

---

# Incestuous Festivals: Friendships, John Greyson, and the Toronto Scene

By Antoine Damiens

Film festivals often rely on “precarious cultural work”.[\[1\]](#) Increasingly adopting the neoliberal logic of the creative economy, they entail particular forms of affective labour, combining “the pleasure and excitement experienced during the festival - alongside the lesser-known affective states of despair, disappointment, and anger that need to be managed as a consequence of films being rejected from the festival”. [\[2\]](#) Although recent scholarship has emphasised the precarious material reality of cultural workers, festival organisers often describe their activity as a “labour of love”. “Labour of love” - a somewhat naïve and romanticised shorthand for the less glamorous and resolutely not sponsorship friendly term “precarious” - insists on cultural work as producing not value or economic stability but intangible affects and relationships - friendships.

While the expression “labour of love” certainly participates in rebranding festival organisers’ precarious, unpaid or underpaid, cultural work as engendering positive affects, it also points to the central role played by collaborations and friendships in artistic endeavours. As I argue elsewhere, this emphasis on affects and friendship provides a productive framework for understanding festival studies itself: academic discourses on festivals often refract our own circuits and networks. [\[3\]](#) In the context of this article, however, I am interested in how friendships sustained at and through festivals participate in shaping cinematic cultures.[\[4\]](#) Reflecting upon her contributions to both film studies and the festival phenomenon, B. Ruby Rich resituates the role played by chosen networks of friends in establishing Women’s cinema:

Knowledge can be acquired and exhibited in a variety of ways. To read and then to write: that’s the standard intellectual route. In the years of my own formation, though, there were many other options. Journals and journeys, conferences and conversations, partying and politicking, going to movies and going to bed.[\[5\]](#)

Scholars traditionally describe festival circuits and networks in terms of their “relation to living and non-living actors”.[\[6\]](#) Emblematically, Dina Jordanova describes festival circuits as a “treadmill in motion only for as long as there is the living person to service it, only as long as there is someone to keep it in motion”.[\[7\]](#) In this framework, participants are first and foremost defined by their professional occupation: they are

---

understood as “stakeholders” or “cultural intermediaries” whose competing performances regulate the event and who have “particular interests in seeing the network proliferate”.[\[8\]](#) While this framework posits that collaboration between stakeholders is crucial in organising festivals, it does not fully account for friendships sustained beyond the duration of the event.

In contrast, Rich’s autoethnographic history of Women’s cinema starts not from the festivals she successively curated, organised, or simply attended, but rather from her own encounters with festival-goers turned friends and collaborators. In so doing, Rich echoes Michel Foucault’s definition of friendship as a productive, radical, and “slantwise” *network* of relationality, one born out of her participation in various festivals and conferences but that exceeds traditional definitions of the circuit. As a network of relationality, friendships “*short-circuit* [institutions] and introduce love where there’s supposed to be only law, rule, or habit”. It produces a potential for collaborations beyond one’s participation in an event, “[tracing] diagonal lines (...) [that] allow [relational] virtualities to come to light”.[\[9\]](#)

In this paper, I hope to illustrate what could be gained in taking seriously friendship as a *network of relationality*. Shifting the emphasis from traditional definitions of festival circuits to the interpersonal networks created and sustained at festivals, I analyse the role played by friendships in fostering artistic collaborations in 1980s-1990s Toronto as expressed through Canadian director John Greyson’s oeuvre. Indeed, Greyson’s work as a film and videomaker, political activist, curator, and festival board member generously refers back to friendships born out of his involvement on the festival/academic circuit.[\[10\]](#) As Susan Lord argues,

While Greyson never divests authorship and its social responsibilities, “John Greyson” is also central to the formation of collectivism since the 1980s. Much of the work is [sic] produced with his name is done within collective processes wherein filiations, collaborations between friends, and artist communities develop a praxis and an imaginary.[\[11\]](#)

In tracing Greyson’s collaborations through (and involvement in) various North American festivals and cinematic organisations, this paper argues that theorising friendships as radical networks of relationality enables us to advance festival studies on two fronts: (1) a reconceptualisation of the relationship between festival stakeholders through their artistic and institutional collaborations and (2) an analysis of interpersonal relationships as “crossing over” festival circuits and producing cinematic cultures.

**Greyson’s “gay squib”: Friendships, collaborations, and the**

---

## emergence of a gay and lesbian film culture

Greyson's first tapes coincide with the emergence of a gay and lesbian cinematic culture marked by both video activism and an ethos of collaboration between artists, activists, and scholars. As Larry Horne and John Ramirez's review of an academic conference held within the 1983 UCLA Gay & Lesbian Media Festival makes clear, Greyson's politics and aesthetics cannot be separated from

the specificities of the video apparatus - [he] attempted to situate the emergence and input of gay and lesbian artists in video where the codes of production are not yet rigidly conventionalized. Promoting the undertaking of a history of alternative practices, Greyson's history of video attempted a clarification of the social and cultural contexts for the medium's development, its relation and intersection with other artistic forms, and its possible place in the social struggle for increased sexual liberation.[\[12\]](#)

In the early 1970s, a few critics and scholars organised gay and lesbian film festivals, largely dedicated to unearthing the gay subtext of European and Hollywood films and influenced by traditional modes of cinephilia.[\[13\]](#) The situation changed rapidly in the early 1980s: the Alternative Cinema conference held at Bard College and the protests against the films *Cruising* and *Windows* served as catalysts for the development of a community-based gay and lesbian cinematic culture, highly influenced by the politics and aesthetics of the video format.

In June 1979, "[f]our hundred film and video activists [as well as critics and scholars] met at Bard College in New York State (...), the most important national gathering of progressive media workers since the 1930s." The conference, organised with the support of *Jump Cut*, aimed at bridging the gap between film scholars, artists, and activists. It featured workshops as well as an extensive screening programme, akin to a festival. While the conference emphasised the role played by video as a minority-led praxis of resistance, participants soon "recognized that their needs were not being adequately addressed by the structure and organization of the Conference, whose Organizing Committee was dominated by white, male straights from New York." [\[14\]](#)

In order to defuse the controversy, the organisers included special sessions dedicated to minorities, albeit relegating some gay and lesbian programming to late night sessions.[\[15\]](#) In that context, the Lesbian and Gay Male Caucus (which included film and videomakers, critics, and scholars, among whom Thomas Waugh, Jan Oxenberg, and B. Ruby Rich) established a list of demands directed at the organising committee. The group called for an exchange of information between gay and lesbian

---

media workers and scholars, as well as for the creation of “[a]lternative distribution centers which must seek out, distribute, and encourage the production of media made by lesbians and gay men.”[\[16\]](#)

A month later, a coalition of gay filmmakers, critics, scholars, and activists crystallised around two films distributed by United Artists: William Friedkin’s *Cruising* and Gordon Willis’s *Windows*. Importantly, United Artists’s parent company Transamerica had, through two of its subsidiaries, financed the campaign of homophobic politician John Briggs.[\[17\]](#) Furthermore, Friedkin had already been criticised by the gay liberation movement for his film *The Boys in the Band*.[\[18\]](#) In the spring of 1979, a script of *Cruising* was leaked to *Village Voice* columnist Arthur Bell, who urged readers to actively protest the film. In New York alone, more than 8,000 people marched against the film.

Taken together, the Alternative Cinema Conference and the protests against *Cruising* are emblematic of a new political movement symbolised by an alliance between critics, scholars, festival organisers, and film and videomakers. Gay and lesbian artists and activists were increasingly interested in the video format, which was understood as a community-based political medium enabling new modes of self-representation. Unsurprisingly, video festivals, defined in opposition to the elitism of the celluloid, emerged in the decade.[\[19\]](#) These debates are refracted in Greyson’s first tapes, which articulate a discourse on video as a collaborative critique of traditional modes of representation.[\[20\]](#)

A few months later, Greyson joined two organisations that were particularly active in mobilising against *Cruising*: both the Association for Independent Video and Film [AIVF] and the National Association for Lesbian and Gay Filmmakers [NALGF] sought to enact the recommendations made by the Lesbian and Gay Male Caucus and to create alternative circuits of distribution for video. The NALGF, headed by Richard Schmiechen, Oxenberg, and Greyson, “include[d] producers, directors, writers, editors, cinematographers, video artists, film exhibitors, film organization administrators, critics, and film and video students.”[\[21\]](#) Its mandate revolved around two axes: to lobby against homophobic media and the erasure of LGBT people from Hollywood productions, and to develop independent circuits of distribution for gay and lesbian films and videos.[\[22\]](#)

Members were quite divided on how to achieve these goals. In several meetings, they discussed whether the NALGF should act as a “service organization with a distribution base [akin to Women Make Movies], [a] professional lobbying association for lesbian and gays working both as independents and in the industry, [a] trade association representing and supporting independent gay and lesbian media [modelled after the

---

AIVF]”, or a loose informal network dedicated to connecting filmmakers with emerging LGBT festivals.[23] The NALGF often positioned itself as an interface between filmmakers and festivals. In the early 1980s, the organisation operated as a relay between Peter Lowy’s and Michael Lumpkin’s gay film festivals (in New York and San Francisco, respectively). It not only curated programmes for both events, but also organised a cross-pollination of sorts. These programmes were usually followed by a panel with filmmakers, festival organisers, and critics. [24] The NALGF also provided assistance in organising several ephemeral LGBT festivals, such as Southampton College’s Eggo or New York University’s Abuse, and relayed calls for submission, notably for Waugh’s 1982 Montreal-based festival Sans Popcorn.[25]

The NALGF further benefited from its connections with the AIVF. Capitalising on his role as a coordinator for both the NALGF and the AIVF, Greyson organised in March 1982 the festival/roundtable “Independent Closets: Gay & Lesbian Filmmakers Open Doors,” which featured both film/videomakers and scholars-critics (among which Mark Berger, Oxenberg, Vito Russo, and Waugh).[26] Greyson’s involvement in the NALGF led him to participate in other foundational conferences/festivals. In particular, Greyson presented his videos and gave a talk at the 1983 UCLA Gay & Lesbian Media Festival. This event juxtaposed screenings with panels intermixing scholars (Dennis Altman, Richard Dyer, Martha Fleming, Bill Nichols, Ramirez, Waugh and Andrea Weiss), critics (Russo and Robin Wood), filmmakers (Barbara Hammer, Paul Leaf and Oxenberg), and activists – many of whom Greyson later collaborated with.[27]

The most important conference / festival happened a few years later, in reaction to the sex wars and the AIDS crisis. In 1986, a group of film and videomakers, students, and scholars at Boston’s Collective for Living Cinema decided to constitute a queer reading / screening group. In an effort to further intertwine self-representation and theory, the group tasked Bill Horrigan and Martha Gever with organising a series of screenings, which evolved into the 1989 conference *and* festival “How Do I Look? Queer Film and Video”, held by the Bad Object-Choices collective at the Anthology Film Archives and sponsored by the journal *October*. The event featured an eclectic mix of artists/activists (Gregg Bordowitz, Jean Carlomusto, Richard Fung, Isaac Julien, Tom Kalin, Stuart Marshall, and Ray Navarro) and scholars/critics (Altman, José Arroyo, Douglas Crimp, Theresa de Lauretis, Diana Fuss, Gever, Cora Kaplan, Kobena Mercer, Judith Mayne, Rich, and Waugh). [28]

In the aftermath of the How Do I Look? conference/festival, Greyson started working with Pratibha Parmar and Gever on the field-defining anthology *Queer Looks*, published four years later (1993). It features

---

many of the same filmmakers (Bordowitz, Carlomusto, Crimp, Nick Deocampo, John DiStefano, Fung, Hammer, Navarro, Parmar, Catherine Saalfield, and Jerry Tartaglia), and scholars/critics (Alison Butler, Chin, Gever, Mercer, Rich, Waugh and Patricia White).[\[29\]](#) The book's introduction simultaneously recalls Greyson's earlier attempts to foster a gay and lesbian distribution circuit and summarises the importance of collaboration and friendship in establishing a gay and lesbian cinematic culture:

We wanted to make public some of the exchanges occurring between an ever-shifting network of artists, organizers, and activists that spanned several continents. We wanted to witness some of the coalitions and collaborations, efforts at a new type of politic, a new sort of image. We wanted to put down on paper some of the ideas being debated by this larger "we", this ever-expanding "we", this collective, communal "we" of lesbian and gay critics, artists and audiences. (...) We were bored dissatisfied with queer critics who endlessly analyzed Hollywood but ignored the independent sector. (...) Distribution for independent queer features is both red-hot at the box office and nonexistent. Distribution for queer video art has both mushroomed and ceased to exist.[\[30\]](#)

As these examples make clear, festivals and activist groups constituted spaces where scholars, critics, filmmakers, and festival organisers could meet and collaborate, thereby defining an emerging gay and lesbian cinematic culture. Friendships created through the festival/academic circuit were instrumental in establishing both gay and lesbian cinema and Greyson's career as an activist, videomaker, and book author. Many of the people involved in the NALGF, the UCLA Gay & Lesbian Media Festival, or the How do I Look conference/festival became collaborators, featured in both the *Queer Look* anthology and Greyson's videos. From Waugh's contribution as a "full frontal nudity expert"[\[31\]](#) to Fleming's double role as actor and scholar, Greyson's collaborators often occupied several institutional positions at once.

### **The "Toronto scene": friendships and video/film circuits in Canada.**

Video, a format far less elitist than celluloid films, played a key role in the development of this ethos of collaboration. In this historical context, videos were often marked by the idea of community. In this section, I shift my emphasis from Greyson's collaborative efforts to define a gay and lesbian cinematic culture to friendships sustained through Toronto's video collectives, positioned at the intersection of various festival circuits. Through the development of cooperatives, artist-run centres and festivals, videomakers in Toronto were constantly screening or curating each other's work.[\[32\]](#) Video can be productively thought of as a cultural

---

scene, defined by William Straw as:

designat[ing] particular clusters of social and cultural activity without specifying the nature of the boundaries which circumscribe them. Scenes may be distinguished according to their location (as in Montreal's St. Laurent scene), the genre of cultural production which gives them coherence (a musical style, for example, as in references to the electroclash scene) or the loosely defined social activity around which they take shape (...) Scene invites us to map the territory of the city in new ways while, at the same time, designating certain kinds of activity whose relationship to territory is not easily asserted.[33]

In Toronto, this video scene emerged partly as a response to State censorship. In the 1980s, the Ontario Censor Board [OCB] actively forced art galleries, theatres, and festivals to cancel screenings of sexually-explicit films and videos. In 1979 for instance, the Arts Gallery of Ontario – one of the most prestigious museum in Toronto – had to call off its screening of Jean Genet's *Un chant d'amour* (1950), deemed too (homo)sexual.[34] The Toronto Festival of Festivals (renamed TIFF) faced a similar situation with its 1982 programme "Video/Video," which included tapes from Colin Campbell, Lisa Steele, and Kim Tomczak.[35] Greyson summarises the situation:

[T]he OCB insisted that *any* public screening must submit to prior censorship and that any venues, distributors, makers, or projectionists proceeding without prior approval would be subject to charges – including every art gallery, public library, community centre, high school, bar, bar mitzvah, you name it. (...) Most arts and community groups thought they were exempt or, at least, that the OCB was kidding. Wrong. The Canadian Images Film Festival was fined. (...) A Space Gallery was raided. Despite intensive organizing and numerous (drawn-out) legal challenges, a decisive chill caused the collective balls of the arts community to retract. Groups and individuals were understandably unwilling to become the next sacrificial lamb. Screenings were cancelled for fear of charges.[36]

Video artists were particularly active in contesting the Ontario Censor Board.[37] They often organised illegal screenings, thus openly defying censorship legislation. In 1981 for instance, the magazine *Fuse* put together a 12 hour-long screening of documentaries which had not been approved by the OCB.[38] Protests against censorship often took the form of inter-organisation collaborations. The 1985 festival "Six Days of Resistance", which Greyson helped organising, is here a fascinating example: presented by A Space, the Women's Cultural Building, the Artists Union and Trinity Square Video, it screened over forty films and videos without prior approval from the OCB.[39] This particular event is

---

at the core of Greyson's contribution to the anthology *Queer Looks*. Analysing the relationships between sex panic and State censorship in Toronto, Greyson recalls some of the tactics mobilised by video activists: in order to avoid having the prints seized by the authorities, "organizers would ask any cops present (undercover or not) to identify themselves, and they would then ask them to leave. (...) By law, cops must comply with this request. Since they couldn't see the tapes or films, they couldn't therefore lay charges".[\[40\]](#)

This struggle against censorship partly accounts for the ethos of collaboration at the core of Toronto's video scene, structured along a loose network of inter-related collective organisations which shared a commitment to "access and activism, participation and dialogue", often regrouping "documentarists" and "video artists" in the same space (among others: LIFT, Charles Street Video, Trinity Square Video, and Vtape).[\[41\]](#) These artist-run centres, cooperative distributors, and art galleries were conveniently located around Queen Street, thereby facilitating inter-disciplinary cooperation: one could edit, distribute, and screen videos in the same building.[\[42\]](#) Greyson actively participated in these organisations. He notably took part in the 1984 and 1986 New Works Shows (organised by Trinity Square Video and Vtape)[\[43\]](#) and in YYZ's 1986 Habits.[\[44\]](#) These artist-run centres and video co-ops fostered artistic collaborations and helped materialising Greyson's call for alternative networks. As Lord argues,

[The] role of video co-ops and artist-run spaces in the shaping of Toronto's art scene is profoundly important for our understanding of how Greyson's work of the 1980s takes shape. His credits read like a meeting of Charles Street Video (which he joined upon moving to Toronto in the early 1980s), Trinity Square Video (where he worked with Michael Balser in the AIDS PSAs) (...) or a meeting at Vtape (on which he sat as a member of the board).[\[45\]](#)

Importantly, this cultural scene intersected with various festival circuits. In the 1990s, "over one hundred small and medium sized documentary, queer, experimental, student and community-based media festivals" were organised in the city.[\[46\]](#) In Toronto, festivals dedicated to South Asian queer films (Desh Pardesh) coexisted alongside events devoted to alternative pornography (Pleasure Dome).[\[47\]](#) These organisations did not compete with one another. Rather, they largely shared information and expertise.[\[48\]](#) Toronto's video scene thus reflected "a crucial permutation on the formulation of a metropolitan cosmopolitanism"[\[49\]](#) that juxtaposed festival circuits and promoted collaborative organising.

Several gay and lesbian film and/or video festivals were organised in the city.[\[50\]](#) Some happened only once, such as the 1986 "Inverted Image"



---

organised by the newspaper *Xtra!*.[\[51\]](#) Others were multi-disciplinary: for instance, Sky Gilbert's "Queer Culture Festival" (starting in 1990) featured videos alongside theatre plays and dance.[\[52\]](#) Inside/OUT, Toronto's most famous LGBT film and video festival, was created in 1991 in an effort to develop a queer circuit defined in opposition to commercial films. According to Joceline Andersen,

The filmmakers who began the group saw it as a platform to showcase queer experimental and transgressive work that with short formats and DIY production values could not find a venue in the art house circuit or the burgeoning film festival phenomenon of the largely narrative New Queer Cinema.[\[53\]](#)

These gay and lesbian organisations were actively fighting against censorship. Canadian custom agents and Canada Post enforced censorship legislation rather zealously. Shipments from and to the Glad Day Bookshop and the Women's bookstore were prevented in 1991 and 1992, and many film prints were destroyed at the border. This censorship also took the form of a withdrawal of public funding. Grants to A Space, Arts Sake, and Trinity Square Video were cancelled in 1982.[\[54\]](#) In 1992, the Christian association CURE successfully lobbied against funding allotted by the government of Ontario and the City of Toronto to gay cultural events: the Metro council "voted to rescind a \$4000 grant to the Inside/OUT lesbian and gay film and video festival". The theatre company Buddies in Bad Time was similarly accused of "exercising bad judgement by allowing the Queer Culture Festival of Toronto to rent their space to hold two seminars on bondage and 'female ejaculation'".[\[55\]](#) Due to a strong mobilisation of the press and artistic communities, funding was eventually re-established.[\[56\]](#)

Gay and lesbian cultural events were often connected with festivals organised in the video circuit. Local videomakers both navigated between and participated in the building of different venues: if the Toronto scene was organised around several structures, they were largely incestuous. Images, a festival started in 1988 by the Northern Vision collective, actively curated programmes dedicated to minorities:

It had also been our desire to be egalitarian in our selection regarding gender, region and race. We wanted to represent those voices which through formal concerns or socio-political agendas are often ignored by national showcases. (...) The Northern Visions selection body attempted to represent various concerns of Blacks, Asians, Native Peoples, gay and lesbian activists and feminists. These concerns have traditionally been ignored by mainstream festivals, yet they truly contribute to what is produced and what we know about Canadian culture.[\[57\]](#)

---

These incestuous organisations enabled particular forms of friendship and collaboration among filmmakers. Following the models of artist-run centres, they were organised by videomakers themselves. Their organising teams were largely overlapping. Board members of one festivals were often screened in another. In Figure 1, I trace Greyson's artistic collaborations through his involvement in both Images and Inside/Out.<sup>[58]</sup> More than half of the festivals' team members have participated in Greyson's projects, in one way or another. Greyson's involvement in these events as curator, board member (Inside/OUT 1994-1996, 1998-1999), jury (Images 1994), lecturer (Inside/OUT 1993), or filmmaker (Inside/OUT: 1991, 1994, 1996, 2000, Images 1990, 1992, 1994) indicate the extent to which festivals served not only as spaces of exhibition, but also as places where one could meet old and new friends. These friendships and collaborations were not limited to Image and Inside/OUT. For instance YYZ's 1986 Habits show incorporated Greyson's *Moscow Does not Believe in Queers* (1986) alongside with Kibbins' *Henry Kissinger Won the Nobel Peace Prize* (1986), a tape on which Greyson was a technician.

As this historical example makes clear, festival organising in 1980-1990s Toronto both reflected existing and fostered new artistic collaborations. Cultural work produces friendships that can potentially crossover festival circuits. Greyson's videos both feature friends and collaborators met on the festival circuit and address some of the issues debated within the Toronto video scene. His oeuvre corresponds to a "project animated by friendship through which an extensive and affective political geography grows (...) a spatial network of solidarity [which] form[s] translocal productions".<sup>[59]</sup>

### **Networks of friendship, circuits, and stakeholders**

Filmmaker and AIDS activist Mike Hoolboom describes Greyson's position within the Toronto scene:

[Greyson] is never "at the beginning"; his ambitions rest neither with the first word nor with hopes for the last. Instead, he finds himself always in the midst of a social web of produced and producing identities (...) It is little surprise that as an artist whose entry point admits him to a conversation already underway, Greyson receives and adapts established modes of address.<sup>[60]</sup>

In resituating Greyson's work as a videomaker, curator, festival organiser, and public intellectual, this paper argued that friendship, defined as a network of relationality, provides a theoretical framework for conceptualising both cinematic cultures and crossovers between festival circuits. Greyson's network of friends and collaborators refracts the

---

evolution of both gay and lesbian cinema and the Toronto video scene. While, in Mike Hoolboom's words, Greyson is never at the beginning of this history, his words often preface major anthologies on censorship, AIDS, and gay and lesbian cinema - generously introducing friends, reflecting (upon) the collective nature of video/activism.<sup>[61]</sup>

Greyson's career also illustrates what could be gained in taking seriously these networks of friendship: as such, his collaborations transcend professional occupations. Greyson and his friends often occupied several institutional locations at once, constantly shifting between videomaking, organising, curating, and writing. This is not surprising: in this historical context, "the existence of the pure critic/scholar who has not tried curating or film/video making is as rare as the curator who has not directed a film or written film criticism (though both animals do exist, of course)."<sup>[62]</sup> As a slantwise network of relationality, friendships point to the productive interplays between various forms of participation in festival organising.

This is particularly important, as scholars often analyse festivals in terms of the competing performances of various stakeholders. Actors participating in festivals are traditionally understood through their professional occupation, an hermeneutic model which presupposes that one is either a festival-goer, *or* a critic, *or* an organiser, *or* a policy-maker, *or* a scholar. While such analyses enable us to describe the cultural economy of festival organising, the reality is - as always - messy: one might be a critic and/or a festival organiser and/or a policy-maker and/or a scholar. One might even move from one of these professional occupations to any other(s). As networks of relationality, collaborations and friendships crossover analytically separated institutional locations, thereby complementing traditional analyses of festival circuits and stakeholders. Instead of separating curators from filmmakers, scholars, and festival organisers, friendships as networks reveal what could be gained in taking seriously the interplay between various forms of institutional location. As a "labour of love", festival organising entails a form of collaboration that can potentially be productive, a mode of relationality that largely crossovers existing circuits and participates in the shaping of cinematic cultures.

**Figure 1.: Greyson's (main) collaborators and their role in Inside/OUT & Images (until 2000).**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Participation in:</b>	<b>(main) collaborator</b>
Achtman, Michael	Inside/OUT: screening committee (1997)	- <i>Un©ut</i> (1997,
Campbell, Colin	Inside/OUT: advisory board* (1994-1995),	

---

board of directors (1996)\*. Images: board of directors (1991), advisory board (1994-1996)