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From the beginning of the 1990s onwards, there have been attempts to trace the history of video art in the Netherlands and to preserve its heritage. Relatively recently, this history has been documented in two books, *The Magnetic Era*, published in 2003 by The Netherlands Media Art Institute,[ii] and *A Short History of Dutch Video Art*, an initiative by the Gate Foundation that started around the same time.[iii] Both publications were related to exhibition projects that were presented as a research on what had happened to video art since its arrival in the Netherlands.[iii] Although especially *The Magnetic Era* gives a lot of attention to the rise of early initiatives and institutions, both books fall short of addressing the role of art academies with respect to the integration of new media practices. Having talked to historical witnesses and drawing upon textual sources, it seems that few art schools in the Netherlands appropriated electronic technologies from an early stage. Mainly in the 1980s, AKI in Enschede has played a substantive role in introducing video and audio to the context of fine art, but this was only on an undergraduate level. According to some, attention to video and especially audio technology at the art academy in The Hague as well. However, various records give the impression that the Jan van Eyck Academie was really the first art school in the Netherlands that created a setting for experimenting with video and audio devices in an institutional art context. From the early 1970s onwards, the academy had video production facilities and offered tutoring in this field, albeit on an experimental level. In the following text, an attempt will be made to document some of its history, albeit an incomplete and fragmentary one. It has to be seen as a first initiation of research that has yet to be done. Considering the general Dutch and international conditions under which video art occurred, many names and facts cannot be mentioned, however important they are, as it would go beyond the scope of this short introduction. The starting point of this project was – among the few documents that remain from the 1970s and 1980s video production at the Jan van Eyck – a series of interviews with artists and facilitators active in and around the academy: JCJ Vanderheyden, Servie Janssen, Madelon Hooykaas and Berto Ausseums (in chronological order), published together with this text.

Video still: Marinus Boezem, *Breathing Upon the Tube*, 16 mm film transferred to video, 2'38", colour, sound, 1971, collection Netherlands Media art Institute

The 1970s

When talking about the history of video art, its legendary origin is often put down to the moment when the American Fluxus artist Nam June Paik bought a Sony Portapak camera, recorded the 1965 visit of the Pope to New York City and presented the footage at a café on the evening of the same day. Although this is a contested scenario, it offers a frame of reference with respect to when video technology might have entered art production, which is somewhere in the mid- to end-1960s. The Sony Portapak it supposed to have become commercially available in 1967. This gives an indication for when one could expect Dutch artists to have picked up the new home-use technology.[iv] However, one might argue at this point that video art might have existed before the fact[v], especially if one considers early experiments reaching from magnetic sound tapes and archaic synthesizers to Gerry Schum’s projects for German television, in which a couple of Dutch artists participated and which were already resonating in the Netherlands. In relation with the latter, one could mention Marinus Boezem’s 16 mm film for television, *Breathing Upon the Tube* (1971), in which he makes the viewer aware of the technological apparatus that normally stays invisible and therefore “transparent”. By breathing as if from inside the box against the television screen, Boezem blurs the image.[vi] Other early film projects that seem to prefigure the rise of video art in the Netherlands are Bas Jan Ader’s *Fall* recordings in the 1970s, documenting actions of the artist falling, for instance, with his bike into the Amsterdam canals. Then there were a couple of international artists who had moved to the Netherlands and left their imprint on both local and global art practice, like Shinkichi Tajiri, from Japan, with his *Berlin Wall* project (1972), in which he documented the 43 km-long wall by filming from a helicopter. All these are just random (yet important) examples that indicate an experimental sphere beyond the beginnings of video.

If one thinks of early video experiments in the Netherlands, there were few artists working with video at the beginning of the 1970s. The typical example are father and son Livinus and Jeep van der Bundt, who made medium-specific work related to both formal experiments and technological developments, similar to what international artists, like the New York-based artist couple Woody and Stein Vasulka, were doing around the time. Notorious is also the reference to the land art exhibition *Sonsbeek Beyond the Pale* that took place in 1971 and included a video tent in which recording and playback equipment was provided for the public to make their own tapes – a paradigmatic case of early
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Even more so as the academy was an important motor for the early initiatives that popped up in the early 1970s was the Lijnbaancentrum in Rotterdam, Meatball and Het Kijkhuis in The Hague as well as VideoHeads and In-Out Center in Amsterdam. Most initiatives were driven by a small group of individuals. There were, for instance, a couple of South Americans who were rather active in and around Amsterdam: Raul Marroquin, Michel Cardena and Ulises Carrión. Also, there was a group of artists from Iceland, some of whom had studied – like Marroquin – at the Jan van Eyck Academie. Lijnbaancentrum, founded in 1971, had a special position, as it was – unlike most other early initiatives – a city-funded institution. Rather quickly, the city of Rotterdam seemed to have recognised the importance of having an experimental platform for new art forms and media. As early as 1973 Lijnbaancentrum hosted the first European video art exhibition. Also, there were video production facilities, used by artists like Wim Gijzen and Pieter Engels, who worked in the conceptual tradition, employing video to merely register action, often involving a gimmick or twist. In the Lbc-produced *Engels Smokes his Signature, Signing the Universe* from 1972, Engels raises issues of “authorship” and “property”, typical of that era.[vi] Then there was De Appel in Amsterdam, which, although it mainly focused on performance art, had an interest in video as part of so-called “environments” and multi-channel presentations, which would later be called “installations”. [viii] An example of such work is *Split Seconds* by the artists’ duo Hooykaas/Stansfield, a mixed-media installation presented at De Appel in 1979. According to Madelon Hooykaas, the “space criterion” was an important factor in deciding whether or not a video work should be considered “art”.[ix] That is, for artists like Hooykaas/Stansfield, the appropriation of space constituted a frame of reference to decide whether the work belonged to the tradition of fine art, or to other histories and traditions, such as cinema and film. This, however, was not so much an issue until the end of the 1970s when video slowly became institutionalised. It was around the second half of the 1970s that video installations occurred in the art spaces of the Netherlands.

Keeping these early developments in mind, it seems rather interesting that in Maastricht, at the other side of the country, an art institute like the Jan van Eyck Academie engaged in video experiments from an early stage. [x] Even more so as the academy was an important motor for the activities taking place in Amsterdam and elsewhere. The production of video and audio work actually started with JCJ Vanderheyden, who, being fed-up with painting for a while, was involved in experimental television and other types of audio-visual experiments.[xi] At the end of the 1960s, he studied at the Institute of Sonology in Utrecht and came in touch with early electronic sound experiments. He discovered video basically through the detour of sound, as sound and video recordings were both dependent on magnetic tape technology. Being a guest-lecturer at the Jan van Eyck around 1970, he managed to get a space and equipment to set up the first – fairly informal – video and audio studio at the academy. Not much has survived from this early period; the tapes were constantly reused and in this way remained in the cycle of production. There were no editing facilities yet, as video editing was still quite complicated. Everything was shot in real-time. According to Vanderheyden, an air of secrecy surrounded the activities. This did not apply to him and the students, but to people who were not involved, who were perhaps afraid of what was happening at the workplace. In that respect, the space functioned as a figurative “black box”; something went in and something else came out, without revealing what had happened in between. This too holds for the people involved, who were discovering new ways of defining art practice. According to Vanderheyden, everything was put on hold in 1973, although other accounts do not indicate a clear demarcation.

Performance artist Servie Janssen was one of the first students of JCJ Vanderheyden. He had initially been taught at the City Academy of Maastricht and later went to Poland to study film, graphics and painting. In the interview, he mentioned that just before his trip to Poland, he visited the Jan van Eyck for an open day and there was an exhibition in the corridors, which did not show works of art, but the technical equipment that was available to make video. Impressed by this progressive display, he joined the Jan van Eyck Academie after his year in Krakow, having already taken on a broadened vision of what art practice could be. According to Janssen, there was a strong idea of collectivity, also in the sense that working materials were shared. Like Vanderheyden, he recounted that the tapes of other students were commonly used for one’s own recordings, only to be taken by others once more. However, after a while people started doing their own thing and began to work in their own studio spaces again, as the equipment was quite easy to move and take along. For Janssen this meant that he was increasingly interested in performance art, in the context of which he used video as a mere tool of documentation, at least in most cases. He later did a couple of projects at De Appel, which he became rather affiliated with. Servie Janssen’s videotapes (1972-1979) are now at the Netherlands Media Art Institute, to be preserved and kept for later research. These tapes are one of the few works from the early period of the Jan van Eyck Academie that have survived, as Janssen withdrew them from constant recycling.

Another student was the Colombian Raul Marroquin, who enrolled at the Jan van Eyck at the beginning of the 1970s, too, and soon became a major innovator, stimulating other young artists in engaging in the experiment. Moreover, he functioned as a mediator between the academy and Agora Studio, an art initiative in Maastricht that played an important role in relation with early video, performance and media art as well as...
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other experimental art forms. Marroquin was involved with various other projects; he founded Mad Enterprises Inc. as a conceptual framework for his own art production and established the In-Out Center in Amsterdam, which existed between 1972 and 1974. A lot of the artists who were active at the In-Out Center were fellow students. Together with Theo van der Aa, co-founder of Agora Studio, he published a magazine called Fandangos, also based in Maastricht. In a general sense, one could say that the magazine was about art and life, with a humorous undertone and a Dada or Fluxus attitude. For the magazine, Marroquin conducted several interviews with international artists and other people that seemed somehow interesting to him. The process of interviewing itself was seen as an art practice. In the “Superissue” of 1978, there is for instance an interview with Mohammed Ali.[xii] Some of the interviews were documented on video, often with Jan van Eyck equipment, like an interview with Joseph Beuys, which is still accessible.[xiii] Marroquin wrote in 1978 that television was the medium video art was intended for, to emphasise the differences between video and film by claiming that they refer to different regimes of time and space.[xiv] This mindset is reflected in some of his own work as well, for instance in his 1977 performance Fandangos Evening News at De Appel. A newsreader uttering nonsense without losing his serious composure—“Blablablablabla...” —is joined by several television sets that show news footage, reaching from catastrophes and terrorism, from the Middle East to the Red Army Faction. The underlying idea is that “commercials are the only good news.”[xv] Another noteworthy project is The World’s First TV Convention (1980), also described as “the first international congress where television sets discussed their problems.”[xvi]

Agora itself did not seem to have had many direct contacts with the Jan van Eyck Academie, at least not according to the accounts of the founders, Theo van der Aa and Ger van Dijck. The studio opened its doors in 1971. Van der Aa and Van Dijck had been in Italy for a while, fascinated by the minimal and conceptual art that was produced there. When they came back to the Netherlands, they were looking for a place to start their activities. The choice to realize Agora Studio in Maastricht was an almost random decision, as they could get a house near the Market, in the Boschstraat. Theo van der Aa wrote later “that the appearance of art is not dependent on a geographic or historical setting, such as the historical ‘hot centres’ Paris, Berlin, New York.”[xvii] This statement draws upon the idea that when art had become technically reproducible (after film and photography, but especially since the rise of video), it was no longer important where one was located—it could even be in Maastricht. In 1982, Van der Aa made the following retrospective statement to describe the activities: “The aim was to start an independent initiative without attempting to define its newness; the ‘new’ happens, it cannot be predicted. At first the Studio was an open ‘atelier’ that had no pre-planned programme and was limited only by its available space, its facilities and the initiators’ attitude towards art as it presented itself in the Seventies. The activities that have taken place at the Studio during the last ten years can be considered ‘laboratory research’, through which the interaction of the artist and his environment produced a number of exhibitions, performances, installations. The realisation that art expression is not developed by the institution, but is the result of an individual creative act, is fundamental to Agora.”[xviii]

Agora Studio did not have a clear-cut outline, this did not take away that many artists, also those who were active on an international level, visited the place and used it as a context to present their work. An example that has been documented is for instance Nan Hoover’s 1977 performance Minutes of the Meeting, which she did together with Sam Schoenbaum, and which was realised in collaboration with Wies Smals of De Appel. This performance is especially significant since it broke with the paradigm of an unmediated relation between performer and audience, as it is often considered fundamental to the experience of performance art. Here, the audience was in another room, but could follow Hoover, who was moving to the text (a quote from Freud, read out by Schoenbaum), on a monitor, whereas Hoover herself could see the reactions of the audience on monitors around her, which enabled her to react to the audience in turn. The two rooms reflected the division between “consciousness” and the “subconscious”, and the interaction between them.[xix]  But Agora Studio was not the only place in Maastricht outside the Jan van Eyck Academie were interesting things happened that involved new media like video in one way or another. In 1976, performance artist Ben d’Armagnac, who was also affiliated with De Appel, did a performance at the University of Maastricht. It was one of the few works that he made directly and exclusively for video. In an act of self-endurance, he drives himself to his physical limits, constantly trying to throw up.[xx] The performance refers to a tradition of transgressive body art, as it was developed in the 1970s and also practiced by other artists around that time, like Marina Abramovic or Gina Pane. Further, there were several smaller exhibitions in galleries outside the Netherlands, especially in Germany, which included tapes produced at the Jan van Eyck Academie, which unfortunately have to remain unmentioned here.

Although Agora Studio did not have a clear-cut outline, this did not take away that many artists, also those who were active on an international level, visited the place and used it as a context to present their work. An example that has been documented is for instance Nan Hoover’s 1977 performance Minutes of the Meeting, which she did together with Sam Schoenbaum, and which was realised in collaboration with Wies Smals of De Appel. This performance is especially significant since it broke with the paradigm of an unmediated relation between performer and audience, as it is often considered fundamental to the experience of performance art. Here, the audience was in another room, but could follow Hoover, who was moving to the text (a quote from Freud, read out by Schoenbaum), on a monitor, whereas Hoover herself could see the reactions of the audience on monitors around her, which enabled her to react to the audience in turn. The two rooms reflected the division between “consciousness” and the “subconscious”, and the interaction between them.[xix]  But Agora Studio was not the only place in Maastricht outside the Jan van Eyck Academie were interesting things happened that involved new media like video in one way or another. In 1976, performance artist Ben d’Armagnac, who was also affiliated with De Appel, did a performance at the University of Maastricht. It was one of the few works that he made directly and exclusively for video. In an act of self-endurance, he drives himself to his physical limits, constantly trying to throw up.[xx] The performance refers to a tradition of transgressive body art, as it was developed in the 1970s and also practiced by other artists around that time, like Marina Abramovic or Gina Pane. Further, there were several smaller exhibitions in galleries outside the Netherlands, especially in Germany, which included tapes produced at the Jan van Eyck Academie, which unfortunately have to remain unmentioned here.

In addition to these smaller projects and activities, there was at least one larger video-related event in Maastricht in the 1970s, organised by
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The 1980s
The 1980s were a period of consolidation for video art – not necessarily on an artistic level, but mainly on the level of institutionalisation and historicisation.

For some, the times of experimenting and playing around with the new medium was over as soon as the “state recognition” of video art set in. The bureaucratisation in the 1980s let to a climate in which there was less space for the unplanned and spontaneous. At least, that is what some of the witnesses suggest. For others, the 1970s merely represented a short time in their lives, where they tried different things, which they abandoned later to do something else or to return to what they did before. This for instance goes for J.C.J. Vanderheyden. For others, the conditions of the 1980s brought about possibilities to set things up that would last and function on a larger scale. One could possibly even refer to a “second wave” of video initiatives, some of which turned into “proper” institutions.

Among the more persistent ones was the Amsterdam-based MonteVideo, founded in 1978 by René Coelho, whose mentor was the aforementioned video and media art pioneer Livinus van de Bundt. Coelho, originally working in the context of television, also became a teacher at AKI Enschede. Livinus’ medium-specific approach definitely had its impact on Coelho’s ideas about video art. In certain respects, one could say that it was medium-specificity that granted video its own history beyond fine art in general, film or a more general media history and at once secured its bond with the art historical canon of modernist self-reflection. In that respect, it does not seem accidental that it was around the time that video turned into both an acknowledged artistic medium and a historical category, that institutions like MonteVideo established themselves, institutions that exceeded the scope of a small artist initiative only accessible for a selected audience. Another important organisation was Time Based Arts, which could be regarded as an answer to the problems De Appel had with video art. For its founder, Wies Smals, video was rather problematic, as it was still object-based, i.e. an art form that contradicted the principles of performance art, which was considered “ephemeral” in nature.

Nevertheless, as I have mentioned before, quite some attention was given to video, especially in the phase where it became part of larger settings like “environments” or the later “installations”. However, there still was a need for a new initiative with more specific attention to technology-based art. In 1983, the Association of Video Artists (Vereniging van Videokunstenaars) set up Time Based Arts. With this name, they tried to transcend the paradigm of video and open it up to something that would probably today be called “(new) media arts”. Last but not least, the 1980s were also the decade in which Het Kijkhuis organised the World Wide Video Festival. The first festival took place in The Hague in 1982, but it later moved to Amsterdam.

These are just some examples of the shifts in scale mentioned before. Typically, it was then that the Jan van Eyck Academie revived the idea of a video studio and/or department, an idea that had somehow died somewhere in the 1970s, if one has to believe the accounts of J.C.J. Vanderheyden and Servie Janssen. Wies Smals, director of De Appel, was asked for advice about whom to appoint as head. Following her recommendations, at the end of 1980 the British artist Elsa Stansfield, of Hooykaas/Stansfield, was appointed head of the department.

Hooykaas/Stansfield were no strangers to Maastricht; in 1978 they had already realised a mixed-media installation at Agora Studio called See Through Lines, with the title referring to the lines constructing the analogue video image. In 1979, Agora published the Hooykaas/Stansfield catalogue 5 Video Environments, with Theo van der Aa as its editor. Unfortunately, Elsa Stansfield died in 2004, so it is through Madelon Hooykaas that the course of actions had to be reconstructed (Wies Smals died in 1982). In the interview, Hooykaas mentioned that Elsa Stansfield was the one who started collecting videos for library use on a structural basis. Often, the tapes came from guest instructors or were in-house productions, but on other occasions, work was bought for the Jan van Eyck collection, which now comprises several hundred works. In the 1980s annual reports of the Jan van Eyck Academie, lists can still be found with respect to which works were purchased over the years. Many of them are still unpreserved U-matic tapes that have not been played for a long time, but there have been attempts to collect the data of the collection. There also seems to be a substantial overlap with other collections (like the former Time Based Arts distribution collection), many of which are managed by the Netherlands Media Art Institute today, which started with the conservation of video work in the early 1990s. An extensive amount of works was screened during the Jan van Eyck Video Weekend in May 2007. But the decision to keep and store video work for later generations of students as a source and frame of reference was not the only change. According to Berto Aussems, technical tutor for Time Based Arts from 1984, with the appointment of Elsa Stansfield a video studio was build that was constructed after the model of a television studio. There were different levels, a sound studio and editing facilities. The studio was located at the entrance of the academy, as the map shows that is drawn on the cover of the exhibition catalogue of Video Maart (1981), an event that Elsa Stansfield organised immediately after her appointment.
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*Video Maart* was a mixture between exhibition and performance programme, which included both Dutch and international artists. Hence, many of the works that could be seen during the manifestation were crossovers between installation and performance work. Video was no longer used as a mere tool of registering the artist's actions, but the live feedback qualities of video as well as its possibilities of storage and capturing were employed as means to create multi-layered experiences. An example of a typical work presented during the event was Christine Chiffrun's *Linestructure Environment*, which she had realised for the first time in Groningen the year before.[xxvi] In the Jan van Eyck version of this performance, Chiffrun used the stairs at the entrance of the academy building and the video studio, where the artist was located herself. She worked with two monitors, two cameras and a video mixer. One camera captured the stairs and the other the performer herself, who was dressed in black and slowly moved a long white stick up and down, parallel to the white marker lines of the stairs, which she could see on a monitor in front of her. The whole action was accompanied by the amplified sound of a rushing brook. The audience played an active role by climbing the stairs when entering the building, determining what could be seen on the monitor in the studio, which showed the mixed image with the multiple layers combined.[xxvii] In the light of the 1970s and 1980s discussions on what made “video” differ from “film”, on whether video was more connected to the context of “fine art” than that of “cinema”, the attempt to integrate video in sculptural and performative settings gained its true significance. In this regard, the situation in the Netherlands was rather different from that in the United Kingdom. Elsa Stansfield had contact with the organisation London Video Arts, whose co-founder David Hall contributed to *Video Maart* with a short essay in the catalogue.[xxviii] According to Madelon Hooykaas, in the United Kingdom “video art” was not that clearly distinguished from a more general video practice, but was, together with film, part of the broader category of “moving images”.

The contacts with London Video Arts were not the only international contacts Stansfield established when she worked at the Jan van Eyck Academie. Hooykaas/Stansfield were travelling extensively in the early period, in particular to video festivals that happened everywhere in the 1980s. In this way, they got in touch with prospective students, but also with other people who were interested in what happened in Maastricht. Later, there were also exchange programmes with Canada and Germany. Furthermore, in 1982, Stansfield was involved in the *International Media Meeting* as a member of the advisory board, co-organised by Agora Studio and the University of Maastricht, which was accompanied by two small publications, one published during and the other after the event. The meeting included many artists that were or had studied at the Jan van Eyck Academie, among whom Raul Marroquin. It was the moment in time when, shortly after or parallel with the attempt to define “video art” and to separate it from “film”, people started to talk about “media art” in a more general, less medium-specific sense. Thus, what Madelon Hooykaas described in terms of video art defining itself – by moving into space, becoming three-dimensional and multi-layered – finally seemed to have led to a new category. In that respect, it is hardly surprising that the “Video Studio”, as it was still called during the *Video Maart* manifestation, was soon after renamed “Time Based Arts Studio”, possibly also in relation with the activities of the Time Based Arts organisation, in which Hooykaas/Stansfield were quite active as well. In a way, these shifts of terminology towards a more general conception of “media art” seemed to have prefigured the rise of the digital, which started to determine the perception of technology-based art from the late 1980s onwards. Strikingly, also in Maastricht there seemed to have been some consideration for this new phenomenon. As early as 1985, Agora Studio organised, once again in collaboration with the University of Maastricht, the event *Digital Media & the Arts*, featuring early computer art, which seems rather symptomatic, as the “digital” once again declared the end of video as a specific genre – something it possibly never was, because from its very beginning, it needed to be supplemented by other practices (sculpture, environments, conceptualism, performance) to define its own boundaries.

In a rather paradoxical fashion, the 1980s were also a period when video art was accepted as a *museal* art form that deserved the attention of the Dutch museums. Alongside tendencies to start collecting video work, there were several large exhibition projects, among which *The Luminous Image*, hosted by the Stedelijk Museum Amsterdam in 1984, which already had the so-called “video stairs” (*videotrap*), a small theatre that continuously showed video work since 1980. The exhibition included national as well as international artists like Nam June Paik, Tony Oursler and Bill Viola. During the exhibition there was also a symposium related to the exhibition at the Jan van Eyck Academie. In the context of what has been mentioned before it seems rather interesting that the then director of the museum, Edy de Wilde, noted in his introduction to the paper catalogue (there was also a “catalogue” on VHS)[xxix] that *The Luminous Image* constituted a unique situation, as seventeen of the installations were commissioned to be specifically made for the exhibition. As the production costs for artworks were not part of the general budget of the museum, the Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds was funding five of the installations. In some other countries, the commissioning of works by the museum was a more common phenomenon. For *The Luminous Image*, Centre Pompidou was lending one of his own productions to the Stedelijk Museum, before it was even shown in Paris. Other foundations covered the rest of the expenses.[xxx] In

http://www.janvaneck.nl/0_4_6_text_files/Video_Jennifer_Steetskamp.html[20-4-2010 17:23:04]
But, to return to Maastricht, one could say the history of the Jan van Eyck video workplace eventually ends with the exhibition Het magnetische beeld, which was organised by Elsa Stansfield in 1988 and was presented at Stadsgalerij Heerlen.[xxxi] The project was an attempt to give an overview of the video workplace productions of the previous years. Like Video Maart it featured many crossovers between monitor installations and performances, although the more recent video work was technologically much more sophisticated than at the beginning, being in colour and employing editing techniques. It was the time just before the popularisation of the video projector and a couple of years before a general digitisation set in, which made an end to the medium-specific approach to “video art” (which, as has been shown, was problematic from the very start). In the early 1990s, the Jan van Eyck changed its organisational structure and Elsa Stansfield left the academy. The video studio was dismantled in 1992. Over time the complicated structure and the extensive facilities of the studio appeared less workable than one had hoped. There still was a production place, but it did no longer look like a television studio; no levels and compartments were dividing the space. Since the 1990s, video work has been produced under rather different circumstances. For a technical tutor like Berto Aussems, the advisory role shifted from hardware to the application of software, which was prefigured by developments in the 1980s: in 1985 Aussems took his own Commodore64 to the Jan van Eyck and in 1988, the Jan van Eyck bought an Amiga 1000 with sound and title software. This development culminated in the acquisition of the first Avid Media Suite software package in 1992. Today, video work is mainly produced on the students’ own laptops.

**Based on a lecture held during the Jan van Eyck Video Weekend.**

Jennifer Steetskamp is a researcher who read Modern Art History, Philosophy and Cultural Studies in Amsterdam and London. Her education included a training in curating offered by the Sandberg Institute and the University of Amsterdam. Since September 2007 she is a PhD candidate in Media Studies at the Media & Culture department of the University of Amsterdam and the Amsterdam School of Cultural Analysis (ASCA). Between 2005 and 2007 she worked as a collection and mediatheque manager at the Netherlands Media Art Institute, Montevideo / Time Based Arts.

Related texts on the history of the video workshop at the Jan van Eyck Academie

- Interview with JCJ Vanderheyden
- Interview with Servie Janssen
- Interview with Madelon Hooykaas
- Interview with Berto Aussems
- Programme Jan van Eyck Video Weekend
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[iii] One of the aims *Thirty Years Dutch Video Art* at the Netherlands Media Art Institute, for instance, was the re-installation of works that were seminal for the development of video and installation art in the Netherlands, but had in some cases not been on display since a long time.

[iv] Video technology as it was used in a television context, for instance, is much older, but did not become available to a broader audience in terms of recording and storage devices until the 1960s. This is also consistent with Bill Viola’s observation that video might have been the only art form to have a history before it actually had a history. Quoted in: Sturken, Marita. “Paradox in the Evolution of an Art Form: Great Expectations and the Making of a History.” In: Hall, Doug and Fifer, Sally Jo, eds. *Illuminating Video: An Essential guide to Video Art*. New York: Aperture, 1990: 102.

[v] *Breathing Upon the Tube* (Het beademten van de beeldbuis) was actually part of a series of three programmes that were modelled after Schum’s Land Art (1969) and *Identifications* (1970) projects. The series was called Beeldende kunstenaars maken televisie (Visual Artists Make Television). Boezem’s work was broadcast on 21 February, 1971.

[vii] The collection of the Lijnbaancentrum is now part of the collection of the Netherlands Media Art Institute.

[viii] Alongside, video was used to document performances. The Netherlands Media Art Institute is also in charge of the collection of De Appel.

[ix] See the interview.

[x] It actually does not seem that strange given the proximity to Belgium and Germany – just as a side-remark.

[xi] See the interview.

[xii] See *Fandangos* nos. 8-11 (Superissue, Spring 1978).

[xiii] A copy of the taped interview is available at the Netherlands Media Art Institute.


[xv] Collection of the Netherlands Media Art Institute.

[xvi] See the folder published by Agora Studio that came with the exhibition.


[xviii] Idem.

[xix] Collection of the Netherlands Media Art Institute.
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[xx] Collection of the Netherlands Media Art Institute.
[xxi] For example, video documentation of the performance done by Gerrit Dekker during the event is preserved at the Netherlands Media Art Institute as well.
[xxiii] Collection of the Netherlands Media Art Institute.
[xxv] See the internship report by Dionne Pin (2006).
[xxvi] Collection of the Jan van Eyck Academy and the Netherlands Media Art Institute.
[xxvii] This is also what is left of the performance.
[xxix] Copies of this tape are accessible at the Netherlands Media Art Institute.