pears from it because she is afraid he's falling in love with her Violet alter-ego and not her 'true' self, and reenters her life as Elizabeth. They only sleep together because Elizabeth reminds Mark of Violet. This is real love.

Ignorant of the purpose of the genre's language, Mort Ranson makes the mistake of taking it too literally. In one scene the little girls of a couple dancing to their own song, oblivious to the world around them, is presented word for word, to the viewer as Elizabeth's voiceover oating and Mark dancing to a slow song while the other people on the dance floor move spastically (such as a painting, a postcard, or a movie camera) and even a picture of a toy boat, while in the background is a shot of a real boat. The real boat is the camera itself, and it is a shot of the viewer's imagination. The purpose of the genre's language is to}"nify the viewer and to entice them to create their own fantasies.

Unlike Champagne for Two, which gives us access to the heroine's inner thoughts, Sincerely, Violet effectively locks us out. Elizabeth is too busy writing a book and would rather not share her thoughts if it means falling behind schedule. However, even if Sincerely, Violet had given us the opportunity to know her heroine's thoughts and feelings, it is doubtful that any identification with Elizabeth would have been possible. Elizabeth is depicted as the retiring and shy heroine in some scenes and as a sensual, femme-fatale in others. The two aspects of Elizabeth/Violet are never reconciled into a whole and complete individual. It is as though the film takes as truth the Manon/whore myth that a woman can't be both intelligent and seductive. She must either be an Elizabeth or a Violet. This depiction of a dichotomized woman will be insulting to many of the female viewers who see themselves neither as pasteurized maidens nor as irresistible vamps.

If Shades of Love doesn't undermine the intelligence of its predominantly female viewer, as it does in Sincerely, Violet, it will be an incredibly successful series. Few can resist a warm invitation to fall in love, at regular intervals, in the privacy of one's home. And without having to worry if this is for real. As Champagne for Two proves, when the romance novel is interpreted correctly, it will be.

**Ana Arroyo**

**Chris Gallagher's Undivided Attention**

**Undivided Attention** is a feature-length experimental film by Chris Gallagher which could be seen as part of a trend in Canadian experimental film which has surfaced in the last few years. This trend can be defined as a move away from the purely structuralist inspections of time and space to include elements of character, narrative, emotion and text.

Other films by Gallagher have been fashionable primarily in the structuralist mode; for example, Atmosphere (1975) or Seeing in the Rain (1981). **Undivided Attention** is essentially a non-linear, narrative construct (with a voice-over text and an original musical score) which uses structural devices like Godard or Straub. Gallagher relies heavily on a collage technique which uses the film elements like puzzle pieces, that only come together as an emotional and narrative whole in the viewer's mind.

Gallagher's metaphor for narrativity, and construc of the film as journey, is a recurring shot of a woman and a man in a small sports car travelling through various rural and urban landscapes. We always see the couple from the back of the car where the camera has been placed and travel with them, in what seems to be a cross-country journey, through a series of jumpcuts which destroy the illusion of a continuous time and space.

This emblematic couple is always crossing bridges just as Gallagher's film attempts to bridge the gap between the dichotomies that define his filmmaking and himself. This film seems to be dealing with the split in the postmodern world, between the natural and the civilized, the emotions and the intellect, woman and man, and art and theory, sign and meaning, and whatever we see and know we know. These splits are imagined through a collage which becomes a three-way relationship between perceptual disorientation, an ambiguous conceptual relation to the world, and the problematic of male-female relationships.

The recurrence of perceptual, cinematic games is the most noticeable feature of the film. Aside from the numerous uses of rhythmically edited jump cuts, we also get many shots which serve to disorient the viewer's relationship to the visual world of the film. One often used device is that of isolating a part of the frame; usually some sort of symbol (such as a painting, a postcard, or a wheel) and holding it steady while the rest of the frame - a conventional, realistic shot - spins out of control. At the be the film Gallagher does this, with a strip which goes horizontally across the center of the frame, showing a picture of a toy boat, while in the background is a shot of a real boat. The real boat is set spinning but the sign remains in control.

Another type of shot which Gallagher uses to question and distort our sense of space and control of the view, is one where the camera is seemingly directly attached to some object in the frame. In the most spatially disorienting shot of this type, he mounts a camera on a指挥 with the shovel blade in the center of the frame. This at first seems to give us a point of reference but as soon as the manipulator of the shovel (maybe the cameraman/filmmaker) starts to shovel, the background space becomes real and yet a virtually unreadable, swirling sea of matter. The central view orients to the shovel but disorients us in space. The background and foreground seem separate realities but become one as the shovel picks up snow. The soundtrack also disorients as the live synthesized sound is intentionally put out of sync, thereby creating a further feeling of a world out of order. Gallagher's perceptual games and intentional blurring and undermining of an easy viewing or reading of his work is implicitly a call to pay attention (**Undivided Attention**) to his mode of construction of a work of art, his style of representation, and his version of a cinematic self.

The previously described shots could be seen as pure structuralist constructs, questioning the relationships between viewer, film and reality. However, Gallagher, in this film, often uses these structuralist devices to put forth an emotional reality. As in a Brakhage film, we share the filmmaker's subjective point-of-view. The narrative line of this film, as disjunctive as it is, seems to follow the progression of a sexual relationship. The emblematic couple in the recurring car scenes is replaced by other actors in different scenes, but these scenes when strung together do make a poetic and narrative whole. The feelings of disorientation, which the perceptual trickery conveys to the viewer, are not only feelings of disorientation towards the perceptual world, but also towards the conceptual and emotional world.

A scene central to the definition of the male/female relationships in the film is that of a man typing up a shot by shot description of The Blue Angel by Von Sternberg, while a part of the film plays on a television set in the background. The scene on the TV is that of Marlene Dietrich in the cabaret singing Falling In Love Again while the German professor.
who is soon to become her lover, watches from the audience. The song
derives her as a femme fatale, a destructive
force who draws women like "moths to a flame." At the same time, in her role as
cabaret singer, Dietrich obviously por-
trays the woman as spectacle, as unat-
table other. The Blue Angel is about
a relationship between a sexual woman
and a rigid, over-intellectual professor
who is locked in by acceptance of the
codes of his society. This could also be
seen as a description of the relationship
portrayed in the film. The spectator/auteur
seems to be struggling with a dichotomy in himself, a conflict
between the emotional self and the intel-
lectual self. This scene also contains
perceptual-conceptual game-playing in
which the camera appears to be directly
attached to the typewriter and moves across
the screen in small jarring motions dictated
by the typing, while on each return the
shot gets tighter and tighter on the face of
the man who is typing. The typing
(supposedly of the screenplay of The
Blue Angel which we hear on the
voice-over track) dictates Dietrich's
unusually fluid and freewheeling
general mechanical sense, just as the voice-
over describes the breakdown of the
German film playing on the video monitor.
Dietrich's performance reveals
Galgaro's innovative manner, and the
audience is cued to look closer for the
subtextual connections to his emotional
themes.

In another scene, the neon sign of a
running horse is juxtaposed with a
voice-over narration which recounts
the story of Mubi, the photographer
who was a seminal force in the investi-
gation of modernism by the Wielands and some other
still camera images. Mubi's career can be seen as
tracing a path from an apparition through
intellectual means, but in the end we learn that
he was put on trial for the murder of his
wife's lover and even though he was ac-
quitted the suspicion remains that he was incapable of controlling his own nature.

In this respect the filmmaker's hand-
ing of the scene where the couple make
love is one of the most interesting for its
many reverberations of meaning. The scene starts with a shot of
Niagara Falls, as the camera pulls back it
reveals a woman reading a book held
over the falls. The voice-over is a
doubled voice, male and female, reciting
these words: "I look into his eyes and he looks back. Who are you and what do you mean?" There are more shots
of the falls as and the camera goes into a close-
up of the rushing water, we hear the sound of a woman's voice during the
sexual act. The speed of the rushing
water is manipulated (slower & faster)
it until becomes an abstract, electronic
light play -- an apparent linking of the
natural and conceptual. Next we see a
woman walking over a bridge and then
an out-of-focus image of two bodies
making love, so abstract as to become an
almost unrecognizable form. The previous dou-
bled-voice-over text is played back-
wards and eventually a small spotlight
appears caressing the bodies and reveal-
ing certain parts more clearly and sharp-
ly than the overall image. The spot-
light is a very suggestive device, impli-
ying the eye of the camera, the peephole
gaze of the viewer and the objectifica-
tion of the bodies. But the shots of the

The first thing you see in Kay Armat-
gage's Artist on Fire is a joke. Joyce
Wieland, according to the Canadian
officially sanctioned radical woman
artist, our Joyce sits in a stuffed
chair putting the finishing touches on a
portrait of a young man in ancient Greek
costume. She projects on the screen a
series of revolving signs -- an out of focus
image of two bodies making love the
viewer is cued to look closer for the
unattainable 'other' in a sharp jab. This documentary about
Wieland makes its first point quickly and de-
ftly: the boy's clubhouse is a farce, it just
plain looks silly. But our Joyce is in a
tricky position because she's just been
invited in.

Artist on Fire arrives as Joyce Wiel-
and finds herself being celebrated on
several fronts as "Canada's foremost
woman artist." After decades of working
on the fringes of recognition, working in a way that would not be
readily seen in Canada, Wieland becomes
recognized as a major figure in history
of her work. The film works by intercutting
voices of other artists and critics, actually all of this, but it stands to one side of it.

Armatage's film was conceived in 1983, stemming from an initial interest
in Wieland's formalist/feminist films of the
'60s and '70s, and an amazement at the
difficult of critical writing about them. Both a film scholar and a
filmmaker, Armatage makes documen-
taries that usually approach women's
issues -- abortion in Speak Body, objec-
tification and economy in Strip-tease --
from a grounding in theory. Artist on
Fire, as she saw it, would attempt to
place Wieland's films within the larger
context of her work -- canvases, draw-
ings, sculptures, quilts, etc.; it would de-

strate the richness of (and in) Wiel-
and's work as a whole, and rescue her
films from the confining structuralist
designation. Traditionally, films such as
Reason Over Passion, Handwriting, and A and B in Ontario have been
looked at (when they were looked at at all) as experiments with the medium
formal. Artist on Fire views them in
the context of Wieland's personal concerns: feminism, the environment,
and the Canadian political and geographical
and economic situation. It is a

The film works by intercutting inter-
views with Wieland -- she addresses
the camera directly -- with examples of her
work, scenes of her at work, and staged
scenes which usually quote her work. We see
Wieland swimming in a lake, repriming a
scene from her feature film The Far Shore. We see Wieland aiming a
hand-held camera at the camera, quoting A
and B in Ontario, a technical trick
which is to blend her text with Wieland's
words, insinuating commentary into art.
She's able to do this partly by not iden-
tifying shots from Wieland's films when they appear. They simply form a part
of the text, given no more weight than Ar-
matage's own images. In fact, the film's
cutting style insinuates the erasing of the
lines between what is secondary and what is primary, materials, constructed seamless
join between Wieland's life (or
performance) and her art: associative cuts may take the viewer from an object
in Wieland's home to a similar object in a
film of hers, to a canvas, to a new se-
quence. This is not a distance, 'objec-
tive' documentary; Armagage has called
it an ode.

Or perhaps a chorus. Armatage's use
of voice in Artist on Fire is characteris-
tic of her work. She blends the commen-
taries of Denis Reid, Joyce Zemans, Judy
Steed and Michael Snow, which include
both personal and critical statements.
Armatage has used this strategy before, most effec-
tively in Speak Body, where the com-
mon personal experience of the woman
and the emotional resonance of the sub-
ject combined to give the voices an
irresistible conviction.

The effect isn't as strong here, but the
doices do convince, and that causes
some problems. Intervening voices
would seem to solve the problem of the 'authority' of the traditional documen-
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Joyce Wieland gets ready for the jab