9/00

Article Number: 00060 Comments: just fragments!

<u>Burris/Polidori/Vasulka Conversation</u> (also, <u>The Vasulka Imaging System</u> and The Vasulka Corporation fragments)

(comment: obviously, I was not looking for the self-deception, I was looking for a revelation) (in revision)

**Poli:** I feel quite opposite to what you say here, let me quote you: "I am trying to destroy the perceptual mechanism as the only possibility of perceiving 'reality'" ..... I'm saying ......

Woody: ...you are saying...that is the only possibility....

Poli: Right, right. If you don't have that, how can you do it?

**Woody:** As long as we're staring at the surface of the image, negotiating its finite possibility, we are bound to discuss the property of that surface in terms available: as an iconic or a symbolic, for instance. [Here in] electronic imaging, at least for me, being driven by the desire for revelation of that [complex] principle of organization just below the surface of the image, I expect to witness this moment of transcendency, and this I expect to elect as my supreme aesthetic fulfillment.

So, I have the privilege to commute between the surface and its interpretative modes which in general we label as mood, emotion, feeling ....and have also the privilege to stay distant, detached within the different logic sphere, to realize the image forming process itself.

I object being confined into the surface perception only. Besides that, being historically proven effective, it has all the control modes perfected enough to betray you at will. I prefer the aesthetic appreciation beyond the perceptional one, where a particular event fits the architecture of its media and when it performs its generic move. I confess to that aspect of control of primary materials as being a content of my work.

**Poli:** Okay, but then I would say if the control is not exhibited on any object, you can't get to the control. It completely bypasses any perceiver and you're left with nothing transferred.

**Woody:** All I am trying to suggest is to invert the hierarchical order of these two ....

**Jon:** One of the problems with this is, that you're speaking in a tautology of perceiving. The perceptual mechanism is perceiving. You do not mean perceiving, but conceptualizing, rationalizing, categorizing; these are higher level functions.

**Woody:** Here is another way of looking at an object of image. For me the most interesting is the image development and a transition between images. The electronic tool-based syntax is a qualitative and quantitative extension of the cinematic modes. In many cases, it opens totally new wells of poetic justification not experienced and specified yet. It's funny to celebrate what is plainly called an "effect," but to me, this is the only new quality in electronic imaging of any substance. I think these two systems, the human and the electronic, recognize the point in which the later is very close to human perceptional decoding so that you, as maker or viewer, don't even have to rationalize it. At least that is my personal mythology. I believe there's a meeting of two great qualities regardless of our slavish contemporary ego, our traditional sense of image recognition. I might even say there's a conspiracy within us which is much greater than we understand.

**Poli:** Right, but I think that's because if you're working on it yourself you've already established a certain set of terms of what things mean. You've worked on your operant vocabulary, so in a sense you're your own audience and

you already know, but to communicate it to another person, you have to put it out in a certain way so they can input into your rationale.

**Woody:** Jon was asking the question what I mean by "I'm just trying to destroy the reliance on the perceptual mechanism as the only possibility of perceiving "reality"." Polidori brought to me a certain kind of objection . . .

\* \* \*

## The Vasulka Imaging System

Our imaging system grew from a simple demand for real time dynamic imaging, to follow the way, we knew in video. Until now, we have encountered at least some primitive level of digital image organization and transformation, the process of remapping camera images within a fast buffer, we observed the expression of the arithmetic/logic unit functions as images and set a few hardware loops of a system feedback. Images of ALU functions have introduced us to the most new and unfamiliar organizing principle of imaging, radically different from our video experience. This provided an important critique to our naturalistic instinct to follow the presence of image within the circuitries rather than control programs - an instinct, based on our profound mistrust in the treatment of image as a thought transformation.

Implementation of control modes has often been the content of our work. Sometimes, we have concentrated on a smaller than field time as a compositional element, but video tools support strongly an overall development of field successions and seldom allow control within a singular field.

In computer imaging, our attention to composition has almost all been consumed by a concentration on a single field formation. The density of events associated with this action, vocabulary, and a presence of a strong imaging myth, has fully satisfied our need for narratives. We have directed all our attention to that territory. -The Vasulkas in Buffalo, March 7 1978

<u>The Vasulka Corporation- 1978</u> As in our earlier work with analog video, there is a need for special purpose imaging tools in computer video that is not provided by the industries. We therefore propose to construct and develop such a device, "the image emulsifier" (see supplementary material #1), to reside alongside our already built "Vasulka System" (see supplementary material #2). Some of the features we envision the "image emulsifier" to have, are picture "melting," crystallized grow/decay mode, an edge expander, a texturizer, a ......

End of fragments.