Nasher Sculpture Center

360 Speaker Series
Artist Rachel Rose

Presented November 12, 2016 at Nasher Sculpture Center

Anna Smith: Welcome to the Nasher's 360 Speaker Series. I'm Curator or Education, Anna Smith, and today I'm pleased to introduce artist Rachel Rose. Rachel Rose creates deeply experiential works in video that investigate how we define mortality amid our shared current anxieties. Manipulating sound and image, Rose brings together found footage and her own in what she has described as an alchemic process that occurs through pushing together different parts of time in an image. In her videos, disparate histories and eras coalesce: flowing through subjects that range from zoos and cryogenics, the American Revolutionary War, Philip Johnson's Glass House and the sensory experience of walking in space. Rose's work has been the subject of solo exhibitions at Pilar Corrias gallery in London, Museo Cervales, the Aspen Art Museum in Aspen, The Whitney Museum of American art in New York, Serpentine Sackler Gallery in London and Castello Di Rivoli in Turin. She has recently been included in group exhibitions at Hayward Gallery in London, and the Sao Paulo Biennial. I know we have some great fans of Rachel's work on our staff and we have been quite excited for the opportunity to bring her to Dallas. So I expect we are in for a lovely, thought-provoking presentation this afternoon. Please join me now in welcoming Rachel Rose.

Rachel Rose: Hi, I'm Rachel, it’s nice to see everyone here on such a beautiful day. I don't know how familiar you all are with what I do, so I thought I would actually speak about my work from the very beginning and talk about it chronologically. Feel free to interrupt me if I’m speaking in a way that is confusing...if something's opaque, let me know. I actually started my career, I guess, as a painter. I was making abstract paintings very much in a studio practice structure. I did my undergraduate at Yale and I studied with a painter named Robert Reed who is recently deceased but influenced two generations of artists. He taught alongside Joseph Albers—he actually taught Richard Serra, and Matthew Barney, and Sarah Sze, and just a whole history of artists have come through teachings of Robert Reed. His approach was a very formal, strict practice. I don't know how else to put it. And I was really taken with that, and in a way turned myself into a kind of bubble around a very limited formal perspective. I thought, “okay, that's what I'm gonna do, I'm gonna deal with the problems of being a painter and these minor issues about color and composition and the history of painting, and that's what it's going to be.” When I went to do my MFA at Columbia I soon felt that this was a very boring trajectory and a deeply unsatisfying life for me personally. I would go to the studio, sit alone, check my email, go on Facebook, check the internet, go talk to my friends, and that would be a day. And it just felt like, “this is a waste of my time, this is waste of money, this is a waste of a life. I want to do something that has meaning that allows me to explore the world— what's happening now, that feels urgent to me.” And I actually thought consciously, “okay, that means I can't be an artist,” which in some ways seems counterintuitive, but I had such a negative almost apathy towards the formal problems that play in art that I just thought, “fuck it, I'm done with art.” But I had another year left at Columbia, so I thought, at the time, I would try to make a documentary film and not do a film that would not exist at all in the art world or place me as an artist or anything like that. It

2001 Flora Street
Dallas, TX 75201

+1 214.242.5100

would just totally begin a new career somewhere else doing some kind of political activist work I didn't know.

So this is the first work that this is a still from on the screen, and it's called *Sitting, Feeding, Sleeping*. And what I tried to do was, in a sense, take this apathetic depression that I had about my life, about art and find it in real places in the world that I could connect this feeling to. Some of that is psychological projection and some of that is actually true aspects of what was happening in these various places. So the three places that I went to film were a cryogenics lab in Arizona. A cryogenics lab—there are two in America. The one in Arizona is called Alcore. It's supposedly where Walt Disney is, and other celebrities. It's where they take your body after you die and they basically put freezer fluid—they take out your blood— and put freezer fluid in your body. The idea is that you could be revived a hundred years from now when the technology exists, which is kind of what this whole singularity thing is about. So then I shot in zoos across the country—west coast, east coast. And when I shot in these zoos, I started to notice that the zoos were local expressions of other ideas.
So for example, the Smithsonian in D.C. functions kind of like a museological thing, like the animals are almost presented as artifacts. Whereas in Santa Barbara, the zoo is much more like a theme park. In New York it's much more like a small public space. And so I was thinking about what the actual lives of these animals were within these, in a way, projected spaces of human imagination. The last place I shot was a robotics perception lab in San Diego where—I don't know what slides are in here, I should just see—yeah, so this is the zoo in New York. A robotics perception lab in San Diego where, at the time they were working on developing this giant baby robot that would be able to read human emotion. So if you smiled in front of it, it would know you were happy, if you cried it would know you were sad. And so this very short, 8 minute—what became an artwork *Sitting, Feeding, Sleeping*—was about finding the through line between the zoo, the cryogenics lab and the robotics perception lab. And, for me, what they shared was this flatness that—this confusion between life and death, this state of depression, this, maybe in a sense, a sculptural quality was shared by all three. Animals in zoos, especially for example the polar bear living in a tiny, basically on a tiny set with props, that sort of image what his life might have been like in Antarctica or somewhere else. It's basically like he's living within a sculpture or something, like a theatre set. And the same is true for the bodies and for the robots. So that's what that became. And that sort of got me noticed by some curators at my show for Columbia and that sort of began me being an artist and not a political activist or documentary filmmaker or something else like that.

The next work I made was called *Palisades in Palisades*. In this work I was thinking about inverting the process I had done in *Sitting, Feeding, Sleeping*. In that work I had taken this very real emotion to me, this kind of depression and flat-lining, and projected it out into these sort of external spaces across the country. And in *Palisades and Palisades* I wanted to pick a sort of ordinary place anywhere. It could be this room, it could be the sidewalk, anything, and just try to learn about what's happened there on different moments in time. And connect those things together to look at what time really means and place really means. And so I chose this very small park which is across the Hudson River just over the George Washington bridge in Manhattan that sits atop this cliff, and the cliff is actually this 200 million year old formation that you would expect to find actually in the west. It's like this very dramatic, sublime, rock. And on top of it sits a kind of 19th century Olmstead style mini park—

it's like an acre and a half, it's tiny. And actually, this site that I found, I learned, was where the battle of Fort Lee took place during the American Revolutionary war. So it was actually where all of these people had died. And it was also where the first serial film—almost like a TV show—called *The Perils of Pauline* was filmed, and it was from that cliff that the term 'cliffhanger' came. So there were things about film history, things about American history, things about death, things about time, that supersedes human life span and all of humanity. They were all there.

This is the installation at The Serpentine. So, as you can kind of see in that short clip, you can see the park a little bit, but the way that I edited it was through a kind of trompe l'oeil-ing of space, so trying to match the cut and also overlay different sounds that come from different times within the shots to create this sense of circularity or interiority within the work itself. And my friend Deana, who's basically just standing in different positions in the park as I film her, everything she's wearing is like the park just basic, everyday—a sweater, jeans, a jacket—becomes actually a tool for me to use to trompe l'oeil the edit. So this particular sweater she's wearing matches one of the jackets of one of the soldiers, and the canvas—her coat is actually canvas—and I was able to use the weaving of the canvas to cut into the back of a canvas depicting soldiers in that space. So I was thinking about this closeness between our bodies and our skins and the edit. And I also worked with a camera that I hadn't worked with before, which is very simple, just a rig on a person and myself and another person pulling the focus so that you could get from very far away to very close up without cutting the shot so that everything inside could be in focus. Which is sort of what I was thinking about in terms of the space itself, trying to bring everything into focus and bring depth to where maybe we don't normally see it. So when I showed this work at The Serpentine, just to go back, oh I guess I can't—oh, sorry, I guess I can't go back, but when I showed it at The Serpentine, I took the sounds that you hear like the bullet shot, the sound of wind and I separated them out and had them circulate around the gallery as a way of actually masking the sound within the video and this next work, which I'm going to talk about, which were shown alongside one another. Because one of the problems with showing video in museums and galleries contexts is sound and natural light. And I tried to always work with the way I edit the video itself to be adjusted for the conditions of what it means to show a video work in an art context and not a cinema context. So that's one example of how the sound worked in The Serpentine.

So the next work I made happened after hurricane Sandy in New York, which was a really scary time for anyone concerned about natural disasters and global warming and the future of humankind. It was like, all of a sudden New York was completely blacked out, and I had to stay at a friend's house for a week, and just everything was disrupted and changed, and it happened just so quickly. After that, a few months later, I was in a coffee shop near my apartment. You know, hurricane Sandy was over and everything was sort of back to normal, and all of a sudden this crazy gust of wind with rain just comes out of nowhere, and you could actually almost see it—almost a form—and everyone in the coffee shop was just silent and, like, staring at what happened, like a kind of fear that this was what had just happened again. And I started thinking about that small experience after Sandy again and again, and about glass and why buildings have glass in them and what glass means in terms of our vulnerability to the outside world and our sense of protection and maybe visibility from the inside.

So, because I live in New York where there are so many skyscrapers and in such a place of the development of the skyscraper, I got interested in that and the history of the use of glass in buildings, which led me to the international style, which led me to this architect Philip Johnson, which led me to his house, this glass house. This house was so filled with so many of these issues around natural catastrophe actually and ways that we built our environment that are so incongruous with the problems that we are soon going to face. The house has no circulation, so the day I shot there it was like 110 degrees, probably 130 degrees inside the house. It has—because it's basically a greenhouse, it's all just glass—it's constantly developing mold and there's a famous Poussin painting inside the house. It's called *The Funeral of Phocion*. Yeah this painting, it's just literally constantly being destroyed, and they have to be re-fixing it, which again felt somehow true to this issue of sustainability and vulnerability of our time.

So what I did when I shot there is I took an old VHS interview with Philip Johnson right before he died— yeah right before he died where he was giving a tour of the house. I replicated the camera movements and the time of day and the light and the angles the best I could from this original interview without him there, so filming in the present, and then I basically hand cut him out of this VHS video through rotoscoping, which is basically drawing around something in a frame, and if there's 24 frames per second you can imagine that's 24 drawings per second. For a 5 minute video that's a lot. A lot of episodes of *The Real Housewives* that I was simultaneously watching. Anyway, that took a few weeks. So I cut him out of that and then I sutured them together so when—I think the clip you're going to see, you see it—there's a weird feeling of which kind of time you're in: are you in his time or are you in my time? Or our time now? And I was interested in that in terms of this question of what this glass house means now symbolically. And the other thing that I did is, I was searching for a long time for a real life clip that showed this transition from total calm and obliviousness to total trauma and craziness. It's something that you see all the time in blockbuster films through special effects and compositing, this kind of pasting of different things within one frame. And it's something that we experience, like in hurricane Sandy, but it's not something that you actually see in real life filmed very often because why would they be randomly filming two seconds before something happened? So I found this kind of famous footage of something, a hailstorm in Siberia. And I ended up combining that hailstorm with this house. So, I can show you a clip of that. Yeah, this is the hailstorm in Siberia. I don't know if you guys saw this like about 3 years ago. Oh it should be, oh okay, this is the clip. Yeah, so you have a sense of this suturing that I was talking about. Okay, go to the next work.

Okay, yeah. So the next work I made, I should say about *A Minute Ago,* this whole work with the compositing of cutting Philip Johnson out of one piece of footage and putting him into another and looking at how compositing works in Hollywood film—so, like, for example a tractor just fell through the ceiling that would be a compositing, maybe the rendering of the tractor would be special effects, but the actual cut and pasting in the frame is a compositing thing—and so I was thinking about Hollywood special effects and collaging and the way in which catastrophe in a way is like collage. Your experience is one way in one second and another way in another second. So it's been, the two have been cut and pasted together like there isn't the transition that I was maybe thinking about recuperating in the work before in

Palisades and Palisades. So that meant that when *Interstellar* and *Gravity* came ou,t I was, like, super excited and really interested in paying a lot of attention. I remember when I came out of seeing *Gravity* in the movie theater in New York, I felt this very confusing sense of displacement from earth. Like I almost felt wobbly when walking on the street, and I remember it took almost until having dinner after that I was like "Okay, here I am on Earth, in this condition." I really felt displaced, and what I was actually struck by wasn't that it had occurred through special effects and amazing 5:1 sound design and being in a dark space, but actually that it had occurred through simply the projection of light on a screen and me sitting in a chair hearing things. That felt so basic, and so much more basic than many other ways that people can feel deconditioned from their experience, like going to outer space or even taking drugs or something like that. It was just simply absorbing, in a way, frequencies that had produced this effect in me.

A few months later I was cleaning my apartment and I heard this interview with this astronaut named Dave Wolf and he was describing an experience he had doing a spacewalk in outer space. He was doing repairs on the international space station, and as he was doing them they had a half an hour of a break, and it was night on that side of the Earth, and he turned away from the space station and describes just floating in this complete darkness and then watching this sun come up on the Earth and experiencing color at a frequency that he didn't know his eyes and his body could intake and perceive. And again, I was doing something very basic, just cleaning my apartment and I felt completely like removed from my environment, taken somewhere else, and it was just through hearing this story on the radio. So that's set out on kind of like an adventure to try to find, to speak with Dave about his experience. I just basically stalked him, like hand-written letters and called every place he had spoken to try and get his contact information, and eventually I did and he was willing to let me interview him for this project.

So I interviewed him about this experience of perception coming back to earth and the experience of perception within his body being in both pure darkness and then being subsumed in the color of our earth. And then I shot, I shot the video in two other locations. One was at a neutral buoyancy lab—you can't see it super well in this image, let's see if there's, well I think you'll see in the video, but—which is where astronauts go to learn how to spacewalk—and what was so striking about this was that it's actually just a pool of water. Like a five-story tall pool of water. And again that's so basic. There's nothing crazy or even technical about that. That water could be an analogy for being in outer space felt very profound to me. And then I shot it also at, in my apartment using, let's see, just using things that I could find in my kitchen, so food dye, water, oil, milk. I was looking at artists like Jordan Belson, who had experimented with this, also Douglas Trumbull, the person who did the special effects for *2001: A Space Odyssey*. Many of the special effects were not done in a computer, they were done just by hand with micro and macro lenses. So I tried to replicate that and I shot it on a piece of glass, and when I showed it at The Whitney, I showed it on a translucent screen against a window, so I was hoping there would be this one to one relationship between how I shot it against this translucent, thin thing and again how you see it in the space. And then the last place I shot it was—and then I also got found footage for it—was at EDM concerts, which is like a growing thing. And I randomly had a friend who's now kind of a famous EDM guy, and he let me shoot there, so I shot some stuff of crowds and then I worked to make it look bigger

and more than it was. And then I used those chemicals—for the kind of household objects or the materials I was describing—to displace this camera movement. I think you'll see it the clip.

So as the video goes on, this shot which is already, you can see, displaced here, but this shot of the neutral buoyancy lab becomes increasingly corroded by the chemicals:

Video begins. Music plays and male voice begins speaking about spacewalk: "When I first came back to Earth after 128 days in space, I thought I had ruined my life. Just walking, I took a few steps off the spacecraft and then decided to go ahead and use, to lay down on the stretcher and be carried, because gravity felt so heavy, my wristwatch felt like a bowling ball on my arm. The weight of your body—even my ears felt heavy on my head. But some senses are increased. For example, when you are in space, the air cleaning systems are so effective there are very few odors. The filters are so good, and when the spacecraft door, the hatch, is opened, you're overwhelmed with the smell of the air, and you must feel like a dog feels when you smell bushes as you walk by them. Your sensitivities are so increased because they've been absent for so many months."

RR: So the voice you hear at the beginning is the voice of Aretha Franklin. One of the things that I wanted to do was work with music as a frequency and work with a kind of harmony between the way he's speaking, which I emphasized its flatness. I emphasized the way in which it sounded like a radio transmission. When I did the interview with him, I actually did it in a sound studio. We were doing it through—I had a problem with the microphone and I ended up having to put my phone on speaker phone and then put the microphone above my speaker, and it just totally corroded how you heard his voice. So when I was editing, I tried to actually work with that, thinking of his body, like light, and that sound was also a frequency.

And then this is the most recent work that I made called *Lake Valley*, which I just finished in September. This work actually came from thinking about childhood, maybe through questions around mortality and lifespan. The idea of childhood is a relatively modern idea, Victorian idea. It used to be, especially in Europe, that children were more thought of as mini-adults. They were just born an infant and then the infant became an adult. I was thinking about my own childhood and ways in which experiences then have shaped who I am now and maybe why I'm an artist or why I think about things in a certain way. So I wanted to look back and investigate the idea of childhood, basically. One of the things that just kept coming up when I started looking at the emergence of children's books in the 18th and 19th century was abandonment. That in “Hansel and Gretel,” in most children's book stories, that the kid is abandoned and goes on an adventure and has to find its way back. In a way there are these mini-stories of what it is to be an adult, or what it is to go through any kind of struggle and return. So what I did is I made an archive of thousands of illustrations from mostly 19th century children's books, and working with a cell animator, someone who hand draws animation, we kind of developed this new way—kind of new I guess for us—new way of doing things whereby each image was constructed through collaging different surfaces from these 19th century illustrations to be a different thing in the present. So the story that I wrote, which came from different other children's stories, is about a kind of animal—sort of like a dog, sort of

like a cat, something in between—living in a house and asking for attention, never quite getting it, but not because the family doesn't care or is evil or something, just because they are busy and they don't have time for this pet. Then he ends up going on his own exploration, leaving the house—and it takes place in a contemporary suburb now—imagining a friend, imagining connection, which is in fact, in the end, just an object that explodes, and he is left alone again. So I was trying to reimagine everyday things, like making breakfast or flowers in a flower bed or an office park, but I was trying to reimagine them through these other surfaces to create kind of a disclarity about what time you're in, and kind of what emotional space you're in. So the pasta is made out of a woman's hair and the water is made out of waves, the flowers are made out of cloth.

Video sound begins. Ambient noises and nature sounds such as water flowing and birds chirping and ominous tones play.

RR: So this is when he kind of takes off into the, what he thinks is a forest but is actually a bump of land in an enclave. This is his imagination. So how are we doing on time? Okay, good. Exactly 40 minutes. I wanted to leave time for questions because I know there's a lot here.

Audience Question: I wonder about your work *Palisades, A Minute Ago*, and even about this last work in terms of the editing that you talked about in *Palisades*, and also maybe these surfaces in this most recent work: how some of those concerns that you described might be a transposition or continuation of some of the concerns that you expressed as a painter, that you had as a painter as an undergraduate with Robert Reed.

RR: In a way, I don't think about painting, but one of the things that Robert Reed was really committed to was understanding painting in relationship to time. So he would always do these psychotic exercises, like we would have to make a thousand paintings in 24 hours, or 250 paintings in 5 hours, and then sometimes he'd give us a month to do one painting, so he was always kind of pulling/stretching time. And his idea was essentially that every mark and every gesture you make, whatever amount of time it takes, matters. And all of it has equal weight. And there's something true about that in terms of editing. Thinking about how much time a frame is held for means something in relationship to how you as a viewer absorb it. The rate and the tempo. And also, in terms of everything else in the complete work, so if something is 8 minutes long and something takes 30 seconds within that 8 minutes, it means something different than it taking 5 seconds in terms of your absorption. So I always think about ways of expanding and compressing time within a certain kind of limit, which is why my works are always about 8 to 10 minutes long. But I guess, separately from this, I also had the chance to interview, around the time that I had The Serpentine show, a film editor named Walter Murch, who's a big idol of mine and he was the editor of the conversation in *The Godfather* and longtime collaborator with Francis Ford Coppola. And Walter Murch talks very much about not only how the edit can express itself in the viewer's eyes. So the rate at which you blink can sync or not sync into the rate at which an edit is cutting; so you can actually communicate on an emotional level with a viewer just through tempo and not anything to do with content or anything like this. And he also talked about ways of using sound that also communicates with the viewer on an emotional level that maybe they are not

conscious of, for example, if we were filming this hall right now and I was editing it and I put the sound of a truck going by, that wouldn't make any sense. There's no windows here, we are in the basement, you wouldn't hear the sound of a truck. But it could make sense in a film, and it would indicate that this is near a street and it's in the day not at night, probably deliveries are being made. I could put a sound of a siren and then there'd be a sense of, like, panic a little bit. And much of his sound editing is about making unnatural, artificial gestures around what's interior and what's exterior to bring out some kind of emotional truth to what the actual image or the narrative is describing. So I don't know if that answers that, but those are the two ways I think about editing.

AQ: In using your tools to create these artificial yet immersive environments, are you interested in or are you exploring at all some of the new virtual reality-type shooting or the 360 stuff, like for instance what The New York Times is doing with their journalism and any of that? What do you think about that?

RR: I mean, I'm really curious. I actually just had a chance to experience a few of those technologies last week. I'm personally very interested in the flatness of video and the flatness of film. Like, I mentioned how Gravity has this 5:1 sound but I prefer when there's mono-sound, sound is coming from two spaces. And I was recently actually watching, I guess they did an episode of Mr. Robot, which is a show I've actually never seen, but they did it in virtual reality. And one of the problems is that it is very hard to make a cut in VR. It actually looks awkward, and the way I've seen it done is actually the shot will fade to black and then it fades back into the new image. It's very staccato experience and I think it actually somehow produces a further—it pushes me further away from being inside the space than I feel with this more dated technology of just projecting on a screen with two speakers allows for. So I don't have any ideas for that now, but maybe if there was a way to edit differently I could be interested in it.

AQ: I have a very simple question. When I was thinking about your work, where you superimposed the house to the old interview, why did you choose to do the cutting of the person by hand, and it took you so long, instead of digitizing it, because in the end you were probably working on the videos in some kind of digital environment anyway. You probably could have done it much faster. So I'm curious about that.

RR: Well not exactly by hand. I did it in After Effects. You trace around the figure. Something that is important to me in my work is that in each piece I'm learning something new about how to actually make something, so not just like researching and going to a site and all of this but actually physically—I guess it's on the computer—but how to do something new, whether that's working with a new camera, or learning how to rotoscope, or in this case learning how to make a cell animation. It's a lot about, I guess in a really selfish way, just me getting to know how to do something. In the future, if I were to work with rotoscoping, I probably wouldn't do it myself because now I feel I have an understanding of how that material works. But there's all these kinds of things you learn when you do it yourself, like for example that sometimes with the brush tool in After Effects it will grab onto another material like a tree and then like two frames have a tree in them. Whereas if you have it done perfectly you don't have those kinds of hand qualities.

AQ: Do you feel like technology leads you to a project or a project leads you to a technology more often? It sounds like a pretty high percentage of your time is spent thinking. Is that true?

RR: Haha yes. Most of my time is either in the library or sitting at my desk, which looks like an office, it's not like a traditional art studio, and spending a lot of time just reading and allowing that to bring me somewhere. So, like, right now I'm reading about the enclosure movement and Shakespeare's life in 1599. Not because I even necessarily want to do anything about Shakespeare, but the kind of thread of research I've been doing has led me to that place. And then I saw this new film last night, *Arrival*, I don't know if you guys have seen this—you saw it? Oh it's very, very moving and amazing to me. There are certain little things that I noticed in the edit or ways that spaces were constructed in the film that, then I'll now go research, and from there maybe I'll discover, “oh, there's a kind of camera that I want to work with,” or, “oh, maybe I want to build a set for this work,” or, “how did he work with light in this particular shot, in this set,” and then that opens up something new for me. So I don't consciously go “I need to use a new technology and I need a new idea,” it's more like a free-associative, almost like flow that then kind of coalesces into something, and then that's when I begin making work, and so many other things happen once the work starts. So I try to think of each of these as containers for that process, rather than like end products in themselves, even though I spend a lot of time, like, obsessing about the end product. It's more an excuse to be in that space.

AQ: Do you have a lot of projects that are “on the shelf” or not completed that you might go back to, or do you just decide not to finish things and then you're, like, done with them?

RR: Usually it's just one work at a time, but they kind of pick up from one another. I did one time make one video work that I was supposed to show at Castello Di Rivoli, and it was for this specific kind of installation, and I basically just didn't like the work I made and I didn't show it like a week before the show. It's a really bad thing to do. A lot of the research I had done about that work ended up actually informing—I have a show coming up at a place called Kunsthaus Bregenz in Austria—and the way that dealing with light and the screens within that building is actually informed by some research I did that I basically killed. I've only ever worked on two works at once at that one particular time, and it wasn't a good result so I just stick with one.

AQ: You mentioned you thinking about the museum or gallery space that your work is going to be in, and that that affects what you're doing, and video is, at least historically, something that galleries aren't that interested in it—it's non-material object and all of that. And so I was just wondering if there was anything special you wanted to say about how you view your work in relation to that more object-oriented market? Have you shown your work in spaces other than galleries and museums? And what's your relationship to all of that?

RR: Hmmmm...I haven't shown my work, I mean maybe a few screenings or something like that, but pretty much just in galleries and museums. So, like, okay, I'm going to describe two separate threads of the way that I feel video is often shown in museum/gallery contexts. Okay, so, like, one is the thread where the artist shows props and tchotchkes from their experience of filming the work. So, like, they project

the video and then maybe you sit in a landscape that has stuff from the video inside of it. So they try to bring you into the world of how the work was made, or the world that the work is arguing for. Then, on the other end of the spectrum, there's a very stark way of showing a work, which is basically replicating the conditions of cinema in the gallery context. You make a black room with a velvet thing and you project it really big with super loud sound, and you sort of like shock and awe by the spectacle of that compared to, like, a tiny sculpture somewhere. That's, like, another option. So what I try to do is use all of the components of what it means to show a video, so that's projector, speakers, where you sit, scale of screen, kind of screen: is the screen a wall? Is the screen made of fabric? Is the screen made out of aluminum? What's that materiality? Is there natural light? Because often in museums and galleries there is, it's not only a white box. Is there artificial light? What are those sources like? How do they inform your sense of place within where you are? Your sense of interiority, your sense of exteriority? And then I try to work with that as subliminally and also as openly as I can. So, for example, I'm gonna just try to show an example of what I mean. I mean, in this case, in *Everything and More*, it's projected on a screen in front of a window. I picked this window because it's the top of a tree. It's on the third floor of this huge building and the treetops are up there. So when the video has black inside of it, it's actually transparent, so the video is kind of switched for the view of the outside. Or, in the case of the Aspen Art Museum, I was showing in a very small room. So I showed it on a very small screen and made a little window, and then I—the room was a square—and I moved the wall in about five feet to convert the room into the same dimensions as the screen, so as a viewer you wouldn't know I did that. It's a tiny screen, but there's something about the space and the tiny screen that pulls you in there, or it feels in line with what's happening in that. Another example is at The Serpentine, this picture doesn't show it, but I projected *A Minute Ago* onto glass, and I rear-projected it because the room was very long and thin and I wanted to compress the space. So, rather than showing, like, a big projection at the end of the room by putting it—rear projecting it—it cut the room in half, basically, from where you would sit. And also I hung the screen just about two inches above the floor, and what that meant—it seems like, why would I do that—was that when you were watching the video you would notice that it was hung, and then you would look up and in that window was again the treetops from the park outside that mimicked those treetops. So, these are the kind of specific things I think about, but maybe a viewer would just walk in and think, "oh it's just rear projected thing and it's just hung and whatever." So that's how it goes.

AQ: Could you please review what the purpose of the white blotch on the video was, with all the revolutionary scenes?

RR: Yeah, so I was getting all this material from books, basically, and something that recurs in this work is not just the filming on the landscape and the editing of these different things that have happened there, but I wanted to bring in the fact that I was making it, like that it was, in a way, it was not just going through this woman's body through the edit but also through my presence. So that in that, I just took the flash of the camera as I was photographing the images, the paintings, and then I overlaid it as thought it was kind of like a gunshot, something like that. Just trying to make this continuum.

Okay. Thank you so much for having me. Thank you.

2001 Flora Street
Dallas, TX 75201

+1 214.242.5100