Sweeney-Vasulka, 7/2/78

From 022, side 1

Woody: This is supposed to be about what do you think are video tools? In my mind, what do you think are the specialized video tools that cannot be obtained through the Sony Corporation of America? What were the tools you ever encountered, influenced, developed, worked with, named? If you have ever developed your own language? You have described your own work in some particular way that should be put into some kind of book? Thse are the basic questions. So the question is about the tools. If you have considered anything you have ever done in the specialized tools. What was the relationships to your developing this tool, what were your influences? To begin with.

Skip: To begin with, that sounds like the whole story. The first thing that comes to mind when you say "what are my tools" I just think of sitting in a basement wtith a camera and a monitor and the first tools I had were just a CV studio camera.

Woody: So tk tell me what it was. What was the craft of one camera and one monitor?

Skip: It was feedback. I would leave a set up in my basement back room. A camera shooting into a monitor, just the simplest camera and a monitor at an angle so that there was . . . I was starting to get what I call the basic daisy in feedback. And the basid daisy was just five armed or eight armed depending on the angle of the camera feedback blob. And the first tool was my finger on the

contrast and brightness knobs seeing that that drastically affected
the response ax that the feedback generated. And playing with the
brightness and contrast and obviously the zoom, focus and the tripod
with its angle, with what angle was I leaving the camera. And
I used to leave the camera at a particular angle becuase ther was
generally so much to explore in one particular angle that and
movement was so awkward that I . . . .

Woody: The position of the camera was very important to you? The axial . .

Skip: Oh right, the particular angle and . . . . in my first explor-
ations I went completely almost at 180° treating the screen . . .
how can I describe it . . . shooting almost at the same angle as
the screen, just off . . .

Woody: You mean the tangent?

Skip: right. Just off the tangent of the screen to see what that
would do. Shooting straight in and going to the opposite side to
see what that kind of an angle would do, rather what it created.
So position became critical. Generally I ended up wanting to always .
be perfectly centered, wanting to be . . . finding the true axis
into the tube. (interruption here) Anyway, I was just going to
say one other tool that I found just in xayingxxxxh playing with
w hatever I was playing with was the termination switch and using
termination gave me increased gain. And the next step was to put
the . . . was almost automatic that in trying to record some of
this stuff I would put into that circuit of the camera to the
monitor I would put the deck and instantly discovered that different
kind of effect was gotten by trading off contrast and video gain
and super video gain with low iris and low contrast was different

than . . . . the ~~fixt~~ first tool was my mind-finger-gain controls-
contrast controls.

Woody: Let's just go into this angularity because I guess
that's how you basically achieved particular specific.

Skip: Well yes, but I don't think I ever found specific
feedback, I found generic feedback and managed to ~~put~~ play within
. . . specific is dangerous in feedback becase you're saying that
you got a particular . . . you went after a partiuclar image and
I never went after a partiuclar image in feedback.

achieved
Woody: What I had in my mind was that you~~knoxgat~~, probably, the
most controlled manddla I found. Since you mentioned you are
interested in center, ~~afxdx~~ or dead center. Secondly, you are
interested in angularities which always, as you said, you started
with the daisy, the five or eight armed daisy and then you find
many modes of working with that particular constraint. So
~~xyanx~~ would you go into much more precise description of
how you achually achieved control, because feedback is
normally very had to control. How did you confine this into
the way you liked it?

Skip: Patience. Waiting for... like I would leave a mandala
hour
going on the screen hour after ~~afxexxxxxxbxxxxkxxxxxx~~ after hour just
leave it there and walk away and just leave it generating itself
and come back to it and see what had happened to it and I would
noticecycles, that it would go through cycles. And maybe the
cycle was the electrical pulse in the house or something, which
I later discovered had a huge effect on how the feedback developed,
that there were cycle pulses in the house. The electricity

system and that would effect the cycles that thefeedback pattern

would go through. The (inaudible) was always the - - - it was

like walking a tightrope or something because it was finding

a delicate balance because if you went just a little bit

past it you lost control and if you went a little bit past that

threshold you also lost it. So it was like riding a threshold

and riding a balance and learning to and learning what that

turning the contrast too fast the whole thing disappeared and

turning it at the right speed I I could get a change that didn't

destroy it. I was how much play you had in that delicate

balance and knowing how far you could go and how quickly you could

ga change any partiuclar xina element of it. But I think I found

something very early that gave me a tremendous amo-nt of control tha

other people don't get early when they start playing with feedback

and part of why that probably give up with it really fast. And

that was the use of a mirror and by placing one mirror in a

simple daisy feedback taht was angled and by its angle was say creating

basically a xix circle, in other words, if the angle was more

than thirty per cent the image was circular. Th point is if

I brought a hand in between the camera and the screen I would see

hands from above and from below and from the right side xxix from

the top from the left side coming and all the way around in the

circle. But if I put a mirror up then the image was repeated and

it was kaleidoscopic in that it was as if I was putting in 5,

6, 8, 10 mirrors depending on the angle.

Woody: Now let us understand. Xan Whre would you put the mirror?

Skip: I can show you if you can make it verbally.

Woody: Have you ever described your draft?.

Skip: No, never. If the camera were here, the mirror was generally angled below it, balanced on piles of something.

Woody: The edge was horizontal to the screen and then is tilted further back maybe 30 degrees.

Skip: Right. And how far up you moved it, how far down you moved the camera, all those relationships completely changed the image so that xuuxhad every variation had an effect the more you . . . the slighter the angle, the less the angle the better the reflection in the piece of glass. In fact I discovered you didn't need a mirror at all. The piece of glass alone at that angle had so much reflective capability, but by using the mirror I instantly got feedback where the delicate balance, the range was amplified . . . you had to practically knock the camera over to loose an image. The image was forcing itself . . . it was somehow . . .

Woody: It wtarted to live?

Skip: Yeah. Everything you did to it kept it going, so instead of how finding that if you move something just a little too far you lost it you just got something else, you just got something different and it becausd just a question of esthetically where you wanted to stop between zooming . . . Much more flexibility with the mirror and just with the simplest element of the mirror just barely coming into the picture suddenly the range was expanded fantastically and again every angle, every . . . you could raise the mirror up to the point where it was coming up to

almost the half way point on the screen or all the way down almost

to the bottom of the screen depending upon how you positioned

it. It was also the first way that I could fill the screen with

                                          could

an image. It meant the entire screen always/have image in it.

Woody: In a kind of elementary sense, an overall black.

Skip: So I tried as hard as I could not to let anyone know

                             until people could discover it

about mirrors for a long time,/because it was such a simple trick

~~~that that-it-was-such-~~~

Woody: Is that what happened?

(interruption)

Woody: Is that what became "Jonas' Favorite."

Skip: The mirror? No. That was awhole other discovery. That

was discovering the Setchell-Carlson with the detail knob and very

simply . . . its a Setchell Carlson with a detail knob, a

camera . . . by that time I was ~~~inxixnitsex~~~ inside the camera fiddling

with the beam and . . . wth everything. I fiddled with that . . .

I ruined three cameras I'm sure, fiddling with them and not

knowing however to get them back into a legitimage signal. And

"jonas" was a combination of finding out that one, you could

get tremendous enhanced resolution with the simple detail

know on the Setchell Carlson and discovering that very low

contrast and brightness positions going to the point where

you couldn't get an image and gradually creeping up in contrast

and brightness and balancing between contrast and brightness to

                    the

the point where/absolutely~~xxthe~~ most resolution which always

was low. Everyone else always had the contrast and brightness

set up high to begin with. And I got into turning them down

                                       in

low and as soon as I got into turning them/low ranges and starting

playing with the internal controls, the gain and the beams Istarted

geqting the ability to control the speed of the image and usually

the image was going to fast, too fast for my interests. And, one

of the first corrolaries that I developed was that the more you turned

up the target voltage and the lower you turned the iris in combination,

the slower the image got until you could really get it to really

look like slow motion, to crawl like slow motion. And then I think

by adding the removal of the pedestal, the droppingthe pedestal

down below, so the blacks became completely black pusing the

beams high I got this waterfall off the edge effect where things

would just roll right off as if they were rolling off th- edge of

a cliff or something.

Woody: You mean that the center . . ..

Skip: I'm speaking basically of stuff crawling out to the edge

and falling over.

Woody: That's what you call . . . Because I see a kind of logic

Skipx division, where it divides itself and . .. .

Skip: To me, I could get a feedback that was either pouring

into itself, pouring out of itself or floating at some sort of

. . . . a semi-solid state where it would regenerate itself and,

but not push at you or suck away from you or something like that.

Jonas' Favorite was some combination of the high resolution

mandala effects that were created by the . .. . Also that had

a great deal xm to do with running it through a 5000A. The

5000A and a circuit veyy much like the image plus circuit

on the Microtime that cleaded the signal andd enhanced edge

and so a lot of my tools were found that way by opening up

a machine and starting to play with the controls. And many times

blindly found, completely blindly, and having no idea what

the fuck I was doing, what knob I was pushing, just pushing

and seeing the result.

Woody: Besides thax this, what would you say was kind of your

discovery, with discovery in quotes.

Sweeney: Disvoery?

Woody: Was your favorite pastime. Because I know you have been

involved with the Vidium interface.

Sweeney: Yxx Yeah. That was . . . .I guess I feel that that was something

I bumped into and I guess I got so much of it that I got really

bored with it.

Woody: Was the design final when you met it?

Skip: Actually the first time I saw the Vidium Doug McKeckney (sp?)

was playing audio tapes into a live color Vidium that had an

interface board that would trim the sound, whatever sound was

being put into it but particularly Doug's synthesized sound

into various lissajous pattern s and the Hearn had already

perfected the colors changing by the intensity of the sound, and

so it was multiple colored. He had a color television that he'd

taken the yoke off of and controled the, I think he had similar

controls, it was like it was a monochromed image that was multi-

colored. HE I don't think he had the three guns separated into

three different image producers. The three guns wer all producing

the same image and part of it the red gun would be on, part of

it the green gun and part of it the blue gun would be on. And

ich gun was on, or how much of which gun would be on he ahd

related some how, or at least he claimed that it was related to
something like the volume of the sound or I think it was how
loud something got whether it turned red or blue or something
like that. But at the time my interest in the vidium was totally
in its abilityto generate an image and I always thought that I
did not do the Vidium any justice at all because I didn't care at all
for the kind of complicated images the Vidium could create. I
cared only for the very simplest images it could create because
my interest was mixing it into feedback and having it be a central
image in the field of image. And that's something I struggled with
fxaxx from the very beginning, to try to achieve some sort of a key
and I knew that kamxkkx somehow intuitively that what I wanted
was the image completely isolated from anything else thxx in other
words,a simple white on black image xxhx where the white was
keyed through and the image was simple kinds of circles that
pulsed to the sound of the music or waved xf to the sound of the
music that could mix in to feedback. And I think I talked Arthur
into buying the Viscount almost solely based on the fact that it
could key a signal and that thx I coulnd' achieve what I wanted
to achieve without keying.

Woody: You mean you wanted some figure against some background?

Skip: Not against the back ground but against feedback specifically.
In other words, I knew I wanted figures isolated in feedback
and I wanted them isolated well in feedback I didn;t want them
. . . I had this SEG which is one of the first SEG-1s which
kxdxke

has the characteristic when you press two buttons down, on

sort of soft keys into the other. When you press one and

two simultaneously, the combination involves one of th cameras

everything black almost disappearing out of the picture. I'm

sure that depended ¤ on how it was, how the particular camera

was adjusted, how much iris was on a particular camera. But that;s

how I first got any kind of mix of feedback and the Vidium. And

that was really very interesting —— my interest, something I

could point a camera at and get into a feedback field.

Woody: As an input to the feedback?

as
Sweeney: Right. And I had no real interest in it at all in what it

could do itself and really wasn't at all responsibe for in the

Moog Vidium pieces what particular shape it took or how it evolved.

I was really fed that by Hearn and Doug. And an interesting sort of

Moog
sidelight of the/Vidium was that I wanted desperately to get

Doug to turn the sound off and just look at the picure and play not

for the sound and play for the pictuee. He could never really accomplish

that, he just never would do that and I never understood enough

about the Moog at the time to get my fingers of the Moog and turn

the sound offf and just watch how it affected the shapes of the

pictures and the pulse of the pictures. That was somethingI was

interested in seeing. And also I guess the Moog Vidium was sort of

started to whet my appetite for as soon as I had keying at all I

instantly wanted keying and colorizing. I had . . . Arthur brought

Jackie Cassen's CT Lui Colorizer

Woody: That's George Brown's.

Sweeney: George Brown's Colorizer. I was just totally frustrated by it. I mean you could turn . . . there were four knobs and I never knew what any of the knobs were doing. I could see what they were doing but I never could make any intelligent decisions about how I wanted something to look with it. I was just sort of left with whatever I got and it brought me to the point of saying to Hearn that I had to have a colorizer where I had separate control over separate areas. And he just . . . he really said "Well of course I can make a colorizer!" He could make anything at the time and I'm sure he can, but at the time he could make anything and he could make a colorizer. So I said "fine, make a colorizer" and we agreed to pay for parts, VFA would pay for parts or something and he and Alan Shulman would hammer out truing to get it done. And the original colorizer is still sitting up stairs.

Woody: There was no special budget, so to speak, or application. It was taken from your operating budget.

Sweeney: Right, it was spending money that always came from us doing another job for somebody else.

Woody: Did he invest his own time into it?

Sweeney: Yes, he invested his own time and energy into it, knowing full well that it was going to have applicatons beyond the simple colorizer that I could play with. And what I asked for and got/didn't realize it at the time—was basically a simple bank of five background generators with keyers in between, with keyers that would divide the five background generators. He eventually

dropped it down to four for his production models but the old original one has five. I knew that I wanted to be able to . . . I was very frustrated by not being able to turn something that was light, like the white image of the Moog Vidium that was thefirst image in the Moog Vidium feedback tape, which was the brightest image. I wanted to be able to make that look dark red or dark green or dark blue or dark anything. And I couldn't do it because that the George Brown colorizer had no effect on the gray level of it. And so I said I got to be able to drop that gray level down. I gotta be able to make that gray level black so that that image can be deep red or deep blue. Andso that the background instead of always having to be dark could be light by pushing it up. And I think I instantly developed an esthetic of reversing wa what I was giving given always, and always going for making brighter images dark and darker imapges bright. And having that gray level be the hxxx heart of what colors I got. Immediately started palying with hue, chroma and gray level on each separated out section of the picture. And part of it was to insist that I had to be able to colorize one part of the picture without having to change the color of the other parts of the picture. It seemed revolutionary at the time that he could put out a machine that would do all that.

Woody: To what degree do you feel that you have influenced these particular elements that you have described.

Sweeney: Those elements of his colorizer? I feel like I'm, in that sense, the architect, the conceptual architect of having . . . .

Because it's exactly what I asked for. I asked for gray level control,

separateable key levels and gray level and chroma and hue control

over each level separately. Now, xx sine then he's added a shitload

on top of what . . . of that xx. On top of that he's added

being able to mix the picture back into any one of the gray levels,

being able to mix a different picture into any one of those gray

levels.

Woody: Xxxx Was there any memo that was communicated between you

two guys? Xxxxx Did you ever describe what you wanted?

#509   Sweeney: No. This is totally off the record, but I got that

for . . . (deleted)

<p style="text-align:center">END, SIDE I</p>

<p style="text-align:center">SIDE II, from 000</p>

Sweeney: . . . Bill Etra is the archtiect of the Videolab to

my mind, completely. And that my only contribution to the

Xxxxxxx video engineering and all that is that I was the person

who said "make me a colorizer" to Bill Hearn. And to whom he

said back "I can, I can do it." Alan Shulman deserves a certain

amount of credit for having worked with him and made it happen

to the extent that I never could have. As a liason more than

anything else he kept saying "OK, let's to this, let's do that." -

I think, I don't really know. All I know is that Alan was always

working with Hearn when that first colorizer was built.

Woody: How many were built? The one that you've got . . .

Sweeney: That one prototype was the first. No one else that

I know. It was used by other people that came through here

and wanted to colorize something.

Woody: Anyone do some substantial work on it?

Sweeney: No, and I think that the substantial work that I did

on it was almost all redone as newer colorizers . . . as something

I learned right away was to shoot all my images in monochrome

and not to colorize them. Because if they were colorized it was

very difficult to retrieve them from the George Brown colorizers

and recolorize them a different way. So I started and have continued

to do almost all my base work for images in black and whites

because I still believe there will always be a better colorizer.

Woody: You had two colorizers here? George Brown and Hearn.

Sweeney: Yeah, although I think George Brown's went back to

Jackie Cassen at some point. Or as soon as I had that one

I didn't want to play with the otherone at all.

Woody: And that was the last cooperation you had with Bill

Hearn? Did you continue in any way ~~thinkaban~~ thinking about

~~Sweeneyx~~ the next generation?

Sweeney: You mean about a colorizer? No. I was always in touch with

Etra and you and hearing things about voltage control so I knew

that Bill Etra had gotten him to apply voltage control to his

basic colorizer. He gave the exact same colorizer I had, which was

now a third prototype or something like that, Etra took and had

him do complete voltage control on the colorizer.
                                              in
Woody: Let's go back to the esthetic part/which you described

you could separate or slice or classify the image into four

steps and control them independently.

Sweeney: That's something . . . I went to Chicago in 73 or something

and met a friend of Dan Sandin's who was teaching at . . .

Woody: you mean Phil Morton?

Sweeney: A friend of Phil Morton's. Matthew something, I can't remember his name. He'd almost put together a Sandin synthesizer and would turn the knob and would have what looked like a soft key effect and I kept saying that's a key and he kept saying, no that's a comparator and I kept saying that it looks like a key to me, you're going through the luminance level of the picture. And I could never understand what the hell he was talking about. I mean, I figured comparator, you're comparing levels or something or doing something to them. But to me, the effect was keying, the effect was . . . and for me, when you take a picture that's you know, the waveform goes like this and you take a line and you go through from low luminance to high luminance or from high luminance to low luminance and get an effect from one side probably of the line to the other. That's keying. Now, I'm sure it/isn't always keying. There's other terminology for it.

Woody: Sandin did't know television terminology. He called it comparator because that's the circuit on which a key is based.

Sweeney: But it was a keyer then. That's what I thought they all seemed like to me, and it seemed like he had multi-level keyers also.

Woody: He calls it an iamge classifier. It classifies the voltage levels.

Sweeney: To me that was just clip levels or something.

Woody: Indistince but something about modular system performance. He didn't have any language of video or any language television.

What other, then you worked with slo-mo I recall. You had a period

which was kind of always probably . . .(indistince) but some

thing about slo-mo

Sweeney: That was really just, again, I just happened to bump into

a machine that did clean slow motion. It was a Javelin slow

mtion machine that recorded 7 hours, it had two speeds, 7 time

and regular speed. And the machine . . . you could record in

slow speed and play back in regular speed, you got fast motion.

You could record in regular speed and play back in slow and you

could do multiple dig generations and get down to 49 time slower.

It was really just that the machine was there so I started putting

tapes through it because I just knew instinctively that I liked

slow motion. A ãot of the Moog Vidium stuff was too fast for my

taste so just being able to slow it down and to be able to slow

it down clean so it looked like it had to be disc ãlowed down

for nothing but making a dub of it. There were different effects

too. Thre was one effect that was to me the most fascinating

which was the process of . . . if you took a tape and recorded

it in slow speed and then played it back in slow speed you got

and effect . . . skip frames or jump frames. It record certain

frames and then record another frame and then record another

frame and then record another and it would . . .. The effect was

that you played back a tape going in real time and you played

back a tape that had been recorded in slow motion played back

in slow motion and this tape looked normal and this tape jumped

and looked as though it were slow motion. I guess its stop

actďon. It had to be stop action but it had the look of slow

motion. You could watch the two tapes and the time was the same

but the stop action . . . it was an effect I really liked.

Again, it was something I discovered this xx machine could do

and I just happened to have this machine.

Woody: Is "Illuminating Sweeney" a representative work? Is it

a summary? If someone sees those tapes is that according to your

ideas of what you are all about, of what you are?

Sweeney: As much as a half hour of tape can. It shows, I think

for instance the ocean tape ~~ixxtiaxxtydémx~~ xxxixx was clearly for me /me just an exercise

in trying to show what a simple colorizer could do. How it could

take a tape, just a shot of the ocean and one black and white

tape and make it first look like it's a color tape and then

go beyond into realms of fantasy colors and go back out again.

And I felt that it was a very and . . . and that's more my

esthetics than my tools, but my esthetics are to do things very

simply and straightforward and to maybe ~~it~~ demystify the process

and not have it seem like I'm a magician but have it seem like

I'm doing what I am doing which is taking things available to me,

putting them together in ways that look more interesting thatn

when they came to me in the ~~fixtx~~ first place.

Woody: Did you ever make a tape on how to make a feedback?

Sweeney: No, I think I tried once to make a/feedback tape. No, how to make a

I don't think I do.

Woody: indistince, but something about ~~xxhxxx~~ Sweeney's ôther

craft activities.

Sweeney: The only thing is that when we were doing the Moog Vidium

we alwyas shot us actually doing it. And to me the Moog

Vidium piece that's in Illuminantin Sweeney I went back and

forth between the process and the produce. I think I may

have had too much of the process and not enough of the product,

but it was totally to try .... again, it was shot simultaneously.

It was the exact same moment what you were seeing in picture

you were seeing the process of the making of it and to me it

was just like letting peeple see . . . it was collagedxhxx at
                           quad
WNET when they had xxixxgx machines.

Woody: So you had two tapes.

Sweeney: Right in fact, it's great, you know it was a five minute

piece but becuase one was shot on portapak and the other was shot

on a regular deck they were completely out of speed. So John

Godfrey sat there as I would dixssixxx have the engineer dissolve

to the product which would go faster John would drop xxhx the

servo on the AV-1 so that the AVR-1 would catch up and speed

up and as soon as he could hear sync he'd xx say OK, now you

can mix back, and we'd mix back into the process until itix sounded

like it was getting too far out of sync and John would . . . and

we'd go back to t he product and John would . . xzxxxexexxxxz

(stuff follows which is unnecessary)

Woody: I see, but the segment you have is a complete segment.

I mean, there is nothing missing. Do you have hours . . .

Sxxexexz   Sweeney: Oh yes, I have hours and hours and houss

of both the process and the product. And, no, thepiece is not at

all . ... I tell you I decided to give up on the idea of all the

varieties because I didnt have the production time to put in al

the little . . . I could have put in a section that was five

minutes lpng. I could have put in three minutes of that and

two minutes of all the other things that system was capable of
                            which were
generating in types of images xxx/generated as we played with

it and could have done five seconds of 100 different variations.

Woody: xxxxxxxx Is there any of this material in what you

sent to O'Grady?

Sweeney: Yes, almost all the origiaal Moog Vidium materials, and
              the.
they're all/variations xx of the different kinds of pieces that

are in there.

Woody: Did you have any relationship to people like. . . let's

say Steve Beck?

Sweeney: No, the barest kind of contact. I was once . .. Bill

Roarty came over onee and saw some Moog Vidium stuff and he

said "hey, you're doing stuff that we're doing. We really should

be working together and you're doing very similar stuff to us."And

I went over there a couple of tiems and got no real sense . . .

I went there when you were here.

Woody: Cold Shoulder, huh?

Sweeney: Well, sort of, but I remember Bill Roarty saying to me

that we ought to get together and do something and I think if anything

I might have given him a cold shoulder at the time becauee my

head was on Steven Beck and Don Hallock and didn't know who Bill

Roarty was and wasn't, you know . . .. Although I remember sort of

ishing I had related to kim, but . . . I think there was some weird

number going on f-eling that these people wer being paid to do what

they were doing and we were doing it by the seat of our pants.

And we very much felt like we were capable of generating just as

interesting an image with what we~~buxexguix~~ could pull out of

our hat while they appeared to be extremely well funded and that

all they really had for all their well-finding was Steven Beck

and his ability to make a direct synthesizing machine. He would

have done it on his own anyway, I think.

Woody: Were you aware basically, I guess you weren't aware of any

other tools except (inaudible) synthesizer at that time. Did you

have any introduction to electronic tools.

Sweeney: Well, you know, SEGs and switchers I was aware of. Because

I was going to New York just about every year I was aware of the

Rutt/Etra synthexizer and I was super aware and am still totally

hung up in your floating pictures. I mean that was . . . I seriously

am trying to make that happen on a broadcast ip program and

feel like it's a Vasulka inspired.

~~Vasulx~~ chitchat about computers to 231

Woody: But were there any local shows like I recall in the Exploratorium.

There must have been some technological base before you started doing

video anyway here.

Sweeney: Technological base?

Woody: There must have been some activities around, electronic

arts or did you stumble over this video just by change.

Sweeney: Yeah I stumbled. I stumbled into feedback in 68 and

I know from 68-70 or so there were EAT . . . I think the Exploratorium

really evolved out of the EAT.

Some ommisisons for irrelevance until 268

Woody: The question is, what do you think about the matrix? Whose

ideas was it, what did it do to you?

Sweeney: REally it was Arthur's idea and it was based upon

primarily the idea of multiple monitor, multiple track video

theater display. So when we thought we were going to·do a multiple

. . . Actually it was arthur's idea and actually it was a technician

at can't remember the guys name, arthur would know, some think like

Bill Hayward. ANd basically he figured out that you could terminate

the signal vefore you sent it to the monitors and thereby send

to many monitors or few monitors and not change the signal. The

monitors have to be unterminated.

Woody: Do you think it ahs any impact on what you were doing

esthetically.

Sweeney: Oh yeah! It was xxxxxx more like economically, we would

have had to spend thousands and thousands of dollars to get a good

signal to each monitor and not effect the total signal.

Woody: But esthetically do you think this eventually led into the

t heatrical involvements?

Sweeney: In the theatrical stuff I tink the impulse was there bo

begin with. I started . . . the first thing I decided I had to do

was to do public showingsof material. It was an automatic impulse

or something. I came out of theater and doing shows was just auto-

matic, I just had to do shows.

Woody: The idea of multi-channel . . .

Sweeney: Even multi-channel was done in (inaudible name) was

two track . . .

Woody: The Vasulkas developed also a switcher, we had a pin matrix.

So don't you think the whole electronic video presentation was

trying to be multi-channel.

Sweeney: Sure, but I think taht was more because in your head you

were trying to compete with big screen, and the only way you

could compete with big screen was many little screens and a variety

of those little screens.

END