

Anastasia Howe Bukowski

“I’m in Los Angeles, right?”: Charting a *Hole in Space*

Abstract

In November 1980, Mobile Image artists Kit Galloway and Sherrie Rabinowitz premiered *Hole in Space*, a “public communication sculpture” that ran for three days. Linking New York’s Lincoln Center and Los Angeles’s Century City Mall by satellite video feed, the work cohered both sites and the pedestrians who unsuspectingly happened upon them within a temporary spatio-temporal relationship of proximate simultaneity, since nicknamed the “mother of all video chats.” Galloway and Rabinowitz have since characterized their work and interest in satellite technology as an operative foil to contemporary video art practices disinterested in more expansive engagements with telecommunications infrastructures. However, this understanding creates for us a false dichotomy between two necessarily coterminous media universes. More sustained contextualization of *Hole in Space* complicates these assumptions, revealing a broader site of relation linking satellite technology, video art, and commercial television active at this historical juncture. Moreover, Galloway and Rabinowitz’s work offers us an opportunity to consider what Lisa Parks has termed the “televsual,” an epistemological structure emerging from satellite technology that permeates understandings of location, proximity, liveness, and distance across multiple media formats and historical considerations of “the global.” Less a technical configuration than a celestial frame of knowing, the televsual as embodied in *Hole in Space* delightfully renders some of the tensions held by the field of satellite imaging emergent at the time, balancing spatial elements of proximity and distance alongside intersubjective experiences of alienation and intimacy. Charting an alternative televsual geography marked by technological and interpersonal simultaneity, the work extends into lived space while rendering it not-of-this-world, such as when one spectator is recorded asking, incredulously: “They’re in New York? I’m in Los Angeles, right?” Overall, this paper establishes *Hole in Space* as a site through which to consider an alternative televsual history, placing into encounter traditional histories of networked infrastructure with the expanded models of spatial tension experienced through constellated media.

Introduction

Reflecting in 1987 on *Satellite Arts* (1977), a multi-spatial performance project linking via live satellite video feed amateur dance troupes in California and Maryland, Mobile Image member Sherrie Rabinowitz constructs a provocative binary between aesthetic and telecommunications practices. “When we first did *Satellite Arts*,” she states, “nobody was interested in satellites, everybody was interested in, I don’t know, video art. [...] We always approached the *image as a place*. To our way of thinking, the essence, the magic, is this ability to carry a living event and then interconnect with satellites to connect places over vast distances.”¹ Such a want to conceive of their work operating within an inquisitive frame eclipsing

the socio-technic and representational limitations of the art world is equally shared by Rabinowitz’s collaborator Kit Galloway. Commenting in 2005 on the timely legacy and motivations of Moving Image’s interest in satellite technology, he states:

A new aesthetic transcendent of the art world schema and intrinsic to the implications of a potential global revolution in telecommunications was sorely missing. Not only was a fresh start needed, but, like all attempts to reinvent the role of the artist, a new practice and a new trajectory was needed that was both larger and more inclusive than the collective expressions

"I'M IN LOS ANGELES, RIGHT?"

framed by that which was celebrated and perceived as relevant within the context and stewardship of the established art world and its practices.²

As I will discuss here, Galloway and Rabinowitz's shared assertions of the uniqueness of their practice and their reliance upon a stable dichotomy between video art and communications demand a more nuanced contextualization alongside the work of contemporaries similarly interested in satellite technology. However, if we take seriously a gesture towards the "new trajectory" described by both, their claims nevertheless open up onto rich territory for probing the ontological possibilities brought forth by the perceived communicative and spatial orientations of satellite at the time. Mobile Image were then working at a moment defined by rapid advancement in the field of telecommunications and an emergence of discourses around the 'global.' Especially emblematic of these mutual expansions, and traceable alongside the commercialization of satellite broadcasting, is their 1980 project *Hole in Space*. A "public communication sculpture" which linked Los Angeles's Century City Mall and New York's Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts via live satellite video feed over three evenings, *Hole in Space* speaks directly to Rabinowitz's experimental interest in "[carrying] a living event" and Galloway's description of an aesthetic committed to a "global revolution" beyond the communicative purview of video art. Corporeally animated by a cohort of unsuspecting viewers who amusedly shouted, laughed, and quizzically communicated across a bi-coastal, on-screen transmission, the work is complex in its aesthetic and communicative registers, denoting something of the perceived *spatiality* of broadcasting systems able to connect dispersed individuals and events over distances. Addressing with specificity Moving Image's metaphor of the "image as place" and its active role in the larger artistic draw towards broadcasting networks, the communicative framework of *Hole in Space* delightfully renders some of the tensions held by the field of satellite imaging emergent at the time, balancing spatial elements of proximity and distance alongside intersubjective experiences of alienation and intimacy.

This revisiting of the communicative and aesthetic affinities that contextually activate the

"image as place" within *Hole in Space* extends beyond the interaction between video art and satellite. Equally primary to the spatial schema of the work's ambivalent eventfulness being imaged 'live' on screen over distance is a particular form of vision – or, we might say, ontology of communication – inherited specifically from another emergent commercial medium: that of broadcast television. Following the work of Lisa Parks, I argue here that *Hole in Space* is formally and interactively foregrounded by the contextual frame of television, portraying for us an articulation of what she has termed the aesthetic and discursive modality of "televisuality."³ Making sense of the televisual as an "imaginary in itself permeating and reconfiguring times, spaces, objects, and bodies in different ways at different historical moments," Moving Image's work bespeaks in both its technical configuration and aesthetic content the historical triangulation of satellite technology, video art, and the technical innovations precipitating the contemporary rise of commercial broadcasting.⁴ In performing its own spatiality or "image as place," *Hole in Space* reveals an altogether different approach to understandings of the "televisual" as a productive infrastructural site of ongoing communicative tension between distance and proximity.

Three Nights: Charting a Hole in Space

Following the end of the Apollo program in the late 1970s, NASA found itself embroiled in a financial struggle with Congress and was facing the prospect that it would no longer be publicly funded as a research development wing of the emerging commercial satellite industry. To assuage concerns over the administration's developmental future, NASA responded from the outside-in, announcing in 1977 a call for proposals from independent and nonprofit groups wishing to embark on projects experimenting with the American-Canadian CTS satellite.⁵ Included among these first funded collaborations was Rabinowitz and Galloway's project *Satellite Arts (Image as Place)*, a work which united performers from the Mobilus Dance Troupe at NASA's Ames Research Center in Mountain View, CA and the Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, MD over live, bidirectional satellite broadcast. As others have argued, *Satellite Arts* animated the necessary *fiction* of the "liveness" of

the satellite transmission, incorporating moments of inconsistency in which dancers strove to mirror the other's movements, questionably in time.⁶ Each group occupying one vertical half of the screen, their choreography is full of stops, hesitations, and delays as they necessarily respond to the temporal lag in the broadcast, performing a partnered dance that never arrives at a full fluidity of motion. Watching the video, we are at pains to notice the temporal and spatial contours that distance the two groups even as they are united in transmission, anxiously drawn to the infrastructural limits emblemized in the splitting of the frame in half. Such an experience of watching reflects Jane Feuer's contemporary argument that the "liveness" of television is mere mythology; an ontological rather than a literal sensory construct, liveness is "exploited in order to overcome the contradiction between flow and fragmentation in television practice."⁷ Exploring the bounded, experimental field of two-way satellite transmission, these spatio-temporal fragmentations are expanded even further by Galloway and Rabinowitz, moving beyond the unidirectional flow of standard broadcasting discussed by Feuer.

These concerns for and experiences of televisual time and place are central to the framing of Moving Image's second satellite artwork, 1980's *Hole in Space*. Building upon pre-existing institutional and infrastructural attachments, for this project the pair turned to NASA and their CTS satellite once again with an even bolder proposition: to link the US's two largest cities by live video feed. Indeed, if we can understand the interactive register of *Satellite Arts* as being necessarily circumscribed by the closed circuit of its interfacing choreography, *Hole In Space* tears instead into the open, trading in an unsuspecting and unpredictable publicness. With support from a roster of telecom giants including Western Union, General Electric, Scharff Communications, and Rayburn Electronics, as well as the Long Beach Museum of Art and a grant from the National Endowment of the Arts, the project was mounted over the nights of November 11th, 13th, and 14th. Appearing without publicity or warning, Galloway and Rabinowitz installed screens in storefronts at Lincoln Center in New York and the Broadway City Department Store at LA's Century City Mall, broadcasting a live feed from the partner locale for between two and three uninterrupted hours each evening.

Here the unsuspecting passerby was faced with a literalized rendering of the work's title, discovering behind the glass of a window display a screen transmitting in seemingly *real time* the space and scene of its bicoastal pair. Broadcast on screens more-than life sized in scale, assembled witnesses were made into black and white television content through the use of military night-view cameras, ambient and infrared boosted lighting, and somewhat distorted audio recording. Captured in a configuration that has since been coined the "mother of all video chats," pedestrians lingered in time and curiously peered into the unmarked and unannounced space of the screen, unseeing of their own projection like they might in a typically-surveillant department store television display.⁸ Watching the documentary footage taken the first evening of *Hole in Space's* run, there is something both amusing and engrossing in witnessing crowds make sense not only of their own positions, but those on the other side of the television display, arriving at a mutually constitutive experience of both incredulity and wonder. Groups tightly crowd into the perceived space of the framing shot by mimicking the positions of those in another place, captured from the waist up at a low angle. Doing so, they crane their necks to see the screen and to make sure they are *seen* by those on the other side, resulting into a cacophonous ensemble of bodies and voices talking and moving over another. Individuals of all ages appear here, and when any one of them speaks they are beckoned by the other side to clearly enter into view in the middle of the frame, as participants gleefully struggle to link sound and vision to emitting bodies moving through coterminous space. Immediately, concerns for location arise. Crowds appear less concerned with *who* they are communicating with on the other side than *where* this other side happens to be, funneling in closer and closer to specificity of their location; "where are you?" they ask; "New York" – "where in New York?"; "Lincoln Center" – "is that close to SoHo?" Lincoln Center, it is revealed, represents a more cartographically identifiable landmark than Century City.

Over the evening, individuals profess a consistent querying of both where they are and where they *are not*. When confronting the supposed virtuality of the networked image suspended behind glass, a hyper-fixation with place as it

"I'M IN LOS ANGELES, RIGHT?"

manifests itself in a familiar and geographically indexed manner persists. However, there is equally a sense here that geographic boundaries are being phenomenologically suspended through an unexpected encounter of technological simultaneity or an illusion of televisual liveness. For example, upon encountering Galloway and Rabinowitz's b-roll documentary lens, which captured spectator responses along the periphery of the assembled crowd, one woman memorably posits the question: "They're In New York? I'm in Los Angeles, right?" before laughing to herself in seeming disbelief. To her point, we might come to see *Hole in Space* as a work beset by an experience of locational tension, embodying a form of what Norie Neumark has termed "distance art."⁹ Distance artworks, Neumark explains, "contribute to a rethinking of distance itself, reminding us of its multiplicity and potentialities. The 'same' distance that excites the imagination might also disturb the emotions."¹⁰ In the case of *Hole in Space*, the simultaneous encounter with the satellite image contains the possibility to both specify and undermine an understanding of distance, fixing the locationality of spectators' bicoastal partners while potentially disorienting the here and now on their own side of the screen.

III. Artists' Television: A Brief

Despite the seeming novelty of these pedestrian encounters televisually mediated over distance, Galloway and Rabinowitz's work finds itself within a larger framework of artistic interests in satellite transmission that were increasingly reaching a general public alongside commercial expansions in satellite television. Even in 1977, without the confirming hindsight of a decade gone by, we might have had reasonable grounds to reject Rabinowitz's historical claim that "nobody was interested in satellites" at the time of her and Galloway's earlier project *Satellite Arts*. Liza Bear and Keith Sonnier, for example, premiered their collaborative video program *Send/Receive* in 1977, in which dancer Nancy Lewis, performing at New York's Battery Park City Landfill, interacted with dancer Margaret Fisher in San Francisco via a video feed routed through NASA's CTS satellite. The same year equally witnessed artistic experiments with satellite technology at Documenta 6, including a global telecast organized

by Nam June Paik, Joseph Beuys, and Douglas Davis that conjoined performance sites in Kassel and Caracas and was broadcast internationally to 25 countries.¹¹ These broad interests in satellite technology as a tool for art-making is captured well in Nam June Paik's 1984 essay "Satellite and Art."¹² Here Paik conceives of "satellite art" as a significant medium in its own right and notes its nonmaterial potential as a tool for progressive encounter and relation. Querying the adaptive capacity of products of post-industrial society to produce new communicative syntaxes, he writes:

Satellite art in the superior sense does not merely transmit existing symphonies and operas to other lands. It must consider how to achieve a two-way connection between opposite sides of the earth; how to give conversational structure to the art; how to master differences in time; how to play with improvisation, indeterminism, echos, feedback, and empty spaces in the Cagean sense; and how to instantaneously manage the differences in culture, preconceptions, and common sense that exist between various nation. Satellite art must make the most of these elements (for they can become strengths or weaknesses), creating a multitemporal, multispatial symphony.¹³

Tracing experimental concerns for relationality, liveness, improvisation, two-way communication, and multispatiality over distance, Paik's writing on the satellite as techno-relational node evokes the familiar vernacular of new media art, harkening too to the contemporary emergence of digitality and cyberculture. Thinking through these historical examples, however, we must equally take seriously Rabinowitz's earlier comparison of competing engagements with either satellite technology or video art. Addressing the artistic and technological shifts of this period necessitates an understanding of the productive tensions between the networked, infrastructural capacities of satellite broadcasting and the questionably subversive aesthetic ethos of video art from the 70s and early 80s. Considering *Hole in Space* as part of a larger conceptual field interested in the satellite instantiates Mobile Image within a tradition of aesthetic practitioners

– artists and media activists alike – invested in, inspired by, and working alongside and against the developing possibilities of the platformed fulcrum of all of these practices: broadcast television.¹⁴

The 1970s formed the primary decade of what Hall & Fifer and others have referred to as the “video revolution,” marked in part by an insistent desire of many media artists to experimentally address and play within the growing field of mainstream consumer television.¹⁵ A significant moment of commercialization and infrastructural multiplication, US TV expanded at this moment beyond the three major networks and the public broadcaster. These shifts were prompted first in the Federal Communication Commission (FCC)’s 1972 Cable Television Report and Order, which put in motion cable networking, and then accelerated in 1979 by the case FCC vs. Midwest Video Corp, whose ruling served to further deregulated the ever-expanding commercial purview of cable broadcasters.¹⁶ These legislative shifts took root within a broader telecommunications landscape that had over the past number of decades shifted the ways in which publics understood global spatial relations. Following the advent of photography, journalistic wire services, advancements in television and radio, and early satellite broadcasts, far-flung places and events became increasingly protracted in their scale.¹⁷ Still hungover from the media apparatus of the Vietnam War in which the “event” of photography and broadcasting produced an “expanded field of entangled relations between human and non-human actors,” late 1970s America was gripped in an unwieldy experience of globalization mediated on an increasingly domestic scale.¹⁸ Already well-established in the 1960s with the likes of Sputnik and Telstar, the imaginary of the satellite and its immediate portrayal of distant global space had then-entered the home. Following the BBC’s landmark 1967 program *Our World*, the first-ever live international satellite TV production, by 1978 both HBO and PBS were distributing their programming by satellite.¹⁹ In 1979, in step with the FCC ruling, the notoriously absurd Neiman Marcus Christmas Book boasted a home satellite dish for sale for the modest sum of \$36,500.²⁰

When Mobile Image produced *Satellite Arts*, then, video art could not be disentangled from artistic concerns for telecommunications and

broadcasting. A larger outgrowth of interest in video as a communications medium during the 1970s was facilitated by the availability of the portable Sony Porta Pak camera at the conclusion of the previous decade, rendering the previous material limitations of the film mobile. More encompassing histories of artists’ radical experiments in non-commercial permutations of television offer accounts of the genre and its extensive iterations outside of a gallery setting.²¹ Early desires in establishing alternatives to the mainstream network system, such as Michael Shamberg and the Raindance Corporation’s project of “Guerrilla television” (Raindance Corporation, 1972) or collective Videofreex short-lived management of pirate station “Lanesville TV” in upstate New York using a transmitter donated by Abbie Hoffman, foreground a careful balance of aesthetic utopianism and political certitude intrinsic to artists’ TV.²² On a more institutional basis, the late 60s and early 70s witnessed the emergence of independent production and development centers, including the National Center for Experiments in Television (NCET) in San Francisco, WGBH Boston’s New Television Workshop, and the Television Laboratory at WNET/Thirteen New York.²³ Many of these centers were insufficiently funded and thus short-lived. However, they offered early models for collaboration between artistic spheres and the telecommunications establishment, supporting video work and inclining public broadcasting towards more radical or experimental community programming. Taken together, these activities portray the registers of engagement with televisual production at levels both countercultural and institutional in which Mobile Image are situated. Conceived of during a watershed moment of unbounded energy and experimentation, *Hole in Space* must be read as the product of a period humming with vested concerns for aesthetic heterogeneity, communicative possibilities, relations across global distance, and experimentations outside of the uniformity of the commercial broadcasting mainstream.

Watching, Television

Framing Moving Image’s *Hole in Space* as a responsive emblem of this particular aesthetic and technological juncture, we must equally

"I'M IN LOS ANGELES, RIGHT?"

look up at the orbital lights in the night sky. The sensed locational tension in the experience of encountering the satellite image for viewers of *Hole in Space* cannot be simply chalked up to the relative newness of such a technological encounter. In fact, as I have argued on historical grounds, spectators were uniquely primed to animate work which was formally and communicatively foregrounded by the contextual frame of television, portraying for us an articulation of what Lisa Parks has termed the aesthetic and discursive modality of "televisuality."²⁴ In her 2005 text *Cultures in Orbit*, media scholar Parks approaches the satellite as a discursive site rather than a mere form of technological hardware. In these terms, she argues for a historical understanding of the satellite image as a convergent and expansive model of television, examining how satellite technology has been taken up by various social formations and institutions in the development of broadcasting practices that have precipitated struggles over representations of space.²⁵ Key in these negotiations over the satellite's unique capacity to depict global spatial distance is an experiential tension between distance and proximity. Orbiting the world from above, the satellite initiates a critical practice of terrestrial positioning caught between an image-oriented precision on the one hand and network practices that are so deterritorialized and diffuse that they seem out of reach on the other. While these stem in part from the increasingly common circulation of satellite images on television and the use of the satellite as a televisual broadcasting mechanism in and of itself, Parks notes that this form of seeing goes beyond television itself, forming a more fluid epistemological frame for seeing and understanding the world in excess of any medium specificity. At the intersection of these tensions is Parks's notion of the "televisual":

the different structures of the imaginary and/or epistemological structures that have radiated from and take shape around the medium over its history. The televisual is a particular set of knowledge practices or ways of seeing and knowing the world that are not necessarily bound to television industries. The televisual, in other words, can be activated within and across different discursive fields

[...] considered as particular set of critical discourses that define and attribute properties of the medium.²⁶

Returning to *Hole in Space*, I want to argue that engagements with the work stem from a familiarity with discourses and experiences of proximity and distance that animate the televisual. While the first evening largely witnessed spectators communicating with great concern for their respective geographic positionings, by the second evening spectators began addressing the project like a televised variety show. Making themselves into dispersed subjects of television connecting across vast distance, they plumbed their configuration's interactive capacity for entertainment by playing charades, singing songs, asking about surprise guests, and telling jokes. Word of the event having spread by that point via word of mouth and some especially bemused local news coverage, one group in Los Angeles arrived on its second evening with a large image of Ronald Reagan, to which a New Yorker crassly responded by turning around and sticking his behind in the air, exclaiming that president is the "biggest charade [he's] seen all year." In this form, Moving Image's artwork is activated through deference to television as both communicative format and embodied content, with spectators approaching the work much like they would a screen display in a department store window.²⁷ More to the point, the specificity of these registers of interactive hilarity rely primarily on an understanding of spatial tension. Briefly united in the distance overcome by satellite connection, pedestrians are able to commonly partake in humorous disdain for the president, for example, while equally relying on an experience of distance in order for these jokes and games to expressively land, enhanced in the risk of connection with interlocutors heretofore unseen and unknown.

Experiences of global time also form a significant dimension of Galloway and Rabinowitz's probing of space, and the popular imaginary of the satellite as a technology of temporal liveness or simultaneity is critical to spectators' engagements with the work. In b-roll footage from *Hole in Space's* third night at Lincoln Center, a middle-aged man conservatively dressed in a suit and trench coat asks an interviewer: "is this being bounced off Telstar?" When the interviewer

responds affirmatively out of frame, the man and his partner go on to deliberate over the potential uses of the communications network animated by *Hole in Space*. Postulating on its future functions within the corporate board rooms of America, he observes: “a company’s branch is here and a company’s branch is in California, they’re having a meeting here and a meeting there and they discuss it simultaneously.” Drawing on the possibilities of the satellite to potentially enhance and extend the time-based functions of other telecommunications devices such as the telephone, these comments serve to confirm its understood place within the complexly networked infrastructural landscape of the US. Parks similarly emphasizes the *temporal* capacities and affordances of these cross-medial connections are that are local to the broad frame of the “televsual.” As she puts it, the perceived liveness or simultaneity of the satellite image often involves a “negotiation of preexisting temporal structures,” ones that have remained essential to the viewing of television since the airing of *Our World*.²⁸ When inserted into the context of Raymond Williams’s notion of television “flow,” the satellite image creates its own version of what Parks terms “intermediate” time.²⁹ Parks expands on this notion of the temporal intermediacy of the televsual, stating it is “rearticulated as a ubiquitous apparatus that can [...] accommodate multiple media formats [and] traverse unfathomable distances” – not unlike the “image as place” articulated by Galloway and Rabinowitz.³⁰ Much like the telephone before it, the temporal structure of *Hole in Space* as a televsual image incorporates moments of auditory lag, poor or inconsistent reception, visual streakiness and light flares, and garbled and echoing sonic feedback, rendering a kind of liveness that is not always all there in its purported simultaneity.

For Parks, then, the televsual represents both an epistemological structure and techno-social support that carry with them necessary tensions instantiated in experiences of shared global time and space. As she argues, the televsual is marked by “an experience of simultaneous connection and separation,” calling to mind a persistent interchange of mutating senses of distance and proximity.³¹ Witnessing these positional forces at play in *Hole in Space* as a “public communication sculpture,” it is possible to bring Rabinowitz and Galloway’s desires to develop “[a] new aesthetic transcendent

of the art world” down to earth, so to speak.³² Perhaps less “transcendent” as a circumscribed place of inter-coastal communion than Galloway makes it out to be, Moving Image’s work does not form so much a unique and stable locationality than document the constant negotiations that animate historical perceptions and experiences of global spatial distance made through telecommunications infrastructures. Even by *Hole in Space*’s third and final evening, spectators who possess the language of liveness and simultaneity learned from the imaginary of satellite television only ever engage the image behind the glass in part. When a New York woman encounters her brother on screen, seeing him for the first time in 15 years, she notes: “that was enough for me – now I can go to bed and be happy for the rest of my life.” Even here, the vision and understanding of simultaneous spatio-temporal connection is satisfying but ultimately fleeting and unforeseen in its virtual mobility; siblings will still remain coastal in their configurations. Spectators are made aware of their alienable distance even in their spectral proximity, unable to grant the screen a full telematic placefulness in their insistence on the boundedness of their own pre-formed geographies and pre-existing platforms for communication. Where they stand still matters.

Conclusion

Returning once more to Galloway’s call for us to assess what an aesthetically-driven “global revolution in telecommunications” might resemble, we are left in *Hole in Space* with a more incipient rendering of the image as space, evincing the ways in which spectators are still grappling with the connective affordances and limitations of the satellite as celestial node. In line with Parks’s understanding of the televsual as a primarily epistemological system, what remains here are the traces of a distinct historical moment in which the aesthetics and practices of satellite imaging, artists’ television and video, and an expanded field of broadcasting were yet entering into the place-based consciousness of the American public. Comprehending the image as both time *and* place, what emerges is a sense of the televsual as a distributed infrastructural field accounting for tensions between locality and globality, proximity and distance, temporal lag and simultaneity, and an uneven traversing of multiple media formats. Loosely cohering a time

"I'M IN LOS ANGELES, RIGHT?"

and place animated by deterritorialization, humor, and an ongoing yearning for connection, Galloway and Rabinowitz's work takes form as a series on continuous adjustments to the televisual as a discourse of global positioning. As Parks intones, "the more abstract and distant the satellite image, the more tactile and sensuous the forms of engagement

it may necessitate."³³ In the case of *Hole in Space*, even as the transportability of the satellite image takes form at a human scale it remains ambivalent in its orientations, opening up a sense of the televisual beset by inchoate possibilities of connection, separation, bodily inscription, and sheer fun. If the image is a place, then it is one linked to many.

Anastasia Howe Bukowski is a writer, arts educator, and doctoral student at the University of Southern California's Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism. Their research attends to the relationships between histories of public access television, artists' uses of broadcast technologies, community video practices, HIV/AIDS and media activism, and queer histories of music and the moving image, all with an emphasis upon the regional context of Los Angeles. Their work has been published in *Celebrity Studies* (forthcoming) and popular outlets including *The FADER*, *Canadian Art*, and *GARAGE*.

Notes

- 1 Steven Durland, "Defining the Image as Place, a Conversation with Kit Galloway, Sherrie Rabinowitz & Gene Youngblood," *High Performance* 37 (1987): 54.
- 2 Quoted in Annmarie Chandler, "Animating the Social: Mobile Image/Kit Galloway and Sherrie Rabinowitz," in *At a Distance Precursors to Art and Activism on the Internet*, ed. Norie Neumark and Annmarie Chandler (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2005), 156.
- 3 Lisa Parks, *Cultures in Orbit: Satellites and the Televisual* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).
- 4 *Ibid.*, 170.
- 5 Kris Paulsen, "Image as Place': The Phenomenal Screen in Kit Galloway & Sherrie Rabinowitz's Satellite Arts 1977," *Leonardo Electronic Almanac* 19, no. 2 (April 2013): 107.
- 6 For a more extensive discussion of the visualization and spatialization of liveness within the formal structure of Satellite Arts, please see: Paulsen, "Image as Place."
- 7 Jane Feuer, "The Concept of Live Television: Ontology as Ideology," in *Regarding Television: Critical Approaches—An Anthology*, ed. E. Ann Kaplan (Los Angeles: The American Film Institute, 1983), 16.
- 8 There is of course something to say here about the forms of vision and technologies of surveillance actualized by the military industrial complex and the alignments of NASA and DARPA that animate this work, considerations which I hope to probe further in future work.
- 9 Norie Neumark, "Introduction: Relays, Delays, and Distance Activism," in *At a Distance: Precursors to Art and Activism on the Internet*, eds. Norie Neumark and Annmarie Chandler (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2005).
- 10 *Ibid.*, 17.
- 11 Kris Paulsen, *Here/There: Telepresence, Touch, and Art at the Interface*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2017).
- 12 Nam June Paik, "Art and Satellite," in *Multimedia: From Wagner to Virtual Reality*, eds. by Randall Packer and Ken Jordan (W. W. Norton & Company, 2002).
- 13 *Ibid.*, 42.
- 14 David Joselit, *Feedback: Television against Democracy*, (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2007).
- 15 Doug Hall and Sally Jo Fifer, eds, *Illuminating Video : An Essential Guide to Video Art*, (New York, N.Y: Aperture in association with the Bay Area Video Coalition, 1990).
- 16 Federal Communications Commission, Cable television report & order, 36 FCC 2d 143, 176 (Washington, DC: United States Government, 1972).; Federal Communications Commission, U.S. Reports: FCC v. Midwest Video Corp., 440 U.S. 689 (1979) (Washington, DC: United States Government,
- 17 Roland Wenzlhuemer, "Globalization, Communication and the Concept of Space in Global History," *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 35, no. 1 (131) (2010), 19–47.; Jonathan Dentler, "Images câblées. La téléphotographie à l'ère de la mondialisation de la presse illustrée," *Transbordeur: photographie, histoire, société*, no. 3 (2019), 14–25.
- 18 Susan Schuppli, "War Dialling: Image Transmissions from Saigon," in *Mythologizing the Vietnam War: Visual Culture and Mediated Memory*, eds. Val Williams, Brigitte Lardinois, Paul Lowe, Jennifer

Good (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015), 247.

19 Parks, *Cultures in Orbit*.

20 Peter W. Kaplan, "Sales Of TV Dish Antenna Raising Problems," *The New York Times*, July 8, 1985, sec. A.

21 For examples of this scholarship please see: Goddard, Michael. *Guerrilla Networks: An Anarchaeology of 1970s Radical Media Ecologies*. Amsterdam: University Press, 2018.; Boyle, Deirdre. *Subject to Change: Guerrilla Television Revisited*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.; Joselit, David. "Tale of the Tape: David Joselit on Radical Software." *Artforum International* 40, no. 9 (2002): 152.

22 Michael Shamberg, *Guerrilla Television* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971).; Fred Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

23 Glenn Phillips, ed., *California Video: Artists and Histories* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2008).

24 Parks, *Cultures in Orbit*.

25 *Ibid.*, 168.

26 Parks, *Cultures in Orbit*, 12.

27 We might wonder, of course, about the comparative framing and influence of the Century City display literally being hosted at a department store versus the New York showing being at a performing arts locale.

28 Parks, *Cultures in Orbit*, 38.

29 Raymond Williams, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (New York: Routledge, 2003).; Parks, *Cultures in Orbit*, 146.

30 *Ibid.*

31 *Ibid.*, 174

32 Chandler, *Animating the Social*, 156.

33 Parks, *Cultures in Orbit*, 175.