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| The term “structural film” originally came from P. Adams Sitney’s essay of the same title, published in *Film Culture* in 1969. Sitney’s essay aspired to label a new aesthetic he had observed in the films of North American artists like Michael Snow, Hollis Frampton, Joyce Wieland, and Paul Sharits. For Sitney, structural cinema comprised ‘films that insist on their shape.’ He distinguished this new aesthetic from the ‘mythopoetics’ of Stan Brakhage and Maya Deren, who, up to that point, were major representatives of the postwar American avant-garde. In Sitney’s view, Andy Warhol’s early films (which comprised lengthy single takes of actions like eating and sleeping) were a huge factor in shifting the North American aesthetic to the cooler, more detached aesthetic of structural film. |
| The term “structural film” originally came from P. Adams Sitney’s essay of the same title, published in *Film Culture* in 1969. Sitney’s essay aspired to label a new aesthetic he had observed in the films of North American artists like Michael Snow, Hollis Frampton, Joyce Wieland, and Paul Sharits. For Sitney, structural cinema comprised ‘films that insist on their shape.’ He distinguished this new aesthetic from the ‘mythopoetics’ of Stan Brakhage and Maya Deren, who, up to that point, were major representatives of the postwar American avant-garde. In Sitney’s view, Andy Warhol’s early films (which comprised lengthy single takes of actions like eating and sleeping) were a huge factor in shifting the North American aesthetic to the cooler, more detached aesthetic of structural film.  For example, Paul Sharits’s ‘flicker’ films cycle rapidly between single frames of solid colour or bold graphic design, thus emphasizing the materiality of the film strip. The first section of Frampton’s *Zorns Lemma* (1970) adheres to a predetermined, rule-based structure (based on the 24 letters of the alphabet) so rigorously that its structure could be said to comprise its content. Another example is Snow’s *Wavelength* (1967), comprised of a 45-minute zoom. Sitney argued that *Wavelength* lays bare the very structure of cinematic narrative: space itself is a necessary condition of cinematic storytelling, and *Wavelength’s* gradual zoom tells ‘the story of the diminishing area of pure potentiality.’ In all these examples of structural film, we are unable to distinguish between form and content in any meaningful way.  Structural film was not a movement organized by filmmakers themselves, but rather a label invented by one critic and imposed from the outside. As such, it took some time to catch on. In a 1971 interview with Charles Levine, animator Robert Breer found himself surprised to be categorized as a structural filmmaker—he had not yet heard the term. Sitney was criticized for his essay, not because it mischaracterized the work of the filmmakers in question, but because it asserted structural film as something entirely new. Sidney’s essay did not acknowledge the influence of Fluxus and minimalism on structural film, or the structural tendencies in earlier avant-garde cinema. Artists like George Maciunas argued that structural film did not represent the stylistic rupture that Sitney thought it might: it developed out of established practices in film and other media.  In the 1970s, a group of British filmmakers started a movement called ‘Structural/Materialist Film,’ inspired by the North American structural filmmakers and the films of Andy Warhol. Structural/Materialist filmmakers used formal devices like repetition and long duration, which, in Peter Gidal’s words, ‘result in demystification or attempted demystification of the film process.’ For Gidal, the ideal film makes its medium-specific qualities apparent, and offers spectators a sort of Brechtian awareness of their viewing position. Though working in a different theoretical and cultural tradition than the North American Avant-Garde, Gidal’s theory of Structuralist/Materialist film nonetheless influenced contemporary critics, who tend to characterize all of structural cinema as a modernist exercise in medium-specific aesthetics. The Structuralist/Materialist tradition influenced many UK-based political filmmakers, including the filmmakers and theorists Peter Wollen and Laura Mulvey.  In the United States, the late 1970s saw the end of the structural cinema tradition. Younger filmmakers like Vivian Dick and Scott and Beth B were pursing a different aesthetic, based in the punk and no-wave scene. In the 1980s, many would distinguish themselves from the structural tradition by their explicitly political content: filmmakers and video artists like Peggy Ahwesh, Barbara Hammer, and Isaac Julien maintained a formally rigorous aesthetic reminiscent of Structural Film, but engaged issues of race, gender, and sexuality in a way earlier filmmakers had not.  Videos available online  Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oRd3727lwXs  Owen Land, Film in Which there Appear Edge Lettering, Sprocket Holes, Dirt Particles, etc. (1965)  Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aBOzOVLxbCE  Michael Snow, Wavelength (1967)  Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ihTynFLMy2Y  Paul Sharits, T,O,U,C,H,I,N,G (1969)  Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=voMDL1TgTh4  Hollis Frampton, (nostalgia) (1971)  Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2deRSqwZyI0  Peter Gidal, Clouds (1975) |
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