"THE CEAC WAS BANNED IN CANADA"

PROGRAM NOTES FOR A TRAGICOMIC OPERA IN THREE ACTS

Epilogue

> We wanted to be famous, glamorous and rich. That is to say, we wanted to be artists and we knew that if we were famous and glamorous we could say we were artists and we would be. We never felt we had to produce great art to be great artists. We knew great art did not bring glamour and fame. We knew we had to keep a foot in the door of art and we were conscious of the importance of berets and paintbrushes.
> —General Idea, "Glamour" 1975.

> What perpetuates the reactionary mystification of the role of the artist is the "world of scarcity" and the "incapacity to survive" in a capitalist society. The artist defends the privilege and the entrenchment he/she holds in a capitalist society. Also symptomatic, even and not less so among the vanguard, alternative and co-op artists groups, is the sense of hopelessness for social change, as these same groups mimic those repressive methods of economical capitalization adopted by the art world.
> —Amerigo Marras, "On Organization" 1978.

In 1975, General Idea, an art collective comprised of AA Bronson, Felix Partz, and Jorge Zontal, published a tongue-in-cheek manifesto proclaiming that "in order to be glamorous we had to become plagiarists, intellectual parasites. We moved in on history and occupied images, emptying them of meaning, reducing them to shells. We then filled these shells with glamour, the creampuff innocence of idiots, the naughty silence of shark fins slicing oily waters."[1] Taking up the challenge of New York's cultural dominance and divesting it of its social, economic, and political ramifications through a mocking semiotic mirror, General Idea was instrumental in shaping a context for Toronto's vanguard art scene in the 1970s. Under their aegis, parody and the simulation of media referents became the framework for a local discourse

that was slim in substance and big on self-promotion. Thus, ten years later, Philip Monk concluded that we suffered from "a lack of history, and so we repeat one from elsewhere, or from Western history, but without the grounding of history or context."[2] This configuration of appropriation and lack is in itself a context, one that identifies dominant ideology as the sole ideology and constructs a mythology of subversion.

At the same time as we have inherited the vanguard legacy and creampuff shells of General Idea as a materialist base for history, we are, as writers and artists, involved in an extensive cultural bureaucracy. Our intellectual and aesthetic autonomy comes from our collaboration with state-funded artist-run centres and magazines; the production and dissemination of alternative artistic practices are dependent upon art councils' support. Given the existence of this clearly materialist base for a local art practice, one that bears little relation to General Idea's capitalist, media-saturated paradigm, it seems improbable that we suffer from a lack of history. Perhaps, instead, we suffer from the lack of a history constructed outside the confines of an institutionalized and state-funded art system. Perhaps it is not history we lack, but an acknowledgment of and interest in the history of art practices and politics that stray too far from the cultural mandate of the status quo.

Prologue

It is December 1985…January…February 1986. In search of history, I travel to the north of the city to work in the archives of York University. The journey is numbing. The subway pulls out of its subterranean passage to reveal an endless landscape of high-rise apartments and urban townhouses; the bus winds through an abandoned army base and along avenues lined with strip malls. As I look through the windows of the crowded bus, the downtown arts neighbourhood of Queen Street seems both psychologically and topographically distant. From the bus stop, I walk through a maze of buildings and down a labyrinth staircase to the York archives. Entering the archives feels like approaching a military bunker, requesting entrance to a sterile tomb. The door is locked at all times; there is a hushed, brittle feel to the atmosphere. It is here, tossed unsorted into seventy-odd boxes, that I find the documentation of a Toronto artist-run organization that existed as the Kensington Arts Association (KAA) from 1973 to 1978, and which in 1976 opened a large multimedia space, the Centre for Experimental Art and Communication (CEAC).

Dedicated to "a continuous collective experiment in living and in sociological infiltrations with practical demonstrations,"[3] the KAA, located at 4 Kensington Avenue, grew into CEAC, an artist-run centre located at 15 Duncan Street in the Queen Street district that housed a library and archives, a video production studio, a performance space, a film theatre, and a punk-music venue. Between October 1975, when KAA sponsored the *Women in Society Festival*, and April/May 1978, when CEAC held a lecture series entitled *Five Polemics to the Notion of Anthropology*, the activities of this "collective experiment" were prolific. In a few brief years, KAA/CEAC published catalogues, nine issues of *Art Communication Edition* (*A.C.E.*), and three issues of *STRIKE* magazine; it organized exhibitions, conferences, international tours, workshops, performances, film and video screenings, and music events. During 1976 and 1977, there was literally an event held at CEAC every night of the week. Yet a decade and a generation later, it is only through talking to individual artists involved with CEAC that I learn of its existence, two years after moving to Toronto. And it is only through archival research that I am able to uncover, in a fragmented and hieroglyphic form, evidence of its activities and copies of its publications, all of which seem to have vanished without a trace from the Toronto art community's historical record.

After emerging from the archive bunker, engaged in a necrophiliac piecing-together of documentation, have I uncovered a history? Only remnants survive: photographs, lists, letters, files, posters, clippings, catalogues, and books. From these I have gleaned less a history than impressions: impressions of an artist-run centre whose philosophy, politics, and ideals seem very remote from the city's current infatuations. Or are they? In one of the boxes, I find a description of British artists Lorraine Lesson and Peter Dunn's *Docklands Project*, sent to CEAC in 1976. Ten years later a poster version of the project is featured in an A Space billboard exhibition. International artists who performed at CEAC are included in Art Metropole's books *Performance by Artists* and *Video by Artists*. Amerigo Marras's analysis, in *STRIKE* magazine, of the relationship of artists to state funding and his call for a guaranteed minimum income echo similar demands formulated by the recently organized Independent Artists Union. While Philip Monk argues that Toronto lacks a history, what the archives reveal are traces of a very specific and local history: one in which artists' political ideals and cultural practices were realized through and subverted by a state-funded cultural bureaucracy.

In researching CEAC, I was left with the impression that I had excavated but one layer of a 1970s local context for art as a political and

social practice. The early years of A Space, *Body Politic*, and *Centrefold* (which became *Fuse Magazine*) are also part of CEAC's story. While it is beyond the scope of this article to trace the interconnections between them, I invite the reader to bring his or her own knowledge of Toronto's art community to bear upon my history of CEAC. History as personal memory, as collective amnesia, as constructed ideology, as sexual politics, as fiction, as myth, as self-preservation, as rumour, as fact, as eternal return: take your pick. Each of you has a position from which to find in this text continuity, aberration, or lack. It is not my intention to present here an authoritative reconstruction or definitive history of CEAC. Rather, through a description of some of CEAC's activities and theoretical positions that can be reconstituted from written and visual documentation, I hope to encourage speculation about and reflection on the nature of art, ideology, and local context.

Program Notes for a Tragicomic Opera in Three Acts

Overture

In 1970, Suber Corley, Amerigo Marras, and Jearld Moldenhauer formed the Art and Communication group and founded *Body Politic*, which became the voice of the gay movement in Toronto. Out of these initiatives, described by Marras as "clearly negativist and neo-Marxist in ideology,"[4] grew a loose organization of individuals, based at 4 Kensington Avenue, who were interested in challenging capitalism's "specialization of roles and its homophobic sexism."[5] By 1973, *Body Politic*, Glad Day Bookstore, and Toronto Gay Action were operating from this address. In the same year, Marras and Corley became interested in formulating a relationship between art and social practice and incorporated as the Kensington Arts Association, while Moldenhauer continued to concentrate on gay liberation movement. With the opening of an exhibition space in September 1973, the Kensington Arts Association became identified with the writings and programs of Marras, who envisioned the gallery as an environmental structure that would facilitate and exhibit non-commercial and demystified approaches to art and language. The KAA quickly became implicated in the theoretical intrigues of the conceptual-art movement of the time, which sought to establish a currency of non-objects through philosophical manifestos and linguistic interventions. Its exhibition of non-material art practices and simultaneous objective of developing a theoretical

platform that would provide an overarching framework for these practices would become one of the defining parameters that shaped the history of CEAC's rise and fall within Canada's artist-run centre movement.

An Intervention from the Audience

You promised us a history of CEAC. We may not know much, but we have heard that they were gun-toting terrorists, lurking behind every art-ghetto corner to kneecap innocent, fresh-faced bureaucrats. We've also heard rumours. Didn't Amerigo abscond to New York with thousands of dollars worth of video equipment? We want to know the real history of CEAC. DIDN'T THEY SUPPORT THE RED BRIDGADES!

If this is the history that fascinates you, turn in your program notes to the Finale. It is all there in black-and-white, compiled from the archives. But before you turn the page, consider the legacy of General Idea's "shell" of history. In Toronto's collective memory and common currency, that is all that remains of CEAC's years of exhibitions, workshops, and publications. It makes for great rumours, provides a little notoriety, and effectively dismisses a local history. When CEAC went down in flames amid recrimination and government shuffling, the art community's silence supported a state-sanctioned version of the past by default. Yet the events that CEAC sponsored and the theoretical platforms it articulated were the impetus for the ideas behind the development of other artists' collectives and centres that followed. The events surrounding CEAC's demise, not nearly as sordid or interesting as rumour would have it, provided a smokescreen that reduced issues of art and politics to a media one-liner.

The Leading Roles and Supporting Cast

Karl Marx, with ensuing revisionist squabbles, plays a large behind-the-scenes role. Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, R. D. Laing, Ivan Illich, and Marshall McLuhan feature in the formulation of the plot. The theoretical work of the Italian *Autonomia* movement and the writings of Toni Negri contribute to the operatic finale. Guest stars include Yona Friedman, Joseph Kosuth, and Joseph Beuys. Guest spokespersons for art movements of the time include Hervé Fischer of France's Collectif d'Art Sociologique, Jan Swidzinski from the contextual-art movement

in Poland, and Reindeer Werk, a performance collective from England. Philip Glass and Steve Reich provide an intermittent musical score. Local talent is featured in most of the major scenarios. Amerigo Marras, an émigré from Italy, brings a background in experimental architecture and the ferment of post-war Italian politics to his role as the director of the opera. Suber Corley, an American draft dodger, brings extensive administrative expertise to his role as the manager. Beth Learn's interest in language art adds a dimension of semiotics and structuralism to the libretto. Lily Eng and Peter Dudar of Missing Associates offer a theory and radical practice of experimental dance. John Faichney, also an experimental dancer, becomes the librarian of the opera, building a large collection of contemporary-art documentation, including numerous artists' books. Ron Gillespie and the OCA students who formed SHITBANDIT promote an extremist performance style. Michaele Berman advocates the return of ritual, and then becomes a punk singer in The Poles. Bruce Eves, who subsequently became involved with *The New York Native*, infuses performance art with a gay aesthetic and sadomasochism. Miss General Idea hangs around centre-right stage for much of the action. Ross McLaren, a local filmmaker, programs a large selection of experimental cinema. Noel Harding involves video students at OCA in the chorus of the opera, while the punk venue Crash'N'Burn adds the excitement of a local musical scene. An improvised production, based on the ideas and collaboration of all of the players, the CEAC opera was sponsored by the Canada Council for the Arts, the Ontario Arts Council, and Wintario, and supported by the private donations of individuals.

Act One: The Formative Years

Scene One: Radical Design

In October 1973, with the opening of Yona Friedman's exhibition *Self-Design* at a newly renovated gallery space at 4 Kensington Avenue, the curtain rose to reveal a rehearsal for an opera in progress. Friedman, a French architect, had created a manual instructing children on the possibility of conceptualizing an architecture that would translate their needs directly into structure. Marras identified the manual as a political tool with interventionist possibilities, and situated its importance in the gallery setting as an example of environmental adaptation based on self-determination and the existence of multiple, self-directing communities. The stance adopted by Friedman, suggested Marras, "rejects the

utopistic nuclear (single) mini-society which some thinkers proposed in the 1960s. It also rejects the totalitarianism of much left-wing doctrinary approach to society."[6] Friedman's goal of altering the language of architecture and its specialized application, documented in the magazine *Supervision*, also encompassed the possibility of translating architectural language into user-friendly, computerized design, and an analysis of the relationship of architectural imperialism to conditions in the Third World.[7]

After Friedman's initial exhibition, presented by Marras as a synthesis of language, environment, and technology—a theme that will recur in CEAC's investigative platform—there is little information about the gallery's activities during 1974. A letter sent to supporters of the gallery by Corley and Marras in January 1975, however, gives some indication of the gallery's direction and the conflicts it had experienced during this year. Quoting from the KAA's first written statement of its philosophy and objectives, they remind participants that the gallery encourages "the showing of…propositions for non-marketable environments, demountable or temporary objects, illustrated ideas, programmes and manifestos."[8] Corley and Marras go on to state that these basic objectives have not been supported by the majority of participants. According to their letter, artists interested in producing static objects had usurped the gallery space after Friedman's exhibition, and were utilizing the KAA as a stepping stone to the commercial arena. In response, Corley and Marras announced the cancellation of all shows scheduled after May 1975, stating an intention to program events and shorter exhibitions on a more spontaneous basis. Thus *Works in Progress*, a series of installations exhibited from February to May 1975, belongs to this first, uncertain era of CEAC's development. The works in this series—Gary Greenwood's sound performance *Table Talk*, Don Mabie's *Second Annual Correspondence and Junk Mail Art Show*, and Angelo Sagbellone's *Monolithic Intervals*, an audience-participation environment piece—were part of a rehearsal for an opera whose stage set was not yet developed. When the curtain rose again to reveal the full production, CEAC would be an opera of manifestos, rhetorical stances, and orchestrated exhibitions that persisted in addressing the political and social dimensions of the art world.

Scene Two: Language and Structure in North America

With the stage set proving inadequate, there was a desire on the part of the cast to reinvent the principles of set design. Beth Learn's proposal for a comprehensive exhibition of language art suggested the means for

this reinvention. With the opening in the late fall of 1975 of *Language and Structure in North America*, a sprawling exhibition of wall/book art, poetry, sound pieces, environmental investigations, film, video, and performance, the conjunction of theory and practice that would become CEAC's trademark coalesced. The exhibition, envisioned as a travelling visual and literary manifesto on aspects of language, art, and structuralism, was coordinated by Learn, who was working at KAA at the time, and curated by Richard Kostelanetz, a language artist and cultural historian living in the United States. Learn, who was interested in the margins of communication and the "strategraphic" variance of language as it is mapped through visual, literary, and sound sources, coined the term "contexturalism" to describe the deep structure (in Noam Chomsky's sense of linguistics) of language and technology that the exhibition addressed. In the catalogue accompanying the exhibition, Kostelanetz compiled a lengthy enumeration of artists working with language as an aspect of their production, while KAA featured portable pieces that were available for showing in a gallery setting.

As part of the exhibition, a performance series entitled *Language Art* was held between November 4 and November 30, 1975. Featuring Richard Kostelanetz, Yvonne Rainer, Vito Acconci, Vera Frenkel, the Four Horsemen, bill bissett, sound artists, experimental poets, structuralist cinema, and radical theatre, it offered a survey of conceptual, structural, and process-oriented approaches to the remapping of language's functions and systems. In an article written by Learn published in *Queen Street* magazine, her use of a quote from Roland Barthes to describe the exhibition—"Exhaustion through catalysis is the impetus by which art constantly re-generates itself"[9]—suggests both the ambitious spirit of the project and its drain on the resources of the gallery. Where catalysis overreached its proportions to the point of exhaustion was in the plans to tour the show. With insufficient funds and a lack of time and resources, *Language and Structure in North America* began to fragment at the same incremental rate as the investigations it presented. Conflicts arose between Learn and Marras, between Marras and Kostelanetz, and between KAA and the participating artists. As a result, Learn left KAA in 1976, with debt and recrimination ensuing. Although the opera would never again attempt such a grandiose scenario for the presentation of an art manifesto, Marras and those surrounding him began to utilize the ideas articulated in this exhibition to construct a theoretical platform for CEAC that linked art to the politicization of language, technology, and culture.

By 1976, Marras and Corley had built an elaborate stage set to present their operatic vision. The cast, however, had been assembled in a minimalist tradition. With the rearticulation of their non-commercial and investigative goals and the impact of *Language and Structure in North America* on the local art scene, a number of Toronto artists, many of whom had graduated from OCA in the wake of Roy Ascott's experimental directorship and ensuing shake-up, began to focus their activities at the KAA.[10] As more cast members were added to the chorus, the conceptualization of a multimedia space to house their opera came into being. Marras and Corley moved KAA to a temporary location at 86 John Street where a number of diverse art practices could share the stage. With $55,000 in funding from a Wintario grant received the same year, KAA became the first artist-run organization in Toronto to buy a building and effectively establish a large multimedia centre. Relocating from John Street to their newly acquired premises at 15 Duncan Street in September 1976, KAA launched CEAC: the Centre for Experimental Art and Communication.

In anticipation of the full production of the CEAC opera, KAA organized an exhibition entitled *Body Art* that opened in January 1976. Influenced in part by the Vienna Body School and the extremist work of Hermann Nitsch, the exhibition explored the mapping of the body through the investigation of its architecture, transmutation, and social behaviour. Proposing to redefine the functions of violence, actions, and structures of the body's political, social, and sexual dimensions, *Body Art* established a platform for performance and non-object art that countered the strategies of parody and appropriation promoted by General Idea, and the phenomenological investigations prevalent in the United States. The exhibition featured Suzy Lake's photographic transformations; Darryl Tonkin's film *Cantilever Tales*, which introduced the aesthetics of black humour and sadomasochism; Peter Dudar and Lily Eng's structural dance performances; and the collaborative performances of SHITBANDIT. In April 1976, Bruce Eves organized another performance series, *BOUND, BENT, AND DETERMINED*, which elaborated on the theme of sadomasochism introduced in *Body Art*. Included in this series were Wendy Knox-Leet, Ron Gillespie, Heather MacDonald, Darryl Tonkin, Blast-Bloom, Bruce Eves, Andy Fabo, and Paul Dempsey.

Parallel to KAA's programming of performance art was its interest in showcasing experimental cinema and video. As the theoretical catalyst of the organization, Marras had been influenced by his studies with

McLuhan, and by the contacts he subsequently made while attending an international video symposium held in Buenos Aires in November 1975. It was here that Marras met a collective of thirteen video artists working out of Argentina who called for the gallery system to be replaced by a system of workshops that would encourage a wide range of multidisciplinary activities. Within this system of workshops, the artists envisioned the video medium as a tool to diversify the hierarchies of information and media, to foment political unrest and promote revolutionary aims.[11] The radical impetus of their aesthetic, intent upon challenging the repressive regime of Argentina as well as the broader concept of alternative information networks, influenced KAA's theoretical approach to video. With the opening of CEAC in September of 1976, KAA sponsored the production and collection of local and international tapes and placed an emphasis on the documentation of events at the centre. Toronto artists involved with CEAC's video program included Noel Harding, David Clarkson, Elizabeth MacKenzie, Susan Britton, Peter Dudar, John Massey, Ian Murray, Ross McLaren, and members of the Development Education Centre and Trinity Square Video.

Concurrent with its political commitment to the accessibility and "new television" aspects of video, KAA began to program experimental cinema, with a particular emphasis on super 8 production. Marras, strongly influenced by Michael Snow's *Rameau's Nephew* and the films presented during *Language and Structure in North America,* including Vito Acconci's 8mm films and Yvonne Rainer's *Film About a Woman Who,* organized an initial *Art Film* series in March 1976. Working with Diane Boadway, Marras programmed works by Michael Snow, Ross McLaren, Lorne Marin, Rick Hancox, Vito Acconci, and David Rimmer, among others. Marras and Boadway then approached Ross McLaren to coordinate super 8 open screenings. These weekly screenings, which began in October 1976, were a regular programming feature of CEAC, with documentation published in CEAC's in-house magazine, *Art Communication Edition*. Providing a focus for local filmmakers, these screenings led to the formation of an experimental cinema collective The Funnel in September 1977. Canadian experimental filmmakers exhibiting at CEAC during this period included Ross McLaren (who also programmed a large selection of British, Austrian, Australian, and American films), Michael Snow, Keith Locke, Jim Anderson, Peter Dudar, Eldon Garnet, David Rimmer, Rick Hancox, Ron Gillespie, Noel Harding, Raphael Bendahan, Al Razutis, Holly Dale and Janice Cole, and Chris Gallagher.

While more local filmmakers congregated around CEAC than artists involved in video production, Marras's theoretical interest lay in the political application of video as a cultural practice that would challenge power hierarchies and normative ideologies perpetuated by the mass media. As a result, little theoretical speculation was engaged in on the subject of super 8 and experimental filmmaking at CEAC. With the exception of descriptive program notes and an essay by Roy Pelletier in the final issue of *Art Communication Edition* entitled "Creativity by Default: The Potential of Super 8," writing on time-based media in CEAC's publications concentrated on the revolutionary nature of video production. In an unpublished text on the political potential of video networks, Marras posited that the manipulation of the television medium leads to a condition of simulation in which the viewer is "completely dependent upon 'mediation' in order to watch their own reality."[12] The result of this dependency, Marras goes on to state, is the elimination of critical judgment and political consciousness, whereby politics do not disappear but rather "become invisible."[13] Marras's analysis closely foreshadowed Jean Baudrillard's theories of the simulacrum in his text "In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities." In this text, Baudrillard asserts that the saturation of information in the mass media produces a simulacrum in which representation constructs reality, or, as he terms it, the hyperreal.[14] Marras, however, was more optimistic than Baudrillard in his assessment of the possibility of combating the political fallout of simulation. While Baudrillard argued that the hyperreal signals the futility of oppositional politics and the neutralization of the masses, Marras speculated on the emergence of a new, hybrid form of reception in which independent video production would intersect with television's network-communication systems. Terming this hybrid reception "telemedia," Marras concluded that the technological infrastructure of mass media could be revolutionized through "an ideological programme for a new condition of a self-managed culture."[15]

Through the acquisition of equipment and the establishment of CEAC as a multimedia space, KAA's initiatives for video production and dissemination reflected Marras's stated objective. In March of 1976, the organization began the ambitious construction of a video-production studio emphasizing broadcast quality and colour technology. Artists associated with KAA, which became synonymous with CEAC after the centre opened in 1976, were active in a number of international video exchanges. As one of a number of groups attending these encounters (others included CAYC of Buenos Aires, NTV + KB of Berlin, the Museum of Modern Art of Ferrara, and World Video Association), CEAC emphasized a global perspective for the medium, leading to their

acquisition of a North American-European transfer system that enabled video artists in Toronto to trade tapes and information with European producers. At the same time as CEAC's vision for its video programming and production was international and ambitious in scope, the centre lacked support from the larger video community, which did not necessarily support its ideology or goals.

Competitive divisions developed between CEAC and other artist-run organizations, most notably A Space, the other major artist-run centre in the city promoting the production and dissemination of video. The intensity of this animosity became clear in the aftermath of the *STRIKE* scandal that led to CEAC's demise. In a 1978 letter to CEAC from Renee Baert, the Video Officer for the Canada Council, Baert states that:

> [The] Council had received numerous written and verbal complaints about the lack of access to the CEAC facility, an alleged censorship of projects in the selection process, the disdainful manner in which many artists either using or requesting the use of facilities were treated.

Furthermore, she adds, since the last meeting between CEAC and members of the Canada Council

> The Council has received a telegram signed by every Toronto video or video-related organization receiving funding from the Canada Council, as well as by a number of individuals. That telegram reads as follows:
>
> "As members of the video community and/or administrators of publicly accessible production facilities, we are concerned that the video equipment loaned by or purchased with funds from the Canada Council is being appropriated by the trustees of the Kensington Arts Association for purposes other than those for which it was granted. We are particularly concerned that said equipment may be lost forever to this community for the intended access to artists. We request that the Canada Council ascertain that the said equipment will remain in Toronto and accessible to the community of artists for which it was intended."
>
> This is a very clear indication of a lack of support for, or of confidence in the CEAC from the very community which it was funded to serve, and gives rise to questions about CEAC's use of public funds.[16]

While the cast for the full production of the CEAC opera was assembled by 1976, it was a cast that stood in opposition to other artist-run

centres. In the ensuring arias, some audience members would prove hostile, while others would simply boycott the production.

WHAT IS A/THE CENTRE FOR EXPERIMENTAL ART AND COMMUNICATION?
It is the working ground where the forces of intellectual production, cultural consumption, as well as the exchange and the distribution of culture are managed in accordance to the need of art and communication while affecting art forms.

WHAT IS ART AND COMMUNICATION?
It is the interface impact conductive within social forms as frames, structures, behaviours. Art as materialist practice and communication as dialectics in juxtaposition along contextual layerings produce revolutionary effects. Art and Communication is basically this: dialectical materialism practiced as ideology.[17]

Scene One: The Grand Opening

For CEAC's grand opening of its new space at 15 Duncan Street, a week-long extravaganza of events was presented under the rubric, *CANNIBALISM*, which secured CEAC's controversial reputation. In keeping with KAA's proclivity to program well-known composers of experimental music, CEAC opened its doors on September 18, 1976, with a concert featuring Michael Snow on piano and Larry Dubin on drums. KAA's sponsorship of Steve Reich's *Music for 18 Musicians* at Convocation Hall in May 1976 and Philip Glass's *Einstein on the Beach* in March 1977 presented Toronto audiences with Canadian premieres by musicians whose work had received international recognition, but who were relatively unknown in Canada. In the case of Reich, the audience was small and hostile; in the case of Glass, the audience was also small but more receptive. For Snow and Dubin's concert, however, the audience proved quite large, and most stayed to experience Ron Gillespie's *Katchibatta* performance, featured the same night.

Documented on film by Ross McLaren, Gillespie's performance situated the audience as the aggressor and featured performers enacting ritual definitions of territory. The performance began with Gillespie crawling naked on his knees into the gallery space, his thighs and ankles bound together with leather, and carrying a staff with horns mounted

at the top. SHITBANDIT members Glen James, Lily Y, Marlene X, and Debbie Pollovey followed behind him, faithful disciples of the guru. Circling one another like animals in heat, they engaged in mating gestures, alternately challenging each other and the audience. The climax came when the performers began to throw lighted matches at the audience members, who responded by hurling beer bottles back. At this point, SHITBANDIT disbanded, retreating in the face of audience outrage, and the opening night of CEAC came to a close.

Also featured during CEAC's opening week was Wendy Knox-Leet's performance *Bringing in the Harvest*, which engaged the same elements of alchemy, shamanism, and mysticism as Gillespie's *Katchibatta*. A review in *Art Communication Edition* describes Knox-Leet's performance as a twenty-minute ritual based upon her investigations of megalithic monuments and burial grounds. Knox-Leet entered the gallery with a six-foot-high bundle of corn stalks attached to a wood frame, a canvas dog effigy, her body greased, chestnuts wrapped around her neck and ankles, and horsetails strung around her waist. She proceeded to

> withdraw metal and plastic icons from the entrails [of the dog] and stitch together the stomach opening. These ornaments were attached to the bundle of corn stalks, and then the whole structure was suspended from her forehead by a natural linen strap. With increasing speed, Knox-Leet traced the pattern of the double and triple spirals, the squared circle, and the three-four-five triangle. The whirling motion of the body, corn stalks, and horsetails flying through space transmits elemental connection with forces of the universe, instinctual creation, and of fertility and initiation.[18]

Bringing in the Harvest was conceived in relation to Knox-Leet and Michaele Berman's manifesto "Ritual Performance," which was published in *Art Communication Edition*. In this manifesto, Knox-Leet and Berman describe the visual elements of ritual performance as "conductors of spiritual power," the sculptural elements as "a ritualistic preparation and initiation into the time-space continuum," the sound elements as "piercing the core of the audience," and the movements as gestural, shamanistic, and primeval. Ritual performance, they conclude, is a "revolutionary form which takes this limited and predefined structure [perception], and EXPLODES it. As it shatters into fragments, we see the key to survival."[19] Both Knox-Leet's and Berman's ritual performances, and Gillespie's exploration of behaviour, violence, and sexuality would influence CEAC's subsequent formulation of Behavioural Art.

Although Missing Associates did not perform during the opening week of CEAC, their structural dance experiments also informed CEAC's theoretical platform. Comprised of Peter Dudar, a choreographer and filmmaker, and Lily Eng, a dancer trained in the martial arts, Missing Associates pursued a style of dance that was diametrically opposed to the Martha Graham modernist school prevalent in Toronto in the 1970s. The duo published broadsheets that both self-aggrandized their productions and criticized those of their contemporaries, and were an important, if alienating, component of Toronto's experimental dance scene. Their dance performances were structural and minimalist in concept, and aggressive in execution. *Running in O and R, Getting the Jumps, Crash Points 2*, as well films made by Dudar recording their performances, sought to challenge the definitions of movement and poise current in dance terminology by exploring behaviour patterns and "ordinary" actions. They situated their work in the context of structural film and ritual aspects of body art, while their polemic referenced futurism, Marxism, anarchism, and the opposing ideologies of Bruce Lee and Mao Zedong. Describing a performance intervention at the Art Gallery of Ontario in 1977, Dudar indicates the degree to which their collaborations were shocking to the general public:

> As Lily entered to do her solo number, I reminded her to make it at least 15 minutes. A security guard approached the two martial artists in one of my pieces and asked what was wrong. Derek and Henry said 'Nothing.' The guard then asked what THAT WOMAN was doing. 'Performing' they answered. 'No, she's not!' he responded, and stormed into Lily's performance area. She was lying on her back at the time. He said something and tried to grab her arm. She pulled back, her lips moving. All I could make out was 'Get the fuck out of my performing space!' He drew back (he seemed to be contemplating charging in), noticed the 150 people or so staring at him, then exited, so to speak. Lily went on a bit, then laughed maniacally a couple of times…. She then addressed the audience: 'Every time I come into this fucking place the fucking security guards harass me. Well if you want to get me out you'll have to fucking come and drag me out!'… When she was set I roundhoused Lily quite loudly in both ribcages, moving her a couple of feet to each side in each instance, then side-kicked her in the small of the back where it really hurts. The steel pieces in the brace took most of the shock, and the leather binding helped emphasize the sound.[20]

While the programming of concerts and performances during opening week expressed CEAC's commitment to a multidisciplinary approach to

art and communication, Heather MacDonald's environmental installation *Rain Room* was the focal point of the Duncan Street launch. Built by the CEAC collective, *Rain Room* was an eight-by-eighty-foot enclosed room with white sand on the floor, white walls, a grid of copper piping on the ceiling, heat lights, and speakers. Inside the room, it rained for two days, then heat lamps switched on for two days, causing a cycle of humidity that became dry heat and initiated the rain cycle again. The accompanying audio track juxtaposed the climatic changes with opposing sounds. When MacDonald committed suicide in late 1976, *Rain Room* also became a symbol of tragedy for the active members of CEAC. Together with MacDonald's friends, they viewed her suicide as related to the lack of funding for her work, and to her eviction, along with other artists, from a building at 89 Niagara Street due to land speculation. For Marras, her suicide was a political issue, emblematic of her struggle as an artist "under the brutality of capitalizations with eviction from her work place without a just cause, under the weight of paralytic institutions and of armoured funding agencies."[21] In the aftermath of MacDonald's suicide, her friends approached the Art Gallery of Ontario with a request to install *Rain Room* and documents leading to her "action" as a permanent commemoration of her death. In the ensuing and failed negotiations with the AGO, and in Marras's criticism in *Art Communication Edition* of an institution that would only validate work after an artist's death, *Rain Room* became a flashpoint for issues over the politics of suicide and the politics of state-funded art.

In an unsigned article "The Lumpen and the Lumpen Eaters," published in *Art Communication Edition*, the anonymous author denounced the "unyielding institutionalizing patronage of reactionary minds that make up the government funding agencies" in the "let's not cause a scene land of the beavers."[22] The article defined the lumpen artist as one who experiences a series of "perverse art crimes," from the romanticization of the autonomous artist promulgated through art colleges to the "brick wall of near impossibility of receiving financial or moral support"[23] from older artists co-opted by the grant system and funding agencies who support a "safe, reactionary, institutionalized art…exemplified by the representatives to the Venice Biennale…the most recent example being Greg Curnoe in 1976 with his 1964 pop art style.[24] This characterization of Canada's state-funding system as an institution that places itself "into the pie-in-the-sky ivory-tower framework of producing endless streams of useless objects pandering to the tastes of the bourgeoisie,"[25] and the simultaneous positioning of CEAC as the sole artist-run centre in Canada "maintaining a direct interest in political and artistic activity"[26] affirmed CEAC's confrontational stance and ensured its alienation from much of Toronto's art community.

> Here we have the grandfather of conceptual art, and we have the promoters of contextual art, and we're all going to battle it out and see who's going to run off with the art trophy.[27]

> The atmosphere was banal while charged with defensiveness, combativeness, and constraints parading as *noblesse oblige*. As I often do under the weight of bad faith, I absented myself—until near the end the situation seemed so silly that black humour seemed a viable respite. In short, I think this transcript is fairly worthless. Except perhaps as a workshop on alienation.[28]

In February 1976, a number of artists from KAA, including John Faichney, Lily Eng, Peter Dudar, Ron Gillespie, and Amerigo Marras, were travelling in Europe when they discovered a pamphlet written by a Polish artist, Jan Swidzinski, expounding a theory of contextual art. Published in English translation in 1977, Swidzinski's *Art as Contextual Art* sought to dislodge conceptual art from its vanguard throne by arguing for "art not as the syntactic proposition of conventional art or as the analytical proposition of conceptualism, but as the indexical proposition / the occasional sentence / of naturally contextual meanings."[29] Describing the logic which rules art as epistemological, and contextual art as "signs whose meaning is described by the actual pragmatic context" where there occurs "the continuous process of the decomposition of meanings which do not correspond to reality and in creating of new and actual meanings,"[30] Swidzinski arrived at the paradigm:

REALITY INFORMATION ART NEW OPEN MEANINGS REALITY.

The thrust of this statement, which comprised part of the "Sixteen Points of the Contextual Art Manifesto" outlined by Swidzinski, was to situate contextual art as a dialectical praxis in which "truth" was subject to the context of the ever-changing flux of reality. In Swidzinski's search for a paradigm that could describe the relationship of art to a modern condition of knowledge, he identified three models of visual semiotics that coexisted in current art practices. The first, the universal model of classical art, assumed that the "signs with which civilization shows reality are transparent for art,"[31] and arose from a belief that language expresses a reality of recognition rather than structure. The second, originating in Romanticism, was relativistic. In this model, a direct and homogeneous image of the world depends upon the tools with which we

learn about it. Swidzinski suggested that a problem arises in this model between the relationship of the signifier and the signified, whereby the relativism of modernism creates uncertainty about whether art produces a "true" reality, or a reality that only expresses knowledge about art. Citing Ad Reinhardt's proclamation—"permanent revolution in art as a negation of the use of art for some other purpose than its own"—as emblematic of contemporary relativism, Swidzinski posited this declaration of art for art's sake as the "last expression of this tendency."[32]

For Swidzinski, the consequences of relativism were related to the philosophical problem of neo-positivism, from which he traced the origins of a third model, conceptualism. This third model was identified by Swidzinski with the platform articulated in Joseph Kosuth's *Art after Philosophy* and in the publications of the Art and Language group, founded by Terry Atkinson and Michael Baldwin in England and Ian Burn and Mel Ramsden in New York. According to Swidzinski, the language of conceptualism brought a semantic function to art in order to produce meaning rather than formalism. However, Swidzinski critiqued this model by claiming that the only difference between modernism and conceptualism was the locus of expression: relativists used visual signs, while conceptualists used the language of logic. This, he insisted, created a tautology in which the analytical sentence as an art form becomes a sign that is non-transparent, and therefore ceased to relate expression to reality. Swidzinski goes on to list the Collectif d'Art Sociologique of Hervé Fischer, Fred Forest, and Jean-Paul Theno in France, who situated art as "the practice of negative utopianism directed against the bourgeois order;"[33] Joseph Kosuth's *Artist as Anthropologist*; and the neo-Marxist debates in the Art and Language publications as examples of a "declaration of good will"[34] seeking to escape this tautology. In conclusion, he forwarded his model of contextual art as the solution for a social theory and praxis of art.

For Marras, Swidzinski's model of contextual art provided a philosophical synthesis of KAA's programming strategy to date: encompassing ritual performance, Missing Associates' structural dance actions, and Beth Learn's use of the term "contexturalism" in *Language and Structure in North America*. Moreover, the model that Swidzinski proposed offered CEAC the theoretical means to locate their activities on an international art map of manifestos and debates. Contextual art was appropriated by CEAC as the paradigm by which didactic, interrogative, and situational performance art realized an "object" of social practice through the dialectic of meaning created between the audience and the performers. What was still to be done, however, was to inform the coterie of international artists involved in conceptualism about CEAC's

imminent role as the new vanguard of contextual art. And so Marras invited the key players in the conceptual-art arena to a "Contextual Art Conference" held at CEAC from November 10–12, 1976. Among those who participated in this conference were Anthony MacCall, a British structuralist filmmaker; Joseph Kosuth and Sarah Charlesworth, New York artists involved with the Art and Language publication *The Fox*; Jan Swidzinski and Anna Kutera of the Polish contextual-art movement; Hervé Fisher of the Collectif d'Art Sociologique; and Jo-Anne Birnie-Danzker, who had worked for *Flash Art* and was currently working for the NDP. Others who were invited but declined to attend included Victor Burgin; Peter Kubelka, an Austrian filmmaker associated with the structuralist cinema movement of New York; Chantal Pontbriand, the editor of *Parachute* magazine; and Ian Burn from Art and Language. Karl Beveridge and Carol Condé, who had been involved with *The Fox* while living in New York, declined to sit directly on the panel but participated from the audience floor. Others who participated from an audience position included Vera Frenkel, John Scott, John Bentley Mays, AA Bronson of General Idea, John Faichney, and Ron Gillespie.

In bringing together this configuration of participants, Marras assembled a fractious group of artists who in many cases brought to the table a legacy of theoretical and political squabbles. Kosuth and Charlesworth implied that the conference was a set-up meant to position their conceptual-art practice in opposition to a previously unknown Polish artist's critique, with Marras as an opportunistic middleman. This issue of positioning was complicated further by the intricacies of a split that had occurred between Kosuth and the New York Art and Language group. The "declaration of good will" that Swidzinski had attributed to Art and Language's adoption of a neo-Marxist position had subsequently disintegrated through internal divisions that had occurred over the publication of *The Fox*. The New York collective involved in producing *The Fox*, including Kosuth, Ramsden, Burn, and Beveridge, sought to identify a revolutionary platform for art, foregoing identification as individuals in support of cell solidarity. In the context of the New York art market, however, the publication soon became associated with Kosuth, undermining the collaborative attempt to define revolutionary practice and leading to internal divisions over issues of individualism and group hierarchy. These rifts deepened over the collective members' differing political alignments—with Maoism, Marxist-Leninism, and anarchism—and *The Fox* ceased publication after three issues. By the time of the conference, Kosuth and Charlesworth had disassociated themselves from *The Fox*, adopting a loose and self-styled combination of feminist, anarchist, and Marxist ideas. Karl Beveridge

and Carol Condé had thrown up their New York art practice and returned to Canada after exhibiting their Mao-inspired call to arms, *It's Still Privileged Art*, at the Art Gallery of Ontario in February 1976.[35] Feelings ran high at the conference over these ideological differences, producing an atmosphere of hostility and political infighting that was all but opaque for those unfamiliar with the specific histories of these artists and with the rhetorical polemics of 1970s neo-Marxist theory.

What the conference transcripts reveal is an intense two-day discussion that oscillated between theoretical posturing and personal invective, in which the participants attacked, denied, and redefined their positions on the nature and practice of political art. For Kosuth and Charlesworth, the conference was engaged in a highly specialized discourse they had expressed a wish to demystify, and positioned them within a theoretical arena they had recently rejected. On another level, their condemnation of the conference revealed the arrogance of artists producing at the cultural centre who felt no obligation to provide the periphery with a clear understanding of their aims. Swidzinski himself was attacked at the beginning of the conference for assuming he could propose a "social practice" based upon forty pages of theoretical generalizations. Hervé Fischer tried to re-establish an amicable level of discourse by stating his collective's intention to create not a social practice but a sociological practice. Basing his ideas upon Adorno's negative dialectic, Fischer proposed a theory and practice of art that would enable a productive criticism of society rather than the creation of prescriptive models that included Marxism, which he characterized as "an answer system, ready-made, to try to get the power, to try to get into a bureaucracy."[36] For Fischer, the role of the artist was not to produce vanguard ideas but to facilitate the means through which all classes in society could arrive at their own self-determinism of language and structure. Charlesworth, in turn, refused to participate in a dialogue at this level, and launched into a polemic stating that the conference's context made any viable analysis of the participants' roles as producing artists impossible. Birnie-Danzker insisted throughout the discussion upon the importance of framing the debates within a context of ideology and economics that would engage the audience. In response, John Scott introduced from the audience floor his dilemma of exhibiting in the art world as a self-identified Marxist artist and working as a union shop steward, while AA Bronson and John Bentley Mays found the whole discussion of artistic imperialism and economic appropriation "astounding," failing to see what was wrong with a hierarchical structure that valued "famous" artists' discourse over the average person's perception.

Despite the obtuseness of much of the conference, in the final analysis it provided a valuable opportunity for local artists to consider and debate issues of politics and art that were not monolithic in their assumptions or aims. Among the key issues raised during the conference were the relationships of the artist to cultural imperialism, to a mercantile market and the absence of one in Canada, to the problems of producing work in a system that buys and sells both objects and ideas, and to the posturing of art as communication through inaccessible language. As convoluted as the discussions may have been, they offered a context for Scott to argue that General Idea's strategy of appropriation "reinforces oppressive structures" and for Birnie-Danzker to argue for the importance of Partisan Gallery's murals as "community art." These issues of strategy, community, markets, and funding remain pertinent for the practice of a politically engaged art in Toronto, while the complexity and contradictions of the political debates of the 1970s, often unacknowledged, underlie many of the representational strategies of the 1980s.

Scene Three: Behaviour Art

CEAC's interest in promoting contextual art continued through 1977. In February 1977, CEAC presented three lectures on "contextualism" in New York City to introduce the idea of "art-as-empty-sign, that is structure in which the introduction of meanings is the activity of the audience."[37] During the same year, an exhibition of Katherina Sieverding's work-in-progress examining Chinese and American propaganda photographs, as well as an interest in the performance work of Marina Abramovic and Arnulf Rainer, also contributed to CEAC's articulation of a "contextual" art practice. Through the three-week residency in March 1977 of the British performance collective Reindeer Werk, CEAC's objective of promoting "contextual" performance became linked to the idea of behaviourism. Reindeer Werk, composed of Tom Puckey and Dirk Larsen, proposed a behavioural school of performance in which investigations of deviance and response could provide a critique of Skinnerian models and the dominance of behaviour modification in the social sciences. Through their writings and performances, they found a receptive audience in an international circuit of alternative spaces, including Galerie Remon in Poland, De Appel in Amsterdam, and CEAC in Toronto. Their manifestos, reprinted in *Art Communication Edition*, called for an expedient artistic exploration of the "doublethink" in society that "begat ideas, which begat literacy, which begat the

concept."[38] Their action-oriented collaborations involved the formal mechanics of socially unacceptable behaviour. In a review of their performance, Peter Dunn described them as having the appearance of two people "suffering the traumatic contortions and involuntary spasms of severe behavioural disorder,"[39] in which:

> …small idiosyncratic gestures acceptable as "habit" slowly transformed into the involuntary pacings, rubbings, and scratching associated with neurotic "ritual." Finally, after random fluctuations of intensity, it attained a pitch comparable to severe hysterical psychosis ending with the performers spent in exhaustion.[40]

For the artists associated with CEAC—whose work shared an affinity with Reindeer Werk's shock tactics and whose critique of media-saturation and state-funded conformity echoed the British artists indictment of conditioned response and "double-think"—behavioural art offered a platform to achieve theoretical credibility in a European context. Misunderstood or disregarded in Toronto, and perhaps indifferent to the community's acceptance of its objectives, CEAC began to aggressively promote behaviour art in New York and on the European continent. Functioning as a collective in their approach to cultural exportation, CEAC artists had already toured Europe in 1976, highlighting the work of Missing Associates and Ron Gillespie and making their initial connections with the Polish contextual artists, the "action" school of performance, and Reindeer Werk. In seeking to consolidate their collaboration and alignment with these groups, Marras characterized CEAC's "contextual behaviouralism" as a social practice that refused to cooperate with the capitalist reinforcement of production and consumption. He described a range of potential activities from therapy communes to the establishment of a school where members would exist as "behavioural catalysts—non-functioning as 'tutors' or 'students' but existing as questions."[41] In the context of performance, he defined behaviour art as the interface between the provocation and demarcation of aggression, listing the actions facilitating this interface as:

> psycho-physical deprivation of a precise element.
> confrontation with an unaware group.
> analysis of social conditions through the effects of a given ideology.
> media analysis and its assumed language.
> dialectical interface and collective creation.
> bringing to its extreme contradiction a definitive condition.[42]

This fusion of hot psychotic behaviour and the cool analysis of context was first presented as a "behavioural action" on March 24, 1977, at Pier 52 in New York. A collaboration among Bruce Eves, Ron Gillespie, Amerigo Marras, Marsha Lore, and Reindeer Werk, the action was intended to challenge the definition of acts such as cruising, a common occurrence on the pier, as culturally deviant. Puckey, Larsen, and Lore sat in a car with its headlights shining through a hole in the wall, creating an interior context of "a leather queen cruising ground."[43] Inside the wall, illuminated by the car headlights and a single flashlight, Gillespie, Marras, Eves took a series of photographs of:

> Me [Eves] on my knees with Ron's cock in my mouth.
> My legs hanging over the edge.
> My foot holding Ron's hand down securely on a broken pane of glass.
> The flashlight in Ron's, Amerigo's and my mouth.
> My cruising stances.
> The tension on Ron and Amerigo's faces.[44]

Similar in aim, but different in content, were the collaborative performances presented by Eves, Marras, Suber Corley, and Diane Boadway during CEAC's second European tour in May of 1977. Taking part in discussions held in Paris by the Collectif d'Art Sociologique and in Poland by the contextual-art movement, the CEAC group also presented, in various art venues, a didactic seminar/performance critiquing the art-world frame of reference and asserting the importance of performance as a means to break down audience/performer barriers. In this seminar/performance, Eves, Marras, Boadway, and Corley placed themselves in the four corners of a gallery, and reading from a text, spoke in turns into a microphone for fifteen seconds at a time, reading from a lengthy text. A photographer, obscuring audience's view, intimidated the audience with a barrage of candid-camera shots. The text consisted of seventy statements proposing an antithetical stance to dominant ideology rather than "alternative" positions that could be re-appropriated by the cultural hegemony. Samples of the statements read include:

> Any particular performance, like any particular moment in time,
> can only be presented once.
> The spontaneous situation is the performance.
> Performance is flux.
> Theatre is in direct opposition to the theory and praxis of behaviour
> and context.
> Performance art has not yet left the wall.

> The performer and the audience are autonomous.
> Performance art creates no interchange.
> Performance art creates no solutions.
> Performance art does not alter perception.
> Performance art can no longer exist within the art world frame of reference.
> The art world frame of reference fails.
> Performance fails.[45]

The European reaction to this didactic approach to performance reveals much of the irony implicit in a project that sought to announce its own failure while maintaining the privilege of speaking within an "art-world frame of reference." At De Appel in the Netherlands, a member of the audience felt as if the CEAC performers were "acting like gods of the art world, talking down to people there."[46] At the Museo d'Arte Moderna in Bologna and the Palazzo dei Diamanti in Ferrara, CEAC's questioning of the audience's collaboration with bourgeois-capitalist ideology evoked a less-than-civil response. According to Diane Boadway, who described the performance in her journal of the tour, the reaction of the Ferrara audience was the most exciting. In response to such questions as, "Does a repressive society reproduce repressive social models?" she writes that

> Some students get up on stage and begin to mimic us. They stand in the corners and one at the microphone on the table takes a beetle and places it upon the microphone and then tries to hit it with a sledge-hammer. Amerigo begins to stamp his feet loudly and clap yelling 'bravo bambino.' More students join in and they rip the paper with the statements and the questions off the wall and take it out in the court-yard and burn it in a ritual.[47]

In contrast to the tumultuous audience reaction that greeted their performances, the seminars CEAC attended in Paris and Poland were long, drawn-out, and intensely serious discussions of the nature of defining a revolutionary practice of art. The Paris seminar, attended by the CEAC group, Jan Swidzinski, Peter Dunn and Lorraine Leeson, and sponsored by the Collectif d'Art Sociologique, agreed upon a manifesto entitled "The Third Front" that was subsequently published in *Art Communication Edition*. Committing themselves to a collective strategy of combating the "capitalist division of labour in the art market" and establishing an "international network of communications,"[48] the Third Front spent much of the seminar attacking the cultural hegemony of the New York art world. Similarly, a "Polish Front" was established at the

seminars in Warsaw to oppose the imperialism of a New York international centre. From the Contextual Art Conference at CEAC in November 1976 to the seminar in Poland in July 1977, a recurring theme dominated discussion: how to achieve an art practice antithetical to the consumerism of American ideology within an art world dominated by the New York market. The contradiction implicit in this objective, in which the emphasis upon New York as the centre of the art world only reinforced its hegemony, would end up defeating attempts on the part of these groups to create an oppositional front. The hegemony of New York, whether real or perceived, created a situation in which artists such as Sarah Charlesworth could declare that "I am not about to become a political artist, although I am concerned with political questions and I am an artist,"[49] while CEAC scrambled to establish political platforms and political fronts to oppose the ease with which she was able to breeze in and out of ideological stances.

Scene Four: Raw/War

In the spring of 1977, the Toronto scene saw an explosion of local bands adopting the paraphernalia and alienated stance of the British punk movement. Marras initially perceived the phenomenon as a spontaneous behavioural reaction against mainstream media and CEAC sponsored the first punk venue in Canada, Crash'N'Burn. Organized by The Diodes, a band of composed of OCA students, Crash'N'Burn was located in the basement of CEAC from May through August 1977. The Diodes original members—John Catto, David Clarkson, John Hamilton, and Ian MacKay—collaborated with Marras and Eves in the production of a 45-rpm disc entitled *Raw/War*, which was distributed as *Art Communication Edition* 8. The music on the disc was interspersed with droning statements by Marras and Eves from the behavioural manifestos of CEAC and Reindeer Werk. Heralded by Marras as the instrument to produce the "great awakening in the brainwashed television public,"[50] *Raw/War* stands as an example of the incongruity of a highly sophisticated rhetoric pasted onto the extremely raw and naive sound of hard-core punk. The probably unintentional saving grace of the record is the voice of a woman at the end of the single who responds to the polemic of "you people are the police" and "how can ideology change social practice" by crooning "fuck off" and "stick it up your ass." Other bands that played Crash'N'Burn, a hole-in-the-wall space with a bathtub for a beer fridge, included the all-female bands The Curse and The B Girls; The Poles, featuring Michaele Berman, who had taken ritualistic performance to its media extreme; the

Viletones, featuring the sensationalist violence of Nazi Dog's self-inflicted wounds; The Dishes; and The Dead Boys. Performance-oriented events such as Fashion'N'Burn added a sarcastic and humorous overtone: the interjection "Is that new wave a permanent wave?" pointed to the fleeting nature of the punk craze in the wake of promised record contracts and media hype. As punk's clarion call of "no future" sold out to a music-industry future, CEAC's initial enthusiasm for punk revolution was as quickly transformed into disillusionment by its consumerist appropriation. In September 1977, CEAC closed Crash'N'Burn, and the short-lived energy of the initial punk explosion dissipated as bands found alternative venues and record contracts. All that remains of the heyday of Toronto's musical nihilism is the record *Raw/War* and a film documenting its excesses, Ross McLaren's *Crash'N'Burn*.

Scene Five: Free International University Workshops at Documenta VI

When Amerigo Marras, Bruce Eves, Lily Eng, and Ron Gillespie were invited to Joseph Beuys's "Violence and Behaviour" workshop at the Free University for Creativity and Interdisciplinary Research in Kassel in September 1977, it was as if all of their work mounting the CEAC opera became a dress rehearsal for an audience that counted. Beuys was the radical art darling of New York and Europe, and CEAC was being admitted to his church. With the invitation in hand, CEAC artists scrambled to explain how they could accept participation in an event that had excluded other groups in their Third Front. To this end, Marras issued a communiqué in *Art Communication Edition* directed at Hervé Fischer and the Collectif d'Art Sociologique, in which he attempted to worm out of the contradiction of Fischer's exclusion, declaring with the same vigour CEAC's autonomy from alliances that they had embraced only four months earlier in a united front of common ideals and aims. Hegemony, it seemed, extended further than the New York art market, with the wag of Beuys's little finger creating the same divisions among artists in the Third Front that CEAC had denounced as a capitalist and imperialist ploy of the New York art scene. In addressing this contradiction, Marras argued that "to share commonalities does not necessarily mean to stagnate in a precise model. In fact, shifting the focus makes us realize that there are alternatives to anyone's alternatives."[51] Then, in an absolute tumble of discursive somersaults, he asked:

> How does one defeat the dominant ideology if the alternatives are split by the same dominant ideology? Precisely by oneself becoming the occasional member of some of the thousands of networks in operation and thereby shifting the ground without freezing the role.[52]

This decision on the part of CEAC to justify others' exclusion on the grounds that such divisions would defeat dominant ideology suggests that rather than achieving an antithetical practice to bourgeois individualism, they had ended up being co-opted by the "double-think" they so vociferously critiqued.

CEAC's experience at Documenta VI could be likened to the "perverse art crimes" that they had accused the art world of generating. At the Documenta sessions of the "Violence and Behaviour" workshop, Bruce Eves's argument that the homoerotic in art, the mimicry of drag, and sadomasochism were a safe distraction from and an effective appropriation of violence was neither understood nor well received. His use of mimicry in punk, fashion, and gay art was, however, one of the most succinct statements on the postmodern recuperation of subversion to be issued from the CEAC platform. Eves was personally ostracized after his presentation, and the CEAC group as a whole experienced Documenta as a competitive showcase in which each participating group went out of its way to prove it was more radical and more marginal than the next for the fedora-bedecked master.[53] Documenta had become the pivotal scene in the opera, where comedy turned to tragedy, politics became a bargaining site of bad faith, and polemic ceased to function as an antithetical tool. Nevertheless, Marras returned to Toronto, bent, bound, and determined to establish a free international university at CEAC and to up the ante of his political stance against art-world systems.

Act Three: *STRIKE!*

> We want to come out closer to the de-training programme, opposed to the service systems…. We have to realize a polemical state, a state of permanent questioning. The polemics and its art are the core of our surfacing and switch. To uncover the sore points, the polemics, to challenge them is what we mean with *STRIKE*.[54]

> NO BUTTER, NO BUTTER, NO BUTTER: CEAC DRY HUMPS THE AUDIENCE. MOTOR CITY MEETS CEAC: A CONFRONTATION WITH SEARING ANARCHOFAGGOTRY. ENCOURAGING YONI CONSCIOUSNESS. HETEROCLONES FOR GAY CONSUMPTION: THE AUDIENCE AS SURROGATE SEX VICTIM. WARM IT UP BEFORE YOU EAT IT; MOTOR CITY GETS CRAMPS AND GOES HOME.[55]

In the autumn of 1977, as the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Federal Republic of Germany neared, a wave of assassinations of prominent West German citizens—including chief prosecutor Siegfried Buback, Dresdner Bank head Jürgen Ponto, and president of the manufacturers' association, Hans Martin Schleyer—by the left-wing Baader-Meinhof Group stunned the country. As outrage and paranoia escalated in the media, Andreas Baader, a leader of the group, died under mysterious circumstances in a high-security West German prison. The state's announcement that the official cause of death was suicide instigated a backlash of outrage and paranoia on the part of students and left-wing sympathizers. In Italy, the Red Brigades had engulfed the country in an unpredictable war of violence and chance terrorism, culminating in the kidnapping of former Italian premier Aldo Moro on March 16, 1978, and the discovery of his slain body on May 10. In response, the Italian state initiated a total crackdown on the autonomous workers' movement. Terrorism, state retaliation, and paranoia were in the air. It was the beginning of the post-political era.

In January 1978, at CEAC in Toronto, Bruce Eves, Amerigo Marras, Suber Corley, and Paul McLelland changed the name of their in-house publication from *Art Communication Edition* to a "brave new word": *STRIKE*. The nature of the polemic between the covers of the magazine, however, did dramatically alter at first. In the first issue of *STRIKE*, Marras affirmed his search for an antithetical ground on which to locate a critique of dominant ideology and a mercantile art system. Peter Dudar and Lily Eng published an invective against the Art Gallery of Ontario and the state of dance in Toronto similar in tone to the articles that appeared in *Art Communication Edition* after Heather MacDonald's suicide. John Faichney featured examples of artists' books. Fred Forest of the Collectif d'Art Sociologique published a communiqué explaining a sequence of events that led to *Newsweek*'s refusal to run his advertisement selling "Artistic Square Meters" in France. According to Forest, his ad, entitled "Buy France Piece By Piece," was considered by Newsweek to be deceptive advertising, given there was "inadequate information concerning the financial structure of your company."[56] From the absurd to the sublime, the issue also listed a number of workshops and seminars conducted by members of the newly established CEAC school. Among the eclectic courses on offer were Ross McLaren's Basic Filmmaking; Ron Gillespie and Veronica Lornager's Introductory Seminar on Evolution; Harry Pasternak's Kindergarten and Inflato-Art; Saul Goldman's Video Cassette Editing;

Amerigo Marras's Art and Revolution; and Lilly Chiro's Buddha Maitrey Ame Wears a Purple Taffeta Dress.

In conjunction with the CEAC school, a set of open discussions were held on Monday evenings in the CEAC library to plan a series of seminars on the topics of human rights, ideology, behaviour, work, and community. Entitled *Five Polemics to the Notion of Anthropology*, the seminars took place in April and May of 1978. Guest speakers included Marty Pottenger of *Heresies* magazine; Bruno Ramirez of *Zerowork*, a journal calling for the elimination of work; Maria Gloria Bicocchi of Art/Tapes in Florence; Gerald Borgia, a socio-biologist pioneering work in the field of genetic science; and Bernard-Henri Lévy, a founder of the *nouvelle philosophie* in Paris. Guest artists included Lorraine Leeson and Peter Dunn, whose work in Britain focused upon community intervention through poster campaigns, and Marina Abramovic, a performance artist from Yugoslavia. Also planned was a Toronto segment of Caroline Tisdall and Joseph Beuys's Free International University, which fell through in the aftermath of the scandal that broke in May 1978 over the second issue of *STRIKE*, which would number CEAC's days.

The most widely publicized event of the seminar series was a lecture and discussion led by the French philosopher Bernard-Henri Lévy. Based on a critique of Marxism, rationalism, and classical dialectics, Lévy's anti-authoritarian and anti-system stance was derived from the influence of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. To understand the last fifty years of history, he argued, "you must understand the camps. You must begin with the point of view of the prisoner."[57] Jay Scott, reporting in the *Globe and Mail*, described the seminar:

> Several people are on hand, an oil and water beaker of leftists who ask questions and sneer at Mr. Lévy's answers and rightists who make statements and sneer at Mr. Lévy's responses. To mix the metaphor, since nothing else is mixing: his audience is hard-top not convertible.[58]

Lévy, in calling for a philosophy that was immediate and individual in protest, stated that if he were a Canadian, he would "talk about Indian reserves, about unemployment, and the RCMP—who are listening to you and opening your mail."[59] Upon opening the second issue of *STRIKE*, it was as if Levy had had a profound influence on a group that had managed to assimilate only half of his platform. In CEAC's publication of court transcripts from the Red Brigades' trial and the exposé of Salvadorean death-squad tortures, it was clear that they had internalized the point of view of the prisoner. Their editorial, seeking a radical solution to the incarceration of artists by a capitalist system, advocated "leg

shooting/knee capping to accelerate the demise of the old system."[60] Their cover displayed the bullet-ridden bodies of Aldo Moro's bodyguards, killed during the Red Brigades' kidnapping. With the discovery of Aldo Moro's body only days after *STRIKE*'s publication and a *Toronto Sun* headline denouncing CEAC as bloodthirsty radicals, Scott's article would be the last sympathetic press CEAC would receive. And it would only be after the ensuing scandal that CEAC appeared to have absorbed the other half of Lévy's anti-system philosophy. In the next and final issue of *STRIKE*, a critical exposé was published on the RCMP, who clearly had been opening CEAC's mail and listening to their phone-calls.

Scene Two: Finale with Full Chorus[61]

> It's the ferment of ideas that makes these people cultural revolutionaries. Where their revolution is headed and how influential it will be is pure speculation, but what they are doing now is worth more than a cursory glance.
> —Bruce Kirkland, *The Toronto Star*, March 19, 1977.

> The mutilation behaviours, virus works, punk art, kidnapping practices, bombings, terrorist actions, arson and even political behaviours have made art-behaviour a vastly more effective instrument than the simple subjective artists in the 1960s and their paper tiger paws.
> —Ron Gillespie, unpublished text on behaviourism.

> CEAC is an institution in power, and therefore dangerous. Solidarity is rarely a communion and commonly a retreat into fear and alienation, a block with which to wield power: ideology as corporate alienation. The projection of violence is not altruistic but masturbatory and adolescent.
> —Tom Dean, "No Butter, No Butter" January 1978.

> We are opposed to the dominant tendency of playing idiots, as in the case of punks or the sustainers of the commodity system. The questioning of thorough polemics of the cultural, economical and political hegemony should be fought on all fronts. To still maintain tolerance towards the servants of the State is to preserve the status quo of Liberalism. In the manner of the Brigades, we support leg shooting/knee capping to accelerate the demise of the old system. Despite what the 'new philosophers' tell us about the end of ideology, the war is before us and underneath us. Waged and unwaged sector of the population is [sic] increasing its demands for 'less work'. On the way to surpass liberalism we should prepare the barricades.
> —*STRIKE* Editorial, "Playing Idiots, Plain Hideous," May 1978.

Ont. Grant Supports Red Brigades Ideology: Our Taxes and Blood-Thirsty Radicals
—*The Toronto Sun*, May 5, 1978.

What position do we take in relation to the BR [Red Brigades]? We present their accusations of the ruling order in an extract of their court proceedings published in our paper. We share their anger and we agree that it is the power sector that must be on trial. We do not believe that terrorism makes any sense in the context here and we question the theoretical basis of any vanguard group that intends to lead or speak for the people, as little better than the farce of representation that exists in the present power structures of the state. We have published this material on the BR to rectify the repressed and distorted coverage they have received by all media.
—Statement to the Press, May 12, 1978, *STRIKE* Collective (Amerigo Marras, Suber Corley, Bruce Eves, Paul McLellan, Roy Pelletier, Bob Reid).

I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie): "That the method of deciding on Canada Council grants be made fully public at once, that all grants to organizations, groups or individuals under investigation by Canadian security service be immediately suspended and that the Prime Minister is forthwith ordered by the House to call a judicial inquiry into the shocking aims, decisions and actions of the Canada Council."
—Defeated motion by Tom Cossitt (MP, Leeds), May 23, 1978, Canada. House of Commons Debates.

Make no mistake about the seriousness of *STRIKE*'s threat to humanist values. Art is only a minor battlefield. The Board of Directors of *STRIKE* is well prepared for a larger fight. Through the Free University, International Art Fairs and visiting guests, experts in the fields of sociology, economics, philosophy, psychology, architecture, they are preparing for long-term revolutionary work. In recent issues, the journal has denounced art, capitalism, Russian and Chinese models of Marxism, Liberalism, CAR…. Ironically, *STRIKE* is the official publication of CEAC which relies for the majority of its revenue on federal and provincial funding…. Having established a façade of respectability, CEAC, through its affiliated publication, has now formed a political front to denigrate all art-making, to urge the overthrow of all existing structure and to declare its support for the terrorist strategy of the Red Brigades. Now that *STRIKE* has declared its destructive platform, continued financial aid by the provincial or federal government must be seen to be a support of the publishers' connections and entrenchment with violent

political revolutionaries. It is equally ironic that *STRIKE*'s indulgence in self-promotion by sensationalized and deviant behaviour, and its endorsement of "leg shooting/knee capping to accelerate the demise of the old system" has been supported by the tolerance and silence of an art community unwilling to take any moral stand on art or politics.
—Letter to the Editor," in *Open Paper Today*, June 1978.
Signed by Fran Gallagher, Bruce Parsons, Roby MacLennan, Ron Shuebrook, Art Green, Alison Parsons, Natalie Green.
cc to Louis Applebaum, Director of the Canada Council.

I feel obliged to respond to a letter that was directed to Louis Applebaum by persons affiliated with the Fine Arts Department of York University…. 8. "CEAC has now formed a political front" "the publisher's connections and entrenchment with violent international political revolutionaries." Oh, come on now. Are these more people who read the *Sun* and take it literally? There is absolutely no foundation in reality for such ridiculous statements…. 9. We totally agree with the next paragraph that the "art community is silent" and "unwilling to take any moral stand on art or politics."
—Letter to Arthur Gelber, Vice Chairman, Ontario Arts Council
from Suber Corley, dated May 29, 1978.

Quite clearly, such a statement [the *STRIKE* editorial of May 1978] is an indictment to physical violence which is to be directed at individuals and to be carried on outside the legal framework of our society. Council members believe that such statements are unacceptable in a democratic society where there are other means of expressing protest or criticism…. They do not believe that public funds should be used directly or indirectly to support the advocates of such views…. They have therefore decided that the Council should not make further payments to the centre until they are provided with a satisfactory explanation of the philosophy and objectives of the centre's directors.
—Letter to Amerigo Marras from Timothy Porteous,
Associate Director, Canada Council, dated July 4, 1978.

Because we hold the Kensington Arts Association/Centre for Experimental Art and Communication responsible for *STRIKE*, and because *STRIKE* has taken a position in support of terrorism, the Ontario Arts Council withdraws its funding from both *STRIKE* and CEAC.
—Letter to Amerigo Marras from Arthur Gelber,
Vice-Chairman, Ontario Arts Council, dated July 10, 1978.

It grieves me to hear that you have decided to hold back funding which you have promised CEAC for this coming year's projects. I find it hard to believe that an educated man as yourself could possibly be so influenced by the media. I am of course referring to the articles on *STRIKE* magazine in the Canadian press. I, as any rational creature, must question the credibility of the issue and the underlying factors which relate to this matter. I can only come to one conclusion, and that is that *STRIKE* magazine exposed the ideas of the Red Brigades in Italy. Now you may say this is reason enough to cut the funding, but I ask you how such a matter as freedom of speech can be ignored?… many people depend on the facilities of the centre, myself included. Can we now say that these ten words which created so much controversy are enough ground to stop the funding of such a crucial centre?… I leave you with one question and that is can we allow the media to create the demise of such an important member of the world art community? The answer is no! If this continues there is surely no hope for this country and all of the artists and intellectuals who view their opinion of it.
—Letter to Arthur Gelber from Gerard Pas, undated.

Postscript

With the withdrawal of government funding in June and July of 1978, KAA was unable to meet its payments on the 15 Duncan Street space, the bank foreclosed on its mortgage, and CEAC closed its doors. Wintario, however, permitted the organization to maintain its matching purchase funds if the group that was left, spearheaded by Saul Goldman and John Faichney, bought a building with similar overhead. Television Production Studios, as they named themselves, bought a large building at 124 Lisgar Street in early 1980. Hoping to rent out the premises and maintain an artist-access video production studio, they were also unable to survive without grants. In 1981, TPS walked away from Lisgar Street and the Canada Council repossessed the video equipment, distributing it between The Funnel and Trinity Square Video. As far as I have been able to ascertain, Amerigo Marras and Suber Corley left for New York in January 1980, with neither the proceeds of the sale of Duncan Street nor the video equipment from CEAC's production studio. What they did take with them, however, was a history of RCMP harassment and investigation, as documented in detail in *STRIKE*, and the cold shoulder of an art community struggling to maintain its equilibrium in the aftermath of a funding scandal.

The year 1978 saw not only the end of CEAC, but also a crisis at A Space involving the purge of its original director; a crackdown across Canada on written publications that included the banning of Pulp Press's publication of a German terrorist's memoirs; and the *Body Politic* court case over a gay-sex article.[62] The arts councils, in the aftermath of the CEAC funding scandal, which had reached the debating floor of the House of Commons, demanded more financial and budgetary accountability in their grant applications, and the era of General Idea's "shell" of history began. With CEAC's demise, Toronto's art community would turn from radical stances and towards an awareness of their dependence upon state-funding. There would be no more scenes in the "let's not cause a scene land of the beavers." Oppositional energy, with all its contradictions and radical stances, would dissipate, and Philip Monk's lack of history would become the political analysis of the 1980s.

Notes

The title is from an advertisement placed by CEAC in the Ontario Association of Art Galleries, *Magazine*, Winter 1978/79 that read as follows: "As the futurists were in fascist Italy, as the Bauhaus was in Nazi Germany, as the constructivists were in the Soviet Union, the CEAC was banned in Canada."

The epigraphs are taken from General Idea, "Glamour," *File* 3:1 (1975), 21; and Amerigo Marras, "On Organization," *STRIKE* 2:1 (1978).

1. General Idea, *File* 3:1 (1975), 22.
2. Philip Monk, "Axes of Difference," *Vanguard* 13:4 (1984), 14.
3. Amerigo Marras, "Notes and Statements of Activity, Toronto," *Europe, Art Contemporary* 3:1 (1977), 30.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.
7. *Supervision* was a magazine produced by Blast-Bloom Associates, comprised of Amerigo Marras and Angelo Sagbellone.
8. Letter from Amerigo Marras and Suber Corley to KAA members. CEAC Collection, York University Archives, Toronto, Ontario. No archival designations are available as the CEAC Collection is uncatalogued.
9. Beth Learn. "Language and Structure," *Queen Street Magazine* 3:1 (1975).
10. For an historical overview of the Roy Ascott years at OCA see Morris Wolf, *OCA 1967–1972: Five Turbulent Years* (Toronto: Grub Street Books, 2002).
11. Marras met these video artists during a video encounter at CAYC, a centre for art and communication that was a focal point of the Buenos Aires avant-garde. Information on their project was described in promotional flyers. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.

12. Amerigo Marras, "Revolutionary Process of Organization of Telemedia: Towards the End of Separation Between Television and Video," unpublished text. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
13. Ibid.
14. Jean Baudrillard, *In the Shadow of the Silent Majorities*, trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton, and John Johnston (New York: Semiotext(e), 1983).
15. Marras, "Revolutionary Process of Organization of Telemedia."
16. Letter from the Canada Council to CEAC, dated October 26, 1978. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
17. *Art Communication Edition* 2 (1977), no author cited. From here on cited as *A.C.E.*
18. *A.C.E.* 4 (1977), no author cited.
19. Wendy Knot-Leet and Michele Berman, "Ritual Performance," *A.C.E.* 3 (1977).
20. Peter Dudar, "I Don't Know If You Believe This Could Actually Happen At The Art Gallery of Ontario," *STRIKE* 2:1 (1978), reprinted in *Missing in Action* 1.
21. Amerigo Marras, Editorial, *A.C.E.* 3 (1977).
22. *A.C.E.* 3 (1977), no author cited.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Sarah Charlesworth, unpublished transcripts from the Contextual Art Conference. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
28. Joseph Kosuth, "What is this Context," [a response to the conferences proceedings], unpublished transcripts from the Contextual Art Conference.
29. Jan Swidzinski, *Art as Contextual Art* (Warsaw: Art Text, Galerie Remont, 1977), 9.
30. Ibid., 5.
31. Ibid., 5.
32. Ibid., 15.
33. Ibid., 17.
34. Ibid., 17.
35. For a description of *It's Still Privileged Art* see "Is It Still Privileged Art? The Politics of Class and Collaboration in the Art Practice of Carole Condé and Karl Beveridge" (1994) reprinted in this volume.
36. Hervé Fischer, "Sociological Art as Utopian Strategy." CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
37. Amerigo Marras, "Programme Notes for Artists' Space," February 26, 1977. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
38. Reindeer Werk, "The Last Text: Some Notes On Behaviouralism," *A.C.E.* 4 (1977).
39. Peter Dunn, "Review: Performance," *Studio International* 193:983 (1976), 199.
40. Ibid., 199.
41. Amerigo Marras, text in *Behaviour School*, unpublished catalogue. CEAC Collection, York University Archives. (Versions of this text can be found in *A.C.E.* 4-7.)

42. Ibid.
43. Bruce Eves, text in *Behaviour School.*
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. Diane Boadway, unpublished diary of CEAC Tour. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
47. Ibid.
48. "The Third Front," *A.C.E.* 6 (1977).
49. Unpublished transcripts from the Contextual Art Conference transcripts.
50. Amerigo Marras, "The Punk Scene," unpublished text. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
51. Amerigo Marras, "Alternative Work Process," *A.C.E.* 9 (1977).
52. Ibid.
53. Unpublished description by Marras. CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
54. Editorial, *STRIKE* 2:1 (1978).
55. Tom Dean, "No Butter, No Butter," *STRIKE* 2:1 (1978).
56. Fred Forest, "Artistic Square Meter," *STRIKE* 2:1 (1978).
57. Quoted by Jay Scott in "The Young Turk of the New Philosophy," *Globe and Mail*, (May 10, 1978).
58. Jay Scott, "The Young Turk of the New Philosophy."
59. Ibid.
60. "Playing Idiots, Plain Hideous," *STRIKE* 2:2 (1978).
61. All citations for the Finale were taken from the CEAC Collection, York University Archives.
62. On Friday, December 30, 1977, the Toronto police raided the office of the *Body Politic* and seized twelve boxes of files, including subscription lists after the *Body Politic* published an article by Gerald Hannon entitled "Men Loving Boys Loving Men." Three people were charged under two obscenity statutes and subsequently acquitted.

This essay first appeared in *C Magazine* 11 (1986).