

OPERATIVE ASSUMPTIONS



Gregg Bordowitz

1996

living mockery of your own ideals. If not, you have set your ideals too low.

- CHARLES LUDLAM¹

For the past five years I have worked as a videomaker for the Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC)² where I have been the coproducer, with Jean Carlomusto, of the "Living with AIDS" cable show,³ as well as the producer of many videotapes addressing the concerns of people living with AIDS or HIV⁴ and members of groups hardest hit by AIDS—lesbians and gay men, drug users, poor people, people of color, women.

In 1985, I started making video as a young artist searching for ways to represent the manifold processes through which people come into being as subjects. I realized that by making video I could introduce the element of time into my work in ways I couldn't possibly achieve by making static images or installations. I wanted to represent the formation of subjectivities by creating conflicts between sound and image over time. Video seemed to be the most effective medium to picture the ways representations assign us places from which to identify. I was excited by its counterhegemonic potential. Additionally, video was relatively cheap and I had access to equipment. It was easy to learn how to use.

As a student I began to question the ways video art had been canonized within art world institutions. In general, video made for galleries and museums pursued two tendencies. One tended to be preoccupied with the formal limits of the medium and the other used the medium as a means to further the concerns of performance art. There were exceptions. Dara Birnbaum's work addressed issues of representation in video by appropriating and questioning network television. I have in mind Birnbaum's video *Wonder Woman*, which repeated an image appropriated from a popular weekly television show of the superheroine transforming from a mild-mannered woman into Wonder Woman, spinning in circles and exploding. Viewing this video rendered open the possibilities of a critical video practice.

APPROPRIATED
FOOTAGE

→ Around the same time I was introduced to the works and writings of Martha Rosler and Dan Graham—two distinctly different artists, yet both used video to interrogate mass culture. Rosler's *Global Taste: A Meal in Three Courses*, a video installation at the New Museum in New York in 1985, was a fragmented collage of material presented on three monitors housed within a structure that did not permit the viewer to see all three monitors at the same time from any one vantage. The "interlocking motifs in its videotapes are children, food, commercials and learning." The theme of the installation was "colonization of the self and of other countries, by media and advertising."⁴

As a student, I was overwhelmed by the complexity of the work and its ambition to map complex social forces. Rosler's printed works, specifically, *The Bowery in Two Inadequate Descriptive Systems*,⁵ introduced me to criticism of left-identified documentary practices.

Dan Graham's video *Rock My Religion* (1984–85) introduced me to the idea of the video artist as cultural critic. *Rock My Religion* legitimated the idea that an artist could and should take popular culture seriously.

The idea that video did not have to be relegated to monitors in separate, well-defined spaces in galleries and museums came to me through watching Paper Tiger Television as it waged its own weekly cable struggle against dominant media. Paper Tiger comes out of a recent but not well documented history of alternative media, including but not limited to Third World Newsreel, Videofreex, and other groups of alternative makers grounded in movements for social change. An article by Dee Dee Halleck, founder of Paper Tiger, "Some Arguments for the Appropriation of Television,"⁶ inspired me at the same time I began to think of myself as an "activist videomaker."

audience
I was very much influenced by all this work for many reasons, but the one attribute all these makers shared was an interest in using video, both inside and, more important, outside the context of galleries and museums. All the work I mentioned fostered the idea that video could be used as a means to organize audiences around critical activities—questioning the culture industry. These makers considered viewers as participants in a process of making meaning. In making my own work I began to think of critical pedagogy as an ideal practice.

I think many video artists were and continue to be daunted by the monolithic enterprise of broadcast television. Artists feel that they can't possibly compete with it because of lack of resources and lack of access to broadcast venues. Video can be, and often is, employed in installation work to address conditions of spectatorship in the gallery or the museum. I can't limit myself to using video in this way. The broadcast dimension of television is the fundamental component of the medium. I have been much more interested in television's broadcast capacity than in its multichannel capacity employed in constructing installations and shows because I am interested in exploiting television's capacity as an organizing tool. Further, I view broadcast television as a field within which to intervene and bring about meaningful change.

Commercial television is produced with an agenda: to dominate the leisure time of its audience in order to sell products, to engender a public of consumers. Fundamentally opposed to this, I have attempted to travel the way of Bertolt Brecht: to

employ forms of entertainment that engage the critical skills of an audience, galvanizing the potential for collective action. I approach television production as an activist, employing video as a means of organizing. My work is a hybrid of concerns derived from critical theory and concerns affecting my own conditions of existence. I place my own subjectivity at risk within my work, drawing on my own daily experiences, using my own identity and the various subject positions comprising it. My interest in videomaking developed at the same time I was coming out as a gay man and coming to consciousness about the AIDS epidemic. My first video, "... some aspect of a shared lifestyle ..." (1986), considered the topic of the emerging AIDS epidemic in view of my concerns about the formation of subjectivity. It's a raw tape, juxtaposing first-person narration with varying medical opinions and differing representations culled from the dominant media—news reports, television specials, magazine and newspaper articles. While making this tape, I realized that I was part of an emerging identity. The AIDS crisis precipitated the formation of a new subjectivity—the person living with AIDS—a subject with a disease asserting his or her right to determine the conditions of his or her own health care. The formation of this identity was significant. People with a disease organized as a constituency, a political identity, questioning the ways they are positioned by authority and subjugated within the dominant culture. After the first tape, I became involved with the emerging AIDS activist movement, participating in several AIDS activist video collectives—Testing the Limits and DIVA (Damn Interfering Video Activists)—and producing television for GMHC. I tested positive for HIV antibodies in 1988. This informed my decision to make tapes by and for people living with HIV.

Over the past six years of AIDS activist television production I have come up with a set of fundamental organizing principles underlying my efforts. The following is a manifesto to which I have added explanatory notes to clarify specific concerns. I hesitate to use the word *manifesto*. This text lacks the force of certainty that often justifies the use of the term. It's riddled with ambivalences and ambiguities. In spite of these, I use the term. The following principles are intended to foster the spread of participatory democratic forms of media production and reception.

OPERATIVE ASSUMPTIONS CONCERNING THE COMMUNITY-BASED PRODUCTION OF TELEVISION

DEFINITIONS

Two concepts shape my understanding of what I will repeatedly refer to as "dominant culture." The first is "hegemony," which Raymond Williams defined as "a more or less adequate organization and interconnectedness of otherwise separated and even disparate meanings, values, and practices, which it specifically incorporates in a significant culture and an effective social order."⁷

The second concept is "tradition," defined by Williams as follows: "For tradition is in practice the most evident expression of the dominant and hegemonic

pressures and limits. It is always more than an inert historicized segment; indeed it is the most powerful practical means of incorporation. What we have to see is not 'a tradition' but a *selective tradition*: an intentionally selective version of a shaping past and a pre-shaped present, which is then powerfully operative in the process of social and cultural definition and identification.⁹⁸

Dominant culture is culture produced in the interests of the current hegemony. Its material means of support come from sources with an interest in maintaining the status quo. These are the corporations, the big businesses, and the government interests that determine the content and form of newspapers, magazines, television, films, and so on. "Tradition" is the principle that upholds the sanctity of the forms and the values determining representations. Dominant culture borrows and steals from alternative cultures that are produced on the margins of societies by communities whose lives and experiences aren't accounted for within the current hegemony. Dominant culture changes and grows constantly to account for historical change. Disfranchised communities must act on and intervene within dominant culture to get the recognition and resources necessary to their survival.

There is a distinct difference between the production of commercial television and the community-based production of television. The latter is produced by disenfranchised groups who are not recognized, or are recognized in limited ways, on dominant television. Community television is no less deserving of the label "television" than what is considered appropriate for broadcast. The fight is to expand the notion of television to include the kinds of production now assigned only a place at the margins of broadcast and production.

In this context, community must be understood as a shifting, horizontally expanding entity open to change and growth. Communities of the disenfranchised are formed through negation. Forces within the dominant culture construct differences among subjects and establish exclusive principles that govern group formation. Subjects excluded by these criteria identify with each other along the lines of differences that have been established within the dominant field. Identity formations arise among the disenfranchised as a means to speak in a society that has refused them the opportunities to represent themselves. Alliances among different disenfranchised groups create the possibilities of new communities that transgress constructed boundaries. New alliances and coalitions give rise to communities that promote social equity, dismantling the structures of power that have shaped dominant culture.

TWO CHALLENGES

Who is your audience?

1. Ask yourself, "What images would I like to see more of in the world?" Make them.
2. Face the representational problems of the day in ways that affect your daily life.

The most widely recognized problem among community producers is lack of access to the means of television production. Disfranchised groups affected by AIDS have had

limited access to the equipment necessary to produce programs addressing the concerns of their communities. Access to broadcast standard equipment is limited, but the increased availability of small-format consumer production equipment has enabled television production by disenfranchised groups. Additionally, programs that are produced have little access to broadcast venues. Video activists have been gaining access to this kind of equipment by organizing resource pools and collectives.

Alternative distribution networks have been established to get these works shown—cable broadcasts, organizational newsletters, and relations among AIDS service organizations are just some of the means used to distribute activist video. Many of the videos produced at GMHC, including videos produced for the "Living with AIDS" cable show, are available through the GMHC catalog of AIDS educational material distributed nationally to health care institutions and service providers. An excellent example of community education efforts that employ video is the "Seeing Through AIDS" program in New York—an innovative mobile teaching event that uses alternative and activist video as a stimulus for training and discussions about AIDS in many different workplaces.⁹

The kinds of representations, or the lack of representations, addressing disenfranchised subjects within the field of dominant media can be a primary motivation for making video work. Television legitimates the experience of some subjects, and it provides a witness to the current times for anyone willing, or able, to identify as a member of the "general public." The "general public" is a fiction established to organize consumers around purchasing products. Anyone who may not fit the image of what advertisers want television viewers to imagine as the kind of people who want a particular product is excluded from the field of representation. For example, people with AIDS and HIV infection are often invited to speak about some of their experiences on television, but they are never pictured speaking to members of the audience who may also be people with AIDS and HIV. It may be a long time (perhaps never) before we see public service announcements directly addressing people with AIDS in the audience of television. No one wishes to be the subject of that address. The repressed fact is that the many people living with HIV and AIDS don't have a choice. The production, distribution, and broadcasting of video work intended for an audience of people with AIDS and HIV, representing some the complexities of living with HIV, creates opportunities toward the inclusion of groups affected by AIDS into the audiences of television.

NINE OPERATIVE ASSUMPTIONS

1. Video is a medium, but television is a situation. Video describes a means of production, a specific technology. Television production engenders a set of relations among workers: producers, writers, camera operators, lighting designers, sound engineers, and so forth. It also engenders relations between makers and viewers.

2. Don't trust technology. Did you have a hand in its development? Is it developed in

6. In community television production the ends are the means because new possibilities emerge when the means of production are in the hands of a self-determining group of

subject matter on television.

dominant as signifying absences that play a determining role regarding the choice of

establish its own veracity. Exclusions and marginalizations figure within the field of the

There is no outside to dominant television. Television necessarily refers to itself to

other, and there are no beginnings or ends. Dominant television is an immanent domain.

5. On dominant television, images, words, and ideas have no causal relation to each

witnessed and documented all these actions.

York City Hall, the New York State Capitol, Saint Patrick's Cathedral, and so on. I have

Administration in October 1988, and subsequent New York ACT-UP actions at New

efforts—for example, the ACT-UP, ACT NOW nonviolent takeover of the Food and Drug

I have seen groups of people accomplish great tasks through collective

create opportunities for the formation of new audiences and communities.

primary goal. The most significant feature of television production is its capacity to

many different people working together toward common goals. Entrenchment is the

It requires faith. Have faith in the power of collective action and document the efforts of

television in the interests of community. This is the spiritual dimension of production.

4. Television should not be limited to a means of defense. It can be proactive. Make

system.

into the works of an engine, or like a virus introduced into the hardware of a computer

thrown at a group of armed soldiers. It can be a form of sabotage, like a wrench thrown

can be a crudely fashioned weapon, like a handful of nails bound by electrical tape

Television is a form of intervention—interfering with the current social order. Television

3. Television can be used in directed pragmatic ways as a means of defensive action.

tive.¹⁰

uses can be seen as socially, commercially and at times politically manipula-

new and powerful form of social integration and control. Many of its main

Thus, if seen only in hindsight, broadcasting can be diagnosed as a

than as [retrospectively] inevitable results.

ly if imperfectly fathomed that it is now difficult to see them as decisions rather

of particular decisions, in particular circumstances, which were then so wide-

destination, however, when closely examined, proves to be no more than a set

familiar form, seems to have been predestined by the technology. This pre-

social institution, in which there is always a controversy but which, in its

We have now become used to a situation in which broadcasting is a major

inform all decisions concerning its design, use and implementation:

designed within the context of social relations. Thus, relations of power and dominance

your interests? Take what you can use and use what you can take. Technology is

people representing themselves. A community creates itself as it represents itself. Video-making can foster a process of consensus building and can provide the arena in which goals are identified by a group.

7. Ontology and tactics merge on the television screen. The subjective conditions of the makers must be acknowledged as a fundamental factor informing all productions, broadcasts, and screenings. Static, the hissing, grainy emission of light and sound present on the screen of an operating television, is the presence of nothing—the positive, substantive form of nothingness. That we produce television at all is an attempt to cope with the existence of this static state. I realize that this may sound pretentious, but I think it's necessary to recognize the existential dimension of production, to state what is fundamentally at stake for the individual maker.

Two fundamental dialectical formulations structure my understanding of the contradictions inherent in making television. (1) I accept as a given fact that the dialectic between eros and thanatos is a determining factor affecting our actions. A dynamic tension exists between desire and death—the strong impulse toward the experiences of pleasure that disclose one's being to oneself exist alongside strong impulses toward the self-negation of one's being. The knowledge that one may die gives life its value. (2) I accept as a given fact the existentialist dialectic between being and nothingness. The agency of the subject is opposed by the arbitrary nature of the sign— when I speak I risk being understood in very different ways than I intended; perhaps I will not be understood at all. Meaning is always threatened by non-sense. Reason is always humbled by contingency. There are forces at work beyond one's control that can thwart one's best devised plans.

To avoid facile, vulgar, deterministic accounts of events one must admit that there are limits to what one can know. All accounts must allow for unknown factors. No single cause can explain a situation. No explanation can sum up the totality of a situation. Truth, like tradition, is an absolute category established in the interests of an established order. Work that questions the status of truth in representation runs a great risk of exclusion within dominant media, but it serves the interests of those whose history has been done great violence by the official record.

8. Television cannot instrumentally affect the actions of viewers. Television presents options and possibilities for action. Community producers can picture forgotten options and ignored possibilities.

9. Television doesn't belong to the producer. The producer is its reason for being, but this is a legitimate claim any spectator can and should make.

NAGGING AFTERTHOUGHTS

1. The issue of whether to make video or film is not only an issue of medium. It can be framed as an issue of idiom. Choosing between video production and film production is often framed as an economic decision by many producers. Video is cheaper to produce,

but film has greater avenues for distribution. In general, the distinctions between the two media are breaking down. Most broadcast television is filmed in production and many films are now edited on videotape.

Neither television nor cinema are pure categories anymore. Accepting that as a given, I am committed to making television. I produce video work that draws upon, refers to, and comments on the history of television. The decision to make television is a choice to produce within and improve on a set of idioms within a specific history of production. I like television because it is cheap, fast, superficial, and disposable—like a daily newspaper. To make film is to work within the idioms of cinema. A decision to work within either category is founded on the belief that there are still tendencies within each worthy of pursuit.

2. *The category of experimental work in video has been challenged and broadened over the past decade.* It now includes work concerned with the relation between the speaking subject and the subject of address. The structure and formation of identity is being questioned with new rigor. Addressing new audiences, communities, and constituencies is the goal of much new work. Even more ambitious is new video work that attempts to form new audiences by picturing alliances among disenfranchised groups.

There has been a shift away from previous areas of experimentation. The limits of the video medium and the science behind television have been explored by artists like Nam June Paik who strongly identify with the notion of the avant-garde and whose concerns were formed out of formalist problems rooted in the history of painting and sculpture. Video has been used effectively to make viewers question their presumptions about time and space within the context of galleries and museums by Dan Graham, Vito Acconci, Bruce Nauman, and many others. The status of truth in documentation has been questioned and dealt serious blows by artists mentioned before—Rosler and Paper Tiger. Godard and others associated with cinema have made their contributions by posing tough philosophical questions about television.

Many contemporary videomakers start from a critical interrogation of dominant television, developing complex, rich, and affirming representations of disenfranchised subjects and communities —*Tongues Untied* by Marlon Riggs or *L Is for the Way You Look* by Jean Carlomusto.

In general, significant shifts have occurred in theoretical conceptions of audience. The notion of an audience composed of artists and videomakers has been under assault for the past two decades. In the eighties, under the Reagan presidency, decreases in arts funding and conservative attempts at censorship have limited the resources of arts institutions and strained and severed the ties of arts communities. They have also politically charged the atmosphere, resulting in a resurgence of identity politics. My work is the product of these times. The AIDS crisis created a situation in which my identity as an artist became subordinate to my identity as an activist, although making video has remained my primary activity.

CRITIQUE OF PREVIOUS WORK IN VIEW OF MY
EXPERIENCES AND THOUGHTS ON THE FUTURE

In the spring of 1988, within two months, I tested HIV-antibody positive, came out to my parents as gay, and decided to seek help concerning my alcohol and drug use. This was the densest moment of my life. Since then I have come to realize that there is no reason why I'm HIV positive, why some people get sick and why some people die. Although there are historical conditions that explain the crisis, there is no reason behind AIDS. But there is meaning. My experiences are rich with meaning. They're full of pain, irony, and hope.

The work I've done in the past few years was predicated upon the conviction that action must be taken toward ending government inaction on the AIDS epidemic. This conviction led me to a representational practice with a set of pragmatic goals. This work was often limited to performing a specific function: the documentation of the 1988 nonviolent takeover of the Food and Drug Administration, the provision of vital information concerning alternative medical treatments for HIV-antibody positive people; safer-sex educational videos for bars and theaters. There is some amount of certainty behind the production of this work. Positions must be stated clearly and asserted authoritatively, leaving little room for speculation. Fear of death often goes unacknowledged in much AIDS activist videos. Sexual identities are often presented unproblematically. Safer-sex educational materials often don't consider the complexities of desire.

I still hold the same convictions that motivated me to do this work, but now there is also a need for video work, that explores the subjectivity of a person living with HIV infection. Much of the work done about AIDS and HIV has been documentary work. I've contributed to the development of this body of work. Now I think it is important to produce work that grapples with the subjective conditions of living with HIV in ways that challenge conventional means of representation. We must consider the uncertainties inherent in the experience of being a person with HIV, uncertainties regarding sexuality, agency, and death.

The AIDS epidemic calls all previous notions of sexual identity into question because the epidemic necessitates talking about sexual behavior rather than identity. For example, new categories such as "men who have sex with other men" were developed in the field of sex education to account for the many men who do not identify themselves as "gay." Now, as the lesbian and gay liberation movement enters a new decade, new ideas about identities and alliances are being considered among lesbians and gay men. Established identities are being questioned. Media artists doing work about AIDS now have to recognize the fragility and historical specificity of identities. The shifting forces that shape identity during the AIDS crisis must be named and studied.

Also, new work about AIDS must question agency, the role of the individual in social change. The AIDS activist movement has posed a significant threat to the dominant order. It has been a catalyst for a growing health care movement in the United States. People with AIDS and HIV have been cast as agents of change in a num-

ber of intersecting fields, such as medicine, law, government, and business. Our struggle raises fundamental issues concerning people's rights of choice to control their own bodies. We have called into question long-held assumptions about government's sovereignty over matters of life and death.

People with AIDS and HIV must conduct their lives in the face of death because no person with HIV knows if or when she or he may get sick or die. Activists rarely see concrete results from their efforts, yet they continue to struggle. Identity is a fragile construct shaped by historical conditions. Work that addresses these issues will radically change current thinking about representation and AIDS.

Personal records and testimonies are valuable additions to the growing body of work that is shaping the ways the AIDS epidemic affects our lives. They are part of efforts to legitimate the concerns of people hardest hit by the AIDS epidemic and to pressure established institutions to take responsibility for some of the work that needs to be done in facing the continuing crisis. New video work that explores the psychic complexities of living with HIV can bring an acute awareness of mortality into debate with the ordinary tasks of daily existence. I have started a new series of portraits in video of people living with HIV. They are going to be a regular feature on the Living with AIDS cable program. I've completed six so far and would like to make as many as fifty. The first five portraits are two to five minutes in length. Each features a subject who looks directly into the camera and identifies as a person living with HIV. Then the subject is pictured in a variety of settings—the home, the office, a restaurant—talking about a variety of topics, not necessarily about HIV. However, once the subject discloses his HIV status, whatever follows in the video—a walk down the street, a game of pool, a discussion about pets—becomes a metaphor for living with AIDS or HIV. I am interested in exploring this. Perhaps, new ways of discussing mortality can develop out of this effort. In the portraits, I'm trying to reconcile an acute awareness of mortality with the monotony of daily life.

There has been a shift in the focus of this text that exemplifies a shift in my thinking about video work concerning AIDS. The first part of this text is an attempt to sum up aspects of community television paying special attention to pragmatic concerns. These ideas were formulated at a time when AIDS activist video was not yet an identifiable body of work, as it is today. When they were developed, I was motivated by the need for progressive cultural work about AIDS and I gave much thought and energy to fostering its existence. With the establishment of this small but visible category of video, new questions arise concerning the representation of AIDS, so I have recently become preoccupied with more subtle and complex questions about illness and death, issues that preoccupy my mind for the obvious reason—my own HIV infection. Sometimes I question whether or not I should continue making work about AIDS. I feel trapped by my infection, reduced and diminished. Yet, I can't exclude AIDS and HIV from the frame of my thinking. It has become a prism through which I view the world, and I expect that it will unfortunately take up more space on the horizon of my future.

Currently, I'm at work on an hour-long video concerning the problem of remaining hopeful in the face of increasing loss and despair. It attempts to picture the rage and sense of futility many people with AIDS or HIV experience. I feel a great sense of urgency motivating me to make the tape. Much is at stake.

Sometimes the forces motivating one to make work are not easily located in an identification with a cause external to and greater than the subject making the work—a movement, a group, an audience. Sometimes one has no conscious understanding of why one is making the work. Am I regressing into some kind of expressionist position mystifying the creative process? As a student, I made a commitment against any mystifying practices assigning privilege to an author, a figure, a signature, a gesture. I resisted the notion of the artist as a lonely alienated soul who is the bearer of a unique mark, the product of his individuality, a testament to the universal and transcendent nature of the human spirit. I formed some early assumptions behind my work arguing against neoexpressionism and the "return" to "traditional values" that was taking over the art world during the first years of the Reagan revolution. My peers and I vigorously opposed this tendency. These were the formative circumstances of my education as an artist. They continue to inform the decisions I make today.

Has my opposition to some formulations of expressionism enabled me to ignore the presence of my own unconscious? Has it limited my ability to understand the role of my unconscious? There have been times in the recent past when I repressed my own ambivalences in order to convey a sense of certainty in my activist work. When I was most intensely involved in AIDS activist politics, I was unable to admit any sense of doubt in my work. Doubt, uncertainty, and contingency were temporarily removed from my vocabulary. This was not a crime. I feel more curious than guilty about this. Circumstances seemed to demand it, and now I understand why. It was necessary for me to focus on the problems of representation concerning people with AIDS in general rather than become mired in the circumstances of my own infection—the arena in which I experience fear about the future. This was a good but inefficient means of coping. It left much unattended. Now, I must pose new questions and maybe formulate some answers.

The more rules I try to establish, the more questions arise. Every time I formulate a principle, I feel burdened by the demand to locate its origin of thought. Every assumption is founded on a previously established received idea. My thinking is a rickety structure that can barely support the weight of surrounding circumstances. I call it home.

NOTES



- ¹ Charles Ludlam, "Manifesto: Ridiculous Theater, Scourge of Human Folly," in *The Complete Plays of Charles Ludlam* (New York: Harper and Row, 1989), vii.
- ² The Gay Men's Health Crisis is the nation's oldest and largest AIDS service organization, providing services and advocacy to people with AIDS.
- ³ "Living with AIDS" is a weekly cable program produced by GMHC addressing concerns of people with AIDS and those who care for them.
- ⁴ Martha Rosler, gallery statement, "Global Taste: A Meal in Three Courses," in *The Art of Memory: The Loss of History* (New York: New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1985).
- ⁵ Martha Rosler, "The Bowery in Two Inadequate Descriptive Systems," in *Martha Rosler III Works*, Nova Scotia Pamphlets, no. 1 (Halifax: Press of the Nova Scotia School of Art and Design, 1981), 11-57.
- ⁶ Dee Dee Halleck, "A Few Arguments for the Appropriation of Television," *High Performance*, no. 37 (1987): 38-44.
- ⁷ Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 115.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁹ Seeing through AIDS is organized through Media Network, which publishes a catalog of the videotapes used in the program.
- ¹⁰ Raymond Williams, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (New York: Schocken Books, 1975), 23.