

CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES OF THE ARTISTS' FILMS COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON 2 MAY 1977 IN THE CINEMA OF THE ARTS COUNCIL,  
105 PICCADILLY, LONDON W1V 0AU

---

Present: Professor Stuart Hood Chairman  
Mr Ian Christie  
Mr David Curtis  
Mr Simon Field  
Mr Tony Rayns  
Ms Laura Mulvey  
Mr Rodney Wilson Film Officer  
Mr Richard Landau Finance Assistant  
Ms Stephanie Featherstone Secretary

---

1 Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were received from Ms Caroline Tisdall.

2 Minutes of the last meeting

These had not yet been circulated.

3 Financial report

The financial report was laid on the table. The Film Officer explained that the report showed an analysis of 1976/77 expenditure totalling £38,375 and the 1977/78 allocation of £45,000, of which £3250 was already reserved for the Maidstone film and video bursaries. A balance of £41,750 remained for commitment in the current financial year. The total 1977/78 Arts Film allocation represented an 8% increase over the level for 1976/77.

4 Matters arising

a) RCA video bursary

It was agreed that the colour video bursary made available with the Royal College of Art would not be offered in the 1977/78 financial year.

b) Maidstone College of Art film and video bursaries

The Film Officer reported that advertisements had been placed in all suitable magazines and requests for application forms were being received. He suggested that the beginning of July would be suitable for assessing the applications and exact dates would be arranged by telephone.



- c) London Video Arts  
The Committee discussed possible dates for a meeting with David Hall and representatives from LVA.
- d) Film-makers on tour  
The Film Officer informed the committee that there was now a regular flow of bookings and the eight participants had given on average two shows. Most bookings were at colleges and polytechnics. However, he was very unhappy about the delay in payments of fees and expenses, which were taking as long as four weeks. The Finance Assistant felt that these were initial difficulties, and that in future payment would be much quicker.
- e) Perspectives on British avant-garde film  
The Film Officer now had approximate attendance figures: 5698 people had seen the shows (plus those who came on two Saturdays when figures were not recorded). This gave an average of 48 people per screening. The Committee thought this was indication of the show's success. The Film Officer said that he and Deke Dusinberre would be producing a full report shortly. It was interesting to see, from the names and addresses left by people wanting programme notes to be forwarded, that the audience was far wider than had been expected and did not just consist of film-makers who had applied for awards in the past.

Ms Mulvey asked what sort of press coverage the event had received; the Film Officer explained that it had been factual rather than critical. The Time Out articles had been the most comprehensive and the weekly programme listings had been very helpful.

- f) Arts Council video distribution research interim report 1977  
The Film Officer reminded the Committee that this was the report that had been asked for at the last meeting and should be seen in the context of the application from LVA.

5 Applications referred from the Art Finance Committee

- a) Artist in Residence - Aidanvision, Carlisle  
The Committee did not feel that the application was sufficiently informative or formulated with its terms of reference in mind. In addition it appeared that Aidanvision was not yet equipped for editing which made the idea of a placement seem premature. The Committee were particularly concerned about eligibility for the scheme and how selection would be carried out. It was agreed that the current application should be rejected but that a future one would be considered if full facilities were available at Aidanvision and the project was correctly formulated.
- b) Studio grants  
The Film Officer told the Committee that the Art Finance Committee had passed on the application in question, which



had been made by Chris Welsby and Jenny Okun. It consisted of a request for funds to convert a studio. Mr Curtis and Mr Rayns were against using the Artists' Films Allocation for the kind of costs outlined, such as building materials and heating. Ms Mulvey agreed that the Committee were neither constituted nor competent to make assessments of this kind. The Finance Assistant said that the Photography Committee now made similar assessments and that he would have thought it in line with the general policy of assisting artist film-makers. The Film Officer said that this would only be practical if the Arts Films Allocation were increased accordingly. However, he thought that this kind of application would necessarily involve discussion of revenue grants; he thought it unlikely that the Council would agree to increase the Arts Films Allocation for this reason. The Finance Assistant agreed but did not feel that these types of application need have revenue implications. The Film Officer pointed out that if it were felt that studio grant applications came under the Committee's terms of reference in future there would have to be a review of policy. If the application in question was successful a similar application from an organisation such as the Film-makers Co-op would be hard to refuse since many more people would benefit. Also any move into a new funding area should be made after the needs of artist film-makers had been assessed in broad terms rather than on an ad-hoc basis. After further discussion the Committee informed the Finance Assistant that they would not accept the referral and passed the application back to the Art Finance Committee. The Chairman suggested that the Committee should examine possible extensions of funding in the near future.

6 Proposed projects

I) Production - Film

a) John Apps

Some film and folders were seen in support of the application consisting largely of college diploma work. The Committee were interested and it was agreed to recommend a bursary of £300 from the 1977/78 Artists Film Allocation.

b) Derek Boshier

The Committee felt unable to make a decision without seeing a recent film. The application was deferred until supporting film was available.

c) Nicola Bruce/Michael Coulson

Having seen examples of animated films by the applicants the Committee were not in favour of the application and it was rejected.

d) Thelma Goldman

There was no support for the application. The Chairman did not feel she understood the principles behind computer animation although her project depended on it. It was also agreed that



the budget was excessively high and appeared to have no regard for the Committee's guidelines. The Film Officer agreed that she should be discouraged from making further applications.

e) Marilyn Halford

A short test sequence for the project was shown. Mr Rayns did not think the idea very original. Mr Curtis suggested she re-apply for a small bursary. The Committee agreed as it was not felt possible to support this particular project but there was interest in Ms Halford's work in general. The Film Officer said he would write suggesting she reapply to the next meeting for a small bursary.

f) Hans Hiegel

Mr Rayns told the Committee that he had met the applicant and had been impressed by the quality of his still photography. He thought it very likely that the film would be good despite his lack of experience. As the project was not properly budgeted, Mr Field suggested an initial small bursary and the possibility of future funding if the material justified it. It was agreed to recommend a bursary of £300 from the 1977/78 Artists Films Allocation.

g) Margy Kinmouth

A film combining live action and animation titled 'Sham Foppery' was shown. There was a general feeling that too much money was being requested for the stage the work had reached and there was little support in terms of the drawing and animation. The application was rejected.

h) Adrian Norman

There was no support for the application and it was rejected.

i) Ian Oddie

The Committee asked the Film Officer for his opinion and he said that following a meeting he thought the applicant worth supporting. It was agreed to recommend an award of £50 from the 1977/78 Artists Films Allocation.

j) Jenny Okun

After some discussion it was decided to recommend a £300 bursary rather than the full award she wanted, as the Committee were not in favour of the particular project but wished to encourage her work. It was agreed to recommend a bursary of £300 from the 1977/78 Artists Films Allocation.

k) Colin Pahlow

Mr Rayns informed the Committee that he had met the applicant when lecturing and thought him very original and deserving support. The Committee saw a super 8 film 'Pat in the Bath' and were favourably impressed. It was agreed to recommend a £300 bursary from the 1977/78 Artists Films Allocation.



- l) David Parsons  
Mr Field said that he would recommend the applicant having seen a programme of his films recently. The Committee then saw a double-screen film and it was agreed to recommend a £750 bursary from the 1977/78 Artists Film Allocation.
- m) Kevin Pither  
The application was deferred until supporting film was submitted.
- n) Stuart Pound  
The Committee felt unable to make a decision without seeing some recent film and the application was deferred until supporting material was available.
- o) Gough Quinn  
A 16 mm film 'Old Dip Slides' was shown in support of the application. Ms Mulvey did not feel the applicant had adequately thought out the means of dealing with his ideas. Mr Rayns agreed. The Committee found it hard to understand from the written submission what he was intending to do and did not feel the film helped clarify matters. It was agreed to reject the application.
- p) William Raban  
The Committee saw part of a 16 mm film 'Surface Tension' in support of the application. There was general support and enthusiasm for the application. It was agreed to recommend an award of £930 from the 1977/78 Artists Films Allocation.
- q) Jane Rigby  
The application was deferred until supporting film could be seen with the application.
- r) Guy Sherwin  
The Film Officer told the Committee that in his view the applicant had made very good use of a £300 bursary awarded the previous year and that he supported the current application. It was agreed to recommend a £750 bursary from the 1977/78 Artists Film Allocation.

At this point Mr Field left the meeting.

- s) Ron Smits  
The Committee asked if the Film Officer was in favour of the application; he was and it was decided to recommend a £50 award from the 1977/78 Artists Films Allocation.
- t) Alison Winckle  
Part of an 8mm film was shown in support of the application. However, the Committee did not feel able to recommend the application and it was rejected.



II) Production - Video

a) Kevin Atherton

The Film Officer explained that the applicant had been strongly recommended by the Subsidy Officers in the Art Department who knew his performance art work. The Committee were in favour of the application and it was agreed to recommend a £750 bursary from the 1977/78 Artists Films Allocation.

7 Any other business

a) David Dye - Arnolfini Installation Piece - £190

This was a late application prepared at short notice since the show was due to start in July. The Committee supported the application in principle but thought the budget rather high. The Finance Assistant agreed that it would be possible to pay half the amount in advance and the balance on production of receipts. The Film Officer undertook to write to the applicant explaining the Committee's decision. It was agreed to recommend a maximum award of £190 from the 1977/78 Artists Film Allocation.

b) Print buying

The Film Officer informed the Committee that a policy discussion would be necessary at the next meeting on the question of purchasing prints of films made with awards and bursaries. Since the Committee had moved from grants to awards as the basis for making finance available prints had been purchased on an ad hoc basis out of general funds. However, now that the volume of work completed was increasing and nearing a level that was likely to be a continuing factor given the amount made available for film-making, a policy for purchasing was necessary. It was agreed that a full discussion would be held at the next meeting.

8 Date of next meeting

This was to be arranged for mid-June.