

Steina

Steina's Lillith uses focalplane shifts and frame-grabbing to enthrall our gaze, to transfix and hypnotize us; then her protagonist, cobra-like, darts across the paradoxical landscape (that has become Steina's signature), with a sibilant and ambiguous voice, her image inscribes, indelible the fact of presence, but - ironically and impossibly - without the content or context of presence

Tony Conrad, 1987

Video Art Review — Anthology Film Archives/Electronic Arts Intermix

AN INTERVIEW WITH STEINA

By Robert A. Haller

RH You and Woody have been involved in video for...

SV Ten years.

RH In that time you have made three major moves, from the Kitchen in New York, to Buffalo, and now to Santa Fe, New Mexico. What are you looking for, or escaping from, or trying to find?

SV We have never lived permanently anywhere. I have been on the move since I was seventeen. When I lived in New York that was the longest stable period in my life. I was here [in New York] seven years; Buffalo was six years—it was admirable! It was time to move. I think people do that regularly. It doesn't directly have to do with the making, but—to go from place to place—it certainly changes it.

RH In New York you created your environment at the Kitchen; in Buffalo there was already a supportive structure at the University; and now in Santa Fe you are creating from scratch again.

SV I guess we have to create our own [environment] but this time we are interested in creating a more private environment. Although we are already being approached by different elements in the city to coproduce and work on projects.

RH What you and Woody work in is called "video." What that word means is not the same thing to many people. What does it mean to you?

SV Video has a common denominator: the signal of video. It is what film is to film. But otherwise, video artists have found various creative spaces within video. Let me suggest a few categories where I think most video is being practiced. Some artists work with space that is given in front of the camera (obscure), where the creative effort is in the arrangement of space, and the main concern of the artist who works in this area could be a performance, conceptual thought or an installation. Then there is another concern: the use of the extended eye through camera, and as you know, that principle has been thoroughly explored in film. If you go the other way, you get to people who modify or modulate images, either gathered through camera or generated internally without

any optical or external input. If you think about image generation and manipulation, you get very involved in the control part. In analog video it consists of waveform controls, and is almost never repeatable. It is like a musical improvisation. At first, the motivation to get a computer was to program the waveforms ...

RH But you still wanted—

SV No. After we got the computer the concerns became totally different. Before we could even perfect the control of analog tools, we plunged into digital ones, where in fact everything is a product of control. It is in "interactive real time" where I feel video becomes a category apart from the others (film on one side and computer graphics on the other). Everybody who works in video insists on it. In fact, there is no other, let us say, "time lapse mode" of video—unless you go beyond personal gear. Film "real time," as real as it can be, can never be interactive in sense of its feedback loop to its image forming process, and and in this context it has always its lapse. I would terribly miss this exciting control mode

RH But all video artists don't work in real time.

SV They do.

RH Well ... Nam June Paik, for instance, edits.

SV We can say that editing as inherited from film may analyze, or rather, criticize the "real time" of a scene, but in our context where video and computer are side by side, we must discuss a quite different aspect of "real time." The tools we use, video tape recorders, cameras, etc., operate in "real time" as a time in which signals propagate from input to output. You must realize that this term is the technological one, yet it is placed in the competitive context with our momentary perception as a tool of single frame composition. One result of real time system performance is that you can continuously modify the sequence, which in a process resembles [the] playing of a musical instrument; which also gives you a great amount of variations and immense capacity to discard unnecessary themes. So "real time" in our context does not mean the "infinite take," but the observation of image forming processes, which look to us as perceptually continuous, yet interactive in all modes, including the image forming.

RH Many people have problems with the lower levels of information content in video. For you this is not an issue?

SV The aesthetic and the industrial drive is toward higher and higher resolution. Obviously, video wants to get even with film to begin with. Our personal need tends to be the opposite—we have to break down the video image to much less elements than a television camera offers. We must take this road to work with our digital tools meaningfully. We must sacrifice the resolution for speed (necessary in digital imaging). We are working with [the] moving image, and the pressure of time is immense. It is hard to imagine, but in microprogramming our device, a range of nano-seconds is the area of our practical work.

RH The low field rate, and low resolution then, aren't crucial to video aesthetics?

SV There are two ways to answer the topic of "field" or "frame" in television. The usual and most complete descriptive terminology is purely technological, referring to elements of television frame as a succession of two video fields, each containing 1/2 of the information in relationship to each other, called "interlace." However, no aesthetic account of the technologies we use has

been accomplished--not even attempted. So before we get into a discussion about the performance of the medium on the level of its elements, we would have to devise a specific language for it. I guess film had to do the same.

RH Recently you have discussed making your own "chips," which are miniature electronic circuits.

SY In our system, we have encountered chip manufacturing on one level in a device called "Field Programmable Logic Array" which is a programmable multipurpose circuit. You open particular pathways within the chip to achieve a particular function of that circuit. But now we could get together, say, ten individuals with very different needs. All our needs could be designed on just one chip. It can then be sent for photo reduction and on to the chip manufacturers. You can have your own custom-designed chip, operating at far greater speed than the industry is interested in at the moment.

RH You have made an installation, Machine Vision, with cameras rotating around a sphere, taking images reflected on the metal sphere. Is it--

SY All my installation pieces have involved rotating cameras, explorations of space/time. I do not like to arrange my spaces. If there happens to be a chair, even a knocked-over chair in the room, it stays that way. My pieces are an analysis of a space, or even a surveillance of a space.

RH Machine Vision was very elusive and involving.

SY Habitually, by looking, we keep selecting, subjectively "cropping" and "framing" the space around us. I wanted to create a vision that can see the whole space all the time. It took two cameras looking into the sphere. I have done more variations with more moving elements surveilling space by tilt, pan, zoom and rotation.

RH In Machine Vision there is no tape (the work is "live"); but you have also made a tape called Switch Monitor Brief (1976) where the camera is also rotating, but pointed outwards. Is that work another form of "machine-vision?"

SY Yes. And it too derived from my watching so many videotapes, watching an individual behind a camera "delivering you" space. You are not in charge of the space; it is not your choice--it is somebody else's. It was a challenge to me to create a space that would not deal with the idiosyncracies of human vision.

Interview conducted at Anthology Film Archives, Oct. 28, 1980, and revised by Steina, Feb. 18, 1981. Interview published by Anthology Film Archives and Electronic Arts Intermix, March 1981.



ART OF MEMORY

Not only is *Art of Memory* Woody Vasulka's most famous work, but it must be counted among the most acclaimed and widely exhibited works in the history of video art. Three and a half years in the making, *Art of Memory* has won numerous awards and has been exhibited countless times around the world since its premiere in November 1987. There were three major sources of inspiration for the tape—Vasulka's childhood memories of newsreels of world conflict; historian Frances Yates's book *The Art of Memory* and the engravings of the 19th century Romantic illustrator Gustave Doré. Vasulka took from Yates not only the title of his videotape but also one of the tape's two organizing principles, that of "putting thoughts into a landscape." Yates writes in *The Art of Memory* about mnemonic devices used by classical Greeks and Romans. In preparation for his long orations, Cicero would walk through a temple noting the number and positions of the columns, assigning to each column one of the topics of his speech. By visualizing his temple walk when he debated, he could recall the points of his speech with a perfection that left his opponents defenseless. The mnemonic architectures in Vasulka's tape are newsreels, photographs, and texts—"memories" of major conflicts of the 20th century, World War II primarily, but also the Russian revolution and the Spanish civil war. The movies, photos, and book pages ("leading through history") do not fill the screen, but instead are mapped onto shapes or objects that float above the landscape of the American Southwest or are continuations of it.

The second organizing principle was to display these image-objects in brief segments with openings and closings. Each segment is composed of three elements: the image-object that is to disappear, the image-object that will replace it, and a wipe that performs a syntactical operation of replacement or succession by masking one while revealing the other. The wipes constitute a vocabulary of visual syntaxes divided into nine different shapes with varying durations of opening and closing. They

allow Vasulka to replace the direct cuts of conventional montage with complex translations or transmutations of imagery. Into these structures Vasulka inserts the newsreels as what he calls "tones" with no narrative function. He "performs" the images as one performs notes in a musical composition. The resulting visual drama is one of discontinuity rather than causal linearity. The segments are organized into six major movements—an introduction/European theater, the atomic era, the Spanish civil war, the Russian revolution, the war in the Pacific, and an epilogue which Vasulka calls the "catharsis." The movements are demarcated by a sound like the door of a great vault slamming shut as a black wipe closes down over the segment's final image.

The one direct cut in *Art of Memory* occurs when a winged figure inspired by an image from Gustave Doré's *Paradise Lost* flies over the man Vasulka calls "the witness," the artist's alter-ego. The winged figure could be interpreted as Icarus or an Angel of Death, but for Vasulka he simply represents the metaphysical world, which must share the burden of responsibility for the violence and cruelty of human nature. The epilogue represents for Vasulka a catharsis of the inner conflict that manifests itself in the outer conflict of war.

Vasulka used a variety of sophisticated electronic instruments to create *Art of Memory's* spectacular images and sounds, which have been so heavily processed that their original form is often unrecognizable. It will interest the viewer to know that the four faces in the lower right of the epilogue, the convulsive dancer confined in a box, and the witness who earlier scoffed at Destiny in the form of the winged figure are all the same person, performance artist Daniel Nagria. And most of the haunting soundtrack was also derived from a single source, the voice of Santa Fe artist and poet Doris Cross reading her poetry.

—Gene Youngblood

