

Rudzienko

Sharon Lockhart

September 8 - October 29, 2016



SHARON LOCKHART, *RUDZIENKO*, 2016. PRODUCTION STILL. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHNEIDER, BERLIN.

The Toronto International Film Festival and Gallery TPW are pleased to co-present *Rudzienko*, a new film installation by American artist Sharon Lockhart. Through her precise films and photographic works, Lockhart explores the relationship between still and moving images and the productive space between the choreographed and natural gesture. Known for her collaborations that unfold over extended periods of time, Lockhart rethinks ethnographic curiosity as a project of exchange: working together with

her subjects to understand and depict their worlds. Her characteristic aesthetic combines a cinematic eye with long-take fixed frames, employing duration in service of an ethics of slow looking, asking spectators to move beyond first impressions.

Lockhart's new work explores a recurring theme in her practice: the experience of childhood and adolescence. *Rudzienko* was born out of Lockhart's long-term friendship with Milena Slowinska, a young Polish girl

with whom she began a collaboration in 2009, during the making of her previous film *Podwórka*. For the past four years, Lockhart has organized several rural retreats for Milena and a group of her peers living together in a home for girls in the town of Rudzienko, near Warsaw.

Influenced by the work of Janusz Korczak, a Polish-Jewish pedagogue who argued the importance of children's rights, including a child's right to freedom of expression, Lockhart and several colleagues (including artists, writers, a philosopher, a movement therapist, and a theater director) worked with the girls in a series of workshops. Together they experimented with forms of thinking, movement, writing and performance, encouraging the teens to articulate their individual perspectives. Collectively, they created the script for *Rudzienko* and choreographed a set of scenes in which the girls' conversations and gestures interact with the surrounding landscape. Created in the girls' native Polish, Lockhart's film employs a unique structure for the use of English-language subtitles, proposing a new consideration of the dynamics between image and language, and highlighting the hybrid nature of the work as both document and fiction. With a protective affection, the resulting film introduces spectators to the lives of these young women as they openly explore their own understandings of agency, selfhood, and expression.

Linda Norden in conversation with Sharon Lockhart

A few notes by way of background for the conversation transcribed below, which is at once an impromptu exchange and contingent on what's become a long and deeply gratifying friendship with Sharon Lockhart.

I was asked late this summer to come up with a short list of questions pertaining to *Rudzienko*, the film on view at Gallery TPW. I'd seen the film as installed at the Arts Club of Chicago in mid-July, and I'd seen it close to its finished state in March, at Lockhart's Los Angeles studio. She was about to take off for Poland, to conduct another workshop with the girls in the film, and was working on refining the English translations of the recorded Polish conversations. As always with Lockhart, the work was exquisitely beautiful, deceptively quiet—hugely ambitious, in spite of its concerted slow unwinding. The atmosphere in the studio was beyond intense. Every detail matters for Lockhart, and the

crucial role played by the verbal exchanges between the girls in *Rudzienko* was proving to be a stumbling block in translation. Lockhart was after an English-language counterpart that did justice to both the ambient sound of their voices and the urgent content of their words, and that translation was foundering. She had also yet to work out a happy way to introduce those translations into a film so contingent on the visual gorgeousness and idiosyncrasies of each shot and the timbre of the girls' voices in Polish. Lockhart wanted the language to be idiomatic for its Polish audience and those viewers fluent in English; but she wanted the sound in the film to be indigenous to the landscape.¹

My relationship to Lockhart's work began with my viewing of two wildly different films—each of which struck me as entirely distinct—and a third that I saw later, and counted as one of the most beautiful I'd ever



SHARON LOCKHART, *RUDZIENKO*, 2016. PRODUCTION STILL. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

seen. In retrospect, *Khalil, Shaun, A Woman Under the Influence*, (1994); *Goshogaoka*, (1997); and *NŌ*, (2003), are each studies in method: Lockhart's exceedingly self-conscious and wonderfully transparent rejiggerings of the structuralist and independent films she seems to have inhaled as an art student, in the service of an amateur ethnographer's probing curiosity about the way people from particular places structure and ritualize their relationships to each other, to their habits and talents and tasks, and to their surroundings. But at the time, these were just deeply affecting and uncannily strange films, which seemed to have sprung whole from the head of their maker. *Khalil, Shaun, A Woman Under the Influence*, Lockhart's first film, is already clearly structured and structural, a three-part meditation on real pain and overt artifice, a metaphor for capital "C" Cinema and an opening essay on the empathetic, collaborative documentary film she'd go on

to make, inspired by both Jean Rouch and John Cassavetes. Four years later, Lockhart's 1997 *Goshogaoka*, which records the exercises of a Japanese middle-school girls' basketball team, makes the melding of documentary clarity and aesthetic deliberation at once that much clearer and that much harder to pry apart. Its classic, six part, 10-minute-each takes and visible fixed camera reveal all, and yet the girls pictured practicing become only more confounding for the transparency of the filming. *NŌ*, a film I saw after beginning to work with Lockhart, only amplified my intrigue with Lockhart's penchant for ritual and film, and the extent to which a keen sense of portraiture particularized her subjects.

It was with these thoughts that I first met Lockhart. That relationship goes back to the late 90s, when I was curating contemporary art at what was then Harvard's Fogg Art

Gallery. I'd been approached by the film and video historian, Bruce Jenkins, who was directing the Harvard Film Archive at the time, and deeply immersed in the work of creating long-term storage and conservation facilities for its great film collection. Jenkins had just given a talk at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago, in conjunction with a mid-career survey of Lockhart's work and had learned from Lockhart, while there, about a new project she had only just begun.

That project entailed a series of planned meetings and filming toward a portrait of the great camera designer—Godard's favorite—and inventor of the Aaton camera, Jean-Pierre Beauviala. The idea was to exhibit both Lockhart's filmed portrait and a kind of filmic scrapbook, or journal, that Beauviala had compiled over his years. This journal featured portraits of his son and many girlfriends, and things like advertisements, color and sound tests: mundane, but richly informative windows onto the constituent elements informing some great film history. The fledgling Harvard Film Archive conservation crew was prepared to restore this filmic journal and all parties involved were extremely excited about the prospects of the project. Aside from those committed to the Film Archive, the anthropology department, and what was then called the Film Study Center—now the Sensory Ethnography Center—were both excited about Lockhart's unusual straddling of ethnographic, sociological, collaborative and structuralist filmmaking: the project inspired some exciting inter-departmental conversations and a symposium including anthropologists and artist-filmmakers, called "Setting Up the Document."

As it happens, what got produced and shown, eventually, at Harvard, was Lockhart's very



SHARON LOCKHART, *PINE FLAT*, 2005. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

different but equally monumental *Pine Flat* (2005). Unbeknownst to either Jenkins or myself, Lockhart had moved to the mountains west of L.A. for a much-needed post-retrospective respite. She had purchased the Aaton camera to use in the filming of *Pine Flat*, her first venture as cinematographer of her own film.² Lockhart's films, as I note more than once in the interview that follows below, have remarkably strong through-lines—even films as wildly different as *Khalil*, *Shaun...* and *Goshogaoka* share a profound sense of empathy with their subjects, which can seem in marked contrast to the tight, formal control of their structural composition. This remains true in each of the films to follow. But Lockhart's long stay in the place she called Pine Flat yielded something much more closely observed and personal, an inside-out perspective which, embodied as it is in the kids' performed play, works powerfully against the insistent beauty of the landscape, and Lockhart's obsessively controlled, painterly shots. *Pine Flat* is as conspicuously structuralist as *Goshogaoka*: twelve shots, ten minutes each, divided into two acts, with an intermission. However, that tight structure, and the sometimes excruciating attenuation that ten minutes bestows on the spontaneity of kids' activities, yields a flood of far more nuanced insight into the way these kids manage themselves in the absence of parents, and occupy this landscape. More than that, *Pine Flat* torques Lockhart's already hyper-attentive relationship to her subjects: in both *Pine Flat* and the films made in Poland—perhaps above all, those made with Milena Slowinska, including *Rudzienko*—the representations entailed in the making of the film became a way into long-term, ongoing relationships between Lockhart and those she portrays. And yet, despite this real world involvement and commitment, Lockhart's structural

underpinnings sustain her deep-seated respect for the privacy of her subjects. I'm astonished each time I see *Rudzienko*, or *Pine Flat* or *Goshogaoka*, again: I don't learn any more about her subjects; I just learn better.

¹ Lockhart arrived at a brilliant solution for the translated English dialogue in her Arts Club of Chicago installation. In *Rudzienko*, the English translations are presented as intertitles in scrolls of white text on a black screen between scenes, allowing for full immersive impact.

² The 16mm Aaton camera's signal innovation was to allow sound-sync: or, to use the more technical description, a camera that allows a single reference to both film and audio takes by clearly indicating on the film stock, as well as the magnetic tape, the precise time that it recorded the images and the sounds. First produced in 1967, the Aaton played a major role in the Parisian student demonstrations of 1968; its ability to record real time, synched sound and image offered a new order of document and evidence.



SHARON LOCKHART, *RUDZIENKO*, 2016. PRODUCTION STILL. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

The following is a conversation that took place over email between Sharon Lockhart and curator and critic Linda Norden.

Linda Norden: Can you talk a little about your original invitation to do a project in Poland—that is, what brought you to Poland, initially? And then, can you say whether, in your conversations leading up to that initial project *Podwórka*, you knew you wanted to focus on kids/adolescents, or did you come to that when in Łódź?

Sharon Lockhart: The initial invitation to work in Poland was from Adam Budak, curator of the Łódź Festival of Cultures, with whom I had previously worked at the Kunsthaus Graz. He invited me to come to Łódź to see if something piqued my interest. I had just finished *Lunch Break* so had moved away from the young people I worked with in *Pine Flat*. I had no plans when I came to Łódź. It was quite by accident that I noticed kids playing in courtyards and came up with that idea. It was really the quickest I had come to and carried out a project.

LN: Can you give a rough chronology of your time in Poland and how it led to the current project?

SL: All of my work in Poland started with *Podwórka* in 2009. I met a young girl named Milena Slowinska during the shoot and befriended her. She was nine at the time. The following few years I kept in touch with her, as did the Polish producers of *Podwórka*, Ola Knychalska and Wojtek Markowski. When I was invited back in 2012 to do a show at the Ujazdowski Castle in Warsaw, I decided it would be great to work with Milena. By that time, Milena and her brother were separated and they each were living in a different institution. I wanted to give Milena



SHARON LOCKHART, *PODWÓRKA*, 2009. PRODUCTION STILL. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

an opportunity to spend some time with her brother in the countryside. She told me she wanted to write a book about her life and I liked the idea of playing a part in giving her voice a platform. She had something to say, although I'm not sure she had yet to say it directly. Ola, Wojtek and I rented a house near her grandmother's town and I tried to learn about her life and help her write her book. Although her brother was unable to join us, we had a lot of fun doing the kinds of things you do on a family vacation. Milena and I shared a room and would stay up all night looking through pictures on my phone. We had a great rapport but neither of us understood the other's language. After that summer, I kept in touch with Milena and we planned more adventures together. She still felt she wanted to tell her story but she didn't really know how. When I was invited to do a work for the Liverpool Biennial in

2014, I decided I wanted to do something with Milena and the girls of the home she lived in, the Youth Centre for Psychotherapy, Rudzienko. Nobody ever asked any of them about their opinions. They were told what to do every moment of their lives. We tried to present a different kind of education for them. We developed workshops to give them a voice, to bring out that part of them the system had tried to repress. It was a continuation of the process we began with Milena to tell her story but it was expanded to them as a group.

LN: Your work has certain through-lines: for instance, adolescence and the activities, states of mind, and awkwardness specific to that transitional age—both universally and as informed by very local circumstances and traditions—are interests of yours that are conspicuously evident in the projects and

people you've pursued in Poland. But, I'm also interested in the way you develop very intimate, or at least close, relationships with the people who then feature in your films and photography. Can you speak to the ways some of those relationships develop?

SL: The relationships I have with my subjects are almost always continued after filming. I like spending time with the people in them, getting to know them and seeing them grow. In many ways, it is the most enjoyable part of a project. Each of those relationships is unique, as any friendship is, and they develop in their own way. When Milena ended up at the Youth Centre for Socioterapy, Rudzienko, I decided to do the first set of workshops for her and her friends not knowing how much I would love those kids and identify with them; how they would have a hold on my heart.

LN: Do most of your projects begin with an invitation, or are they prompted by a subject, location or place, or an activity with which you identify a place (such as *Goshogaoka* or *NŌ*, or the Ikebana project; or *Teatro Amazonas*; *Lunch Break*; *Double Tide*)?

SL: It is different each time. *Podwórka* started with an invitation. *Lunch Break* started with an idea or subject matter and Maine became the place because of circumstance. The Milena projects were developed through my relationship with her and her friends.

LN: A question about the order of things: in the move from your personal relationship to the film, did you, Milena and her friends discuss the various activities you ended up using in the film—the kite flying, the dancing—as planned actions? Or were they generated from the sites you were drawn to for a particular shot?

SL: Things really developed organically in that film. We were discussing subject matter and sites all the time. Sometimes I think subject matter led to site and sometimes the site generated a subject.

LN: To go back to where I left off, I'm really interested in the order of things, and especially, where a film begins—*Rudzienko*, in particular, but also generally. I'm also interested in the increasingly complex intermingling of theatrical set-ups—or mise-en-scènes—that you stage, with your committed relationships to the lives of the people in your films, which lie behind them and become an outgrowth of them.

SL: *Rudzienko* has really been a different kind of project for me. The idea of the workshops and generating something for the girls, aside from my filmic project, has always been out in front of producing a product, both in chronology and importance for me. The first year of workshops was an experiment and a surprise. I wasn't completely prepared for how personal it would get and how quickly we would develop friendships. The girls themselves generated this. They were very open to me and the people I brought to them. Everyone who has participated in this project has been amazed by these girls. The set-ups and mise-en-scène staging is something I've been doing ever since the 90s and it has always really depended upon the things my subjects bring to the project. None of them would have worked without that personal element that brings something unique and unexpected. It is important that they are real people, given the space to bring their own personality to the project.

LN: That's so deeply evident in the work, a kind of insistent reminder or pulse against the often unnervingly beautiful landscapes



SHARON LOCKHART, *RUDZIENKO*, 2016. PRODUCTION STILL. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

in which those relationships get framed. But your fields and frames are equally crucial, and so subtly differentiated that it takes acutely attentive looking to track the differences. I love the way you build surprise into the landscapes, the way you reveal all they hide and hold with seemingly silly gestures, as in the scene where the girls emerge from the tree, or pop up from the fields. I love the way that plays against the more natural hanging out, as when the three girls are sitting on the stone wall, talking. Your work has any number of complex, interwoven constants that work as a counterpoint to the very specific circumstances of the girls in *Rudzienko* or the kids in *Pine Flat*. For example, the ethnographic underpinnings, which you invariably reconceive around those very intense relationships to your subjects, or your penchant for a certain pastoral, cinematically composed field. That is, I'm trying to get at the way you mess with the distancing usually imposed on unfamiliar or remote subjects by working closely enough to them to enable them to perform in your films, rather than to be filmed as if by a documenting camera.

Can we talk a little about the art/life implications, here? How do you get to know your subjects; how do you script and direct them?

SL: Again, I think this most recent project is a bit different than previous ones in how personal it has gotten. I am in touch with a number of the girls on social media every single day. As I said, I was surprised by how open the girls were with me, but I did work to create a space for that. When we first went to the Centre to recruit girls for the project, they showed us their bedrooms. When they first came to the farm we rented for the project, the first thing we did was show them our rooms. Then we sat down and ate

something together before Polish educator and philosopher Bartek Przybył Ołowski conducted a workshop in which I and my collaborators participated. I've worked very hard in this project to keep the girls as equal participants, guiding the direction of the scripts and locations and taking cues from things they are into and pulling something out of that.¹

LN: And then, to get back to the distancing... you do all sorts of things to open a space between the viewer and your subjects: reinstating, in a way, a more documentary distance, but structurally. For instance, through your use of timed shots, fixed camera, and via the mise-en-scènes or clearly staged reenactments of what would have/could have been a "found" activity.

SL: That is an interesting point. The production side of my projects is so different from the reception side. I think this is really because media (film and photography) has such a peculiar dynamic. I think you have to recognize the distance you have from the subject of a film in order to create the space for viewers to participate through their own thought processes. Media itself is so manipulative and viewers are so used to acquiescing to that manipulation that it becomes necessary to pull back from the image.

LN: Can you say a little more about the relationship to your subjects that you're trying to achieve for the viewer? That is, how much do you want us to think we "know" the subjects in your film, and what would you like us to know about them? Is this something that's as important to you as your structuring of the film or relationship to those in it?

SL: I don't know if I want viewers to feel they

"know" the subjects at all in the conventional sense. I want them to think about their own lives. I want them to have a relationship with the subjects of the film and that almost always comes by being aware of yourself and, at the same time, being interested in the other person.

LN: There's another sort of play you establish, between the intimate and the formal: intimacy with and amongst your subjects and your highly formalized, exquisite set-ups. Aside from the obvious joy you take in the formal beauty of your shots and in the sound, are some of the formalizing devices meant to protect your subjects?

SL: I know I am very protective of my subjects, and I take it personally if audiences don't "get" them. I wouldn't say that the formal elements are meant to protect them. I recently screened *Rudzienko* to a non-art audience at a center for wayward teens in Sweden. Someone offered the comment that they really appreciated the awareness of the frame that the static camera created because it suggested that there is always something outside the frame guiding what goes on within it. He felt that created an empathy that called for a wider view of behavior and the circumstances that generate it.

LN: That's a great observation. This might be a good place to say a little more about the particulars of how you worked with the girls in *Rudzienko*: your research, the workshops, and the theatricalized set-ups you constructed for shots...

SL: When we started *Rudzienko* I didn't know exactly what it would be as a film. I knew I wanted to do the workshops and that they would generate something discursive. What it generated was a conversation or

set of conversations. As I said earlier, we wanted to give them something different as an educational model, to ask their opinions and develop those ideas. Each day we chose a different location and based our programming on some aspect of the site. In this way, each conversation is linked to its setting.

LN: I think *Rudzienko*, and your other projects with Milena—also *Lunch Break* and *Double Tide*, but not *Podwórka* or *Pine Flat*—seem more sociological than ethnographic. That is, the subjects seem less exoticized and at once more clearly “known” by you and more developed as characters, rather than as exemplars of what they do. Does that seem like an accurate perception?

SL: I would include *Pine Flat* in the more sociological group. *Pine Flat* was really the first time I worked for years with a group of people before filming them. In general, I would say that a time commitment will generate a different project than something done quickly. I hope that my subjects are not exoticized and I am always working to move away from that.

LN: Can you talk about translation in *Rudzienko*? More specifically, can you elaborate on how you gained understanding of what the Polish girls were saying, what you wanted to capture from their dialogue, and what you wanted to protect? Following this, can you explain your reconstruction of sound in the film, and how you decided to show the translation?

SL: Translation has been a huge issue from the start with this project. I’ve always had Polish speakers working with me and some of the girls were even fluent in English, but I never had professional translation so was



SHARON LOCKHART, *LUNCH BREAK*, 2010. COLBY MUSEUM OF ART, WATERTOWN, MAINE. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

always working hard to communicate. I think the amount of effort we had to expend on communicating became a bond we shared. In the initial workshops, Bartek was quite helpful in communicating his ideas to me and bringing my ideas to the girls.

The texts the girls generated were a product of his workshops. The crew, Bartek and I discussed the content every night and talked with the girls the next day about what they might want to say on camera, but often they came up with their dialogue improvisationally on the spot. I had a general idea of what they were saying but the specifics weren't fleshed out until I had a translator go through the footage and translate the texts word for word when I was back in Los Angeles. Later on, I had another translator go through the texts and found out there were subtleties that the first one had not noticed. For the most part, I did not see my role as protecting them from their own words. They were told that this

was their opportunity to say something to the world so I took them seriously, and assumed that their speech was intentional.

Deciding what entered the film and what did not was difficult. The conversations that didn't work were the ones that were confusing and aimless. I wanted to put everything in but I had to limit the content so it worked as a totality. I had a really hard time coming up with a way of presenting the text since I think subtitles are problematic. If you are always reading, you are unable to look at the image and really listen to the sounds of the Polish voices and the ambience. Subtitles make everything textual and rob you of your senses. I felt that their “voice” was more than what they were saying. It was also the sound of their voice. I tried every way I could to present the translation and ended up with the 3 scrolls. I like the way it gives a solemnity to the text and gives you space to sit with it and also sit with the picture.

Well, at least now we can just lie here and listen to these sounds ...

And talk in peace. And stop this endless routine.

And separate ourselves from the rest. From the whole world ...

And the rude comments, the swearing, from people who don't respect ...

... their own selves.

Or their own lives.

Especially since you only have one life.

It's so peaceful here.

Very. You can really calm ...

... calm yourself.

SHARON LOCKHART, *RUDZIENKO*, 2016. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

As for the sound, we did a lot of work on bringing out the texture of the places we filmed. I wanted people to hear the conversations, and if they were native Polish speakers, be able to understand them, but I wanted the feeling of the landscape to be ever-present.

LN: In the earlier installation of *Rudzienko*, you incorporated a selection of re-photographed color snapshots of yourself as a child, in various landscapes and with other family members. Can you talk about the re-photographing of your childhood pictures? For me, those suggest the role that set-up and self-consciousness play in mediating experience and memory, which seems pretty core to your work. There's a degree of self-consciousness that each of those images feature that you seem to have embraced in retrospect.

SL: The process of making the untitled snapshots is very much about creating a self-consciousness in relationship to pictures. They are about noticing something in the photographs that might speak to larger questions that could be formal, or about the role of images in our lives, or about our relationships with each other or the landscape. I prefer to think about them in terms of self-reflexivity rather than through memory. I wouldn't like to think that they were somehow nostalgic.

LN: The gallery installation of *Rudzienko* includes a second film, a short text work. Can you talk a bit about that second film? I love the way it plays against and with the scenes of the girls in *Rudzienko*.

SL: I think about that film as a prelude to *Rudzienko*. It sets up a way of looking

and considering text and sound, with a continuous background sound and poet, Andżelika Szczepańska, reciting her poem. The only visual is the translation of the text that appears at a rhythm similar to the spoken text. When I was thinking about breaking up the film into a series of small installations, I came up with the idea of this separate piece. It was the only section that worked perfectly on its own as a single, very concise work. I appreciate your insight that it has a very specific relationship with the larger film. I wanted viewers to consider the way sound, image, and text function both separately and together.

LN: I wanted to ask about your thinking around Janusz Korczak and his book, *How to Love a Child* (1919). That title alone speaks volumes and is something you're so hyper-attuned to. I think for me what's so astonishing in your films is the way you reinforce the importance of a quality of attention—to people and landscape and work and craft and things in our everyday lives—and the ways in which small gestures and hard words and just a lack of attention can so quickly hurt and do damage. But more specifically, the way you consistently get at those overlooked, tiny exchanges and recognitions through the intensifications and reenactments that cinema and painting and photography (images and encounters intensified by aesthetic adjustments) allow. I think this question is both about quality of attention and about scale and magnitude. That is, I think your precisely calibrated formal intensifications—the slowed looking and long still shots; exaggerated (manipulated) sound; acutely observed, staged, filmed and framed mise-en-scènes; and perhaps above all, the real relationships you establish with real people in real lived situations, and your collaborative direction of same—draws your

viewers into an order of attention that comes close to yours, and an order of experience that comprehends that of your subjects, even as you protect your subjects from any false assumption on our part that we can judge them.

SL: It is interesting that your question starts with Korczak and goes on to encompass almost everything I do. I think it is insightful to frame it that way because it is really about giving everyone (the subjects of the film, viewers, and all the participants in the projects) a certain amount of respect. That is what drew me to Korczak in the first place: the fact that he respected children enough to cede them a level of autonomy that adults often reject as dangerous. He encouraged the children in his orphanage to form their own parliament, their own court system and made possible their own newspaper, *The Little Review*. He was one of the initial authors of legal rights for children. I've always been interested in this topic, both the question of rights in general and rights for children in particular. One inspiration for *Lunch Break* was the research I did for *Pine Flat* and the Lewis Hine photographs lobbying for child labor laws. Korczak thought it was important that children be given the opportunity to fail. For me, that is such an interesting and important stance. In a sense, it is how I like to think of audiences. My films are more about giving people an opportunity to approach the work in their own way than an attempt to force them into a certain kind of spectatorship.

¹ In 2014, the group worked with Polish educator Bartek Przybył Ołowski to create exercises designed to empower the girls' individual voices as they articulated their perspectives about the world. In 2015, they worked with curator Ewa Tatar, theatre director Tomasz Węgorzewski, and dance movement therapist Małgorzata Wiśniewska to explore the psychological derivations of movement. Then, as a group they read Edgar Allan Poe's gothic story *The Fall of the House of Usher*, which was used as a framework to engage with the girls' own dreams.



SHARON LOCKHART, *UNTITLED STUDY (REPHOTOGRAPHED SNAPSHOT #19)*, 2015. FRAMED CHROMOGENIC PRINT. COPYRIGHT SHARON LOCKHART. COURTESY THE ARTIST, GLADSTONE GALLERY, NEW YORK AND BRUSSELS; NEUGERRIEMSCHEIDER, BERLIN.

Linda Norden

Linda Norden is a curator, writer and part-time professor of art history, theory and criticism currently teaching for the BFA and MFA programs at the Malmo Art Academy in Malmo, Sweden, and at Cornell University. Norden curated contemporary art at Harvard University's Fogg Art Museum between 1998 and 2006; directed the City University of New York's Graduate Center Gallery (The James Gallery) from 2008-10; and served as Commissioner of the U.S. Pavilion for the 2005 Venice Biennale, where she organized Ed Ruscha's project, "Course of Empire" with Whitney Museum curator and Deputy Director, Donna DeSalvo. She has written on many contemporary artists for *Artforum* and for various catalogues and publications, most recently on the L.A. painter Laura Owens, the Norwegian photographer, Torbjorn Rodland, and the NYC/LA artist, Jordan Wolfson. She is currently organizing "Project in the Drain," based on the late, "Marxist movie composer," Hanns Eisler's, mid-20th c. composition titled "14 Ways of Considering the Rain," with New York/Austrian artist Rainer Ganahl, and a longer-term exhibition two-part project on Sol Lewitt as collector and artist advocate, and on the shifts in the conceptualization of his instruction-based art over the course of his years living part time in Italy.

Sharon Lockhart

Sharon Lockhart lives and works in Los Angeles, California. Her films and photographic work have been widely exhibited at international film festivals and have been the subject of solo exhibitions at major museums worldwide, including the Museum of Contemporary Art Chicago, Walker Art Center, Kunsthalle Zürich, Wiener Secession, San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, the Israel Museum, Jerusalem, and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, among others.

Sharon Lockhart, *Rudzienko* at Gallery TPW is co-presented with The Toronto International Film Festival, Wavelengths Programme.

Rudzienko is co-produced by Kadist Art Foundation and the Liverpool Biennial with the generous support of the Alpert Foundation.

Gallery TPW

170 St Helens Ave
Toronto ON CANADA M6H 4A1
gallerytpw.ca info@gallerytpw.ca
T 416-645-1066

