ideas held something you didn’t have imagined and the story and the way of telling it revealed itself at the same time. It was not necessarily narrative but something more personal, like psychoanalysis or dream. I was dissected with unwound film. Its unique twists that seemed the same as the films, winding, breathing, breathless, its derivative variations on Keith’s work on Maya Deren films. I was dissected by a general lack of content, and I found criteria, on house films. Hollywood, also punk, novels, art, painting, understanding. Suddenly, there was the field of possibility when you were in those cliches and you could go out into the pale court, here a clip of you, talk about work and go back in.

MG: When I was told about the videos and the adjacent generation, this is the sense that the equipment that they were using in the Go-up very much determined the aesthetics and the language of film that they were producing there. Peter Kubov is speaking during his lecture. He talks about the tools and the ingredients that you have in the kitchen determine what you make. Nina has spoken about the fact that although you were using the same tools as the previous generation, you were doing something different with them. What influence or importance did the tools of production have on your work?

AM: I wasn’t trying to do anything different. Both are right about all the other influences — punk rock, novels, etc. — I was watching American films at the Metro cinema in Soho, reading Tony Moniz, Mary Angeles. It was enough for me to explore my interest and my emotional world through film because I was held within this community that allowed me to do that. I wasn’t becoming a filmmaker. I wasn’t becoming an artist. I wasn’t doing anything that allowed me to stay same.

BM: What do you mean, on practice, on the articulation of the image, on unmanned, performative space, on narratives and directed time, on unapologetic topologies of force, tension and vibratory (of colour saturation, of density, of lines). On banal bodies, on the opening of spaces, on the emptiness of images, on broken and big screens and the terror of concrete meetings. Despite the discourse-specific aspect of my practice, the formulation that best captured my process was being open to the imperceptible, as an indiscernible subject, to cross the unnameable in my films.

My projects, crossing out all inclusive measures through extreme layering within and between film formats on the optical printer opened hidden spaces within and between frames (for lengths of mood, atmosphere and feeling) through layering colour and light, folding in voids and darkness with anomalous shape-shifting between frames was an effort to demand on my practice to meet the crime that I was drawing through.

SB: For me, my material engagement was as simple as putting film in a cutter, filling and cutting on a linotype, where you hung your footage in p鼓舞, which I did for the first time in the making of films. This impact on how I make films now. There is a discipline of the past that we use to get the image onto film — the cost ranges on months or years for funds before you start and then you have to worry until you get it. This time is spent on film what we do. The process of cutting and collaging with a sphere is an experience. You can’t like the cut you can’t really put them back together. So the process becomes the language of the film. It is the sequence. The last ten years, the process changed because it became automatic and direct. The film is the sequence. The last ten years, the process of cutting and collaging with a sphere is an experience. You can’t like the cut you can’t really put them back together. So the process becomes the language of the film. It is the sequence. The last ten years, the process changed because it became automatic and direct. The film is the sequence. The last ten years, the process changed because it became automatic and direct.

AM: The time element allowed emotions to be held coldly. The process took a long time you were having with equipment. In a way this allowed that community to come because we were all doing this together.

BM: This is rewarding it is reassuring. There were those men with their passions of fiction, and so I bet there was (LoPic, which was my first personal film, having I graduated and the sound track playing in front of those guys). It was so expressive.

ND: It is important not to describe the material relationship with film. This idea of the ‘hand on’ was necessary only at some stage of the production. In the space, content could give access to high-end digital technology on an intimate basis. Silvian Ferrini and Dave Marks who produced their films in the mainstream industry on a miniature. That’s how I made ‘Now I am yasmen’ (1987), which I put produced by Chrysalis TV in one era and liquidated back to film. This cross-media platform is now possible in production but in the sense the two media were still separate and I tend to yet what I needed them each in my working method. This was prompted by Mike Mabe (1984), which was filmed on Super 8, blown-up to 16mm to show in the art film festival and sold by film editors. I spoke the film into the microphone on the 16mm off film decks I inherited, because it provided more intimacy, immediacy and existential closeness than recording to a sound booth. The relationship of picture and sound was more flexible on film than that which is part of a film and imposed a rhythm that was antithetical to what I wanted. The one-off edit was then translated into images and sound. In the films of the 80s, I was seeking the flexibility that would only become available with digital, but at the time I did not exist and you had to find this plastic flexibility in your own associations of technologies.

ND: I am making National Letter from any way at the Film Co-op and at the same time I was a student at the Medill School. Another project had taken ‘The Other Story’ at the Harvard Gallery (1979) and exhibited throughout the British art scene, one of the issues being that women artists of colour were under-represented. There was a change awareness about black artists and their lack of representation within the canons of western art. The term then was ‘Black Artist’ (umbrella term for colour). Mia Sweeney programmed Tim Etchells’ Raabhausen (1979) at the Co-op. Mike He also talks about the video era as being to the side of the film. The idea that ‘you don’t know what you are looking at and everything you think you are looking at it other than what you are looking at it’ is something that really influenced me in making National Letter when I presented images of the London Underground but the voices over came from an interior space, I think we were all dealing with a personal voice. There was a space between the image and the text that was relatively new and was coming from (different) peers like feminism, black politics, Third Text, ‘ queer’ politics etc. — all of this film in different ways.

This was also taken up by people who were working in distribution at the Film Co-op or who were producing workshops, a job specifically created by the Executive to facilitate access to the Co-op. Tim Etchells programmed monthly screenings and people like Andrew Macleod came and presented ‘The Nature of God’ (made in 1979 and shown at the Co-op in 1980), which was about the sort of programming and interest. Jim Sweeney and Sclere Motter also came. Jim then did an. In 1982, Carolin Sauer, an artist, curated a programme of films called ‘Unseen Directions’ where all the films were connected to the context. Sauer and Sweeney and Chris Roach. I went to meetings where people became committed to very important, particularly valuable to value. We had to be in each other in order to create a system of value that was there and that was there in the system. That was not as the expectation of experimental film at the London Filmmakers’ Co-op, did not disappear.

The problem with this idea of being ‘unconnected’ is that it suggests we have to be strong, positive voices. I think that’s where the experimental cinema lies. It’s not an
idea builds something you didn't have inside and the story of selling it reveals itself at the same time. It was not necessarily narrative but something more personal, like psychoanalysis or dream. I was disoriented with structured films, foreshadowed tracks that seemed the same - devolving sounds, breathing, heartbeat or derivative variations on Keiji Niice's work or Mary German's films. I was dismissed by a general lack of content, and I loved cinema, those horizons, Hollywood, also punk, novels, art, painting, everything. Suddenly there was this field of possibility where you were these clichés and you could go out into the Bally Court, have a cup of tea, talk about work and get back in.

MNS: When you talk about the 60s and the 70s generation, there is in your sense of the equipment that you were using in the Co-op very much determined the aesthetics and the language of the films that were produced there. Peter Kubelka speaks about this in his lectures, how the tools and the ingredients that you have in the kitchen determine what you make. Nina has spoken about the fact that although you were using the same tools as the previous generation, you were doing something different with them. What influence or impact did the tools of production have on your work?

AK: I wasn't trying to do anything different. I was in the middle of all the other influences - punk rock, novels, art - I was watching South American films at the Moi cinema in Soho, seeing Terry Anmer in Mary Angelou. It was enough for me to explore my internal and external world through film because I was held within this community that allowed me to do that. I wasn't becoming a filmmaker; I wasn't becoming an artist. I was just doing the thing that allowed me to stay sane.

MNS: I placed demands on practice, in the articulation of the image, on anaesthetic movement spaces, on reports to all dimensions, on kinetic micro-topologies of focus, intensions and vibrations of colour saturation, of density, of illumination, of grain, of flat and intensity, on the opening of spaces, on the expansion of images, in breaks in edge and the terms of orientating meaning. Despite the discourse-specific aspect of my practice, the formulations that best captured my process was being open to the imperceptible, as an indiscernible value, to create a non-material in my films.

My encounters crossed out all narrative measures through extensive layering within and between frames on the optical printer opened up hidden micro-spaces within and between frames (false changes of mood, atmosphere and feeling) through layering colour and light, folding in voids and darkness with amorphous, shaggy-sifted shifts between frames was an effect of a demand on my practice to meet the cause that I was being through.

SP: For me, my material engagement was as simple as putting film in a projector, filming and cutting on a foreseen, where you bring your lineage on a peg, which I did for the first two or three years of making films. This impact of how I make films now, there is a difference of the process of getting into the image into film - the content was working six months or a year for finals before (Co-op) or estate then you have to wait until you can see. This time is spent playing the cinema of the whole. The process of cutting on celluloid with a sphere in preference. If you don't like the cut you can easily put them back together. So the process becomes the language of the film. It is in its content. For the last ten years I have also put films on celluloid and edited on a computer. I've left the limitations that celluloid forced the eyes. The latest edition in digital post production means that that control becomes automatic and I'm feeling the actual relationship with the material. Although I'm planning to shoot my films on digital or on non-reel with celluloid, I'm just interested in celluloid. But because I end up with a digital print, I am working between languages and time periods.

As. The time element allowed moments to be held constantly. The process took a long time; you were working with equipment. In a way, this allowed that community to exist because we were of this working.

MNS: I find it interesting to go to those labs, where those men with their posts of frames, and all the editing, which was my personal film, having a grad and the sound track playing in front of those guys. It was so separated.

NK: It is important not to idealize the material relationship with film. This idea of the 'hands on' was necessary only at some stage of the production. In the period, artists could get access to high-end digital technology on a freelance of means. Derek Jarman and John Maybury also post-produced their films in the mainstream industry on detergent. That's how I made 'How I am now' (1995), which I post-produced at Chelsea TV in Nice and Television Pictures. In this new, advanced media platform, new standards in post-production but in the space of two media were still separate and it was I got what I needed from such as my working methods. This was post-processed in Studios Mauer (1996), which was filmed on Super 8, blown-up on the optical print filmed and of film. I don't make films on the super 8 system, but the work shown in the exhibition is the regular end edited. I spoke to the director of 'the Michele' on the jungles of the film. I think this provided more immediacy, immediacy and 'virtual' cloutness then recording in a sound booth. The relationship of picture and sound was more flexible on film than editing or that, which went off the film and imposed a rigidity that was artificial to what I wanted. The off-line editing was then transferred to magnetic and stereo. In the films of the 80s. I was seeking the flexibility that would only become available later with digital, and at the time it did not exist and you had to find this plastic flexibility through your own combinations of technologies.

AK: I was making Formal Letter from 1966 to the Co-op and at the same time I was a student at the Chade. Auguste Hennan had curated 'The Other Story' at the Hayward Gallery (1968) and machine-registered throughout the British art scene, one of the issues being that women artists of colour were under-represented. There was a huge awareness about black artists and the lack of representation within the causes of women artists. The term then was, 'Black Aesthetics' (ambiguously term for people of colour), Mona Sawahra programmed 'The Third Text' at the Co-op, and later he talks about the race over as being to the side of the film. The idea that 'You don't know what you are looking at and everything you think you are looking at is other than what you are looking at.' It is something that really solidified me in making Formal Letter where I presented images of the London Underground but the voice came from an interior space. I think we are all dealing with a personal voice: There is a space between the image and the text that was relatively new and was coming from different ways.

This was also taken up by people who were working in distribution at the Film Co-op and the Teer Wicke, Pat Wilkie who was running educational workshops, a job specifically devised by the Free Cinema to facilitate access to the Co-op, Time Life programmes the monthly screenings and people like Amand Pender-Swan came and presented In The Name of God (made in Nice and shown at the Co-op in 1967), which was about the rise of racism in India. April 1971 and Sconeternet also came. Lina Markovic did a lot in 1980, Carole Frontare curated a programme of films called Urban Diaspora, where the showed Iranian Americans. So the process was ongoing, Jean Bouchet. I do not mention these people because citizenship is very important, responsibilities and the way they operated: To create a system so that now it is a space that is accessible, that were other to those expected of experimental film at the London Filmmakers' Co-op, do not disappear.

The problem with this idea of being 'the filmmaker' is that we suggest we have to be strong, positive voices. I think that's where the experimental comes in; It's not an