INTRODUCTION

Art has traditionally been a commentative form of expression, positing a Weltanschauung which might change the perceptions of its audience through exemplary (pictorial) demonstration. Currently, more radical artists are dissatisfied with what they perceive as the passive-- and socially co-optable-- nature of pictures and objects. They prefer to create art that is activity itself, that is in the world as much as about it. By exploiting the conditions of everyday life-- by bringing ordinary things and ordinary situations only slightly out of their normal context-- these artists express their relationship to the world around them by intervening in it, changing it and their audience's perceptions of it subtly but assertively.

Their art thus freed of traditional restraints on forms and media, the poetry and polemic of these artists' ideas go to work immediately. These artists voice their understanding of the interrelationships between human beings by isolating and (re)staging details of these interrelationships. These artists convey mystery, menace, and revelation by conjoining real objects and actions in tableaux only a step removed from the fortuitous situations that provide the models. These artists explore personal and cultural memories and responses in real time and space, thus giving to these memories and responses a vital palpability. These artists respond to their environment by manipulating its apparent and actual dimensions. These and other kinds of expression are effected directly on and in their subject matter. Even within the relatively rarefied context of an exhibition space the artists can observe and alter myriad base realities. By subjecting these realities to a flux of concepts and perceptions these artists arouse our awareness of the facts and possibilities inherent in these-- and, by extension, all-- common situations. This is an art of ideas, ideas not just about being in the world, but about doing something with and to that experience of being.

-- Peter Frank

...at other projects were you working on ... this time?

I was working on the Brooklyn Navy Yards - that was my big hope. I wanted No. 113, one of the buildings there, a large three or four-story many terraced warehouse, and I chose it because it was in the worst shape - the least easily utilized for factories - the City's main concern was to employ people in the area.

Why did that project not come through?

In the end, the City simply didn't want to do it. They didn't want artists out there; they would much rather have the buildings torn down. Because they're evil? no. It was a very difficult political situation at the Brooklyn Navy Yards. The Feds had given money for its rehabilitation under Kennedy - I'm trying to think of the man who was responisble for closing down (government?) installations that didn't pay. But then the City had the burden of giving empolyment to that whole area of Brooklyn. They organized a community-based organization to run the Navy Yards with these Federal grants. By the time I got to it, the grants had nearly run out, nobody had rented any space, and the community still had thousands of unemployed people. So that the mere hint that the City would donate the building to long-hairs when people were starving would be political disaster. At the time I said to Mayor Lindsay's representative, that I could assure him that many reporters - Grace Glueck of "The New York Times" I knew would favor our programs and at least be enthusiastic about the plan if not the result - that I was sure "The New York Times" would write favorable coverage of our programs. His answer to me was, "One line in the Daily News:'Lindsay Gives Building to Long-Hairs'would make any number of articles in "The New York Times" Art Section worthless."

From their point of view they were right.

Yes. From their point of view they were right.

Had you received No. 113, would you have made it into an all-Workspace program? (what?)

Y es. We got Coney Island Factory out of it though. I finally tracked it down to the person really in charge.

here wer

nd: Ken P. ent Administration, who is a very, very brilliant man. I finally got to his deputy, and he and Patton were the ones who finally rejected it - for the reason I gave you, only on a very sophisticated level. But then, I was so crushed that they said they would try to find another space for me - and they did. They came up with the Coney Island Factory, which, of course, was small compared with the Brooklyn Navy Yard building, but it was very useful for us at the time. And they've continued to try to be helpful. Since they're trying to develop the economic life of New York City, they see things in larger economic terms than most bureaucrats. They see that the arts represent economic input into the city; they know it dosen't make sense to have things sitting vacant year after year after year.

When did the Coney Island Factory open?

Summer 1973

A few months after the Clocktower opened with its first show.

Actually I had Coney Island earlier that year, but we couldn't get the electricity turned on. Grosvenor was out there in the late spring of '73, then Jene was out there in the summer of '73, then Nonas.

It was primarily a workspace, and I gather that Jene's was the only exhibition in the Coney Island Factory that served to announce the presence of the Coney Island Factory.

Yes.

Did the artists take full advantage of that space?

I think that they took adaquate advantage of the space. I think that it was unfortunate we had as little money as we did. We needed $700. to pay of the electricity connection, and we certainly didn't have it. For a while we didn't have water. We finally got the water, but no heat or electricity. Also there was a security problem. The security people could have dealt with it, if they'd had either electricty or heat. I should have said first of all this factory space only applied to people who had heavy moving equipment, it was perfect for sculptors

becau . Richard Serra went out to the factory retended to spend his Christmas there. But the real fact was that winter there was os cold, people rigged up gaint tins taht bums use and lit fires in them. So in practical terms, the space was temporary, month-to-month. The artists did offer money to have the electricity connected, but I never felt we were secure there.

In other words, you didn't have a lease at all.

Absolutely didn't. Well, I think it was a three month (which is it?) The City was supposed to notify us three months before they wanted it back. I think during the time we were out there they had three different negotiations with industrial concerns who would provide jobs for the neighborhood, three different near contracts which, each time, right at the last minute, fell through because the company pullled out. I feel EDA handled it very well because they agreed to let us stay until the actual contract signing. They trusted that we'd get out. Finally they were able to sign a lease.

When was this?

Last spring (1975?)

Last spring - did you occupy the space until that time?

Yes. What happened was, it became pretty unrealistic, with the problems at Coney Island, to assign it on a frequently rotating basis, so we stated an artists-in-residence program. I approached four different artists with the proposal that they have it for a year and use it as an accessory studio. Tow of the artists were women and two of the artists were men.

Who were the artists you invited?

Jackie Farrara, Jackie Windsor - I approached her and we talked

~~seriously~~

serio , did not need it, - Grosvenor, and I think Serra. Serra, I understood, at that point had a very severe need because _____ (What? Why?) was coming up, it was a terrible problem _____ (?) needed a much more elaborate space than Coney Isalnd, such as the Brooklyn Navy Yards, which I knew he couldn't get. Anyway, he needed a big crane. The two women artists didn't want it in that condition. Grosvenor could use the space and became the artist-in-residence for that year. He produced a number of works, one of which was shown at the Clocktower. Had we contunued Coney Island we would have done it on an annual basis. That waa the most successful solution for similar spaces.

That are physically limited.

Yes, with some hardship or with unkown qualities about it.

Did you feel that the distance of the Coney Island studio from Manhattan was a drawback fo the artists who worked there?

Well, it either was a total handicap which made it unusable, for the artist, or it was a great benefit.

Being isolated.

Yes. For the majority of artists, it was a handicap. Had there been even the most minimal housing arrangements, and had Coney Island been around for five years, numerous - - Richard (Serra? Nara?) wanted to rent a room. The problem is there is no hotel in Coney Island but if he had been able to do that, he would have been there for two weeks blocking out a piece. But to the serious collector or curator, the distance to Coney Island was absolutely no problem. I thought they would find it a terrible problem but to the person who had to find out about the work, that didn't matter at all. Consequently, the visits that were made to Coney Island, I learned from the artists,

were [illegible]sits. They were made by people who were very committed to the artists in the first place. Schneckenberg from Documenta went out there. It's not easy for a foreigner to find his way to Coney Island, Barbara Haskell (her affiliation then) went out there. Actually, it always seemed to me that as long as one was going to go someplace out of the ordinary, Coney Island was attractive because it was so weird. It wasn't bourgeois at all. It had gypsy air - exotic, as if you're on a trip. I would take another place there in a minute.

~~ALANNA/MAS~~ [1976] [Wlyn 10-1 original]

Q: What was your job at the Municipal Arts Society?

A: I was the program director.

Q: What does that mean?

A: I was the person who was supposed to make up programs and adminstrate them and run them, that would make joining that organization somewhat worthwhile, arranging architectrual tours, being the person who would following through on problems with the City. The Organization was supposed to be a sort of watch-dog of the esthetic of NY, it had a large title. A lot of people belonged to it, mostly elderly people. By paying fifteen dollars a year, all of NY's problems were supposed to be solved.

Q: When was the Institute formed? did you form for Art and Urban Resources?

A: I started separate activities around 1970, a year after I was there, doing actual separate activities. So I have been working as a separate entity since 1970, but continued working for MAS, it crosses over. I began working for MAS.

Q: I thought the Institute was formed under the auspices of MAS.

A: You may have a better perception of this than I do because you were around at the time, near me. I had projects that I wanted to do, and I wanted to do them under MAS. But I was quite anxious to have an umbrella, and I was quite anxious to get paid. I was also interested in a respected umbrella, to interest some of the powerful people in NY to help things to happen. So the director, who is now director of the State Council, promised if I did all these other things, I could do the contemporary art thing. He was also convinced about the studio program, he thought it was a good thing. He thought that interests dove-tailed, interms of preservation and the studio thing.

Q: May I ask his name?

A: Kent Barwick.

Stynnie Light
Questions = Italic
Answers = Roman
Set 10/12 x 24½ RR

~~BROOKLYN BRIDGE INTERVIEW~~

Q: How did MAS help, ~~if they did, in~~ the Brooklyn Bridge Event ~~(BBE)~~?

A: MAS never had any money, and it didn't really have that much power. The trick was to make it seem powerful in the right way, instead of being poverty - stricken and ineffective, ~~elderly~~ struggling organization, the trick was to make it seem elitist, because ~~it was~~ small ~~it was~~ elitist, liberal, quickly - acting, tremendously powerful ~~interms~~ of certain people. So we had to keep up with the other welfare organizations, such as the Parks Council, South Street Seaport, ~~and so on,~~ to reform long after, and we had to continue to emphasize our ~~ground - power~~ position and ~~quickly~~ be sure we got in on all the meetings and hung in with all the other program directors and directors of these ~~other~~ organizations. ~~That and money~~. So there was a luncheon held in the South Street Seaport ~~and~~ during the course of ~~the luncheon~~ people ~~got a little drunk and they~~ decided to have an 81st birthday party ~~for~~ ~~and~~ It was decided it would ~~be a~~ wonderful ~~thing~~ to ~~try~~ and spotlight the fact that there were parks on both sides, City Hall Park and Brooklyn Park, ~~and it was~~ actually designated parkland, ~~all the way, and~~ without stepping outside the park you could go all the way from the park in front of City Hall to the park in front of the ~~mayor~~ of Brooklyn's, borough President's. ~~So that was all park,~~ and since there was a ~~feeling~~ that the ~~feds~~ might give money for the urban renewal, ~~renewal of the water fronts,~~ it was decided that if we had a festival to celebrate the BB's birthday, then ~~the~~ it ~~festival~~ could spotlight the fact that there was all this waterfront, ~~that it was a good area.~~

~~Q: Whose idea was it?~~

A: ~~I have no idea. I think it was Peter Stanford, totally crazed, formerly the director of the South Street Seaport. May have been his.~~ So 18 organizations were involved. Somehow, someway, the Municipal Art Society got stuck with organizing a certain area of the activity... well, Kent volunteered me to organize

the Manhattan side of the operation, pooling all the resources of the other organizations. This was actually a wise decision on his part, because if I was the organizer, we wouldn't have to come up with any resources. The other side was managed by the Downtown Brooklyn Development Committee and they had a series of actions going on on the other side of the Bridge. So there was no budget, zero money. I decided what would I really like to do when I was walking around down there was to use the area underneath the Bridge as an exhibition area. So I thought I could get away with it, one, because I was organizing the upstairs in a traditional festival.

Q: Upstairs? I only know of two levels of the pier.

A: Oh, you don't know about in front of City Hall? The Park? I was the organizer for that. This was a side activity. I was particularly frantic at the time because that was another thing I didn't tell the artists about it because it would have been too complex for the... the way I got all my permits and everything was because I was the organizer for the Manhattan Festival. I was working with Margo Wellington who was then program director of the downtown. What they wanted was a Saturday, Sunday, Monday (it was a holiday) celebration of activities down at City Hall Park, straight through. Everybody in the sort of cultural/architectural area felt that it would be nifty, and all these people would do all these wonderful things for free because it was for the B.B. So the idea was to have rock and roll bands, poetry readings, fan dancers.

Q: Did any of that take place? What actually took place?

A: We did have all those things, but what happened was certain people had different responsibilities. The Parks Dep't had the responsibility for supplying the electricity and the electrical hook-ups.

Q: Are you talking now about the BB or City Hall?

A: ~~City Hall, we're not talking at all about the B.B. yet.~~ ~~They~~ It were supposed to run lines for all the rock bands ~~we didn't have a stage or anything~~, we needed an electrical plug - in for the mike, ~~the~~ P.A. systems for the Chinese dancers, ~~the music,~~ nobody could do anything without music. ~~So what happened was,~~ the Parks Dep't was responsible for getting the juice for the park, ~~and~~ so I left it with them. ~~Thursday,~~ my rock bands ~~which~~ I'd finally gotten from Bowdoin ~~no~~ rock bands from Manhatten wanted to go to City Hall Park and play for free, ~~we~~ finally got them ~~from Brooklyn~~ to come across the Bridge by telling them it was a reverse exchange, ~~and~~ lying to them. On Thursday when they all came over, ~~all my rock bands~~ were there... there was no juice. When I called the Dep't of Cultural Affairs, I found out that was the day of ~~Dipoillio's~~ [title, first name] Aurelio's wedding, ~~this is political history~~ and, the Lindsay administration had left that day ~~for a giant wedding for one of his top aides,~~ ~~they all went~~ to Conn. including the person at the Parks Dep't who was responsible for this, ~~had gone to this wedding,~~ the person ~~who was~~ under him couldn't deal with it. They just cried. The department had completely forgotten about it. What we did then was, Saturday morning Kent and I then convinced the guards at City Hall to let us run extension cords from City Hall steps down into the Press offices of City Hall, and I went out and bought 800 yards of extension cords at Canal St., kept my rock band there, ~~kept them~~ drinking, ~~so they were happy~~ and ran up the extension cords. I talked the guards into letting us plug into the window, running it down to the ~~Press~~ Office. Then Kent went away ~~and~~ he waved at me and ~~said,~~ saying "Now that it's all set..." But what happened was that as the rock and roll band was playing on City Hall steps ~~and~~ people were gathering in the Park because the newspapers had printed the press releases describing the Festival as if it had already happened ~~and people were gathering~~. Unfortunately, earlier that morning there had been the killing of a policeman. So right at the ~~wrong~~ moment, ~~just~~ as the rock band was ~~warming up~~ tuning up, Lindsay came back to town with all the staff to talk with [John ?] Murphy, ~~who was Chief of Police, to have this big grim meeting.~~ Since the Lindsay administration was anxious to convince the public ~~that they're~~ if they were ter-

rified and horrified ~~because of~~ by the police killing, ~~they~~ it had arranged ~~separ-ately~~ Meanwhile, for all the ~~t.v.~~ TV cameras to be there to watch their grim meeting. We were standing there with the bands and everything, and I was also running back down underneath the bridge to check on my exhibition. I came up and welcome to my band ~~was~~ playing, ~~they~~ weren't very good, you know -- ~~I kept seeing~~ seeing more and more TV ~~t.v.~~ cameras lining up. I kept thinking ~~I couldn't~~ I was unbelievable TV people had responded to my press releases. ~~they were all there~~. And each time I would encounter yet another mayorial aide, ~~the aide~~ who would say to me, "Who told you you could be on the steps of City Hall?" and I would say, Ted Mastione, Commissioner of Parks and Recreation. This is the official Brooklyn Bridge festival, Lindsay is Honorary Chairman, this is where we are. I would convince ~~each single~~ the little girl who at each successive encounter aide, ~~they~~ would get higher and higher and more insane, they would say, "We don't know any thing about this festival, but we know that it shouldn't be here," And finally, all the way up to Aurelio Orillio, ~~and he was just an incredible looking guy~~, he said, "Lady, I don't know anything about who gave you permission, but I know that you're not supposed to be here. You better come inside." The rock band was told to leave the steps, and they sort of shuffled down, ~~they were sort of _____~~ up, down and stood on the sidewalk, with the beer cans were strewn about. I was standing there when Aurelio Orillio got Ted Mastione on the phone, he was sound asleep, we got him out of bed,"Teddy? What's the festival doing here?" And Ted said, "I don't know what you're talking about." It was just awful. I went on the phone and I said," Mr. Mastione, don't you remember, this is the B.B. festival that Lindsay is the Honorary Chairman of. You signed our permit for City Hall Park, anywhere in City Park. Well, we're on the front steps." And Ted Mastrione said, "Oh my God, why are you on the front steps of City Hall, you can't be there." I said, "You didn't give us juice." He said, "Go away, get off, get off." At that moment I look up, and that's when I met Lindsay, a very, very familiar face. And he said, "What are you doing on my front steps?" And Aurelio Orillio said, "It's alright, it's alright." So we just walked right out, and we told the rock band to go home, and we told everyone else to go home.

would have her banners on the Bridge itself, and she agreed, you see, she thought it was a wonderful idea. She knew all about banners and wind velocity and everything so there wasn't any problem. And she met with the BB maintenance crew, who were suspicious of the idea, but she convinced them with her terminology and she'd done it many times before. So these banners, the two arches, on the BB were filled with her banners. It was quite extraordinary, it took 3 weeks to organize. The BB maintenance crew went up and they hung it. The trouble was that we didn't count on the winds that night and the winds came up at a very high velocity. You can actually check with Anne what her opinion of just why they came down. She probably feels they came down because they were not properly fastened, Maintenance crew feels they came down because they were not properly designed. I don't know who is right, all I know is that Anne called me about 2 or 3 that morning and said the banners were coming down. It was nerve-wracking. There was absolutely nothing I could do. The maintenance foreman was not home at Long Island and I coundn't get to him, and I finally got to him and said there was nothing we could do. But Anne kept calling me, her husband was down at the Bridge watching them slide and she was concerned about them getting ripped, but I frankly was only concerned about them falling on top of cars. That's all I was concerned about. So I called the Fire Dep't and told them to go there to take them down. Fortunately, nothing happened. She lost her banners, ot they were torn.

Q: The MAS was the, what shall we say, the letter of introduction, that you needed. Could you reconstruct how you made those negotions? How did you begin on that project. The BBE? What did you need to secure?

A: The artist... it was clear to me that the whole area looked like the Guggenheim without walls and it would be a setting for a very incredible show. A lot of work that was being done then I knew about because of Jene Highstein, and Richard Nonas and those artists that I knew. Once having seen that site, they not

only agreed, but suggested more and more names. I talked to Gordon Matta-Clark very, very early on and he was very helpful. ~~Helped~~ with phone numbers. Many of the artists' suggestions ~~of names~~ were ~~very~~ instrumental.

Q: So you thought more about the artists, ~~initially,~~ then you did about how to secure the permits?

A: No, I ~~continued to work on~~ the permit ~~situation,~~ which I originally thought would be very easy because of this festival. But ~~it took,~~ it was not easy because of the fact that the ~~area~~ ~~it used~~ constantly and ~~anyone can go out on it~~. It is actually condemned. ~~So~~ to have the kind of thing I wanted to have, and yet ~~administratively try~~ to provide ~~for~~ not so much security, just ~~to see that it could happen and actually go through, and~~ that no one would get arrested, I wanted to get a permit. It proved ~~impossible~~ to get because ~~it was legally condemned~~. There was no way ~~for~~ the city ~~to~~ legally give me a permit ~~or else they would be~~ opening ~~themselves~~ up for liability ~~or such that they didn't want to consider~~. It because so difficult ~~that what~~ I decided to ~~do was have~~ the artist ~~to~~ build the work during a 3 day period of time. ~~Which~~ was all I felt ~~it could hold up under because I thought by that time~~ the police, the coast guard ~~would be too much aware~~ of what was happening. I also had the Highways dep't involved ~~in the Bridge~~, because the Bridge falls under the Highways dep't. ~~But~~ they were working on the festival, they'd agreed, ~~so I had a big in~~. ~~The Highways Dep't agreed to come in on the festival~~, so I had ~~all kinds of~~ in$, but the problem was ~~this~~ permit, which I ~~co~~uldn't get under the Parks Dep't because the area was actually w owned by the Marine and Aviation. Maine and Aviation turned out to be a dep't ~~which~~ did not actually exist. It had been discontinued several years ago. ~~So~~ what finally happened was I didn't get any ~~of those~~ permits, ~~and~~ ~~I stopped all that and I~~ finally figured out ~~was~~ that the reason we didn't get permits was because it didn't make sense, we had to find another ~~logical~~ And the logic was the fol-

lowing: films are made in many cities, including N.Y. N.Y.C. wants the revenues of films made here, they want that kind of publicity. Films make sense because films make money. Film makers need to ~~use~~ the extraordinary measures to make their films, so there must be an avenue under which film makers get clearance for their activities. And, indeed, there was. None of ~~those~~ the dep'ts I've mentioned, but rather ~~under~~ the Dep;t of Commerce, which is the Dep't having to do with people making money. ~~so~~ finally helped when I went to the Dep't of Commerce, ~~and~~ there was a woman ~~there~~ at that time who did nothing else but give film-makers permits to do things like shoot people up on streets and jump off buildings. So to her, my request was not in the least un-ordinary and I merely ~~applied for a request~~ made an application which called for 30 or 40 people, with 2,000 or 3,000 extras.

Q: Meaning the viewers?

A: Yes, and I told her we were going to work for three days, using 30 to 40 people, and then that for the last ~~part we needed for the~~ big scene, we needed 2,000 extras. And I organized the festival so that during the 3 days, only ~~the~~ artists would be there, just a small crowd, whoever knew about it. And the last day, instead of ~~being~~ an opening, there ~~was~~ would be a closing. The last day would be the day the public, as such, would come. That was my plan . To do that, we had to pretend we were making a film doing the exhibition, so that I had to give her the licences of the various trucks and cars we were using, and the equipment cars ~~and~~ of the camera men. But it worked out, a very quick procedure, ~~and I had all these plans.~~ Then with those permits I was able to go to the local police precinct and discuss with them what was going to happen, both ~~in terms of~~ the festival, which they knew about, and the film, that is, the exhibition, ~~and~~ I also participated in that precinct's opening exhibition of community art.

~~Q: You had before, or later?~~

~~A: I did~~, during the planning of the briefly exhibition. I went to the opening, and helped

the. I planned this for about 3 months. During the course of time I got very friendly with the police captain, so I knew his name. And one of the ways I got stuck on City Hall steps, when Mayor Lindsay came, was because I knew the policemen so well because I talked to them, every shift. I found out lots of info. Even if you send messages to the police, they change shifts, and the next shift doesn't know anything about it, and they can just as easily come. And I knew the police would come, see a public gathering and ask people to leave, so I would go to the different shifts and tell the different shifts what was happening so that they were all aware of it. I knew the policemen so well that when we were in City Hall Park, the police would normally have been the people to not allow me to stay there regardless of what permit I had, but I knew them so well that they believed me, and that's how I ended up still being there when Lindsay was. I was determined to get permits and I had xeroxed hundreds of this same permit, which was not a big deal, I mean its only a scrap of paper, xeroxed hundreds of them, and stapled them together.

Q: Did the artists know the circumstances they were...

A: They were told they would have 3 days to put up a piece ot that a piece could be up 3 days and that during that time, we would probably be hassled by the police, but that I had a permit. And I could try and protect them.

Q: Did you tell them what kind of permit you had?

A: Some of the I did, yes, I don't remember. I was constantly working on that permit the whole time. Some of them, of course, I didn't. A lot of people were unaware of that. Maybe I don't remember correctly but they seemed pretty used to being asked to leave places, Especially the sculptors, who were there the longest. They seemed sort of glad when I arrived with the permit. I wasn't really as organized then as I am now. I told them no one could do anything dangerous, and that they would be risking my situation if they did. I told them

nobody , under any circumstances, was to go into the water.

Q: It didn't work out that way, did it?

A: No, it didn't. I started learning some lessons from ~~then~~ this later I told them the Coast Guard had refused me permission to enter the water which was true and that if anybody entered the water the Coast Guard would arrive, and it would be all over.

ALANNA/MAS

Q: What was your job?

A: I was the program director.

Q: What does that mean?

A: I was the person who was supposed to make up programs and adminstrate them and run them, that would make joining that organizationsomewhat worthwhile, arranging architectrual tours, being the person who would follow through on problems with the City. The Organization was supposed to be a sort of watch-dog of the esthetic of NY, it had a large title. A lot of people belonged to it. elderly people. By paying fifteen dollars a year, all of NY's problems were supposed to be solved.

Q: When was the Institute formed?

A: I started activities around 1970, a year after I was there, doing actual separate activities. so I have been working as a separate entity since 1970, but continued working for MAS, it crosses over.

Q: I thought the Institute was formed under the auspices of MAS.

A: You may have a better perception of this than I do because you were around at the time, near me. I had projects that I wanted to do, and I wanted to do them under MAS. I was quite anxious to have an umbrella, and I was quite anxious to get paid. I was also interested in a respected umbrella, to interest some of the powerful people in NY to help things to heppen. So the Director, who is now Director of the State Council, promised if I did all these other things, I could do the contemporary ar thing.. He was also convinced about the studio program, he thought it was a good thing. He thought that interest dove-tailed, interms of preservation and the studio thing.

Q: May I ask his name?

A: Kent Barwick.

ALANNA, IDEA WAREHOUSE (replace this one you have in I.W.)

Q: Could you describe, in some detail, the negotiations for the Idea Warehouse?

A: I was after space, as usual, and I was hanging out at the Dep't of Real Estate's office, hoping to hear accidently dropped information about ware-shoude space. I had been trying to get warehouse space, and depending on what kind of space it was, I would develop a particular program suitable to it. I think I was after studio space. We desperately needed studio space to continue our workspace program. We had hundreds of applications by then, but aside from workspace at 10 Bleecker St., which fulfilled its name by providing as bleak a space as possible for artists, I found out there was a series of buildings on Reade St., and somehow got in to inspect them, saw that from the second to the sixth floor were empty. As usual, I tried to find out who controlled these floors. These buildings were part of a package or plan that would see them razed to form a lower Manhatten Cultural Mall. I forget the exact name. Blocks of downtown were mapped out for this plan by the Downtown Development office. Lindsay had created a Downtown Cultural Center to oversee the downtown cultural area, which included the buildings on Reade St., which lay to the south, across tne street from the Clocktower. My friend and sometime enemy David Hupert from the Whitney museum had managed to secure the basement ina building along Chanbers st., by methods not only do I not know, but that I can't even begin to imagine. I started to sort out which city agency had control over the upper floors of these buildings. Other agencies included the Dep't of Tax and Finance, the City Planning Commission, and some of the responsibilities were held by Milton Mesic's gang . The ground floor was occupied so one stations of the City Planning Commission, while other parts of the ground fToor , the store-fronts, were occupied by rehabilitation post-prison programs. On the upper floors there was nothing but filing cabinets. It seemed to me that if we could consolidate the storage, two entire floors could be given to us. After quite a while of wrangling, about a year, we could indeed prove that the filing cabinets could be consolidated. This was a really interestin g negotiation because, about this time, most of the agencies were desperate for filing cabinets, and were attempting to barter with the Institute for these cabinets. While I of course knew where there were filing cabinets and that they were in storage under that Commission, and that they very well might have been their own filing cabinets. I attempted to barter the whereabouts of the filing cabinets and the filing cabinets themselves, in return for either their removal from the premises, or the promise to relocate them. Many people in the Commission

simply did not believe there were these filing cabinets on these floors under their jurisdiction. Taking people to the site to prove this was tricky since everybody wants space, and once they saw these gallons of space, I would have essentially put the Institute in danger of losing this space altogether. I think the only reason we got this space finally was because it got to be such a muddle which Dep't, which floor, which filing cabinet. I got it to a high enough level so that the people in charge were slightly embarrassed to be dickering over filing cabinets and space allotment. They City Planning Commission, through the Downtown Development Administration, Richar Weinstein was the director, not he, but a deputy under him made the requisition for the space, under an enormous amount of pressure from me, for the Institute to have this space. I made this request through the Economic Development Administration, an agency which figures frequently in these chronciles. This has been subsumed, by no, under another agency, called OED (Opportunity of Economic Development) EDA was the salvation of the Institute, being the office of almost any intelligent, far-seeing action.

Q: Was Ken Patton, the man who negotiated for Coney Island Factory, still at the head of this agency?

A: I don't know whether Ken Patton was still there at that point. Most of oursuccesses with the City over the years I have attributed to the people working at the agency. EDA was, in some way, in a similar position to the Institute and represented to corporations why they should remain in the city, why they should come to the city, rather trying to bring new corporations to they city, involved with leases and bringing jobs into the city, etc. Because they were not involved in the day to day practical concerns of running the city but in planning.

Q: You felt their solutions to your problems would be more imaginative than those of agencies strictly involved with practical matters?

A: I felt that their own efforts would be as frustrated as ours. I don't know for a fact but I projected that they were so frustrated in their own efforts to convince the administration of their schemes that they sympathized with us and our problems in confronting the City with plans. They were not particularly interested in art, but again and again I would encounter a very different mentality in this administration than in the others and I think it has to do with what must have been, to them, a duplication of their own efforts to deal with the city. The mentality was such that it saw no reason why these

requests which made perfect sense, should not be honored in a very short time. And they were not adverse to using their powers to see that my plans, my suggestions were taken up, but only if it did not cut into their time too much.

Q: Then you sought help in securing the Idea Warehouse for the Institute.

A: Yes. They didn't actually approve and administer the space for us, rather they were a local arm of government that had to appeal to one of the regional planning councils, which in turn had to appeal to the City Planning Council, the EDA couldn't simply grab the Idea Warehouse for us.

Q: Did you ever have a written lease for the occupation of the Idea Warehouse? What was your actual agreement?

A: I remember we got a letter signed by someone at the City Planning Office,I truly can't remember. I know we had a lease of some sort which stated that we were responsible for insurance for our own activities and employees, although I believe we were also requested to insure the building. It actually didn't turn out that we had to do that, though later that proved to be a question. I think we had a one month lease with a three month alert to get out of the space, should the City notify us that they would act on the property. What we received was the top floor of three separate buildings interconnected. One of the buildings was extrememly large with a floor space of 100X100'. This became the Idea Warehouse. The other two remained workspace. And we wnet immediately into workspace occupation. I transferred some of the unhappy residents of 10 Bleecker St. workspace to these studios, namely Phil Glass and Charlemagne Palestine, into one of the studio spaces. Mabou Mines and Ken Jacobs occupied the other. The buildings were occupied a year before the events took place, these four separate groups occupied and rehearsed in these studios. That took care of the two smaller studios. The larger studio sat for awhile, it was in very bad repair,had no working toilet. The big loft used to fascinate me with its vast size and its sloping ceiling, 10' on one side, 30' on the other. It was a beautiful, beautiful space and the idea was to program this space.

Q: Did you anticipate the increasing demand for performance space as this kind of activity superceded minimal and conceptual art?

A: I believe none of us anticipated the importance that performance would have in occupying the scheduling space, that it did. It was apparent that per-

formance had received new life in the scheduling and funding space that it has come to occupy in budgets everywhere. It was apparent that new life had been pumped into the memory that had resulted from Rauschenberg's Nine Evenings and the interaction between artists and dancers. It seemed apparent to me and I assumed apparent to observers of the art world that dance groups that had been peripherally attracted to the art scene -- Tricia Brown and a lot of the dancers of the Judson Theater Group-- that there had been a burst of activity on the part of the artists, and a new demand on the part of the audience. Most of these artists were not involved with performance art as we think of it now, but they were -- Tricia Brown, Phil Glass, Mabou Mines -- many of the people who did occupy the Idea Warehouse studios at the time. This was clear, this was information anyone could get on the street. These people had been denied traditional proscenium stages. Instead, they hung around museums, particularly in museums, but also in the US, such as the Walker Museum. Under Sue Weil's direction, the NY activities and concerts were starting to happen in galleries in Soho. The Paula Cooper Gallery would consistently turn over its space on Friday and Saturday evenings for poetry readings, concerts, performance groups, performance of all kinds. When Castelli and Sonnabend occupied 420, they gradually turned over single evenings to performace.

Q: Not until they incorporated the performance people into their regular stable of artists and exhibited them on a regular basis.

A: You're right. If they didn't do it because they were their own artists, they did it because they were friends of their own artists. However, in a certain sense, the galleries were inadaquate, this is the entire point to remember, because the needs and uses that the perfoomance artists had, in everything except audience, were wrong. It seemed to one that one of the characteristics of the new performance activity was based very much on the way visual art was moving, exploring the unique acoustic quality of indivudual spaces and the dimensions of the space, the environemtn that affected the structure of the dances in very different ways, the nature of the space, in other ways. It seemed to me, in light of these developments, that what the dancers needed was time to develop rehearsals in which these spaces as they required. So the contradiction between being offered an evening at Paula Cooper between one show, as it was being taken down and another before installation, compared to the needs for time to rehearse and develop the piece, was apparent. The

Kitchen, which had been at the Broadway Central Hotel, where it collapsed, had just opened a very temporary space on Wooster St. The direction at that time was very, very much related to video and the traditional music world concerts, and they were concerned with booking as many events as possible. While it was clear that the Kitchen was a very important outlet for performance it was also clear that the administration of such a performance wanted very accurate scheduling, infact booked 3 or 4 performances a week.

Q: By contrast, your performance schedule which allowed an artist a residency for a month, allowed for development of a much more elaborate performance.

A: Exactly. We would give the most beautiful space in the world, the Idea WArehouse -- I've never seen the unique features of the space duplicated anywhere else: the huge wide space,sloping ciling, columns which were narrow and didn't intrude into the visual arena -- to artist who never dreamed that they would get this opportunity to perform in such a space. We gave them a month long residency in which to develop a piece. We tried this for a year, to test the Idea Warehouse. There were two big problems which brought about its downfall, and which in some ways prevented it from being a useful experiment. The missing factor in the formula was money. With the invitation to these small groups of artists, should have been a grant. Anything! In terms of the ambitions we hoped to realize, there should have been a materials grant, at least $500 . But there was nothing we could do about it at the time, although we did pay for the announcements in the mail, a minimum contribution.

Q: And what was the second problem?

A: The second has been variously called administration or support style. We took on the project at the Idea Warehouse with the idea that people would be supervising their won occupancy much the same way they would be supervising themselves in their own studios. This is the only way we could take advantage of the space since we didn't have the money to have a staff person over there full-time supervisng activities. The artists could supervise themselves, since it was just a studio operation. What they couldn't supervise and deal with were the problem s in the buildings, namely the running of the elevator, simply because these performing areas were not located on the ground floor, but the sixth floor in the building and anticipated once a month the elevator would be needed to transport people to the location of a performance. The audience somehow had to be attracted to this absolutely isolated warehouse, which didn't

turn out to be a problem , and moved from the street level to the sixth floor in a building whose elevator was constantlybreaking down. Also, a nerve-wrecking factor, was that we realized that the Dep't of Real Estate, did not anticipate (that is putting it in the best possible light) made sure we did not utilize this as a public space, and it we allowed the public to attend any of the performances, this would be in direct violation of our agreement. So it was nerve-wrecking because if anything should have happened during that time...I knew their perception of the public was very different from my perception. Unfortunately, a lot of the excitement at the Idea Warehouse was generated by the fact that the ax could fall at any moment. So our announcements were couched so that the Dep't of Real Estate couldn't pin down our activities. We would inform them of what we were doing, bu we would do it in a way...we told them we had studio projects,which was true, artists in residence, which was also true, and that once a month we asked the residents to display the result of their work. Our experience with the lower level inspectors for the city told us that we should convey to them that we found it unconsiouable that we would give this space to the artist without in some way, making them deliver. They could understnad this. Of course, there was some concern about the people who they delivered to. We told them that the artists would be delivering to our own inspectors and supervisors. I attempted to build up in their minds that we had staff over us, meaning NEA, NYSCA etc., who were suspicious of how their funds were being used, and we needed to be responsive to their demands. I told these inspectors that it would be interested in people, who would be invited to come, and that there would be a gathering of them, of people who had received invitations, that these were no public events, only those who'd received invitations were permitted to come . All of this was true to the extent there was a gathering, we had invitations, people who came had to bring them. There would be administrative people supervising these events, and there would be guards. There always were. There were Pinkerton guards at the door. The timing of these events, whether 6-8 or 35, indicated when we would be doing these inspections. The artists who evidently saw that we were nervous in our arrangements with the city, were more or less cooperative. To some extent they saw our nervousness because we were doing something underhanded, as our problem, with the sort of feeeling one has toward anyone who's doing something underhanded, assuming that if they are doing something, they're doing something underhanded to you too. With this lack of respect, the artists would

often interpret our problems very casually, inviting anyone they wanted to, groups of people. Linda Blumberg was very involved with this operation, and spent hours and hours trying to construct ways to satisfy the Dep't of Real Estate. People would come over to the Idea Warehouse, use the elevator, leave it on the sixth floor, so no one else could use it. Each time they did this it provoked outraged cries from the other occupants of the building. When the artists would tell us that the other occupants had kept the elevator on the fifth floor, the day before and they were afraid to return it to them. There was always a pig in the poke. We would hear from the other occupants in the building how terrible our artists were, until it was very hard to sort out the truth -- who was wrong and who was right. Throughout the time that the Idea Warehouse, the drain that it took on me, as a result of the back and forth and back and forth, between the Institute and the City administration, was never visible. The perception of some artists was that they shouldered the entire load of the building. The prime example being Charlemagne Palestine. A charming man when he cares to exert himself, to this day, Charlemagne feels that he shouldered the entire burden of dealing with the superintendent, and all the building problems. He may have indeed negotiated with the superintendent much of the time, because Charlemagne was living in the building, although under the terms of the workspace program this was forbidden. The whole question of honor revolved around his agreeing not to live in the building because then we'd get in trouble with the City. My blackmail on Charlemagne was he was living in the building; his on me was that he was supervising the elevator and other building problems. It's a clear example of what happens when one tries to run a program without a paid staff person on the premises. Hupert, across the street, had a paid staff and paid interns . Hupert, who is an excellent administrator, guided his projects so that the Chambers St. location worked for a much longer time than the Idea Warehouse, but he wasn't able to escape the problems either. Hupert was accused of having encouraged vice dens. In a whirl-wind inspection by the Morals Dep't they did find artists sleeping in the studios with members of the opposite sex, I believe there was an accusation of their drinking wine and taking dope. It was conceded that yes, artists were sleeping there with members of the opposite sex, and yes, artists were drinking wine, and we avoided the question of dope altogether. The Inspector General who was in charge of the group that did swoop down on the basement studio apartments across the street and found what was found there, almost caused everything to end, the end of all institute programs, almost caused the Whitney programs to end, the Institute programs to end. It was

evident to the City that these artist were unreliable and that any arts programs would only ultimately bring shame upon the City. Hupert was able to appeal to his Board of Trustees, who represented slightly more sophisticated interests, who understood his situation and pled his cause to the city. However, he was by no means a white knight in battle, because in order to keep the studios he had to clean out the sleeping couples entirely. It's really hard to imagine how shatterring this was for all of us. Hupert and I often had this experience thrown at us in years to come. People would bring it up in committee meetings: Remember when X happened?" I believe it was even brought up to Jeffrey Lew, who was then negotiating for use of the Brooklyn Bridge. To many city employees, this was a low point in the moral history of NYC, perfect evidence of what happens when you allow the burdgeoning of cultural affairs.

75 + x 37 ALANNA/BROOKLYN BRIDGE EVENT pt 2 Wynn (6)

A: The gangs weren't as negative as they could be, during the building of most of the pieces. If we'd had a complete war on our hands, it couldn't have been done. Because it wasn't a complete war, I can view this as a positive. ~~Desubro's kids, there were three of them involved, and they were older, were not able to~~ organize them as guards for the show, which is what I would do now, I would really hire them all. I was able to talk to them, and they talke to certain other members of the loosely organized groups of kids. They weren't really interested in staying out there and keeping their people under control for three days. But they did exert a certain amount of control. They didn't pinpoint us as people to be exploited. What happened was the closing was a very confusing social situation for everyone, certainly for the people in the gangs. They had seen the beginnings of the Demolition Banquet and had partaken of it to a great extent. They had seen Gordon there all night with his friends' roaring fires. You can picture the number of people in evening dress, in tuxedo, and jeans -- the gangs, then the police, the Coast Guard, all attending this one event, coming by ship or land, depending on their occupation. As the thing got wilder, there was more and more drink, and more and more dope. The artists were getting very drunk and stoned too. They were either giving out stuff to drink or withdrawing ~~stuff to drink.~~ There major effort was over, whereas the performance people, Mabou Mines and Phil Glass, were just starting, ~~so~~ they were very straight, trying to professionally get it tofether. The artists then became the audience, this social revelry began. Dancing, a lot of the kids had portable record players. When they say Phil's equipment, they just went out of their minds. Here it was, late at night, ~~all these~~ specail lights all over, incredible equipment which looked like ten rock bands in one spot at one time. They thought ~~it was~~ going to be rock music and they were very excited. The nature of the music, ~~which was~~ the first outdoor concert Phil Glass ever gave - we had ~~many~~ many talks about what would happen to the sound when it was dispersed, ~~and he was very concerned~~ --the nature of the work was ~~this sort of~~ hypnotic sound. Combined with the lateness of the hour, the explosives of the occasion, the disparity of the audience, ~~the sound of the music,~~ the dope and the drink, things began to get very wild. And they got progressively wilder ~~and it lasted later into the night~~. When we all started leaving, ~~it was~~ 1 or 2 A.M. ~~and~~ it was still going on. ~~In terms of~~ the destruction of Highstein's piece, ~~that~~ happened that night. It's a mystery, ~~I know the next morning~~ I turned up ~~ther~~ at ten ~~in~~ the morning, ~~and~~ it was gone. We talked about whether or not it was destroyed by the

kids, or whether someone took it for the plywood, and I don't know which. Gene at the time thought it was for the wood.

Q: Would you continue to give your account of the closing. We were up to the evening performance.

A: Things were pretty much in reverse of the museum situation that we tried to duplicate. The dinner party was very elaborate. Only the best and the worst people were invited. It was called the Demolition Banquet because it happened where all the wrecked cars were. That was the first thing. I think Gordon may remember better, I think about 150 people were invited to the Banquet. The circulars that you've seen I think a thousand were sent out, by word of mouth people started arriving midway through the Demolition Banquet. It was planned that it would still be light when the one thousand people arrived, and they could walk around the pier and see what was there and what was left. I always knew that it was very possible that a lot of the work would be destroyed. It was intended to take slides of all the works that were produced during the three-day event and project those slides on the Bridge. It was difficult to do at the time because no one could get a developer to work overnight. If the pieces were done on Saturday, there seemed no way to show them on Sunday. The problem was solved by finding a private color film developer who did the work all Saturday night on the slides. Two people took slides, Carol Gooden and David Greenberg. We had that arranged and that was supposed to happen first. Then Phil was going to do his concert, then we worked out a very intricate thing with Mabou Mines for "Come and Go" which involved them being on another pier. They were on the South St. Seaport pier. It seemed like it was a mile away, but it isn't actually that far. They were not reachable. Lee Breuer and I talked about anything from across the river to the next pier. That was sort of the interesting presentation point of the piece because it was a distance situation. They had the sound system run so that the sound was where the audience was and the players were half a mile away, on a pier far away. It was an was not successful. The people who saw it, it was fantastic and successful, one of the strangest things. It was totally typical of a lot of the bizarre type of set work that Mabou continued to do, like when they did "Come and Go" with the mirrors. Many people didn't know that it was happening., they just heard all these whispers. I would say the crowd that was nearest to the side that faced Mabou Mines' pier knew what was happening.

Q: If they remember anything, artists I've spoken to remember that, so in one

sense, it was successful.

A: I can't remember at what point the slides were showing, but they were repeated over and over again on the side of the bridge, of all the work. That was enormously successful, more so than I had ever anticipated. I don't know what the artists have said, I'd be curious because at the time, that was one of the things they said made the whole thing make sense. At the time it seemed magical, people kept saying, it was so bizarre to have just looked at something, and then as soon as it became night... and of course they were shaped on the base of the Bridge. You'd see the slide, then you'd see the artist, 10 minutes late. You'd ask him, and he'd say, "Go over to the piece, I'll go with you," You'd look at it and you could talk to the artist about it. People were doing that a lot. Then the last part of the Event had to do with Rudy Burckhardt. I understood, but had not seen, that he had a film "Under the Brooklyn Bridge," and that seemed totally fantastic to me. So I asked Burckhardt, because I knew Edwin Denby very well, and Edmond had offered me an introduction to Rudy. I asked Rudy if he'd show that film. He was very generous, he didn't know who I was, or why or anything, he agreed to do it. He, furthermore, advised me that perhaps a more successful film to show would be "Inside Dope." There was a clear split. As the planner of the Event, I felt it should be "Underneath the Brooklyn Bridge," but I took Rudy's advice and asked him to show "Inside Dope" also. And that turned out to be a very fitting film. He was indeed right because of the nature of the film. It's so hilarious. Geographically, it has no connections. It's on 14th St., and they're just hanging around on 14th St. it's a street film and people are engaged in all sorts of scurilous activities, It was the final thing that was seen that night, absolutely befitting the moment. By that point, the dancing had started, artists dancing intermingled with raids by the gangs who would swoop down, run through a group of people, the Coast Guard at that point was totally circling the pier, police were on the other end, cordoning it off. The police ended up getting very confused. We had so many meetings and talks about this, that they were quite convinced that the mayor was there or someone similar to the mayor, so they were trying to be very helpful. They were giving protection, and they were not sure who to protect who from, whether they should allow more street people to come in, or what. I must say I could sympathize with their confusion. There was no way to tell who was who at the Event. The police didn't know who were artists and who were bums. They were sort of wandering around, trying to instill a note of sobriety.

~~Then some of the artists, late at night, got very very drunk and started fighting with the gangs. No one was hurt.~~

Q: ~~Could~~ you ~~judge~~ how successful the evening performances were and how the Event as a whole was received?

A: People kept saying it was ~~just~~ fantastic. I got a tremendous amount of that feedback. People ~~kept saying~~ the slides were wonderful, the concert was fantastic, the Mabou Mines thing was just great. My memory of it being ~~mostly just~~ tremendously worried. I got the feeling about ~~two days before.~~ It was more than a case of nerves. I realized the enormity of the situation, what could go wrong. I started getting worried about the semi-legality of the permits I'd been using, names I'd been using of other individuals. By the time I say the Beckley piece ~~go~~ up, ~~and~~ Jeffrey Lew in the water, and George Tracas in his kayak, ~~and~~ then the gangs, I started really getting worried. I just couldn't sleep. Anne Healy's things came down ~~on the Bridge~~. On the night ~~of~~ the thing I was ~~just~~ mainly worried, happy but ~~just mainly~~ worried.

Q: For the record, could you recall how you solved your problem with the wiring?

A: The City got their wires crossed, and it didn't get us juice. But I had a subplan. The subplan was to have our own person, totally familiar with the street lighting system, run extension cables off the street lighting for the Brooklyn Bridge Event. I never expected juice. I did expect it for City Hall Park, but I knew they couldn't come through on the Bridge because they hadn't been down surveying it.

Q: Then you had expected you would need your subplan?

A: I expected to use the subplan, and that's why we got all of the cable from the World's Fair. I accepted very gratefully, the Parks Dep't's offer ~~to do that~~ and started looking at the problem myself. ~~The problem~~ seemed to me ~~that there had to be~~ an enormous amount of heavy duty cable, not extension cable, ~~cable. I couldn't find it and~~ if I couldn't find it, I ~~knew~~ the Parks Dep't didn't realize the enormity of the problem. I finally did find ~~it. I found that it had been used in~~ the World's Fair, ~~and it was all out~~ in Flushing, ~~stored.~~ I got permission from another part of the Parks Dep't to borrow it, illegitimately. If it came to a real ruckus, they would know who had it, but otherwise they ~~didn't want to know anything about it.~~ So we went out and stole it with an enormous truck, ~~it was~~ big brown cables, and brought it ~~in~~ and had it there to use. We planned to run it from the street light to the

piers. ~~What happened was, that~~ But it rained, ~~And~~ we couldn't, for various reasons, put that subplan into operation. ~~The~~ Our person, ~~that~~ who can't be named, had been a disgruntled employee of the Parks Dep't in years past. What we then did was go to the base of the Bridge, down in the subterraneum rooms near Andre's rooms, and find the ~~original~~ main power supply for the Bridge, and ~~take our cables~~, ~~which we had a lot of because we were going to run them clear across the street out to the pier, instead we~~ attached our cables to ~~the~~ this power supply ~~of the Bridge~~. That was not a subplan at all. We had only a couple of hours before Phil went on and we found it just ~~by~~ through anxiety and, the knowledge that the Bridge had to have a power supply. Because it was raining, it got very dodgey. The ~~main~~ problem was that there was a foot of water in most places in those rooms. We had to ~~do the~~ connecting ~~of~~ the cable in a foot ~~and a half~~ of water, holding flashlights. The fact that it worked amazes me. I remember standing there with Phil Glass and this electrician. I remember this because I was so scared, thinking that it would be totally ruined if we don't get this juice. It wasn't logical or rational thinking at the time. Phil may have really been in another world, because he was under the same pressure to consider the ~~all these people~~ audience ~~ther~~, ~~he~~ had the equipment, the gangs, the performers. Phil gets very calm under pressure; I was very, very pregnant, and the electrician was in a state of terror. I don't remember who actually connected the cable. ~~I don't think it would be very romantic in the day, but at night, with the rain and all those people it does~~. It is possible that ~~Phil~~ he was ~~mainly~~ connecting the extension cables above ground and the electrician and I were downstairs. I couldn't get very close to the cable walks because I was 8 1/2 months pregnant.

In the midst of all of this, I was aware that a piece of choreography, the Event, ~~Q: To what extent were you aware of the Event, as a whol? Did you at any time see the Event as something of your making, or as a leaderless situation, but taking on an identity~~.

A: Certainly not a work of art, certainly not that. ~~As much as possible for me, for that being my first thing, I saw it as being a leaderful situation. I was the leader, and several of the~~ artists that ~~should~~ could have been in the show were not ~~I~~rejected because, ~~to maintain my position as the leader,~~ I ~~had~~ to draw a definition of it. I saw it as a unit, the Event ~~a production, as a presentation,~~ and I was concerned about ~~those~~ its problems. I was also concerned about ~~the program, what order things went in.~~ it as a production, as a presentation, During that Sunday, certainly that night when everything started going wrong, with all the rain and so many more people than we ever dreamed, ~~then~~ and things started happening seemingly at random, ~~then definitely there was no~~ but at last control. I saw it as a unit. I'm sure that many of the participants not

Q [illegible] detail, the negotiations for the Idea We

A: I was after space, as usual, and I was hanging out at the Dep't of Real Estate's office, hoping to hear accidently dropped information about ware-shoude space. I had been trying to get warehouse space, and depending on what kind of space it was, I would develop a particular program suitable to it. I think I was after studio space. We desperately needed studio space to continue our workspace program. We had hundreds of applications by then, but aside from workspace at 10 Bleecker St., which fulfilled its name by providing as bleak a space as possible for artists, I found out there was a series of buildings on Reade St., and somehow got in to inspect them, saw that from the second to the sixth floor were empty. As usual, I tried to find out who controlled these floors. These buildings were part of a package or plan that would see them razed to form a lower Manhatten Cultural Mall. I forget the exact name. Blocks of downtown were mapped out for this plan by the Downtown Development office. Lindsay had created a Downtown Cultural Center to oversee the downtown cultural area, which included the buildings on Reade St., which lay to the south, across tne street from the Clocktower. My friend and sometime enemy David Hupert from the Whitney museum had managed to secure the basement ina building along Chanbers st., by methods not only do I not know, but that I can't even begin to imagine. I started to sort out which city agency had control over the upper floors of these buildings. Other agencies included the Dep't of Tax and Finance, the City Planning Commission, and some of the responsibilities were held by Milton Mesic's gang . The ground floor was occupied so one stations of the City Planning Commission, while other parts of the ground fToor , the store-fronts, were occupied by rehabilitation post-prison programs. On the upper floors there was nothing but filing cabinets. It seemed to me that if we could consolidate the storage, two entire floors could be given to us. After quite a while of wrangling, about a year, we could indeed prove that the filing cabinets could be consolidated. This was a really interestin g negotiation because, about this time, most of the agencies were desperate for filing cabinets, and were attempting to barter with the Institute for these cabinets. While I of course knew where there were filing cabinets and that they were in storage under that Commission, and that they very well might have been their own filing cabinets. I attempted to barter the whereabouts of the filing cabinets and the filing cabinets themselves, in return for either their removal from the premises, or the promise to relocate them. Many people in the Commission

[illegible] to [illegible] which [illegible] were these filing cabinets on these flo[illegible] and [illegible] under their jurisdiction. Taking people to the site to prove this was tricky since everybody wants space, and once they saw these gallons of space, I would have essentially put the Institute in danger of losing this space altogether. I think the only reason we got this space finally was because it got to be such a muddle which Dep't, which floor, which filing cabinet. I got it to a high enough level so that the people in charge were slightly embarrassed to be dickering over filing cabinets and space allotment. They City Planning Commission, through the Downtown Development Administration, Richar Weinstein was the director, not he, but a deputy under him made the requisition for the space, under an enormous amount of pressure from me, for the Institute to have this space. I made this request through the Economic Development Administration, an agency which figures frequently in these chronciles. This has been subsumed, by no, under another agency, called OED (Opportunity of Economic Development) EDA was the salvation of the Institute, being the office of almost any intelligent, far-seeing action.

Q: Was Ken Patton, the man who negotiated for Coney Island Factory, still at the head of this agency?

A: I don't know whether Ken Patton was still there at that point. Most of oursuccesses with the City over the years I have attributed to the people working at the agency. EDA was, in some way, in a similar position to the Institute and represented to corporations why they should remain in the city, why they should come to the city, rather trying to bring new corporations to they city, involved with leases and bringing jobs into the city, etc. Because they were not involved in the day to day practical concerns of running the city but in planning.

Q: You felt their solutions to your problems would be more imaginative than those of agencies strictly involved with practical matters?

A: I felt that their own efforts would be as frustrated as ours. I don't know for a fact but I projected that they were so frustrated in their own efforts to convince the administration of their schemes that they sympathized with us and our problems in confronting the City with plans. They were not particularly interested in art, but again and again I would encounter a very different mentality in this administration than in the others and I think it has to do with what must have been, to them, a duplication of their own efforts to deal with the city. The mentality was such that it saw no reason why these

...which ...ject ...
...requ... wh... ...rfect sense, should not be honored in a very short ti...
And they were not adverse to using their powers to see that my plans, my suggestions were taken up, but only if it did not cut into their time too much.

Q: Then you sought help in securing the Idea Warehouse for the Institute.

A: Yes. They didn't actually approve and administer the space for us, rather they were a local arm of government that had to appeal to one of the regional planning councils, which in turn had to appeal to the City Planning Council, the EDA couldn't simply grab the Idea Warehouse for us.

Q: Did you ever have a written lease for the occupation of the Idea Warehouse? What was your actual agreement?

A: I remember we got a letter signed by someone at the City Planning Office, I truly can't remember. I know we had a lease of some sort which stated that we were responsible for insurance for our own activities and employees, although I believe we were also requested to insure the building. It actually didn't turn out that we had to do that, though later that proved to be a question. I think we had a one month lease with a three month alert to get out of the space, should the City notify us that they would act on the property. What we received was the top floor of three separate buildings interconnected. One of the buildings was extrememly large with a floor space of 100X100'. This became the Idea Warehouse. The other two remained workspace. And we wnet immediately into workspace occupation. I transferred some of the unhappy residents of 10 Bleecker St. workspace to these studios, namely Phil Glass and Charlemagne Palestine, into one of the studio spaces. Mabou Mines and Ken Jacobs occupied the other. The buildings were occupied a year before the events took place, these four separate groups occupied and rehearsed in these studios. That took care of the two smaller studios. The larger studio sat for awhile, it was in very bad repair, had no working toilet. The big loft used to fascinate me with its vast size and its sloping ceiling, 10' on one side, 30' on the other. It was a beautiful, beautiful space and the idea was to program this space.

Q: Did you anticipate the increasing demand for performance space as this kind of activity superceded minimal and conceptual art?

A: I believe none of us anticipated the importance that performance would have in occupying the scheduling space, that it did. It was apparent that per-

formanc... ...d new life in the scheduling and funding space that it has come to occupy in budgets everywhere. It was apparent that new life had been pumped into the memory that had resulted from Rauschenberg's Nine Evenings and the interaction between artists and dancers. It seemed apparent to me and I assumed apparent to observers of the art world that dance groups that had been peripherally attracted to the art scene -- Tricia Brown and a lot of the dancers of the Judson Theater Group-- that there had been a burst of activity on the part of the artists, and a new demand on the part of the audience. Most of these artists were not involved with performance art as we think of it now, but they were -- Tricia Brown, Phil Glass, Mabou Mines -- many of the people who did occupy the Idea Warehouse studios at the time. This was clear, this was information anyone could get on the street. These people had been denied traditional proscenium stages. Instead, they hung around museums, particularly in museums, but also in the US, such as the Walker Museum. Under Sue Weil's direction, the NY activities and concerts were starting to happen in galleries in Soho. The Paula Cooper Gallery would consistently turn over its space on Friday and Saturday evenings for poetry readings, concerts, performance groups, performance of all kinds. When Castelli and Sonnabend occupied 420, they gradually turned over single evenings to performace.

Q: Not until they incorporated the performance people into their regular stable of artists and exhibited them on a regular basis.

A: You're right. If they didn't do it because they were their own artists, they did it because they were friends of their own artists. However, in a certain sense, the galleries were inadaquate, this is the entire point to remember, because the needs and uses that the perfoomance artists had, in everything except audience, were wrong. It seemed to one that one of the characteristics of the new performance activity was based very much on the way visual art was moving, exploring the unique acoustic quality of indivudual spaces and the dimensions of the space, the environemtn that affected the structure of the dances in very different ways, the nature of the space, in other ways. It seemed to me, in light of these developments, that what the dancers needed was time to develop rehearsals in which these spaces as they required. So the contradiction between being offered an evening at Paula Cooper between one show, as it was being taken down and another before installation, compared to the needs for time to rehearse and develop the piece, was apparent. The

Kitchen which moved to the Broadway Central Hotel, where it collapsed, had just opened a very temporary space on Wooster St. The direction at that time was very, very much related to video and the traditional music world concerts, and they were concerned with booking as many events as possible. While it was clear that the Kitchen was a very important outlet for performance it was also clear that the administration of such a performance wanted very accurate scheduling, infact booked 3 or 4 performances a week.

Q: By contrast, your performance schedule which allowed an artist a residency for a month, allowed for development of a much more elaborate performance.

A: Exactly. We would give the most beautiful space in the world, the Idea WArehouse -- I've never seen the unique features of the space duplicated anywhere else: the huge wide space,sloping ciling, columns which were narrow and didn't intrude into the visual arena -- to artist who never dreamed that they would get this opportunity to perform in such a space. We gave them a month long residency in which to develop a piece. We tried this for a year, to test the Idea Warehouse. There were two big problems which brought about its downfall, and which in some ways prevented it from being a useful experiment. The missing factor in the formula was money. With the invitation to these small groups of artists, should have been a grant. Anything! In terms of the ambitions we hoped to realize, there should have been a materials grant, at least $500 . But there was nothing we could do about it at the time, although we did pay for the announcements in the mail, a minimum contribution.

Q: And what was the second problem?

A: The second has been variously called administration or support style. We took on the project at the Idea Warehouse with the idea that people would be supervising their won occupancy much the same way they would be supervising themselves in their own studios. This is the only way we could take advantage of the space since we didn't have the money to have a staff person over there full-time supervisng activities. The artists could supervise themselves, since it was just a studio operation. What they couldn't supervise and deal with were the problem s in the buildings, namely the running of the elevator, simply because these performing areas were not located on the ground floor, but the sixth floor in the building and anticipated once a month the elevator would be needed to transport people to the location of a performance. The audience somehow had to be attracted to this absolutely isolated warehouse, which didn't

turn out to be a problem , and moved from the street level to the sixth floor in a building whose elevator was constantlybreaking down. Also, a nerve-wrecking factor, was that we realized that the Dep't of Real Estate, did not anticipate (that is putting it in the best possible light) made sure we did not utilize this as a public space, and it we allowed the public to attend any of the performances, this would be in direct violation of our agreement. So it was nerve-wrecking because if anything should have happened during that time...I knew their perception of the public was very different from my perception. Unfortunately, a lot of the excitement at the Idea Warehouse was generated by the fact that the ax could fall at any moment. So our announcements were couched so that the Dep't of Real Estate couldn't pin down our activities. We would inform them of what we were doing, bu we would do it in a way...we told them we had studio projects,which was true, artists in residence, which was also true, and that once a month we asked the residents to display the result of their work. Our experience with the lower level inspectors for the city told us that we should convey to them that we found it unconsiouable that we would give this space to the artist without in some way, making them deliver. They could understnad this. Of course, there was some concern about the people who they delivered to. We told them that the artists would be delivering to our own inspectors and supervisors. I attempted to build up in their minds that we had staff over us, meaning NEA, NYSCA etc., who were suspicious of how their funds were being used, and we needed to be responsive to their demands. I told these inspectors that it would be interested in people, who would be invited to come, and that there would be a gathering of them, of people who had received invitations, that these were no public events, only those who'd received invitations were permitted to come . All of this was true to the extent there was a gathering, we had invitations, people who came had to bring them. There would be administrative people supervising these events, and there would be guards. There always were. There were Pinkerton guards at the door. The timing of these events, whether 6-8 or 35, indicated when we would be doing these inspections. The artists who evidently saw that we were nervous in our arrangements with the city, were more or less cooperative. To some extent they saw our nervousness because we were doing something underhanded, as our problem, with the sort of feeeling one has toward anyone who's doing something underhanded, assuming that if they are doing something, they're doing something underhanded to you too. With this lack of respect, the artists would

(to be cont'd)

Q: When did Steven Reichard come into the picture? Didn't he enter the Institute around the time of the Works/Words show?

A: He got interested in the Institute around that time and came to the Clocktower during that show. Stephen had come back from Germany around that time and decided he would work in the arts, he'd studied at Coluumbia Business School. At the end of his first year, he was charicteristically planning what he would do when he emerged. He had an interest, but no real training, no real acquaintance with American contemporary art. As usual, with his very strange nose for what's going on, and he was lurking in Soho, making forays to the art world. Then he made the unusual move of going south of Canal St., whichi was totally unpredictable of someone of his background. I guess he decided when he wandered into the Clocktower and saw the Works/Words show, which included a work by Dennis Oppenheim, that's where he wanted to direct his energies. He called me at that time, but a lot of people had called me, saying they wanted to work with me in contemporary art. We didn't have a lot of money anyhow, but his background made a lot of sense to me. He made an appointment with me for the following September. This was in May. I agreed, and I thought that that would be the end of it. I told him to call me in August to confirm the appointment. This was good training for all my future working with Stephen Reichard because he called me on the very day that he said. The thing to remember about Steve Reichard is that although he operates under the guise of correct managerial propriety in every case, he's just as insane as the rest of us. To think that people operate in the mode of making such strict appoinments is as crazy as not making appointments as all. However, when he turned up in September, I was already impressed that someone had been able to keep a piece of paper with a written appointment on it for so long. And I was very inclined to discuss anything with him what he wanted to talk about. His proposal was that we hire him as a fund-raiser and development consultant for the Institute. Again, the optimism of Reichard showed through. He felt there were unlimited possibilities for an organization of this sort.

Q: From the beginning, though,your plans for the Institute entailed tremendous scale and scope.

A: Yes, and in this sense, our plans matched. Either tremendous expansion or to be able to go to a very minimal structure. When I reflect on him, I see

there was a point of matching between us. And that was, from the beginning I toyed with an idea of a certain socialbility of many of our events. Especially in a certain satirical or perverse sense, as when for instance, at the Brooklyn Bridge Event we'd held a Demolition Banquet. So that much of the blame that fell on Reichard for the Institute's mentality -- fancy dinners, elaborate social mechanisms, banquets , etc., doesn't rightly belong there. I, unlike Jeffrey Lew, was interested in certain silly and ironic social extensions of the poverty in which we found ourselves and that I would mimic whenever it seemed useful or funny, certain museum events. For his part, Reichard took these plans, these events very seriously. He was totally prepared to see these plans with irony, and to make his plans seem even more farfetched. At the Idea Warehouse, for instance, he totally recognized the absurdity of having a sit-down, black tie dinner, with round tables and white table cloth, at which was served fish and aspic on the 6th floor of an abandoned warehouse. He made sure that everything happened as planned, that all the arrangements were made, that the food was delivered, etc. He took this role like a site like a site manager on a Visconti film, constructing strange social events in unusual places was a link between us. But this collaboration between my thinking and Steve's thinking produced, to many people's minds, our downfall.

Q: You're talking about the Institute's style.

A: We've been alternately criticized and lauded, usually at the same time. Through the years we've discovered that the criticisms and accusations have reversed themselves even by the same individuals making them. So that even if we were to try to be good, we've often reflected that we would have been good too, because the same person, by happy chance, who could enjoy the same event, the money raise, the spirit present, at another event.

Q: I was wondering if you would talk about the immediate impact Stephen Reichard had on the organization. He has told me the budget went from 37 to 86 thousand dollars during the fiscal year he joined the Institute. Obviously one effect he had on the organization was to help you realize your goal of scale.

A: All of the plans that were laying around the office with dust on them, Steve Reichard literally dusted them off and put them into action. We were anticipating a very sizeable jump within that year, so part

of that p[illegible]d he [illegible]appened anyway. But the way in which that happened wouldn't have happened without Steve. The great financial expansion certainly would never have happened without Steve. But his fiscal policies were determined by something considerably apart from money -- he had a boudnless enthusiasm. He is a very curious form of optimist. First of all, there was no question in his mind, that we were right. I had been plagued by years of doubts, that to ask for this or that made sense if I asked for things that no one else wanted. I assumed that since no one wanted them.... I gave arguments to the Arts Council, both federal and state, since you have these things that no one else wants, now it's your job to give us this money to make these things useful. This was the complete basis for my argument for supplies, and for real estate. I was cornered right there by the position the Institute had taken in contemporary art. I felt very apologetic toward that. On one hand I was very arrogant, to stay focused on contemporary art. But my attitude was arrogant in the small, and apologetic in the larger scale. There was no way I could even out or justify my position on contemporary art with art education and social needs on a large scale -- welfare, narcotics, geriatrics -- needs which were constantly expressed to me by the City government, not so much by the Nat'l Endowment. I would be arrogant toward a small group which needed modesty, and wishy-washy toward a large group that needed an arrogant position. Reichard entered without any of these confusions. He believed contemporary art was the only thing to be dealing with. He has presumed to continue with this concern, but I think he is weakening; he wasn't at all concerned with who the artists were or what kind of work they did. His way of explaining of what we were dealing with was to say that they were young artists.

Q: Young artists whose contemporary point of view needed supporting?

A: No. Just young and that young artists needed welfare. No, because he didn't feel that was a viable point with the funding agencies. It's just that these were young artists who therefore needed welfare and that we were the people to help young artists who didn't have anyone else to help them. He workedcarefully with the opportunities and kind of shows that were open to them. Reichard deliberately restricted it to this question because larger questions such as whether our artists were more worthy of support than any other group of artists, could take months or even years of debate, through these funding agencies. He did not have any qualms about attaching so much importance to what I considered a rather insignificant aspect of the artists,

namely their age.

Q: The word "young" is often used as a emphemisms to reflect inexperience or that they are unknown which in fact does not reflect the population of artists the Institute does support.

A: But what Reichard grasped that I didn't was that the funding agencies are not in a position to consider any other ramified qualities. Characteristic of his great optimism was that Reichard believed that if these artists were good, by whatever category we chose to name them, people would recognize their quality. He's always surprised when they don't. The dissension between Reichard and me also got on through the direction that the Institute would be taking. He decided that looking over our organization and the other organizations we had more to do with more artists than anyone else around. That wasn't something I particularly cared to contemplate, we tried to give a lot of people a lot of shows. Reichard reduced this to a formula, whereby he said "We are helping young artists, but we are helping them in greater number," so that the artist was reduced, not only to a minority group, but the most numerous minority group. Then he came up with a phrase I find nauseating, that is, "the number of artists served." This phrase emerged from numerous funding battles which would go on between me and the NY State Councial on the Arts many times, over many years. It was very little comfort to me that the battles would be solved two years later, bu that they had interpreted things that I thought I had fought for, finally granting money for those endeavors usually to other people or changing the form of my argument in such a way so that I felt that it would not at all work out. So as to make such and such an idea, or activity, not nearly as valuable as it could have been. My bitterness towards NYSCA was based on the fact that htis bureaucracy seemed to me a swamp, a good-intentioned swamp, which was either holding back or insisting on the welfare view toward artists. Reichard entered bright-eyed and bushy-tailed and he thought it was wonderful that the Institute was in NY because NYSCA gives away more money than any other State Council. He assumed that NYSCA would love to give us money because we were doing the best job. We were the only organization that had a chance of administrating programs of a size, on a level that would conform with the funding programs. He figured that we could whip this into shape quite quickly. He had worked with funding agencies before, and he felt that funding agencies were in the business of giving money and not supervising programs. Since they were legally prevented from administering

programs,, and that therefore they were terribly anxious to give away money to organizations that could operate programs. He thought there were just a few small obstacles in preventing NYSCA and the Institute from joining hands to make a really smooth cha-nel of communication. And when that would take place, the Institute staff would be paid regularly, and paid above the minimum wage, and then they could also receive health benefits and there would be papers documenting all of this which would please the federal government and we'd be on to Green Acres. Reichard couldn't imagine how the Institute could have existed all these years without a budget of at least $100,000, supplied in part by NYSCA, studying the budgets of other art organizations over the years. After four years, Reichard's whole understanding of this has matured considerably, funding-policy has matured considerably, and certainly the whole experience of working with NYSCA has saddened him, as no one who has worked with NYSCA for four years could have emerged with anything but a shrunken attitude toward possible resources. During this time I remember gearing up for the battle with NYSCA with Steve and spending 60-70% of our time gearing up for these battles.

Q: What were these battles?

A: This can pretty well be expressed by the words of a NYSCA official who said that the Institute should not be given money for large-scale projects, it's just like seeing a mom and pop's store turn into a supermarket. He and NYSCA did not feel we were the ones to do it, nor did they feel that they should help anyone turn from a mom and pop's store into a supermarket. Nor did they anticipate any mom and pop's store turning into a supermarket. I cannot easily be their advocate.

Q: Why did the Council oppose you?

A: Personally, I must have been a thorn in their side. To people in the administration ther I think that I was perhps less than diplomatic many times. I think that I had a chip on my shoulder because I was distraught by a number of things I saw happening. Speaking out about NYSCA 's short sightedness and their treatment of artists vs. organizations and their treatment of organizations ingeneral. Having returned from England, where the British Art Council was very active, I found it shocking that I couldn't contemplate seeing the director of the Visual Arts Division at the opening of a museum here. He said that he never went to museums or galleries, he felt that that was unimportant.

Now of course I'm not shocked at all, at the time I thought this was reprehensible. I felt that the talent and the level of work being done here in New York was on a very high level, very professional. I couldn't comprehend his organization not giving large sums of money to the visual arts. I found it hard to comprehend that the people on NYSCA were so different from the museum people that I'd approach -- that they had no scope and no imagination or vision concerning what could be done here. They didn't understnad that they were living in an incredibly exciting time, and that they, as a funding organization, could join with the museums and do extraordinary shows...

Q: Or that they could restructufe...

A: Or that they could jump into what new things were happening and restructure art shows and exhibitions entirely. Instead all that they seemed to be doing was holding back. They did everything in their power so that people could not either expand or improve their services. It was an attitude that drained organizations of power since only the least talented people working for these organizations would be satisfied sitting where they were. We grew hand-in-hand in this estimate, so at one point, without a doubt, we were the most despised people surrounding these agencies. I went to Canada to see how the Canada Arts Council organized these things. I thought my memory was wrong with the English Arts Council, but my memory didn't turn out to be wrong at all. Only after six months our present Program Director Brenda Wallace is appalled. She finds that in the U.S., not only NYSCA, but all arts organizations are discouraging, whereas in Canada they beg and nurture every sign that they feel shows any sign of responsible arts leadership. NYSCA is suspicious of the Institute's administrative structure, suspicious of me as an administrator. Their concern that the paperwork should be done, which has indeed proved a problem I have great difficulty seeing to it that the paperwork indeed gets done. They supported the creation ofa small one or two year projects, with a budget of between 8 or 10 thousand dollars, after which time these projects would disappear. They were mystified by an organization that had a longer-term view of operations. We tried to explain this to them and they countered that with, "Well, you have to have the right kind of administrative structure for this," for which they were utterly correct in saying, but then they seemed to defy any efforts to

try and create such a bureaucracy, such as allotting to us staff money for those who could take care of these activities. This was part of a cycle and the larger and more efficient we would get, the less easy the they would feel about us as we changed our goals. So the more we tried to fill their demands on one side, the more we were going against their perceptions of us on the other side. And this has never been resolved in a satisfactory way. But on the other hadn, things have gotten a great deal better. Yet whereas to observers from Eruope, the U.S., California for instance, we were doing wonderful things at the Clocktower, showing leadership in the kinds of opportunities we provide artists, to NYSCA, our demands were outrageous. Their staff was uninformed, neither was NYSCA sending out their staff on a travel budget to become informed. It seemed that even the staff was discouraged from finding out what was happening by mail, they weren't rewarded for finding out what was happening. To NYSCA our demands were outrageous, arrogant, and seemed to lack sensitivity towards the demands of other arts organizations.

Q: But what specific contributions has Steve Reichard made to the Institute in its organization?

A: Far beyond the efforts of Linda Blumber and others, Stephen Reichard was responsible for the negotiations for P.S. 1. Aside from this, it was the certainty in my mind that we needed a person to guide through the morass of grant applications, foundation appeals, a group of private people to support us. His responsibility, in short, was to map out a plan for our financial resources of the Institute, taking it on as a full-time job, not in the sporadic way we'd been doing it before. Being Reichard, of course, he mapped this all out in one month. He assumed we could achieve this in one year; four years later we have achieved inroads on only one or two of his plans.

Q: When and how did Linda Blumberg join the organization? Did you seek her out or did she find you?

A: She, like Reichard , did come to me. Actually, she started working full-time for the Institute a year before I did, and part-time the year before that. By the spring of the Works/Words show which, by the way, Frank Kolbert organized, Linda Blumberg was working full-time.

Q: And what were her responsibilities?

A: Aside from the normal jobs that we all have hwen we first get out of college, Linda had never had a full-time job in many years. She'd done some lecturing at

museums and was anxious to get involved with the Institute, but hadn't had any other experience. So her offer, contingent on lack of experience, was what she thought she could do best, which was to act as an administrator for the Institute on a day-to-day basis, scheduling, seeing that announcements went through, with programming, public and press relations. She brought to each of these tasks a quality which is often referred to as boundles enthusiasm, a contribution which is too quickly discounted under that term. She described herself as a combination of manager and over-seer of practical affairs which is what she is and what she did do. In compensation for what may seem a dull job of managerial responsibilities, she wanted to have a lot of contact with the artists and work with them on the shows. So that was clearly her contribution and what she was getting out of it. The interesting thing about Linda and Steve was their areas of concentration, because Linda became more and more interested in working with the arts, in fact her title was Program Director, while Steve, under his contract, concentrated entirely on the fiscal direction. By the split, not in ideology, but in their motives, these two very intelligent, highly talented people, made our successes possible. At the same time, those two very different controlling interests presented a very dear difference in orientation.

Q: How did you role change as a result of being able to rely on these two people very heavily?

A: The first thing I was able to do wasto relax. I could actually step back and watch these two people, and see the things that I'd been working on for three years actually come about. so the first direct consequence of their presence in the organization was that I was able to take more time off and devote time to my personal life. But what 4eally happened was that I ended up working with Reichard, because he was able to convince me that the immediate show we were doing was les s important than the over all respectability, aims, and direction of the organization. I was laso convince of his reasoning because i the staff seemed to take on their responsibilities more willingly, no that they were being paid the minimum wage. Also I worked with Reichard night after night, often weekend after weekend, devising programs that would continue, creating a more dignified schedule than the one we'd been following, one that continued beyond the next month. At that point, we were in too deep, we had too many employees.

Q: Though the number of your staff fluctuated, depending on what funds you had,

I believe at one point , 1975-1976, you had as many as eight people working for you, including several part-time people.

A: There were _____ number of people working by the time we opend PS 1, previously my plan was that if things got really bad everyone would go off salary, and if we got in really bad shape, the organization would be reduced to me. Linda immediately grasped the implications of this administrative dictum, because should that happen and we go off salary, having exhausted out budget by April, we might sneak by May and June, hide out somewhere in the summer, re-emerge in the fall, re-forming in September and we'd still keep the perception of our continuity as an organization. This would wreck absolute havoc on an organization that was essentially non-existent for five months out of the year.

Q: You couldn't survive as a seasonal organization.

For doing this NYSCA perceived us as unstable, whereas we perceived them as irresponsible because no other arts organization had an intermittent existence -- alive for a few months and then disappearing off the face of the earth.