Although he is better known for his videotapes and installations, Gary Hill has also been prolific as a sculptor. Born in Santa Monica, Calif. in 1951, Hill moved east in 1969, and in the early ’70s began making videotapes at Woodstock (N.Y.) Community Video. Like many artists in the late ’60s and early ’70s, Hill’s earliest tapes reflected a highly experimental approach in which the capabilities of various electronic imaging tools were explored. For the most part, this kind of video was visual in orientation, and Hill’s work was no exception, drawing on conventions of abstract expressionist painting. Eventually dissatisfied with the limitations of such an approach, Hill began to make tapes that integrated the audio and video components so tightly that sound became almost visually apprehensible. This concern—in which the immaterial is somehow made physical—is central to all of Hill’s video and videocomponents so tightly that sound became almost visually apprehensible. This concern—in which the immaterial is somehow made physical—is central to all of Hill’s video and installations and tapes, and to some extent, is derived from his background as a sculptor. In his movement work, however, language and thought—rather than electronics—are the immaterial entities that are given form. Hill’s tapes since 1980 are of two types: short, descriptive, often convoluted passages which are sparsely “illuminated” by abstract black and white imagery and extended monologues that directly address the viewer, to which video is rapidly edited to the beat of Hill’s voice. Though they differ greatly in tone, these tapes reveal Hill’s exacting—almost obsessive—weighing of image and language as carriers of meaning. At the same time, they are richly evocative pieces that variously resemble poems, stories, and soliloquies. Hill’s installations, too, bespeak his interest in setting up dichotomies between sight and sound, language and image. Hill has received production grants from the National En- dowment for the Arts, the New York State Council on the Arts, and PBS-station WNET in New York. In 1981, he was awarded a video artists’ fellowship from the Rockefeller Foundation. A 1982 recipient of the United States/Japan Exchange Fellowship, Hill will travel to Japan next fall. This summer he will be teaching video at Bard College’s recently es- tablished M.F.A. program in video. The following interview was edited from transcripts of two meetings in Barrytown, N.Y., on Oct. 28, 1982 and Jan. 5, 1983. The interview incorporates Hill’s additions and revisions.

Lucinda Furlong: You worked in sculpture for a long time before you became interested in video.

Gary Hill: I got into sculpture in 1969, when I was 15, while I was still in high school in Redondo Beach. I had always been interested in art, and the brother of a friend of mine—Tony Parks—was a sculptor. He welded. I saw him working and was immediately drawn to the process. I had a summer job at a hamburger stand on the beach—a surfer’s dream—so I earned money to buy welding tanks and started welding. Soon after that I was set up making sculpture in all my spare time, except for a little surfing. It’s not that easy to give up. Even though I had vague notions about the avant-garde, I really wasn’t aware of American art. I was looking at Giacometti and Picasso. Picasso was a god to me. I had lots of support from my friends and parents, in particu- lar my high school teacher, Mr. Pelster, who just let me do my thing. He was a big reason why I even finished high school. I didn’t see much point in it, and almost quit. When I got out, I saw a pamphlet for the Art Students’ League in Woodstock, N.Y., which described it as an idyllic artists’ colony. I came out for a month on a scholarship, but I didn’t do sculpture. I just drew and painted, made thousands of drawings. Then I went back to California to go to a community college—partially for a draft deferment—but decided I would get out another way, and college definitely was not for me. I quit in about two weeks.

My teacher at the League—Bruce Dorfman—had invited me to work independently with him. So I packed my belong- nings and hopped in a driveway car. I experienced my first fall, first snow, first being cold-as-shit, first super struggle. I didn’t stay in that situation very long, though. I got jobs. Actu- ally, I’ve been pretty lucky in terms of being able to do my work with very little struggle.

About that time, I began to see art in New York, and the thing that really overwhelmed me was a show at the Met called “1940-1970.” It was the New York School. I was knocked out, and went through a lot of different attitudes in my own work. I still used the same materials, but I went from making cage-like structures with human forms—almost Bosch-like—to abstract biomorphic shapes mixed with geo- metric shapes. Pretty soon it was all geometric. I started using wire mesh, spray paint, welding armatures for shaped canvases which were incorporated into the work. I would make shapes, pile them into a corner, and then work with them later. It was like being my own factory. I went through a complete cycle of color. I slowly started to add color to the metal. I got very extreme using fluorescent, and later I toned down to metallics, essentially monochromatic, and finally back to the natural color of the material—copper-coated steel welding rods. I started improving large constructions in the exhibition space, usually working off a wall and down to the floor into a kind of sprawl. I was working a lot with movie pat- terns, and the sheer density of layers and shapes. Experi- menting, burying myself in the process, working all the time. It wasn’t intellectual. It was more like—how far can I take this material as a worker? LF: How did you get involved with video?

GH: I got into sound first, I discovered the sculptures gener- ated interesting sounds, lots of different tones. The overall texture seemed to mirror what I was seeing. I worked a lot with loops and multi-track audio tapes, which later became an integral part of the sculpture.

Getting into video isn’t so smooth in retrospect. I think at the time I was getting frustrated with sculpture. I needed a change. I was drawn more and more into working with sound. Around that time, Woodstock Community Video had been es- tablished. I walked up the stairs, knocked on the door, and said, “Gee, I’d like to try that. Can I take out a Portapak?” So I did a performance/environment piece with a friend, Jim Col- line. For four or five nights in a row, we painted colored rec- tangles in the town of Woodstock—all over everything, stores, private property, public property. They slowly ap- peared. I’ll go back and look at it—not really a documen- tary… I just went out and talked about it with people, about what they thought. Should there be more colored rectangles? Should they go away? I really enjoyed the whole process, the experiential aspect of that little thing up there next to my eye. It seemed like there was a high energy connection to what- ever I was looking at. I guess I became obsessed with that electronic buzz [laughs]. It was like a synapse with the rest of
the world in a removed way, yet attached at the same time.
So I exchanged work at Woodstock Community Video—recording and editing meetings whatever Ken Marsh [the former director] wanted—in exchange for using the equipment. Sooner or later I got a job there, because NYSCA [the New York State Council on the Arts], which had been heavily oriented toward community video, switched to the art route—video art.

**LF:** When was that?

**GH:** Around 1973–74. I was given a salaried position as the TV lab coordinator, helping people to use the equipment. They had a few devices—a broken genlock unit and a keyer—put away because they didn’t really work. So I asked Ken Marsh if I could come in late at night and he said it was okay.

I totally got into that. Everything half worked. The keyers would put out really harsh, broken edges. I don’t know what the genlock put out, but there was always something. I had mounted a monitor in a little studio—recording everything, starting and stopping the tape, manipulating it with my hands. Everything was open. It was a very free testing. Discovering how to manipulate this material was amazing.

I can remember being totally naked, lying on the floor with a tripod over my head pointed a camera down on my mouth and another camera on my stomach. I would make a kind of primal sound with my breathing, raising the camera on my stomach so that it would reveal my head from the bottom view, making this sound. This was all somehow mixed through a special effects generator. In a manner of speaking, I was practically fudging the equipment. Some time around then I made *Rock City Road* (1974–75).

**LF:** Were you colorizing the tapes?

**GH:** There was no colorizer there at first, but Ken was friends with Eric Siegel, and he got a Siegel colorizer fairly soon. About the same time, I found out about the Experimental Television Center [now in Owego, N.Y.]. I didn’t know about the equipment there; I just had heard that they had all these possibilities. With the tools I was using in Woodstock I saw an infinity of image-making possibilities, and they had a whole set that was much more sophisticated. So I went up there and met Walter Wright [artist-in-residence at the Experimental Television Center from 1973–75], and became very good friends with him. We did some multi-media performances together called “Synegism” (1975–6), with Sara Cook, a dancer in Woodstock. Then we started fantasizing about having our own machines, but it didn’t really happen until 1976. Ken thought that Woodstock Community Video was going to be a media-organization-in-residence at Bard College. Everyone involved moved over to Rhinebeck, but it fell through at the last minute. So for a short time Barbara Buckner, Steven Cal- pan, and me all lived together as artists-in-residence. There was no money, but we weren’t using all the rooms. I made Ken a deal—I asked if I could have David Jones come down to build some equipment, and I would pay extra rent (Jones, a video tool designer and builder, is now affiliated with the Experimental Television Center).

**LF:** What did he build?

**GH:** First we put together four input amps and an output channel colorizer. Ironically enough, we never got to that. David had designed an analog-to-digital converter, which led to other things, culminating in a small frame buffer with a resolution of 64 by 64. One day I came home and David was gone. He had left the equipment on, and there was this digitally stored image on the screen of him smiling and waving. Suddenly colorizing seemed superficial, next to having access and control over the architecture of the frame in real time.

**LF:** Is that around the time you made *Windows*?

**GH:** No, the first tape I made using any digital processing was *Bathing* (1977), which was all done through the analog-to-digital converter. [In *Bathing*, a color tape shot in real time is intercut with stills rescanned with a color camera and digitized. Different placements of color and gray level are derived from rearranging the digital-to-analog output.] I record something, take the circuit board out, resolder the wires, and try it again until I got the images I wanted. It’s just another way of working. It’s like when I started at Woodstock Community Video; you mess around with the inputs, where all this stuff really happens. It was a process of trial and error. Since I wasn’t working so much with preconceived images, “control” wasn’t a problem. There were always surprises—images that happened outside of control, things you wouldn’t dream or think of.

**LF:** How did the converter change the image visually?

**GH:** Radically. It remaps the gray levels of an image and it also remaps the color you’re mixing with it.

If it had any imposed framework, *Bathing* was centered around vague ideas of painting, taking traditional subject matters—a bather—and exploring it with the notion that any one frame could be a painting. *Windows* (1978) was the first tape in which I explored the idea of mixing analog and digital images together. I did it as a study for an installation that would have been similar in nature—dense, layered images, structured compositionally, but on several monitors. The images would pass between monitors, all under automated control. No tapes. I was still working intuitively, feeding off the images, seeing an image, liking it, working with it.

In those early tapes, though, I was distracted by the phenomena of electronics—several tapes were really part of that learning process. I’d gone through it—to have the knowledge and to feel free to do what I want within the medium. But I never do something strictly magickal again, it wouldn’t matter. The knowledge of how things work is embedded now; it applies itself to whatever I’m doing.

**LF:** Those early tapes seem to fit what has become a genre of video art—image processing.

**GH:** I think there’s a big problem even with the term. What does “image processing” refer to? Any tape that has processed an image electronically?

**LF:** It’s too broad. It can mean video put through a time-base corrector or something that’s been colorized.

**GH:** Yeah, but when someone says “image processing,” what automatically comes to mind is a heavily mixed collage, like *Windows (1978)*, that I can’t possibly decode—in fact I can’t even see the point of using color. When you look at a painting, you can’t always verbalize why the artist used a color or shape, but you feel some kind of visual tension, something getting at you. So much that I see that falls under “image processing” I can’t even fathom.

**LF:** When I first started working with machines, and exploring images—around the time I was working with Walter Wright—I remember him calling tapes *Processed Video I*, *Processed Video II*, etc. But process had no reference to machines. It had to do with the process of working, an improvisational situation in which devices could be patched in a number of different ways. Image processing suggests taking known or fixed images and processing them, sort of like food processing. I think for something that’s put in this category, it was an open method of working—dialoging with the tools in search of images.

**LF:** Did others think of it this way, too?

**GH:** I don’t know. The Vasulkas had to be among the first to experiment with the properties inherent to video. They were certainly more methodical than anyone else. Whatever machines they had, they explored it to the Nth degree. When I think of their work chronologically, the development is razor-sharp, didactic, yet mysteriously powerful, especially Woody’s. Stein, I think, became more idiosyncratic, and that’s probably why they present themselves as two separate artists now. Between the two of them they’ve covered a lot of ground.

This experimental notion of dialoging with tools has its tradition, though. It’s like what filmmakers did. That’s why—in the end—it was no longer interesting for me. OK, it’s video, it’s electronics, it functions differently, it has different properties—but it’s the same approach that photographers and filmmakers already applied. I started to see it as a dead end. I wanted to dialogue with my mental processes, consciously, self-consciously.

**LF:** How important do you think it is for viewers to know the technical circumstances under which a tape was produced?

**GH:** It’s an element, part of the information that’s valuable. But I think this is anything to work, it has something to translate that. Some works do and some don’t; all the explaining in the world and all the complex electronics and knowing the insides of the machine won’t do anything. It’s a difficult question. You can’t sidestep the mechanics of the medium, but it’s not what makes something. A whole different shift occurs in thinking of a work together—materializing it—and perceiving it. If a piece really works for you, your response goes beyond a
question about how it was made, though it might come up later as extra information.

LF: I agree, but it’s something I think a lot about when I look at tapes that are exhausting or investigating the properties of video. They stop at a certain point. I “get it” - I understand what that tape is “about,” and it ends there. It seems that Primary Elements, Mouth Place, Sums and Differences [all 1978], and Objects with Destinations [1979] not only investigate the properties of video, but how video and audio function both separately and as an integrated unit. They illustrate well how the two can operate on one another.

GH: But how video and audio function separately and together are the properties of video. What I was getting at is something else, granted a little more difficult to talk about. I think Sums and Differences really works in terms of sound and image actually becoming one another. In this tape, four separate video images of four musical instruments and their corresponding sounds are sequenced together at a continuously increasing rate. Normally, a video image is scanned on the video raster at 60 cycles per second. As the rates of change increase, starting at about one cycle per second, switching becomes faster than the time it takes to scan the complete image. This produces an effect whereby all four images appear simultaneously on the screen in four, 8, 12, etc. horizontal bars. When the switching rate is at higher frequencies, the different sounds, including the switching frequencies, become blurred into one just as the different images become one image. In that tape, audio and video can’t be separated. There’s a simultaneity of seeing and hearing.

If I were only investigating the “properties,” I wouldn’t have digitized the images, electronically generated the instrumental sounds, or used additional frequencies slightly out of phase with sync that slowly roll through the picture. These were also digitized, which created thin horizontal lines on the edges, that at certain times I associate with “strings.” There’s an overall energy constructed from a lot of subtle modulation. The question here becomes—Did I add things that weren’t there, circumvent my own concept, seduce you, the viewer, into believing something that wasn’t there? I think from this tape on a basic theme in my work became physicality. I no longer wanted to be behind the glass, playing jazz with my friends. I wanted to, you know, communicate—reach out and touch someone.

GH: Picture Story [1979] seems to represent a shift to how language is used to construct meaning. In this tape, Hill’s didactic voiceover describes a quality shared by four letters of the alphabet—H, I, O, and X. Whether they are written upside down or backwards, their readability, and meaning, is essentially unchanged. As we hear this description, rectangles containing words referring not only to videos, but to narrative and pictorial representation, randomly collapse into horizontal and vertical lines and points, whereupon a hand traces them. At the end of the tape, the four letters are used to draw an image of an ox. The letters thus form not only the basis of a story, but a picture as well.

GH: It really wasn’t a shift. Language simply became fair game, too. What I discovered in doing that piece was that there are these invisible properties—properties of language—that I could work with, rather than essentially mechanical or electronic properties. Structurally, perhaps even organically, in some way linguistics seemed related to electronic phenomena. I remember calling it “electronic linguistics.” I really began to think of the mind as a kind of muscle, and wanted to physicalize its workings in some way. But I don’t feel there was a jump from working with the elements of video to a plateau where I said, “Geesh, I’m working with ideas now.” I don’t have any hard-and-fast rules about how I work.

LF: I’m not trying to impose any final categories on the development of your work, but as an observer of your tapes, I think that while your working process may have been the same, the end result isn’t.

GH: In terms of development, Ring Modulation [1978] was just as pivotal as Picture Story. In Ring Modulation, the video screen is divided into three sections. In the bottom portion, there’s a close-up of hands holding a welding rod, attempting to bend it into a circle. As this happens, Hill’s mouth vocalizes an “A” sound, which becomes distorted by the effort of bending the rod. In the upper portion of the screen, one box contains a full image of Hill bending the rod. The other contains a wavering circular image from an oscilloscope, generated by mixing Hill’s unsteady voice with a steady electronic signal. If, instead of the voice, the second sound was a cosine of the first electronic signal, a circle would be produced.

In Ring Modulation, there’s a paradoxical struggle: trying to sculpt physical material into a circle and simultaneously trying to form a circle electronically with non-physical material—waveforms. It’s impossible to do. I did it as a kind of alchemical ritual, trying to change this “material.” In this light, the copper coating of the welding rod took on other meanings in relation to the phosphorus green of the oscilloscope. When copper rusts, it turns green. Ring Modulation was, again, returning to working more physically, using sculptural concerns, getting back to things I had left hanging.

The installation Mesh, which I worked on during the same period, had similar concerns—trying to merge physical material and concepts into some sort of unifying tactile resonance. It was a fairly complex installation, in some ways a culmination of burying myself in circuit building. (In the installation, layers of wire mesh were mounted on walls; each layer contained one oscillator which generated a certain pitch depending on the size of the mesh. The pitch generated would pan between four speakers mounted on each layer of mesh. Hill used small (3-in.) speakers to give a metallic quality to the sound and to give the effect of the sound being “woven” into the mesh.) Upon entering the space, the viewer-participant activated the piece, became “meshed” into it when a camera
picked up their image. This image was digitally encoded, pro-
ducing a grid effect, and was then displayed on the first of four
monitors. Each person who entered the space generated an
image, which, when displayed on monitor one, overlayed the
previous image to monitor two, and so on. I didn’t use discrete multiple channels in that piece—or Primarily Speaking and even Glass Onion. It’s all dynamically controlled and inter-related, so that you’re taking information
and moving it in space, which is really interesting. I want to
idea this later a lot.

LF: You mean a kind of laying? I’m remembering Sound-
ings (1979), where you put sand on an audio speaker, and it
vibrates as the sound comes through. Then you go through
variations—water, burning the speaker.

GH: I meant taking one or more images from cameras or
tape and directing them out into different spaces, different
monitors. Moving images in space. The work came about be-
cause I’d used a lot of mesh in my sculpture, and was inter-
ested in overlapping things to make a third element or pat-
tern. Literally, the title refers not only to the material—the
mesh—but compressing sound and image together. What
was different about both Mesh and Ring Modulation was not
only this preoccupation with physicality, but that an underly-
ing concept was becoming increasingly more important. In
the earlier works, there was much more of a visual orienta-
tion.

LF: Was Mesh your first video installation?

GH: Actually, the first was Hole in the Wall, done in 1974 at
the Woodstock Art Association. Unfortunately, the only re-
mainmg element of the piece—a tape—was destroyed by acci-
dent. You have to see it in light of the political-social con-
text of the Woodstock Art Association, where there’s an old
guard, and there are always new people around who want to
get in. When I was involved with it, it was always a hotbed of
controversy.

I set up a camera and zoomed in on a wall, training an area
approximately actual size when displayed on a 25-in. mon-
tor. On the video screen, you saw a hand with a ruler drawing
a frame on the edge of the screen. A matte knife entered the
frame, cut the muslin surface on the wall, and then various
tools were used to cut through a number of layers—plaster-
board, fiberglass, etc.—to the wall outside. At one point, we
reached structural beams. The camera zoomed in and
framed a smaller frame. Then that was cut through to the out-
side. At the opening, a monitor was fitted into the hole, and
played back the tape performing the action. When the cam-
era zoomed in, I took the big monitor out, put a smaller one in,
and then at the end of the tape, when you see outdoors, I took
the monitor away.

Besides the fighting between the older, established artists
and the younger ones trying to break into the scene, the
Woodstock Art Association didn’t consider video an art form.
It wasn’t until the mid-’70s that they accepted photography!

It wasn’t until themid-’70sthat they accepted photography!

...
Improve the presentation of this text.
Above: installation view of Primarily Speaking at the Kitchen, October 1981. (Photo: Richard Gummere.) Bottom: frames from single channel of the installation.
LF: You've called War Zone a metaphor for the empty mind. The experience of the two pieces is very different. It's like being at war. It also refers to the left and right sides of the brain, the perceptual and conceptual faculties battling for control. It's definitely a battle within myself, but the experience of the two pieces is very different.

The original idea for War Zone was to have many speakers.

How did you choose the objects you used?

GH: I did Glass Onion right after Black/White Text [1980], the single-channel work that Processual Video is based on. They're similar in that both take a very basic image and try to question image versus language—what happens when you use a very simple image with a text that gets very complex.

Glass Onion is much more anchored to the original tape than my other installations. It uses a known image and process as a foundation.

The curious thing about feedback is that it's about delay—that's what makes the squares within the squares—but you see it all at once. You don't experience the time until you know what it is, and then you can conceptualize the delay. The problem with any feedback is that it just keeps going on and on, and it becomes a meta-image of itself, and you're pulled into it without any kind of external check. It's like two people who begin by having a conversation, and then one just talks, and the other just listens, and it escalates into oblivion. That's what I think of when I watch video feedback—it's meaningless chatter.

The text provides a check, a kind of third party. It isolates segments of time, so you don't fall into the feedback. In the feedback, the text literally describes feedback, and it's like a diagram for feedback. It's meaningful rather than a blur.

In other words, the video feedback flows continuously, whereas the text is composed of discrete syllables and words that provide an overall structure.

GH: It's more specific than that. It's like the way the description is structured. The idea was to use video feedback as a feedback, and to have an analog in language, something that would be comparable to video feedback, but without actually using audio feedback. The text literally describes feedback, and is structured as a process of feedback. It is read backwards so that the phrases pile up on one another until the whole paragraph is constructed. Each phrase is twice as long as the one before it, until the whole structure is completed. Each phrase is twice as long as the one before it, and so there is a mathematical relationship among them. The result is a pyramid, a mathematical structure of enumeration is set up for the entire text: one phrase overlaps another at a certain rate, mimicking and thereby describing the process of video feedback.

In using the metaphor of listening, the camera represents a machine gun, the audio speakers function as mines in a room whispering single words, so that the experience would be walking through a room of white noise. As you walked around, individual words naming the objects would become audible. In the end, this became the basic texture of the piece. The large sound space [at Media Study] determined certain details. It's insulated for sound recording, and feels quite raw, with exposed fiberglass on all the walls and ceiling. The pink of the fiberglass and the deadness of the sound changed my thinking about it, and I constructed the space much more literally, picturing the space as "inside the mine field," the panning lights become surveillance lights.
to the central monitor, the image "tomb," and there it is, in living barrier is the "reading" of the text. This describes what you're objectsof meaning" appear.

It's about how content is experienced when structured with other texts, and the piece would still be the "same." The barrier exists on the other monitor.

Do so while you can hear both texts, one text always dominates, depending on where you are. And in the room where one text dominates, its accompanying video also dominates.

Right. At the end of both tapes, one hears the same last sentence, and then the two audio tracks are reversed, along with the images, and repeated in opposite rooms. Inside the passageway there are two more monitors, also facing each other, displaying another videotape. In that tape, there's an abstract image of two shiny, grid-like panels that slowly move until they overlap each other. They overlap at the point where the two texts overlap, creating a more patterned image, and then, when the texts start up again, the panels start to move again. What was the reasoning behind using the abstract imagery in the small space?

GH: The abstract imagery was the original tape for Equal Time. It functions similarly to Black/White Text, somewhat diagrammatically, mirroring the movement of the sound text. There are also a lot of textual, abstract references to the text. Because of the location of those inner monitors becomes so narrow, you almost have to turn sideways to get through. It became a kind of synaptical point, where all four monitors pointed towards each other. It was the "hot spot," especially when there were several people in the space. It was the ambiguous zone, where one asked where one space met another.

The reason for using the abstract imagery was to signify an articulation of an art form backwards, dead, reactionary. So much is manipulated and defined by the market.

LF: Don't you think that there's an imperative to intellectualize, institutionalize, and legitimize video?" GH: Sure. The Paik show "Nan-June Park," a retrospective originating at the Whitney Museum of American Art, April 30-June 27, 1982. It was still a great show though I don't know. I could see some point—not necessarily far away—where I wouldn't be doing video, but something else. I don't see myself as a video artist. Anytime I feel like I'm falling into "this is what I do," I don't like it, and I want to push it away. I worked in sculpture longer than video. I could see working with just about anything, working with nothing, doing anything for two years. Just thinking.

SELECTED VIDEODEOGRAPH

The Fall (1973, 11 min., black and white, sound)
Air Raid (1974, 6 min., color, sound)

Earth Pulse 1975, 6 min., color, sound
Endgame 5 (1976, 12 min., color, sound)
Impressions with Bluestone (1976, 7 min., color, sound)

Menor Roof (1977, 6 min., color, silent)

Videograms (1978, 3:25 min., black and white, sound)
Windows (1978, 8 min., color, silent)

Surf & Turf (1978, 8 min., black and white, sound)
Mount Piece (1978, 1 min., color, sound)

Mobius Loop (1978, 3:30 min., color, sound)

Primary (1979, 1:40 min., color, sound)

Elements (1979, 3 min., black and white, sound)
Objects with Destinations (1979, 3:40 min., color, silent)

Mirror (1980, 3 min., color, sound)

Picture Study (1979, 7 min., color, sound)

Soundings (1979, 11 min., color, sound)

Processual Video (1980, 11 min., black and white, sound)

Black/White Text (1980, 7 min., black and white, stereo sound)

Commentary (1980, 0:46 min., color, sound)

Around About (1980, 4:45 min., color, sound)

Videograms (1980-81, 12:35 min., black and white, sound)

Primarily Speaking (1981-85, 20 min., color, sound)

Road (1981-83, 11 min., color, sound)

Hole in the Wall (1974)
Mesh (1979)

War Zone (1980)
Glass Onion (1981)

Primarily Speaking (1981-86)

Equal Time (1982)

INSTALLATIONS

Nan-June Park, "Black/White Text, 1982"

Long Beach Museum of Art (Photo: Risa Ponce) Right: simultaneous images from the installation. (Photo: Lucinda Furlong.)