

Jan 14 '81

Hi - Just received yr letter - am sending this off fast as i have some comments (as you would expect!)

First, General!

I think it is important to keep in mind the initial impetus towards doing all this Indian stuff (particularly in light of forthcoming repressive Regan/Thatcher era!) - I would be saddened if the show became merely an extension of accepted (and acceptable) gallery entrepreneurship - i.e. too tailored ~~for~~ ^{towards} 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 work care, responsibility and fair returns would be extended to those who participate - and these 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 out, some of his ideas are still to be respected - While i endorse having Don do a

2

lot of the work, and have indeed written him
1/2 of Tibor to express this, I also appreciate
that he is very much involved in his own
career within the gallery process, and I agree
with Barbara that he should not have too
much control - This would also apply with Michael
for somewhat similar reasons - (Tibor?) -
This does not mean that I am opposed to their
participation, its just that I would want to
monitor their decisions, and feel more
confident in you, Sally & Barbara is overall
sense of the real values of the Indian -
and I would be more than pleased if Barbara
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 paintings,
sculpture etc would be ok, if it is compatible
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 historic 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 Jackson is mirrored in both the selection
and hanging of the show -
(end of this)

Particulars:-

- (1) I agree that time pressure makes it
impossible to send me work-punks (i will
of course look at anything if it becomes
possible) I had indeed presumed this when
I had to depart for society -
- (2) I am in a way not clear what if any
my place in The Jackson Project is - at
this point i had not resigned from it,
and provided this is still o.k - i would
be obliged to see copies of contracts to
artists etc - and draft would indeed wish

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 conceived as a reasonable return to the artists (photographers) involved - and i'm not sure that i see it as an "outrageous precedent", unless one is a gallery owner! (or Dan Banks its too little!) - I think we were concerned that folks got sumpin' for their work and this seemed a straightforward way to do it - I think Barber & Peter would be unenthusiastic about a change here - however it might be worth considering the idea of outright purchase, although 200 pr print seems low given the current hot photo market - (thus i suspect selling prices would be higher) - It needs to be worked out in any case

~~to include~~ so that the procedure is applicable to touring as well as Ben & N.Y.C. - ie a secondary clause is needed in relation to possible other exhibition sites.
(Pat Bannister probably need to be involved)

③ Unless Dan has an "in" with Chris-Ross my sense was he didn't want to participate! But his prisms are real pretty -

④ Re Benefit Show for '82 - a three-day would be o.k. - But maybe B.C. - Jackson Creek & School for Advanced Research, rather than Dan's space. (is Cynthia involved with the School at this stage?) - Anyway Cynthia is a good person to be in on this -

⑤ - yes, if possible, Sally could do chronology. I to think its important.

⑥ 2 If you can, give Littman my English number, o.k. - I might (might) get a free meal!

6.

⑦ - Videa:- I am, of course, not happy about the $\frac{1}{2}$ hour edits - (for reasons I have made apparent) (but will mention !!) -

Firstly:- I personally am not sure of Michael's editorial choices - 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 a $\frac{1}{2}$ hour slot which will require a great deal of compression and ~~if~~ ~~may~~ ~~at~~ of itself impose a "packaged" rhythm over the tapes -

I could conceive of stuff being whittled down to 1 hour easier - To me, once again - its an issue of authenticity versus programming -

2

So on this issue i am indeed at
convenience 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
persons involved— unless we mean to risk
alienation of various and sundry artists,
dancers, fiddlers, mutants, dogs, sorcerers,
lexenographers, angels, and the plain folk
out there in the street!

Secondly: Ref: limits on the scope of the
material— Again i would remind you
all that one of the functions of the
tapes 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.

8.

I can see dropping Meridish, Neville,
a K. King - provided the cut-off is
established prior to this - but I still
think it's valuable to have this sense
of work continuing - the new generation
etc - (maybe just do Meridish who would
be pivotal and my general sense from
these with whom I talked was in some
ways more an "inheritor" than King & Neville)

I think both material for McLow and
Passliff is essential - (a) McLow because
he was a vital influence on procedure
(as much as Cage in a way, but not so
P.R.) (b) Passliff because she locates
Jimmy Durante in fluence fully -

I would also think Simone makes a
link with immediate other performance work
plus the Holgerin influence - in a way
in which Cage does not directly.

9.

I think one could back down on DeFord
Hays, Rung, Kiz, Neville, and maybe
Schneeman (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 Christie
(Svane) 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 & 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
Riverside (they are quite disorganised) —

My life seems to be caught up in
domestic duties, none of it easy, —

10.

Hope all's going else in all other areas
d think you got Peter Avery's vite. (C.V.?)
At this point i do hope to be back
for Beginn of '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 pesky letter!

My Love (and to New York!)
Keep in touch - T.C.

P.S. Yes - i wrote Don Brown re: finances
for Tinkum, but not Vandeput-Island
Don to show him my letter. so they
should be aware of the need.
