Hi - Just received your letter... am sending this letter back so I have some comments (so you would reject!

First, General!

I think it is important to keep in mind the initial impetus towards doing all this Indian stuff (particularly in light of former's repressive Reagan/Thatcher era!). I would be saddened if the ethos became merely an extension of accepted (and acceptable) galaxy entrepreneurship, i.e., too tailored for nice "art" consumption. Although I think Jon could be a problem, he did hold out for some things which I think were agreed in the earlier history of events, in particular that both care, responsibility and fair returns would be extended to those who participate - and those concerns are (I think) more important than a discomfort about N-E-A. (Although I certainly can also understand that.) - So my sense is that, although Jon is right, some of these ideas are still too new and are rejected. While I endorse having Don do a
of the work, and have indeed written him so if Tiber to express this, I also appreciate that he is very much involved in his own career within the gallery process, and I agree with Barbana that he should not have too much control—This would also apply with Michael for somewhat similar reasons—(Turkis?)—This does not mean that I am opposed to their participation; I just that I would want to monitor their decisions and feel more confident in you, Sally, and Barbana's overall sense of the real values of the medium—and I would be more than pleased if Barbana would see the way to being involved in the overall choice of photos. I of course agree that all in the show should be "on its own merit" and the extension into using some poetry, sculpture etc, would be OK, if it is comfortably with possible touring. I must however express that one needs to define the nature of "merit" so that it doesn't just become "aesthetic"—Obviously you will have concern for the fact that one is dealing with representations within
a social and historical framework - (i guess
im saying that its not only attractive
representation but proportionate representation)
The criteria for awarding "nostalgia" is (i think) in ensuring that the procedural spirit
of Judaism is mirrored in both the selection
and bringing of the show -

[Draft Art This]

Particulars:

1. I agree that time pressure makes it
impossible to send me rough points (i will
at some point at any rate if it becomes
possible) I had indeed presumed this when
I had to depart for sociology-

2. I'm in a very not clear what if any
my place in The Sunday Project is - at
this point I had not resigned from it,
and proceed. This is still O.K - i would
be obliged to see copies if contracts to
artists etc - and would indeed wish
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to do so (This should not delay procedure more than a week) - obviously it is a
problem having me dangling at a distance! (For me too) But I do still feel involved!
Obviously I will agree to whatever is reasonable.

(3) - Re: artists contracts - The loan fee was
considered as a reasonable return to
the artists (photographers) involved — and
I am not sure that I see it as an "ugly
precedent," unless one is a gallery owner!
(or Dan thinks it's too little?) - I think we
were concerned that we get jumpin' for
their work and Rio seemed a straightforward
topic to do it — I think Barbor & Pitz would
be enthusiastic about a change here —
however it might be worth considering
the idea of outright payment, although
200 per print seems low given the current
best photo market — (I also suspect
selling price would be higher) —
its needs to be worked out in any case.
so that the procedure is applicable to housing as well as Ben & W.Y.C. — ie a secondary clause is needed in relation to possible other exhibition sites. (Pat Bowers probably need to be involved.) Unless Dan hears on "in" with Ches. Ross —

my sense was he didn't want to participate but his prisms are realpretty —

The Benefit Show for '82 — on November — would be OK — but may be B.C. — Is Your
Church or School for Movietone Reprints, rather than Dann's place. (Is Cynthia involved with the School at this stage?) — Anyway Cynthia is a good person to be in on this —

Yes, if possible, Sally could do chronology. I to make it important —

If you can, give Littman my English
 impostor, ok — I might (might) get a free meal!
Video: I am, of course, not happy about the 1 1/2 hour edits—
(for reasons I (ony made apparent)
(but will mention!!).
Firstly: I presmably am not sure of
Michaels' editorial Tho creo in other
words I suspect him of not altogether
being willing to distinguish between
"essential" and "extraneous" information,
in relation to an overall location
of the material—particularly into 1 1/2
hour slot which will require a
great deal of compression and
most of itself impose a "packaged"
style on the tape—
I could consider of stuff being with
down to 1 hour easier—To me
once again its an issue of authenticity
versus programming—
So on this issue I am inclined to continue with the gang! In any case I would like to be informed about how the edited material will be presented to the artists we interviewed and would like to make a reminder that this edited material will need to be cleared with the permissions involved—unless we mean to risk alienating all various and sundry artists, dancers, filmmakers, mutants, dogs, saints, Leninographs, angels, and the plain folk out there in the streets!

Secondly: Ref: Limits on the scope of the material—Again I would remind you all that one of the constraints of the tape is to enlarge on the photo show to help place it into a somewhat wider context—and this doesn't altogether have to do with name values.
I can see dropping Meredith, Neville, a K. King: provided the cut-off is established prefs to this - but I still think it's valuable to have this sense of work continuing - the next generation etc - (maybe just do Meredith who would be finer) and my general sense from those with whom I talked who in some ways more an "inhibitor" than 1. K. (Neville)

I think both material for McLow and Passloff is essential: (a) McLow because he was a vital influence on procedure (so much as cast in a way, but not so much.) (b) Passloff because he locates Jimmy Durigo influence fully - I would also think Simone makes a link with immediate other performer work plus the Holmzin influence - in a way in which Cage does not directly.
I think one could back down on Dublin and Paris, Koz, Neville, and maybe Schuman (I think Simone is more important). But maybe not as she does give another take on things — I realise the time problem — I think you could use Christel (Snow) to work on some edit as part of the deal with Claire (she offered before I left and would have say a week at least, twist now to November)

Anyway enough of my gab — of course I feel wildly foreign from it all and strange about this — I have a meeting with Photographers Gallery here (London) on Friday and am trying to get to see Riversiders (they are quite disorganised)

My life seems to be complicated up in domestic duties, none of it easy,
Hope all is going well in all our areas and that you get Peter Anger's visit. (c.v.)

At this point I do hope to be back for Bayern in '82 - so could be of some use then - and of course I will do whatever possible from this strange land.

(The government just sacked the Minister for the Arts and have cut innumerable grants.)

I hope this isn't a poorly letter!

My Love (and to New York!)

Keep in touch - T.C.

P.S.

Yes - I wrote Don Brown to infancy for Julesma, but not Kowalewski. I included Don to show him my letter so they should be aware of the need.