

GLOBAL VILLAGE

1) The purpose of the Video theatre was to complete the video cycle; to show edited tapes as they were produced so that reaction of the audience would serve to stimulate given work in different area.

2) We had no specific intended audience. There was a wide spectrum of people who came to see the programs in terms of age and background and what they were into. We were interested in reaching as many and as wide a variety of people as possible.

3) We had a small ad in the Village Voice and had free radio spots on WPOJ and WBAI.

4) Economics played no part in the showing of tapes here. In the beginning we were drawing some money from the showings here. At that time we were the only video theatre and only functioning video group in NYC that had regular showings. The money that came in at the door for those programs helped us to buy tape and maintain the limited equipment that we had. In terms of space we used whatever monitors we had or could get. These were placed on one side of the room for multiple channel programs. Obviously if we had more monitors these would have been placed throughout the whole space. The use of the space was determined just by the reality of what equipment we had.

5) The design was very simple. People could either sit or lay down on foam cushions and a bank of monitors was placed at one side of the room.

6) a) In terms of hardware we used 2 or 3 decks depending on how many channels of information we were sending out. b) The crew necessary was dependent on the program - sometimes two sometimes four. It also depended if there were a mix of light projections and video. c) People were free to walk in and out but they usually remained fixed for the duration of the program. In the beginning we did charge admission; then we had free programs during the week and charged only on the week-

ends. Lately or for the past year I'd say no admission was charged at Global. We consider the showing of tapes and the completion of the video cycle to be a logical fulfillment of our community tape resource center functions. In this period of time when we did charge admission, we did it to pay the ad and give the crew a little money and nothing was made beyond those two factors. e) Discussion was possible. The work was not presented in a symposium situation but if people had questions they came up to us privately after the showing. f) The tape makers were present.

7) In terms of audience reaction it obviously depended on which tape was presented. Generally it has been very good. Whether they agree or disagree with a particular statement that is being made there is a high degree of respect for the quality of editing and high degree of seriousness with which the tape was put together.

8) Most of the tapes shown here came out of Global Village; that is out of the production group with John Reilly or with me. In terms of the type of audience, there were many college students but it was not limited to this group. We had a wide spectrum of people viewing our tapes.

9) The economics of video theatre I found to be an absolute disaster. I see no feasible way for a video theatre to pay for itself. The obvious benefits of video presentations is obviously that the people who work on a tape need to get the stimulation and reaction of people seeing their work.

At the moment this reaction is impossible in public access showings for there is virtually no feedback so the showing of tape allows the tape makers to get a direct response to their work.

10) Major problems in terms of planning is just that it takes a lot of time - a whole exhibitors trip. One must plan the ads, make sure the room is cleaned up, the equipment is checked and tested before the

GLOBAL VILLAGE

performance. Ideally there should be one person who does nothing but this one job.

11) The success factor is people seeing these tapes and their reactions to them. The success factor has nothing to do with the financial return, which is virtually none.

12) If we could do it over again I would want to have more programs by other tape makers so that the work of Global Village is only one part of the total that is presented.

13) Successful video theatre depends on audience reaction, audience participation, the flow of new material, and it has to be free of any economic necessities. Therefore you have to have enough. Funding which enables you to plan programs not dependent on financial return, and without having to think as an exhibitor or be preoccupied with those kinds of problems.

14) One factor is the use of video projection. It will be very hard and has been hard to get any large number of people to watch small monitors. The development of video projection that does not breakdown at every turn is essential for this kind of development.

15) Ideal video theatre environment would include monitors on the floors, ceilings, wall; it would be a total information environment, for multiple channel presentations, juxtaposing video projection with banks of video monitors so that mosaics of imagery can be established.

Generally, it seems logical that small store front video viewing centers set up as non-profit community information resources would best serve video groups as might accomodate 50-75 people and would primarily show tapes of local origin. Feedback on a local level is obviously important both for the producing groups and for the public. The success of these mini-theatres depends, I feel, on the absence of any financial pressure. They should not be initiated unless funding enables them to serve a free community function.

**CO-DIRECTORS: JOHN REILLY RUDI STERN
GLOBAL VILLAGE VIDEO RESOURCE CENTER**