

Minutes of the 53rd Meeting of the Artists' Film and Video Sub-Committee, held on Monday, 20th June 1983 at 10.30 a.m. in the Cinema at 105 Piccadilly, London W1.

Present	A. L. Rees	Chairperson
	Mary Pat Leece	
	David Parsons	
	Susan Barrowclough	
	Anne Rees-Mogg	during the afternoon
	Stuart Marshall	
	Rodney Wilson	Film Officer
	David Curtis	Assistant Film Officer
	Anna Kruger	Assistant Subsidy Officer
	Anne Holland	Secretary

1 Apologies for absence were received from Roger Wilson and Joanna Drew, and from Anne Rees-Mogg and Stuart Marshall who were unable to arrive until late in the afternoon.

2 Financial Report

The Assistant Subsidy Officer reported that £11,865 had been committed to date and that £18,135 was left in the allocation. The total sum of applications to this meeting was £26,704. £1,000 remained from the sum originally reserved for Video Placement Bursaries, which could be spent on production if necessary.

3 Applications Deferred from the Meeting held on 13th June

These applications were, in fact, discussed towards the end of the meeting, when Anne Rees-Mogg and Stuart Marshall were present, and after the Film Officer had left. Some applications to the previous meeting which had been rejected were also discussed again.

Judith Goddard

The £500 proposed at the last meeting was confirmed.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Video Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

Zoe Redman

Zoe Redman, whose application had been rejected at the last meeting, had submitted further supporting material so discussion was re-opened. However, the Committee still found too many clichés in her work, and decided to uphold its decision to reject, although it asked that she be encouraged to re-apply in the future.

RECOMMENDATION confirm rejection

Steve Littman

The recommendation to reject Zoe Redman's application presented problems when the Committee considered

whether to confirm its decision to award Steve Littman £500, as the tape on which their decision had been based was a collaboration between the two artists. The Chairperson thought the fairest course would be to reject both applications. Some members of the Committee thought this would be unfair to Steve Littman, but Stuart Marshall pointed out that he had never been in favour of the award in any case, and the Chairperson argued that, although others working in a similar field, such as Richard Layzell and Jez Welsh, were to be given awards, they were artists of more stature than Littman. It was eventually decided that Steve Littman should be encouraged to re-submit and show the Committee examples of new work.

RECOMMENDATION reject

Marion Urch

Marion Urch had submitted a tape made with previous funding, so the Committee was now able to assess her application. It was thought that the project was too ambitious and that previous work should be completed before Marion Urch embarked on something new. Stuart Marshall pointed out that Marion Urch intended to become a student again in the Autumn. It was decided that the Assistant Film Officer should discuss the situation with the applicant.

RECOMMENDATION reject

Michael Maziere

At the last meeting, the Committee had decided to set aside £1,000 for Michael Maziere. However, the Chairperson and David Parsons thought £500 more appropriate to the stage Maziere's work had reached. £500 would enable him to carry on with his current project or begin new work, and he could then re-apply for completion funding. It was decided that he should be encouraged to discuss his work with Committee representatives.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

Nina Danino

The recommendation of the previous meeting was confirmed.

RECOMMENDATION £1,000 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

Cordelia Swann

The recommendation of the previous meeting was confirmed

RECOMMENDATION £1,000 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

Joanna Millett/Rob Gawthrop

The recommendation of the previous meeting was confirmed.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

Christine Felce

Christine Felce's application had been rejected at the last meeting. However, Anne Rees-Mogg asked that her case be reconsidered in view of the fact that Danino and Swann, in her opinion no more deserving, had been funded. She thought that the application had been rejected because Felce had submitted a full budget and the Committee had considered that any sum under £2,000 would be of little use. She asked that Felce be given £1,000. Mary Pat Leece and the Assistant Film Officer were also concerned about the apparent unfairness of the rejection and supported Anne Rees-Mogg's proposal.

RECOMMENDATION £1,000 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation.

Paul Steen/Tom Paine/Susan McLenachan

This application had been rejected at the last meeting because it was thought to be outside the Committee's brief. Anne Rees-Mogg, who had been giving the matter some thought during the intervening week, asked why an element of social documentation should put the project outside the Committee's terms of reference. The Chairperson explained that such a film would fit more easily into the funding categories of other bodies; this particular film would be well suited to regional or local funding. Anne Rees-Mogg countered by expressing her dissatisfaction with the Committee's brief, finding it confining and confusing. It was decided that she and Mary Pat Leece, who had also been confused by the film's rejection, would view the material again at Four Corners and might advise re-submission to the next meeting.

RECOMMENDATION confirm rejection

4 APPLICATIONS

4.1 Film Completion

4.1.1 Paul Bush £708

The Committee viewed Paul Bush's film and were left uncertain of its intention; was it meant to be tongue in cheek? The film was well photographed, charming and conventional but had little to do with the Committee's area of responsibility.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.1.2 David Gillam/Jennifer Akhurst £1,412

Most of the Committee found the script a disappointment; it had presumably intended as ironic comment on the footage, but failed to be so.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.1.3 Tony Thatcher £360

The material viewed was a three screen environment for a live dance piece. The work had been shot with £500 from the Committee and £360 was required to make a print for showing. It was thought to be a legitimate use of the Committee's funds and there was general support.

RECOMMENDATION £360 Film Completion Award from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

4.1.4 L. Yeates £1,390

This project involved a complicated procedure with four screens and claimed to examine narrative convention. However, the Committee could not discern the film-maker's intentions in the submitted work; it was another case of theory not materialising in practice.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.2 Film Bursaries

4.2.1 N. Gordon Smith

The most recent of the submitted pieces was viewed. Although the soundtrack was generally disliked, the Committee was impressed by the techniques used in the film.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

4.2.2 Roberta M Graham/John Stewart £500

The Chairperson pointed out that the £500 asked for was preliminary funding to get a project underway. There was interest in the new collaboration, especially from David Parsons, who had taught both artists at N.E.L.P. There were some reservations, as no supporting material had been submitted, and there was doubt about some aspects of the script. However, after lengthy discussion, it was decided to encourage the collaboration and base any decisions on future funding on work produced as a result.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

4.2.3 Brenda Martin £900

Again, the proposal and submitted material were thought simplistic, not living up to the weight of theory given in the application. Mary Pat Leece had seen the films shown and said, although they appeared simple, they had provoked discussion. She argued that Martin's development may well have been arrested by lack of funding. However, the rest of the Committee was reluctant to finance her until a more detailed application was received. It was decided that Mary Pat Leece should pass on the Committee's views should an opportunity arise.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.2.4 Peter Milner £500

There was some discussion about this application. Some members of the Committee were concerned that the complex ideas that lay behind the application were not resolved in the work itself. Susan Barrowclough was worried about the ideas themselves: in questioning the validity of viewpoint, Milner was inevitably imposing his own. However, Anne Rees-Mogg argued that, although the work produced would be modest, Peter Milner would make the fullest possible use of any funding he received.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

4.2.5 Valerie Penn £500

The Committee enjoyed the submitted films, and, although it seemed likely that the film-maker would eventually move away from avant-garde technique towards more traditional narrative methods, it was agreed to support the application.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Film Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

4.2.6 Carol Salter £500

There was some interest in Carol Salter's ideas on point of view but they were thought to be unresolved in the material viewed, and, as the film-maker was already involved in two projects being funded elsewhere, it was decided not to support her at the present time.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.3 Film Awards

4.3.1 Graham Alexander £1,321

There was no support for this application

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.3.2 Carol Chaffer £1,117

There was no support for this application.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.3.3 Geoffrey Cooper £987

There was strong support from Anne Rees-Mogg. However, the Committee as a whole very much disliked the film they viewed. Although Geoffrey Cooper was known as an inventive and competent film-maker, it appeared he was moving away from the Committee's terms of reference and it was decided not to support him on this occasion. The Chairperson made it clear, though, that narrative method should not necessarily preclude an application from the Committee's support.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.3.4 Simon Du Boski £489

There was no support whatsoever for this application.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.3.5 Mark Nash/James Swinson £631

This application provoked a great deal of discussion. The applicants were asking for funding to prepare home movie footage for public showing, as well as to preserve it. The Committee was interested in the idea and examples of the footage viewed, but had to decide whether such funding was within its remit. Eventually, it was decided that the application could not be supported without an indication of how the film would be interpreted.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.3.6 Kate Richards £1,040

Kate Richards had not submitted any supporting material.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.3.7 Andrew Swain £175

Andrew Swain had not submitted any supporting material, The proposal, for a science fiction film, was considered outside the Committee's remit.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.4 Video Bursaries

4.4.1 Mineo Aayamaguchi £500

A record of Aayamaguchi's installation at AIR Gallery was viewed. Although it was thought to be a rather

orthodox artist's documentation, its concern with perspective was appreciated.

RECOMMENDATION £500 Video Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

4.4.2 Stuart Pound £500

Stuart Pound had not submitted any supporting material and it was agreed he should resubmit and make recent material available for the Committee to view.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.4.3 Gervaise Soeurouge £500

Gervaise Soeurouge had not submitted any supporting material. It was agreed she should resubmit with material for the Committee to view.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.4.4 Cerith Wyn Evans £500

The application had been withdrawn.

4.5 Video Awards

4.5.1 Neil Armstrong £1,434

Neil Armstrong had been substantially funded during the past year; he had been awarded the Brighton Video Bursary. The material submitted was not thought strong enough to warrant further support.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.5.2 Dennis DeGroot £1,376

There was no support for the application

RECOMMENDATION Reject

4.5.3 Susan Hiller £866 Video Award

The majority of the Committee was enthusiastic in its support for Susan Hiller's application.

RECOMMENDATION £866 Video Award from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

4.5.4 Bernhardt Living £718

There was no support whatsoever for this application.

RECOMMENDATION reject

4.5.5 Jeremy Welsh £1,250

Committee agreed that Jeremy Welsh's work had improved

and he had put the small amount of funding he had received in the past to good use. It was agreed he should be given a more substantial amount of money to encourage his development further.

RECOMMENDATION £1,000 Video Bursary from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

#### 4.6 Addition to Agenda

##### Peter Gidal: Completion application

As Peter Gidal was in America, and any funding received after September would be useless, Committee had to come to a decision without seeing any evidence of the progress of Gidal's work. As it had already committed funds, it thought it must take Gidal's application on trust. It was agreed that completion funds of £1,500 should be awarded, part to be paid immediately and the balance on submission of receipts.

RECOMMENDATION £1,500 Film Completion Award from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation

#### 6 Any Other Business

##### The Umbrella Scheme and the appointment of an organiser

A paper by the Assistant Film Officer had been circulated which explained that the current animateur, Simon Field, had accepted a post in America. This meant that he would not be able to supervise the touring of 'short-life' film/video exhibition packages as had earlier been proposed. Instead, it recommended that a part-time bursary with a more limited brief should be offered to replace the 'animateur'.

The paper went on to recommend that the appropriate fee for this post would be £3,000 plus £1,000 expenses, rather than the £5,000 reserved for the 'animateur'. The Assistant Film Officer put forward the suggestion that Mike O'Pray should be offered the job.

He went on to explain how the Umbrella Scheme would differ from that outlined at the policy meeting in April. The scheme would now be spread out over a year rather than being confined to a short Autumn season, a more practical approach as no organiser had yet been appointed and venues, too, preferred a longer period; there would be more time for the new organiser to accumulate film/video programme ideas. He added that the organisation of the new Umbrella Scheme differed from that of the existing Modular Scheme in that the distributors handling the packages would not be involved in their promotion; this would be one of the organiser's primary responsibilities. Although the packages must be designed to be of use to new venues, it would not be the organiser's role to give general programming advice; his function would be more administrative than innovatory.



The proposals received general assent, but some Committee members were disturbed by the long-term implications of the Umbrella Scheme. It seemed that the Committee's role would no longer be one of initiation but of response, and consequently, its influence would be diminished. There was concern that certain areas of activity would suffer, women's film in particular. Mary Pat Leece was disturbed that there might be nothing to fill the gap left by the Her Image Fades package in the future, and strongly urged that the Committee actively promote the interests of women in film, rather than relying on initiatives from elsewhere. The Chairperson and Assistant Film Officer agreed that these were issues the Committee should concern itself with in the future, but in a time of limited funding, the Umbrella Scheme was the expedient course.

IT WAS AGREED to accept the Umbrella Scheme as outlined in the Assistant Film Officer's paper.

IT WAS AGREED that Mike O'Pray should be offered £3,000 + £1,000 expenses from the 1983/84 Artists' Film and Video Allocation, to act as organiser for the scheme.

The meeting closed at 6.15 p.m.