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There are few names in the Western world that evoke as weighty an image as that of Rockefeller: Power, prestige, philanthropy, cultural imperialism, and the old boy network all combine to give this name the heft that sets it apart from many others. This name conjures up the raw power of capitalism before the days of government regulation, antitrust laws, and income tax. To most of the U.S. public, it represents an image of prestige, power, and social influence. The Rockefeller Foundation, while no longer a family institution, symbolizes the power invested in those who choose to use their wealth to effect change in the world.

Like many private foundations, it was founded as a means of promoting change with and establishing a benevolent image for a newly amassed fortune; it was also intended to change the reputation of "tainted money" that had plagued the Rockefeller fortune. From its inception, it was a globally conceived organization, headquartered in New York City. The Rockefeller family, through its foundation, is the direct descendant of the family that established the Standard Oil Company, one of the most successful and influential corporations in history. The foundation was established in 1913 by John D. Rockefeller Sr., a man who had amassed a fortune through his oil empire, and his son, John D. Rockefeller Jr., who was the driving force behind the foundation's creation.

The Rockefeller Foundation was organized as a corporation in 1913 with an initial endowment of $100 million from John D. Rockefeller Sr. and was initially named the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. It was later renamed the Rockefeller Foundation in 1922. The foundation was envisioned as a vehicle for promoting change with and establishing a beneficent image for the Rockefeller family. The foundation's initial mission was to support medical research and education, but it soon expanded to include a wide range of disciplines, including the arts, sciences, and humanities.

The foundation was established in part as an extension of the ideas behind the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research (now Rockefeller University), where scientists were conducting research that would provide the expertise behind public health programs throughout the world. The foundation's reputation stems from its massive programs to combat malaria and yellow fever and to promote the "green revolution" of cultivating high-yield wheat, corn, and rice in the third world.

While the sciences will always predominate at the foundation, the arts program has been a significant component. The arts program gradually developed into a multidisciplinary program that supports institutions and individual artists in music, dance, theater, literature, video, film, and the visual arts. Although its funding has changed over the years, the arts program has been one of the foundation's most visible and influential initiatives. The foundation has been influential in shaping the arts landscape in the United States, supporting a wide range of projects and initiatives.

The Rockefeller Foundation's funding of the arts has been a significant source of support for artists and organizations. The foundation has provided funding for a wide range of projects, from individual artists to major cultural institutions. Its support has allowed artists to pursue their creative visions and to engage with communities in a variety of ways.
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Bence Howard (left) and Paul Kaufman of the National Center for Experimental Television (NCETV) in 1971. Photo by Richard Behak.


Klein saw his role as a funder within the fledging field of media as one of both balance and response, and his role was in fact much more than simply that of a foundation officer. He was directly involved in the establishment of a number of influential media arts organizations and programs, and he worked closely advising many organizations. He is often described as an ideal funder by the fortunate who received funding from him and who formed a kind of club. "Howard was a wonderful sort of guiding influence," says David Loxton, former director of the Television Laboratory at WNET/Thirteen. In terms of keeping you focused in the right direction. At the same time he was so clever about never making you feel in any way that he was intruding or imposing what he felt you should do. Yet somehow or other he always seemed to be terribly pleased with whatever you ended up doing, as if it was, "Well, that was exactly what we thought you could have done." There are some people who simply write a check and then say, "Call me at the end of the year and tell me what you did." But not Howard. He was enormously involved and supportive, but at the same time it seemed to be a very hands-off thing.

That delicate balance of quiet influence is a major ingredient in Klein's style. He exudes an enthusiasm for the arts and artists, at the same time displaying a capacity to play ball with the power brokers and assume the role of the guiding father figure. For Klein, each grant, in effect, posed a question: be it whether a public television station or a university system could foster artists' works for television or the ideal way to support a large number of artists with essentially limited funds. With hindsight, he is not reluctant to point out grants that were unsuccessful, but he stresses the initial questions posed and often answered by those grants.

There is a considerable mythology surrounding the role of Klein and the Rockefeller Foundation's funding of media, a mythology that in many ways attests to the image attached to the Rockefeller name within U.S. culture. While the funding of media by the foundation was substantial, particularly during the 1960s, when it was almost the sole source of private monies in the field of media, it should be noted that it was on the average half that of the New York State Council on the Arts (NYSCA) and significantly less than that of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). However, in influence it was exceptionally important, in part because of the timeliness of many of the grants and because of Klein's own style of grant making. Klein was an active political figure in the media field, offering advice, providing support, and often negotiating on behalf of the organizations he funded. He was well aware of the power of the Rockefeller Foundation and used it to benefit artists he felt were at the forefront of creativity.

It is impossible to discuss the funding of media by Klein and the Rockefeller Foundation during the 1970s without elaborating on the role of Nam June Paik, who was Klein's official and unofficial advisor for many years. Coming to the foundation as he did from a background as a musician and music critic, Klein was not necessarily inclined to pay much attention to media. Also, while the foundation had made a few grants in the direction of media in the mid-1960s, for instance to WNET (New York), WGBH (Boston), and KCET (San Francisco) to produce some experimental programming, there was no previous history of serious funding of media. Klein's relationship with Paik was a key factor in his interest in the developing field of video art.

Paik's first encounter with Klein was far from auspicious. As a Times critic, Klein wrote a scathing review of one of Paik's performances during the Avant-Garde Festival in New York in 1965. Mr. Paik is a rambunctious member of the neo-Dada movement, whose head is John Cage. For this avant-garde segment, it is a minor one, the "happening" is the thing. You just get up and do whatever comes to your head. .. The thing to do is keep the head, but empty. Mr. Paik seems to be succeeding... Fruaght with pretensions of profundity, Mr. Paik's efforts locked any spark of originality, sartally or talent.

When Paik actually met Klein in 1967, the situation was different. "Howard wasn't anti-video," recalled Paik. "He was anti-happening. It is this: Howard did not take that as a bad example of my work. He is a good, straight guy. He is absolutely not a tricky guy. With Howard you always know where you stand."

That year, Paik had run out of money and owed Con Edison a large sum. He had become resigned to leaving the country until Klein (newly hired at the foundation) bailed him out by orchestrating a $13,750 grant to the State University of New York at Stony Brook for Paik to become a "consultant in communications research" (Allan Krapow, who was teaching at Stony Brook, was also responsible for initiating the grant). During that time, Paik wrote the first of two reports he would write for the foundation, probably his most important essay, "Expanded Education for the Paperless Society." Throughout the years, he received many other grants and artist-in-residencies from the foundation, including support for his two large collaborative satellite broadcast projects, Good Morning, Mr. Orwell (1984) and Bye, Bye Kipling (1986), and for his retrospective exhibition at the Whitney Museum of American Art in 1982. Paik officially served as Klein's advisor during 1973.

While he has received much publicity as an artist, Paik's role as an operator behind the scenes in the development of video art has remained largely unexamined. There is no question that Paik was a key figure in Boston at Stabile's infancy and assisting in its "museumization." He has been instrumental in encouraging younger artists, such as Nam June Paik and Nam June Paik's role: Howard Klein's most extraordinary combination of self-effacement, in terms of giving everybody else credit, and also self-promotion, because he has always been very aware of his position in history. In one sense, it is a manufactured position, but it isn't manufactured because it is in fact true. He was not only very important in orchestrating the founding of several organizations and programs. He often acted as liaison between Klein and the video community, introducing him to curators John Hanhardt, Barbara London, and David Ross (meetings that resulted in grants to the Whitney Museum of American Art and the Everson Museum, respectively), and provided the creative force behind several grant trends. Klein defines the late 1960s, as assistant and then associate director for Klein, he began to look at public television and felt that the foundation could play in the support of artists. Certainly, this move could be seen as a response to artists such as Paik who were clamoring to get on the air waves and who had had limited opportunities to do so. It was in looking at the role played by various foundations and at Klein's sense that the Rockefeller Foundation that Klein decided to concentrate on funding which could be seen essentially as research and development in television. During the 1970s, the foundation gave many millions each year for the support of public television.

Klein's initial intent was to convince the foundation to give a significant amount of support for public television, with "the notion that if the experiment wasn't carried out at a substantial level by major public television stations. I think it is the most likely to welcome this sort of thing that we would never know what was possible." Indeed, from 1967 through 1977, the Rockefeller Foundation awarded more than $3.4 million for experimental works in public television. The three major projects initiated and funded by the foundation were the National Center for Communicating (NCC), the New Television Workshop at WGBH (Boston), and the Television Laboratory at WNET/Thirteen (New York City).

Of these, NCT was the most experimental in concept and the most process oriented. The genesis for NCT was a $150,000 grant that Klein's immediate predecessor, assistant director Lloyd Compton, initiated in 1967 to KCET for a television production of Paul Foster's play Haimaruko. Directed by Tom O'Horgan with Ellen Stewart's La Mama Experimental Theater. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) soon provided funds also. In 1967, Brice Howard, who had been executive producer of cultural programs at WNET, came out to run the program (which was not officially NCT until 1969). Brice Howard has maintained the concept, philosophy, which was the guiding force for NCT through its years. He is a metaphysical thinker who maintained a strong rapport with younger artists in the radical foundation of San Francisco. He was very interested in producing products for public television. Instead, he invited artists from different disciplines—poets, novelists, painters, sculptors, among them poets— to shape the idea, to perform a series of readings, and give you one minute of recorded material, then told them to." This attitude, however, may appear to the impressionistic stances of the 1980s, devoted easily with the spirit in which Klein, who received the foundation, first through Compton and Lloyd and then Klein, conceived of the possibility of television research and development. The Rockefeller Foundation granted $300,000 in 1971 to further this artists-in-residence program. Brice Howard invited Paul Kaufman, from the University of California at Berkeley, to be resident scholar and then executive director of the program. NCT also sponsored intern
from public television stations and many artists-in-residence from foreign countries.

Certainly central to the philosophy of the Rockefeller Foundation was that of not simply to make it too heavy and profound, so we invited artists to experiment without thinking of products, in an unprescribed atmosphere. According to Howard, "we tried very seriously not to make it too heavy and profound, so we invited people from the experimental television centers, who were less overtly experimental and closer to the model of WGBH and the Television Laboratory at WNET/Thirteen.

In 1973, the Rockefeller Foundation gave NCET $300,000 to develop a program working with students. Paul Kaufman noted, "We thought it was essential to the longevity of the program, as well as to its mandate of producing artists' programs for broadcast, and that it actually produce programs on Shakespearian drama (in which Norman Lloyd was the flag officer), and forays into funding artists' rights for many projects for which it provided only partial funding."

"I'm skeptical of the Rockefeller Foundation," said Klein. "They're not the only foundation that exists as a much smaller entity, as a co-sponsor with the Institute of Contemporary Art of the Contemporary Art Television (CAT) Fund. Barzyk saw the handiwork on the wall in terms of the direction of funding, as institutions like the NEA were leaning toward funding media arts centers, not public television workshops. In 1973, he convinced the management of WGBH not only to give the equipment from the workshop to the newly-founded Boston Film/Video Foundation, but also initially to underwrite its rent."

The overall intent of the Television Laboratory at WNET/Thirteen had a great deal to do with the attitude of its director, David Loxton. Despite the stipulation by Klein and Lloyd that the lab was not required to produce broadcastable material, Loxton thought it was essential to the longevity of the program, as well as to its mandate of producing artists' programs for broadcast, and that they be aired. The Rockefeller Foundation had given money to WNET in 1966 for a series of programs on Shakespearean drama (in which Norman Lloyd had starred). Through the process of producing Shakespeare rather than the actual production.

In 1979, the New York State Council on the Arts gave WNET funds to set up an experimental project, which artist Jackie Cassen headed. This project faltered when Cassen and the other artists had problems meshing with the TV people at WNET. A buffer system was needed, and, at that point, amid discussions with artists and producers about the need for a center in New York, the foundation decided it was time to establish a TV lab at WNET. Klein recalls that "WNET kept coming to us with more proposals for Shakespeare, and Norman Lloyd said, 'It's much more important in paving the way. That made it possible for us to actually get a $150,000 grant, and then larger amounts after that.'"
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had gotten involved with an organization called CIRCOM (Inter-
national Co-operative for Action and Research in Communications). It was one of the first organizations in Europe to work with the Rockefeller Foundation. I was very much interested in their work and wanted to get involved in similar projects. So I joined CIRCOM and became a member of their board. I also had a chance to work with some of the leaders of the movement, such as John Berger and Susan Sontag.

The Rockefeller Foundation had a very strong influence on the media arts community, and its funding had a significant impact on the development of independent media art. The Rockefeller Foundation provided a lot of support for the establishment of independent media arts organizations and for the development of independent media arts projects.

One of the main goals of the Rockefeller Foundation was to support the establishment of independent media arts organizations and to promote the development of independent media arts projects. The foundation provided funding for the establishment of independent media arts organizations, such as the San Francisco Independent Media Arts Center, and for the development of independent media arts projects, such as the Independent Media Arts Project. The foundation also provided funding for the development of new technologies, such as video editing and digital video.

The Rockefeller Foundation's support for independent media arts projects was very important for the development of the independent media arts community. The foundation's support allowed independent media artists to develop new technologies and to create new forms of media art. The foundation's support also helped to establish independent media arts organizations and to promote the development of independent media arts projects.

The Rockefeller Foundation's support for independent media arts projects had a significant impact on the development of the independent media arts community. The foundation's support helped to establish independent media arts organizations and to promote the development of independent media arts projects. The foundation's support also helped to establish independent media arts organizations and to promote the development of independent media arts projects.

The Rockefeller Foundation's support for independent media arts projects had a significant impact on the development of the independent media arts community. The foundation's support helped to establish independent media arts organizations and to promote the development of independent media arts projects. The foundation's support also helped to establish independent media arts organizations and to promote the development of independent media arts projects.
Ginsburg brought in Gail Waldron, who previously worked at Synapse in Syracuse, NY, and was a relative new-comer to the Bay Area, to direct the organization. Waldron set up BAVC as a financially healthy organization and was instrumental in expanding its wide range of funding and access to production and post-production equipment to independent producers and artists, and it also provided workshops and a newsletter and has produced several series for public television. There is much controversy as to how well BAVC served its constituency during its first years, given the unexpected transfer and in receiving the only Rockefeller Foundation media funds in the area, BAVC was the object of much criticism to follow the route of funding the "coalition." Given the expectations under which this organization was conceived, clearly not everyone could be satisfied with the final product, but as it celebrates its tenth anniversary this year, it is being increasingly as an organization that provides a base for the Bay Area media community.

Waldron set up BAVC as a financially healthy organization and was instrumental in expanding its wide range of funding support, despite the fact that her tenure at BAVC alienated certain factions of the media community and was marked by battles over the use of some funds. Realizing that the foundation would not fund the coalition forever and that BAVC was too great a threat, Waldron set up a two-tiered system of payment where the facility would be used by commercial clients to earn income to subsidize the non-profit projects. While it is still supported by grants, BAVC has a high earned income percentage, which, in a sense, offsets the money it receives from Rockefeller. Klein was instrumental in developing BAVC throughout the years he funded it and in helping the organization wean itself from the foundation. Waldron was aware of his role: "Howard has been a very entrepreneurial and active board member, and because of that, unbeknownst to BAVC, he would never have been involved without him." Despite its rocky beginning, BAVC has emerged as a significant media center, with an annual budget of over $500,000, through which a very large number of independent projects have been produced. In many respects, BAVC is still a laboratory where Klein's intent was to provide a base from which to fund as many artists as possible, while at the same time demonstrating the difficulty of facilitating that kind of philosophy.

The 1970s can certainly be seen as the heyday of media funding at the Rockefeller Foundation. In its tenth anniversary media often comprised 20% of the arts budget, with an average of $500,000 annually, and the funding of television was listed as a separate category. But Rockefeller money was not the only source of funding. By the early 1980s, it was only 10% of the arts budget, although Klein thought it was sufficient to establish, and he was one of the initial funders and supporters of the National Alliance of Media Arts Centers (NAMAC), along with Brian O'Doherty, director of the media program at the NEA. In June 1983, NAMAC received a $300,000 grant from Rockefeller for centers dealing with film and video. He was the initial funder for NAMAC's first two conferences in 1979 in Lake Minnetonka, MN, and in 1979 offered the organization advice and services. Robert Haller, one of the founders of NAMAC, says, "He never gave too much money, but enough so that we could do something with it." In 1986, Klein brought in John Hanback, former curator of film and video at the Whitney Museum, as a consultant to the arts and humanities program. His task was to design a program within the foundation to fund video and film production work. Hanback conducted a series of seminars for the program staff, in which Arthurs and Klein explained their support for the arts and humanities program, and to whom they took artists' presentations to them. He wrote a report recommending a fellowship program. Arthurs says, "He was so dedicated to the arts and humanities that if this program is approved, it could mean a $300,000 fellow- ship program with an international focus for film and video." However, other policy changes have transpired that the foundation's funding of media and the arts in general subject to substantial changes. The foundation's funding was one of the arts and humanities program, mandate, a change that will probably eventually mean reevaluating the role of video and film funding, will be finalized in spring 1987. Albert Abarua stresses that the foundation will continue to support the arts, and will most likely increase its funding to support artists and will most likely increase its funding to support artists and will most likely increase its funding to support artists...
creancy between Klein's philosophy of funding the arts, in which "support for the creative person" is paramount, and that of the foundation, in which a mandate of control will most likely be the key issue. Klein chose to elaborate this relationship from the foundation in October 1966.

Klein's role in the arts is far from complete. His legacy of almost 20 years at the foundation will be that of one of the most influential individuals in arts funding during that time. While his influence in media was substantial, his impact on other art forms, especially the performing arts, has been equally as important. Klein was a primary funder of institutions like the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Whitney Museum of American Art. He was deeply involved in advising and negotiating for those organizations as well. Klein was the originator of the International Center for Cultural Research in 1966, which produced and distributed a collection of 100 records tracing the social and cultural history of the U.S. through jazz. It received more than $3.6 million of foundation money. Artists like Philip Glass, Robert Wilson, Steve Reich, and Robert Ashley rank among those whose work has benefitted signif-

inantly throughout his tenure at the Rockefeller Foundation.

In evaluating this kind of career, it becomes clear that a certain amount of mystique and mythology pervade images of an institution and of the individual who operates it. In the case of Klein, it is very easy to forget that it is not the institution that effects change, rather individuals within those institutions. A field as small as the media field has survived because powerful individuals like Klein took an interest in it and chose to defend it and nurture its growth. While one can question the ways in which much of this money was disbursed, the fact remains that Klein alone was responsible for vast growth in the field of television and film.
Kansas City Art Institute, Missouri. To support a Video Curriculum Development Project. $25,000

Electronic Arts Internex, New York City. Toward the costs of a fellowship to support television program production and editing facility. $23,000

Museum of Modern Art, New York City. Toward the costs of an expanded parking lot for the exhibition of the permanent video collection. $23,000

Washington Community Video Center, Washington, D.C. For Television magazine. $18,000

Cable Arts Foundation, New York City. Toward the costs of final editing of film and video projects. $18,000

Educational Broadcasting Corporation, New York City. For use by the Television Laboratory for fellowship assistance for a writer-in-editing of Visa projects. $18,000

Doug Michels, video artist, San Francisco. Toward the documentation of the Art Film's Dolphin expedition. $15,000

Washington Community Video Center, Washington, D.C. To enable Charles Johnson to be an artist-in-residence at the Television Workshop. $15,000

Robert and Ingrid Wegland, video artists. For filming film and culture in India for the Visa Series. $13,500

Mery Ellen Bute, filmmaker, New York City. Toward the creatively producing the work of Murray Louis. $10,000

Shigeko Kubota, video artist, New York City. Kit Fitzgerald, video artist, New York City. $10,000

John Sandborn, video artist, New York City. $10,000

Ros Barone, video artist, Boston. $10,000

1980

Research Foundation of the State University of New York, Albany, N.Y. Toward the costs of producing arts programming for television. $35,000

Bay Area Video Coalition, San Francisco. Toward the costs of expanding its editing facilities and developing television programs by independent producers. $15,000

Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C. Toward the costs of INPUT 90 to be held in Washington, D.C. and of travel expenses for independent producers to participate in the 1981 International Public Television Screening Conference. $10,000

Long Beach Museum of Art, Long Beach, Ca. Toward the further development of its Video Resource Center. $5,000

Mary Ellen Bute, filmmaker, New York City. To enable her to work on "47,000 Years," a dance project. $5,000

Doug Michels, video artist, San Francisco. Toward the development of a work for SETTET Systems. $5,000

Amy Greenfield, New York City. In support of her creative work in holography and video. $5,000

1981

To selected institutions and individuals in the San Francisco Bay Area. Toward the development and broadcasting of independently produced cultural programming. $175,000

Bay Area Video Coalition, for a 90-minute program called "Screening Room," a showcase for independent video and filmmakers. $35,000

Bay Area Video Coalition, for a pilot project in independent filmmaking. $15,000

Cable Arts Foundation, New York City. Toward the development of a consortium of educational institutions concerned with video art and video-related issues in contemporary art. $135,000

Rob Bann, video artist, San Francisco. $35,000

Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C. Toward the costs of an international public television screening conference (INPUT) for 1979 to be held in Paris, Italy. $15,000

Michael Tilson Thomas, conductor, Buffalo, N.Y. To enable him to do preliminary research for and development of an American music project. $15,000

Cable Arts Foundation, New York City. Toward the costs of promotion and publicity for Visa. $24,000

Bill Simon, video artist, New York City. $18,000

Global Village Video Resource Center, New York City. Toward the costs of a regional public television workshops in video-aesthetics. $12,000

Robert Ashley, composer, San Francisco. To enable him to devote time to the development of a work for television. $10,000

Cable Arts Foundation, New York City. To document the 1979 John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts International Piano Competition for Excellence in the Performing Arts. $10,000

Ros Bann, video artist, Boston. $9,000

Hermine Freed, video artist, New York City. $9,000

Cable Arts Foundation, New York City. Toward the costs of a program on "The Republic of Artists." $9,000

Soleris Dance-Theater, New York City. Toward the costs of a dance video project. $5,000

Ed Bowes, video artist, New York City. $1,400

1979

To establish a pilot program of fellowships for video artists: $23,750 to $25,000. (grants awarded in 1981). $242,000


Bay Area Video Coalition, San Francisco. Toward the costs of expanding its editing facilities and developing pilot television programs by independent producers for public television. $200,000

Raindance Foundation of the State University of New York, Albany, N.Y. Toward the costs of producing arts programming for television. $200,000

Cable Arts Foundation, New York City. Toward the costs of a seminar conference to promote telecommunication diversity for the 1980s: "Independent Television Makers and the Public Interest," held at the WNET Television Laboratory for the production of "Good Morning America" by Morris Rosenthal. $150,000

Doug Michels, video artist, San Francisco. Toward the development of a work for SETTET Systems. $100,000

Stephen Beck, video artist, Berkeley, CA. Foundation for Independent Video and Film, New York City. Toward the costs of a fellowship involving the directors of media centers (Minnesota conference). $50,000

Kinohelostics Foundation, New York City. For use by video artistudy "Love Tape." $10,000

Shigeko Kubota, video artist, New York City. Kit Fitzgerald, video artist, New York City. $10,000

John Sandborn, video artist, New York City. $10,000

Ros Barone, video artist, Boston. $10,000

Research Foundation of the State University of New York, Albany, N.Y. Toward the costs of producing arts programming for television. $35,000

Bay Area Video Coalition, San Francisco. Toward the costs of expanding its editing facilities and developing television programs by independent producers. $15,000

Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C. Toward the costs of INPUT 90 to be held in Washington, D.C. and of travel expenses for independent producers to participate in the 1981 International Public Television Screening Conference. $10,000

Long Beach Museum of Art, Long Beach, Ca. Toward the further development of its Video Resource Center. $5,000

Black Filmmaker Foundation, New York City. Toward its operating costs. $2,500

Eugene O'Neil Memorial Theater Center, Waterford, CT. Toward the costs of a project to develop original drama for television. $2,500

Doug Michels, video artist, San Francisco. Toward the creatively producing the work of Murray Louis. $2,500

Doug Michels, video artist, San Francisco. Toward the costs of an international public television screening conference (INPUT) for 1979 to be held in Paris, Italy. $15,000

University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. Toward the costs of a conference of the National Association of Media Arts Centers (NAMAC). $11,000

Kinohelostics Foundation, New York City. For use by Wendy Clarke to enable her to continue to devote her time to her project "Love Amsterdam." $5,000

Chicago Editing Center, Chicago. Toward the costs of upgrading its video facility. $10,000

Amy Greenfield, New York City. In support of her creative work in holography and video. $5,000

Learning in Focus, New York City. To develop a series of feature-length films for television and corporate training specializing in applications for young artists at the film sites. $250,000

Robert Ashley, New York City. Toward the development of a new opera for television. $50,000

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ. Toward the costs of a public television series for women on data and data dilemmas (also funded by Ford Foundation and Public Broadcasting Service). $30,000

Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, MN. For research and development of "Art Interventions," held at Walker Art Center. $10,000

Pennsylvania Center of Southern California, Spangdahlem, Germany. Toward the costs of its International TV Revue. $45,000

Hudson River Film and Video, Gannett, NY. To research funding mechanisms for the development of performance materials for its new project "Henry Hudson's River—Part II." $15,000

Performing Artists Nucleus (Guadalupe Cultural Center), San Antonio, TX. Toward the costs of administrative services associated with the nationalizing of the San Antonio Film Festival. $10,000

1984

1985

Figure 1: For 1985 ( RHS:grants made only through 1985).