you may have worked with in building or working
your equipment - if this would have meaning for them or you to appear in the
article.

CROSS REFERENCE WITH AUDIO

M: do you go ~~to~~ traveling a lot to talk with people?

St: well, ^{I was lucky since} when we came here that is actually the only money i've been earning, honest living, you know. I get invited from far away, It's all midwest or the east. we are both going to California and we have four gigs in four days. of course we are are going to use it to finance our trip. we are going to see everyone we can in san francisco. of course there are lots of colleagues there a lot of people doing similar things in the bay area. So, don't ~~imagine~~ IMAGINE for a moment we can earn a living in santa fe!

M oh no, i don't know many people who can.

ST oh yes, unless you ^{go} to the supermarket..

J yes, it must take a lot to support this equipment

ST yes but now we are ^{thru} ~~through~~ with buying. we sort of have it

J your system, the vasulka system?

ST yes, but you can always dream abt other things. like we would like to have a good monitor because this is so crummy and this is the only one we have. but it's not necessary... we can work without it so, our financial demands are much less than they use to be when we were accumulating all this stuff.

J I wanted to ask you to talk about the equipment you are using and how it dictates the images ~~the~~ you are putting forth.

M how much is the context the content?

ST well it is to a very ~~strong~~ degree. ^{J I know where these words come from (orig. to Rene Youngblood)}
Jare you doing experimental ~~play~~ with your equipment?

ST the tools predict to a large extent your images; that's why we want to make our tools because you can't make your tools to your images. see, if you are going to take everything that the industry gives you, then you are going to end up with a certain set of possibilities. beyond that we couldn't do -so what we have done consists of a lot of things that are manufactured by sony and panasonic of course and of that equipment, most of it, we can get secondhand. because you see, we feed off the industry that way. the industries throw it out when it gets dated and everything gets dated very fast in electronics. this perfectly good equipment we can pick up for a fraction of the price and thats, well, this is all standard equipment ~~and this is special~~ that's been made to the specifications of the vasulkas.

there are 2 pieces of standard equipment and all the rest is special!

W i feel the situation is much broader. you see other artform or artists have admitted to the ^{with} the material. inspired by ^{play} the material they revert to non ^{play} intellectual working, playing with hands or ^{making} whatever. these are notoriously known processes in art.

the basis of art. but when we pass into playing with this stuff,

people begin to separate it as this would mean something intellectual while it's very much the same process ~~applied~~. of play. because if people did not play then they move into the category of...

ST professionals!

W of the other. and i am always very astonished when people would make a difference between these tools or toys and other tools or toys like ~~printing techniques are very elaborate, Stone and all and and you just play around.~~ if i could not do this, if we were not free... and felt we had to do more, ~~if we decided we could not play for the rest of our life, no meaningful, no dutiful obligation free-we just can play...~~ people are sometimes disgusted by this play with this technology, how can you just play with it, why don't you do something with it? in other words, it's the same principle, it's the play that is the same inspiration of the material- to learn how to understand, ^{the material} to learn the craft to apply the craft to the material and then you get pictures.

ST so, are you saying that all art is play or is their professional art or some kind of art that isn't play, that is serious?

W depends, someone wants to play he can, someone wants to dance it is.

ST but is that still art?

W I don't talk about art, only about the process... ~~the artist usually says. the artist probably, usually has a certain process which is usually play.~~ ^{what is?}

ST but we play very seriously i would say, ~~i think we have...~~

W you see the woman, she is very serious.

ST i mean if you get up in the morning and you sit to late night with the computer and you don't call it serious?...

W oh, you get into these traps like competition with yourself and competition with the machine, all kind of ridiculous things

St and that's play, huh?

W well, it's a play because only subconscious motivation can have a service, not a conscious one if you put a heavy importance on what you do it kind of slips away, becomes kind of ridiculous i mean what the hell, how can you perform with such thoughts. ~~of life but it's very much known, this process of identifying the motives. the process of doing it. so that an ordered product comes out of it. i would say we can't allocate that to a specific. I would say we media or material it is basically the same process if you ask a painter~~

* or artifact

w ~~or other practitioner you will find the same conclusions. what i am trying to say is that we should demythafy the media in the sense of the same type of utility that other artists use in their context. that's what goes straight to the question - why did you ask such a question, you know the creative process.~~

j ~~i know, but i had to have you tell it to the tape recorder so i could write it~~

w ~~now how could you presume we could think differently? (laughter)~~

j but here is what i wanted to know - when you are putting a tape out, that is offering it for viewing, i somehow had the sense that you might extract parts of the tape to expand on or rework it - take a segment and make a totally different tape by using the image with a new program or sound. a person seeing it might not associate it ^{with} the original unless they had studied your work. In that way it is using your equipment to experiment if i might use that word instead of play. society might accept that more easily than the ^{serious} term serious ^{play}

w ~~but experimental art has its own stigma you see..~~

j ~~well i'm talking about all art as experimental and not the specific form that has been termed experimental art but do you that with your tape, pull it apart and work with it in pieces?~~

ST ~~that is just one thing that is interesting about it all~~
~~there seems to be some inconsistency with this. you think that since the material is giving you so many artifacts that you have a much wider choice, that all your tapes are going to be so totally different. but then you look at them and you see this incredible consistency and that is what i would probably call taste, or preference because you are given maybe a thousand images instead of a few hundred to select from. you select those one or two regardless of what the number of choice is i was comparing myself to (Brad smith) because we visited him the other day and he is in this process period now where he is starting on this large work and he only knows vaguely what the shape is going to be he doesn't know how it 's going to ~~be~~ end and whatever. it is the same images that he has always had, it is so consistent with what he has always had and then you understand that he was probably born with them he probably always saw the body like this and then he just learned the craft of how to make it so you know i am getting more and more into thinking those images may be where they are along and i just choose them. in a certain way we have a similar choice of images and in another way we have a very different choice of images so if we take the two together there is a difference in the ones he makes and the ones i make.~~

(Back to w's comment on "process")

w let's say sometimes you have a finite amount of processes. so sometime you sit here and make four programs, four months. now that i call ^{me}

kind of a pure construct, something that you make and regardless of what the pictorial result is these programs are independent on any reality because any image can be put through those programs and suddenly become variations on the program but that is where the problem begins. any image you put through or every image you put through will be an entirely different context. i mean content within that context ^{forming} let's get this straight... that is from very ^{unexpected} different angles ^{thought} that image will take over, totally cover up that process ^{what you mean} let say from color, there is a blue color and it is ^{ins} striking, or there is a movement and you say oh this is like kinetic something and you relate it in your memory to a whole bank of kinetic yet this is what i (call) my dilemma because i want to apply what i call these role artifacts that the machine gives me or i have to negotiate with the machine. i like them to be on their own. yet, when you slip into application of those you develop ^{*suddenly} this rich contextual work ^{it is connected to the world of art} it is connected to pictorial processes, it's going through the painting cezanne and all sorts of realities. some programs are very cubist other remind you of

the relation of ship

ST seurat

W seurat with the ~~picix~~ picxilated or pointilated. so you could say the trap of art, ~~especially with applied method~~ the obsession with application, to apply method onto any concept

only if the role artifact ^{which} has no other ^{pictorial or other} meaning beyond its own existence. you see that would be the dream but it always, by carelessness, by careless handling you always arrive at some product.

ST you slip into product

W or it unnoticed slips by you...you cannot control it anymore it escapes your environment and it represents your art so to speak. so that is why these systems, i think, have to be ^{so} watched ~~so~~ carefully. people should learn to look behind the first ^{Structure at} ~~structure~~ ^{of traction}, behind the pictorial structure. and should learn what we ^{had} ~~learned~~ learned, there is a control system behind that is approached first there is a concept of the image before the image comes out and there are various ways of controlling that image, cyclical way or there is some different, is it countrepoint or ~~any sound~~ relationship between sound and image

suddenly ~~there are various~~ all those ^{dear} which are so ^{is a} ~~dear~~ to us ^{comes out.} of course with time all the garbage which forms at the surface ^{do appears} will be laid bare because people will see ^{through} ~~through~~

they should be watched go well

those elements. you know just by the tradition of looking at the pictures but it may be too late. you have let slip so much of that ~~a~~ surface out that we have captivated those process that will not be repeated, see, that's the trouble.

rather

each tool ^{with} error will always locate their own processes with the tools, with the habits, with the abilities, within the tradition and these should be preserved, more anthropologically, ^{rather} than pictorially ^{or computer image} pictorialism as such, looking at the tradition of video as a pictorial product is very very misleading, very shortsighted. but we have to be careful otherwise we will ^{pollute} ~~the~~ world by meaningless images. People always scream and say ~~FABULOUS~~ colors and you know tomorrow they wouldn't say that

w they would say, oh see that, that's it. so you have to make some moral responsibility which you have to have.

M i am interested by what you mean by anthropological preservation.

W ~~i tell you a typical example is:~~ we started to work with video with a group of people, we suddenly came to this medium and started to work with it. it was extremely primitive. the first artifacts of that medium like video feedback became overnight everyone's art. it was so easy, to make. you just ~~take~~ *take a camera* ~~and~~, put it into the monitor, does a structural image ~~of a~~ *very close to* ~~mandala~~ which is reference to other things which is drugs and meditation and all the cultural validity, it was an instant utility and easy product, yet after you use it for a very short time it became so abused, i would say not abused but it was rejected as a possibility because it became so much a tradition- became so conventional. it would be so outrageous if you would keep on doing it. yet, if you look at it now you see ~~of cause~~ *of cause*, that it becomes ~~looked at or regulated to~~ *original* ~~on the level of other culture.~~ *paid attention* it has a significance but it ~~becomes~~, is located in time, it becomes history. instant history so then, what i am trying to say is that it becomes rather anthropological subject than aesthetic. and that happens in video because it is a phenomena first that has to be identified before it becomes truely workable.

ST like the other day woody was putting two different things together into a picture and it made for a very beautiful picture and i said hey, i want to record this, and he said no I'm just playing around and we didn't record it of course. and that was a typical anthropological thing to do while he was playing around he puts in another number and we don't know what comes out and maybe what comes out is very fantastic, very interesting and we didn't record it and now we are saying maybe we should make a session and put in all those numbers and record it but then it's ~~not anthropological anymore!~~ *artifact* and we are going to frame it and we are going to do all those other things out of context.

J ~~can't that happen when you are working with anything that has the capacity of recording...like one must have the camera or tape record with them all the time because of what might occur..~~

St yes, but how do you deal with it?

J ~~that's a question isn't it,~~ you could make it a practice for a time to record everything as you discover it.1..

St not for a time, forever.

J ~~forever? be that conscientious, it is being conscientious...~~
W basically it is a process of collecting found objects. many times we refer to things as found objects because we truely find- it is somewhat by coincidence or the architecture of the machine produces artifacts which we have never looked for. they are there so you find them.

J let us say you have a program and later you decide the way you might want to show a particular image would be to use this program that gave you certain results before - but this may look very different depending upon the subject, a refrigerator instead of a person... but then you have scripting.

W ~~well~~, everything you do through a computer ^{virtually} has to be organized through a program. it is a score, a priori. again there is a space for improvisation and ~~which~~ you can do some live reprogramming that might not always be directed or written into the program. so there is ~~some ways for play or experimentation~~ but it can and should, if your program is properly written, everything you have done leave a trace of the program behind. there is a notational system a priori and this can empty the machine into the program and preserve the program with a magnetic disc. just to give you an example, all the intelligence is on the magnetic disc so whatever do has to come from here (holds disc up) or has to be taken from the system and preserved.

so this is actually the medium which carries the notation ^{the system} and all the protocol all the rituals ~~is~~ written inside this little hunk of this magnetic medium and as you said it is a score, ^{unambiguous} ~~score~~ and i like to use score in terms of other forms of improvisation ^{compared to other}

with other tools like the analog, like gene discussed yesterday like wave forms were coming so as virtually unrepeatable so it's not unambiguous, it's ambiguous. you can write a score but it will be more or less ^{one} approximate interpretation. but here the ambiguity disappears. but then there is a whole different talk about what image you originate where you take it from, how you organize the primary image even without the machine. but it is a whole different story about the model of the image, if you generate from the data base it's in numerical tables or logarithms, if you take it from a camera, you see these ~~are~~ then discussions which have something to do with computer craft. the imaging craft, the imaging concept. but let's stick with your questions.

J) you said that when you did your work it was very different from woody's, and his from yours. ~~that is very understandable but~~ i wondered if you would characterize the specific differences. ?

St) that is almost impossible to talk about because that is something you know, you see it and you just know and if i was to elaborate on it or what it is, it becomes very difficult because ..

W) yes, what is the difference between you and me?

St ok, i would characterize it this way, i couldn't have made any of woody's tapes and he couldn't have made any of my tapes

W some.

St which ones? give me those, which ones could you have made.?

W you look like a turk,

St which ones would you have done, woodrow?

W the first two years of work is virtually indistinguishable.

(st) yes, you see we really didn't work together in the way of a ^{sense} sometimes we don't know anymore

whatever,

ST formal collaboration called wholistic or how you call it. how e we worked was this, that either of us would take over some process that was already...you know you set up a situation and usually the one of us that set up the situation would not be the one who would execute it. that way. i would set up something and woody would walk in and say, oh, gra (and i wouldn't know what in the hell to do with it) do it.

but even for the first two years we might not ^{always} know which of us did what

W we were kind of observing the phenomena in those years so the only authorship we would take would be to control it, step to it and do something to it in time. she's right, you would have to look at the tapes in order to make the distinction certain things she's done i would probably not have done at all on the other hand, you know, i don't go out and take images because that is something i cannot do, Vice versa

St well, you are not interested in that so he uses my library.

W gathering of images i am not the least bit interested in, you see that reminds me of my film ~~days~~ background so i would rather submit the pictorial part, i always insist on the conceptual part. the pictorial part is kind of arbitrary to me. alot of it. and vice versa, i make programs and she shamelessly

St I shamelessly rip them off, uh huh. and you haven't heard it yet but i am gonna rip off his sound. because he makes good sound. iam gonna go into the library of sound s and just mercilessly...

W well, it's a very strange thing, i think when you will study the work, some of it is ambiguous enough to be ^{produced} credited with either of us, some of it is extremely specific, like ^{flash} tens work, like using various optical ^{flash} -she didn't mind working with reality as i was trying to reality you see, but then she used a way that was very similar to conceptual, it's very abstractive anyway, so i can accept it, so we have no problem. i can like her work, which is good.

get away from

~~S+ yeah that would be a problem...~~

~~W we would have to divorce and instantly... so in a way~~

~~J and who would get the equipment?~~

~~W well, we will stay with each other and carry on...~~

St woody's work is always ^{slightly more} didactic he likes to put it into that context of some kind of a...

W i like primitive magic, like a hand and what happens around it a hand is notorious. it's ambiguous. i like to work with that

W kind of minimal image put in the context of something absolutely abnormal.

St well neither of us likes ambiguous images. ^{but} I am willing to live with a lot of them because i always just count on it that people will not find them ambiguous. you know what i mean - i will not want to verbally explain something because i think that people should just see it. the way one image follows another, that it has an order and woody likes to be able to explain it. to be able to show the order and if not pictorially, then he is unashamed of just verbalizing it. so that people will understand that that is the order.

W ~~i will explain this struggle with image because i don't believe that image in the traditional context has anything to say~~ ^{would it be} if it is a radical image it is useless because it cannot be explained at all. in other words, i would rather use an empty ^{frame} with nothing in it but the permutation of that ^{frame}. but now iam referring to specific work which you would have to see to have this be intelligent. no. our discussion is with certain ^{again} within certain limitations you can not ^{truly} interpret the work only when you are talking about it. the statements we may make may be contradictory which in fact of that segment which delivers empty frames only fractually, by movement, in fact indicates certain style again i cannot personally picture an advancement in a ^{truly} pictorial sense out of ~~either~~ ^{again} this tradition, but again ~~a priori~~ i don't come from a pictorial tradition at all i am not a painter. if anything i would be able to defend photography to some degree and that is in total contradiction with the computer ^{graphics} like photography, ^{aesthetics} computer graphics are in contradiction to computer ^{aesthetics} photographs. Computer graphics indicate there is a ^{that means} structure which is induced by hand, it is a graphic work even by reduction of the photographic image you can hold up a gradual image but i would like to maintain what is ^{called} a photographic image which is in tradition ^{called} photography

*aesthetics

it represents to me a certain truth in narrative ~~context~~ ^{would be} and since i am not a ~~proiri~~ ^{would be} doing graphic work, i have no reason ^{and translate into} to use my photographic work ~~to do~~ graphic work these two terms seem to me - well in a technological sense there is even much more deeper consequences on the ~~insistence~~ ^{insistence} graphic is purely two dimensional with less shading lets say from what reality would bring to an image so this whole context of whether the image becomes graphic or photographic infact a demand of aesthetic and technological talk. you have to sort out what is photographic and graphic just to understand what i am talking about ^{and then} when i am talking about tools we always try to keep the tradition of photographic but yet people sometimes refer to it as graphic. the whole category of computer graphics is very hard to escape yet we project onto this video to maintain the tradition of video

St what do you mean by the tradition of video?

W image that is rather of a photographic character than graphic and the way of obtaining it is from taking it from simple life space

St does it also have to do with dynamic versus static image ?

W that's a more different area but i am glad you said it. sure it is. because infact graphic indicates even the phase accumulations (so to speak) or animations is rather conceived ~~and~~ obtained from a real or life space in object movemet. ^{then} ~~relevant~~ ^{relevant} these are nuances ~~that~~ are very ~~relevant~~ when you work with it. it becomes a moralistic clash a collision of two maral possibiliteis that practically we would call graphic, photographic, computer graphic or filmmaker so these are names that someone has thought up like an art critic

/St i sort of divide my colleagues who work with moving image into iconic and dynamic - very silly words and they don't mean anything. but what i mean by iconic art is that certain artists are obsessed by the space which they have acheived with in the frame they put their whole cosmos into that and the other ones are the ones that percieve the cosmos to be outside the frame and the frame ~~is~~ ^{to be} this tiny little whole where you can see a part of it

M where you are peeking through

St yes, and the way you can detect ~~this sort of~~ the iconic ones, they are so satisfied to work within the frame and they usually put the object straight in the middle. they move it around within that frame. the other ones have things move in or they are maybe framed so that you have a half a cow inside and the other half outside and you don't try to compensate. or you assume or you give your viewer the idea that there is just as much outside what you can see. that to me is interesting that people should always think like that. so the satisfaction within the frame has more to do with people who like to work in graphics . it has something to do with that whole idea of graphics - yeah or people who like to work in photography although some photographers also violate this .

W although photography is extremely sophisticated, you can't lay that down on a specific style. photography ~~has~~ ^{i think it is the finest} degrees of all forms.

St that is true. except they only get one frame.

W It's a view but they still work with time. it is v. limited compared i think photography developed a different kind of sophistication which normally would not have this space to work in ~~a tremendous mental space~~ there is a tremendous mental space to observe details, your perception can get jammed by movement or movement takes precedence over other elements of image. that's what we do, the most primitive and primary interest is the movement which is probably comes from preservation of life you know when something moves you must observe in order to see what it is. the movemnt is...

St yeah, that's my material.

M it's totally primary material. it's vibration.

W W it's primal - also it's located more or less not in the center of the retina not in the forbia but the movment detection of action is in peripheral vision. [↓]

W so how is that, are we right

G Yes

W the moving image is the primary image - real time as we call it which indicates that the movement as it enters ^{the system} is the movement as it exits the system.

M i was going to ask you about time.

W well, it's a long essay on time so ask me that.

M real time, that concept is a mystery because ^{a person's} ~~a person's~~ own real time always distorted - so you are talking about an electronically measured time

W i tell you i got a whole different perspective on it this morning because i got a letter - she got a transcription of an interview in NY and that person is a film person. for him realtime was unedited videotape or unedited film. and it's right, it was once referred to as real time. start the camera and end. but for us it totally bypasses this notion of realtime as actually as a continuity of time. what we call real time is contrary to non-realtime - which an electronic system especially a computer organizes themselves. it is the ability or inability to deal ~~with~~ the amount of information during delivery and retrieval so let me put it very straight - if you want to make very complex images on the computer you have to infact deliver ~~a full~~ ^{forzen} frame that takes it apart or works on it for a second, maybe minutes, sometimes 15 minutes and delivers it to the medium which again ~~has~~ to be time lapse - which, except for the sequence of these frames in time will actually produce again the real time but once...

Handwritten notes:
Hunt
This is
important
for
understand
it?

St viewed as movement / ~~allusion of real time~~ allusion of real time

W yes, we could say film is a real time and animation eventually becomes realtime when viewed, but what is important to say is that in that process you don't have a feedback mode. a feedback mode is taken away from you because the process isn't done, you know it is beyond your control you can initiate and program the movement but when you view it it may be contrary to what you wanted or it brings a different let us say gesture of language instead of representing movement which has a crescendo and decrescendo ~~and~~ other property which is so minute but so important ^{and} ~~that~~ ~~xx~~ to gestural communication . it may disappear or it may bring inverted forms of thats why in animation you may see an amazing gesture they meant maybe in that way yet you perceive it the other way. so, what we rather do, we let the system articulate this. since we only deal with a realtime systems we continuously judge it instantly in a feedback mode in dreal mode

S_ which i call interactive realtime

W could be , interactive, i would call it ~~standard~~ ^{EXTENDED} behaviour that can be modified instantly . so it's rather behavioural than interactive. i don't mind writing a program and looking at it uninteractively that is i judge it and ^{make it continuous} can by repeated self change it that is i can write a program and judge it in an instant process - it's not like film you have to develop it . but again i don't want to be too much bigoted about it because there are now instant replays and the process is getting closer and closer to ambiguous ^{technologies} for us, just to make it straight, realtime is technologies

St: god ~~is~~

W you just video ⁱⁿ and video out. it's a necessity of- it's ^{over media} shot an aesthetic choice

St and this cost us lots of money but it had to be realtime.

because if we had been satisfied with anything less than realtime we could have cut some dollars out. it's a matter of - it's the most important thing because i cannot, i just don't have the skill, the interest and the attitude to work in a frozen frame. whatever medium that would be - i just don't, i couldn't do it animation or whatever medium - so it has to be realtime, that's number one. and i would sacrifice - and any kind of image making ^{requires} sacrifice because you cannot make the perfect image ^{involved}.

so i would sacrifice a lot of things before i would sacrifice realtime that's the only thing i would never sacrifice.

W but we don't know nonrealtime it's not in our craft at all. it would have to be extremely - we would have to change all the experience we have and make non real time images.

J your background being in music fits more into process work

St yes, i guess music fits ^{exactly} ~~more~~ ^{only} into realtime and ^{often} interactively it cannot exist in any frozen moment.

W yes, the frozen moment of sound is silence, the frozen moment of moving image is the still (image) a very profound discovery.

J i noticed when beaumont newhall asked a question on photography of gene youngblood, youngblood referred to the photograph as a still, - certainly if you came from the single image or photographic background you would rarely refer to the photo as a still.

St i would ^{ALSO} ~~often~~ make that ^{same} ~~same~~ mistake - i would say still...

J you just did, ^{that's what} ~~you~~ brought it up - it made me see how your perceptions are a moving , growing, gaining perception rather than static.

working with this equipment, which functions in the ways we have been talking about, i wondered if it altered your personal life perceptions?

St it is very referential, you know. like ^{EVERY} ~~any~~ other medium, you learn so much about yourself - that goes for

St everything. the computer is different because it is not an art tool in the same way. it is even more involved in giving you an idea of who you are . it is a philosophy in itself that information can either be there or not be there. it is not good and bad, it is good and not good, bad and not bad. so you certainly get into this universe that it is the absence and presence of a thing and not the contrast of one thing to another and ..

W and also the computer gives you a different medium - it is not the medium that you look at, it is not the hardware, it is something in between called the code. that means suddenly then that the experience that you have from other art forms which are analogous - what you see - or you can control what you see by mixing the color and make the instant feedback of the color and your vision, suddenly there is a code involved in computer and you have to get hold to master it, you have to master the code which represents that particular property. and as gene said yesterday, it is logistic time ~~which~~ brings these wave forms of analog world, and we chop it ~~that~~ into little pieces -the piece then is reduced so to speak, into a number and that number then propagates inside of the computer as the property of or representation of the reality.. but it is only assembled outside of the system and its referance to certain reality that is translated from the code to certain value, light color, so that ~~once~~ ^{meanwhile} it is in the computer it is in the form of a code so there is this intermediary between you and the world . it is the code. so that is a new thing to all of the processes that is why we are so obsessed by the understanding of that code. anyway it is a binary code - but that code can also represent alphabet, ~~de~~ ^{primary state}

St it can bring us pictures from jupiter

W y3s, and that introduction of code into our processes i find very significant. because that is what people want to cover up. you know many providers of tools - and its users would rather not bother with it because they think it is not the creative part of the process but we discovered otherwise. the creative process should also be controlled and finally it should be controlled on the

end of 1st hour.