

## 11 HOW LANDSCAPE MOVES ME

*A group of youths wander in the streets, repeat Situationist slogans and encounter an old man sitting on a light pole:*

*- Hey, old man, what you doing up there?*

*- I'm not sure.*

*- You need any help getting down, sir?*

*- No, I don't think so.*

*- Stupid bastard.*

*- No worse than us. He's all action and no theory. We're all theory and no action.*

*Unlike the aimlessly wandering group of youths, the old man is drifting in his thoughts, stationary. He performs place.<sup>184</sup>*

In the following chapter I will reflect upon how landscape moves me or how to perform landscape by letting oneself be moved by it. My work can be compared with the action of the old man sitting on the light pole in the quotation above, since it is site-specific, embodied and stationary in a literal sense; it includes repetition, stationary drifting and waiting for the unexpected. Thus, I will also touch on the corporeality of site-specific performance. I will first reflect on landscape and then on stopping or stillness as an action, a still-act, beginning with André Lepecki's (2006) thoughts on the ontology of dance. Then, I will look at stillness (silence and immobility) as actions in performance with the help of Anthony Howell's analysis of action art. I will use as examples some of my video works, where I have video recorded myself once a week for a year in the same place in the same landscape, while keeping the framing constant in order to see and show changes in the landscape.

Movements in the landscape can be approached first and foremost as temporal processes.<sup>185</sup> The cycles of a year and a day and night that I have documented dem-

184 Sher Doruff comments on the episode "A Situationist gang hones in on mr Debord" in Richard Linklater's film *Waking Life*, 2001 in her paper "From Psychogeography to Cybertopology: Situating 'Place' in the Disoriented Dérive", in November 2006 at the seminar *Performing Places* in the Theatre Academy Helsinki as follows: "The event of a dérive-like chance encounter occurs when they meet the old man up the pole. He is stationary yet presumably disoriented. He doesn't know why he's there yet seems open to suggestion. He is comfortable, positioned, deriving through movements of thought. Perhaps he's a seer. The gang does recognise that the disoriented old man is 'all action'. He performs place."

185 I have discussed the temporal dimension of my work for instance in "Performing Landscape – Performing Time?" at the conference *Sensuous Knowledge 5 – Questioning Qualities*, 24–26.9.2008. (Arlander 2008 e)

onstrate how stillness can be used to focus attention on changes in the environment. The changes become obvious, on the one hand, by repeating the same image with a fixed framing and, on the other hand, through the (relative) immobility of the performer, against which the slow movement and gradual changes in the landscape come to the forefront.

According to environmental aesthetics, a landscape is not an image to be looked at from the outside, but rather an environment and an aspect of the world, which we experience with all our senses through movement and action (Berleant 1999). I would like to add that, according to my own experience, one could strengthen the feeling of an embodied connection to a place by returning to the same place repeatedly and by staying there for a moment, motionless.<sup>186</sup>

### 11.1 LANDSCAPE AND THE YEARLY CYCLE

How does the landscape move me? And why does the landscape matter to me? In Finnish the questions sound almost similar.<sup>187</sup> The landscape really moves me, and it really does matter to me. I am not only generally concerned about the environment, our common breathing air, the living conditions of trees, and so on. Physical location is important to me in an immediate sense, in each moment. Where I happen to be is not irrelevant. Unlike when younger, when I wanted to be among people, and preferably on some adventure in faraway countries, the environment matters to me in terms of my mood as well. They say that middle-aged women start to walk to work through parks, and that is exactly what has happened to me. The landscape moves me; besides helping me to accept my many emotions, it also invites me to move.

"If landscape is a way of seeing, there are potentially as many landscapes as individual modes of seeing, or at least as many as cultural ways of seeing" (Lippard 1997, 61). Landscape is understood as an environment seen from a human perspective and it is often linked with a viewer's position, a view. Landscape is nature framed

<sup>186</sup> A (longer) version of this text titled "Miten maisema minua liikuttaa" [How the landscape moves me] has been published in Olli Mäkinen & Tiina Mäntymäki (eds.) *Taide ja liike* [Art and Movement] University of Vaasa Publications 282, Vaasa 2007 (Arlander 2007 c). I began developing the themes in a paper titled "The elements of action art and landscape" at the colloquium *Tutkija toimijana, taiteilija teoreetikkona?* [Researcher as activist, artist as theoretician?], which was organised by the Finnish Society for Aesthetics and University of Art and Design in Helsinki 18–9.2 2005. (Arlander 2005)

<sup>187</sup> In Finnish: *Miten maisema minua liikuttaa* and *Mitä maisema minua liikuttaa...*

and shaped or perceived as a whole (Simmel 2007, 22-23). In English, landscape refers both to landscape as a view and as a painting (Andrews 1999, 4-5). Landscape is the encountered, sensed and perceived environment, as well as its visual, verbal or sonic interpretation (Johansson 2006, 48). In German and Swedish, landscape is also an area like a county (Landschaft, landskap), related to geography and politics. In fine art, landscape is associated with the 19th century and with Romanticism, and represents a traditional genre of painting from a contemporary perspective (Karjalainen 2006, 10-11).

In many contexts the broader term environment, rather than landscape, is preferred. Nevertheless, one of the trailblazers of environmental aesthetics, Arnold Berleant, who claims (referring to Merleau-Ponty) that the environment is experienced in a multi-sensory way by actively moving and engaging with it, rather than in terms of classical aesthetics as a disinterested outside observer, uses the term landscape (1997) in order to emphasize the specific quality of natural environments. Often, natural and cultural environments are indistinguishable and in my examples we could speak of urban nature (Haapala 2006, 9-10). A connection to nature, or at least to large outdoor vistas, is included in the mental associations of the word landscape. The scale of a landscape is larger than the human scale.

The landscape moves me, I am not moving the landscape, although many of the landscapes we encounter in our daily *Lebenswelt* are in motion – flying past car or train windows or flickering on screens in front of us. Movement influences our experience of the environment more and more; we could speak of a culture of mobility (Naukkarinen 2006) and an age of mobility (Parviainen 2007). Perhaps we can think of driving a car, riding a bicycle or running as ways of moving the landscape as well as ways of moving in the landscape, in the kinaesthetic field, as Jaana Parviainen (2007, 32-39) suggests.

How does the landscape move me? And why should it move me? Is it not enough to linger – stand or sit – in or near a landscape? What about my breathing, the small spasms of the muscles keeping me upright, the tiny shivers in my face caused by thoughts and emotions, shudders and contractions due to weather conditions, tics and reflex-like reactions to changes in my perceptual field, or the turns and twists of my gaze? Are they not movements? Of course landscapes often produce movement on a larger scale as well, tempt one to move from place to place, to see what is behind that particular cliff ledge and the next one, to venture on quests or adventures in one way or another.

The landscape moves me from year to year, from day to day. When I travel to my studio by rowing, I am afraid of storms and windy nights, I enjoy the calm summer

evenings, and so on. The landscapes of our daily life influence our mind and our way of moving in the same way as our immediate environment does. Places function through memories; they shape our *Lebenswelt* and our environmental experiences. Through them, we have a geographical biography, a geobiography (Karjalainen 2004, 59–65). Important places in the sensory landscape, with all of their emotional and historical sedimentation, can provoke and ignite gestures, discourses and actions (Seremitakis 1994, 7).

By choosing which places to return to, I can to some extent shape my experiential world. This is true for the performances or actions on Harakka Island near Helsinki, where I compile my video works. Through them I shape my daily life as well. I am to continue the sequence of years – *Year of the Horse* 2002, *Year of the Goat* 2003, *Year of the Monkey* 2004, *Year of the Rooster* 2005, *Year of the Dog* 2006 (and so on) – in one way or another, for the whole twelve-year cycle of the Chinese Calendar, as mentioned in section 10:3. (While re-writing this, I was working on the *Year of the Rabbit* 2011.)

In these performances I am still in the landscape. My staying there is a form of personal stillness, an exercise of breathing, contemplation and enjoyment, or an act of devotion, and also a performance for the video camera. I stop in order for the world around me to move, to emphasize the changes of the landscape in the image. In a moving image something is expected to move, if nothing else, then the clouds. I stop in order to give them space. I wrap a scarf around myself and wait for the wind to move through it.

For each year, I have chosen a slightly different site on the same island, and I return to that place with my video camera every week. Besides staying still in one place, I have used simple movements, or modes of being, so the yearly cycles differ from each other by way of actions, too: for *Year of the Horse* I stood on the hill and sat on a rock, for *Year of the Goat* I walked and stood on the shore, for *Year of the Monkey* I stood on a cliff ledge and sat in the crevice of a rock, for *Year of the Rooster* I walked, stood and sat on a cliff (next to a dying birch), and for *Year of the Dog* 2006 I sat in a pine tree and lay on the cliff as the shadow of a pine tree.

On the same sites, I have video recorded cycles of a day and night, too, with two-hour intervals and as a more tightly framed image – one Easter I sat on a rock, the following Easter I stood on the shore, one Midsummer I sat in a crevice, one Christmas I walked, stood and sat on the cliff and one Halloween I sat in a pine tree. I have emphasized stopping and stillness through editing as well. By cutting away all entrances and exits, an artificial, fictional stillness is produced as the seasons change around a stationary human figure.

The landscape causes me to stop, to stand or sit, to watch and listen, to smell and breathe; it invites me to walk, to follow its paths, to lie on the cliffs or to climb into a tree. Moreover, the landscape invites me to return to the same place repeatedly. More than a desire for specific sites or for certain kinds of favourite places (Kantonen 2005, 191–192) this has to do with repeating a conscious sensory experience, a desire for repetition as such. I repeat in order to notice the changes taking place in my environment. And that is why I repeat, not only the actions, but the video recording as well. I repeat in order to produce time for myself.

The changes in the landscape created by shifting light and weather conditions are visible through repetition. Within only a few hours, everything changes – light, colours, shades, emphasis – everything except the most basic compositional elements in the image, like the horizon, or some entities like a tree or the arch of a cliff. The change of seasons, not to mention changes in the vegetation, is noticeable only by repetition. Over time, one can discern changes from year to year; like the year when the first snow fell early but melted away and the winter only arrived close to spring, or the year when the sea froze only for a few weeks, and so on. The cycles that a human being can perceive and document are short compared with the time of the elements in the landscape, like trees and rocks. A cyclical conception of time differs from the linear time conception of contemporary thinking. Life today is not determined by the changing seasons in the same way as in nomadic and agricultural societies (Debord 2005, 119).

How does landscape move me, or does it? When does movement seem like stillness? Complete, unchanging immobility is almost an absurd thought. Even a dead body rots or shrinks; it moves while changing. A living human being is constantly in motion just by breathing. And there is always movement in the landscape, at least with the wind. Nevertheless, staying in one place, being stationary as when sitting, is easily seen as stillness compared to the constant movement around us today.

## 11.2 STILL-ACTS, IMMOBILITY AS ACTION

Dance scholar André Lepecki has analysed stillness in contemporary dance as a counter reaction to the definition of modern dance as the art of movement. His main interest is in the ontology of dance. According to Lepecki, choreography and philosophy share the same political, ontological, physiological and ethical question: what can a body do? (Lepecki 2006, 6)

Lepecki combines stillness with a critique of modernity's idealisation of movement and change. He refers to cultural historian Harvie Ferguson's idea that the only changeless element of modernity is the propensity to movement, which thus becomes its permanent emblem. He also refers to German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk's claim that the project of modernity is basically kinetic, characterized by a being-toward-movement. (Lepecki 2006, 7)

Subjectivity, like modernity, is one of Lepecki's key terms, and he understands it as a dynamic concept, a process of subjectification, and following Deleuze, as a performative power, as life's possibility of becoming invented ever anew, as intensity rather than a personal subject (Lepecki 2006, 8). Modernity can be understood as a specific type of subjectivity; modernity produces subjectivities by interpellating bodies to a constant display of movement, to kinetic excess. Within the ubiquitous and ontological-political demand for movement, subjectivities create their escape-routes and becomings and negotiate their subjection (Lepecki 2006, 9–10). This form of subjectification is characterised by an experience of being separated from the world. The experience of oneself as completely independent and ontologically severed from the world is basic for the process of subjectification in modernity (Lepecki 2006, 10–11).

Lepecki understands modernity as a project of a long duration, which metaphysically and historically produces and reproduces a specific psycho-philosophical frame. Within this frame, the privileged subject of discourse is always a heteronormative racially white male, who experiences his truth as a ceaseless striving for autonomous, self-motivated, endless and spectacular movement (Lepecki 2006, 13). And this produces problems. Since there are no self-sufficient living systems, all mobilisation, all subjectification that appears in the form of being-towards-movement, must take its energy from somewhere. The fantasy of the kinetic subject of modernity is that this spectacle of movement in modernity happens innocently. The kinetic spectacle of modernity renders invisible all ecological catastrophes, personal tragedies and social disorders resulting from the colonialist robbing of resources, bodies and subjectivities, which is needed to maintain the "most real" reality of modernity, its kinetic being (Lepecki 2006, 14).

Many theorists of movement (like Randy Martin, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari) seem to associate movement with the politics of progress, or at least with critical formations that could be considered progressive. Lepecki emphasizes, referring to Sloterdijk, that critical theory should take into account how nothing is fixed in the dominating order today. The kinetic impulse of modernity appears in the form of a militarisation of subjectivity, articulated as mobilisation, and is combined with

widespread demands on the efficacy, efficiency and effectiveness of performances, to use the terms of Jon McKenzie (Lepecki 2006, 12-13).

Against the ideology of constant movement, Lepecki brings forth the idea of the political power of stopping, of stillness, proposed by anthropologist Nadia Seremitakis (1994). He analyses still-acts by artists as aesthetical, ethical and political reactions to contemporary demands for constant movement. The still-act is a concept used by Seremitakis to describe moments when a subject interrupts the historical flow and poses questions. Stillness does not presuppose stiffness or death-like immobility, but, rather, demands a suspension or temporary cessation of movement, a bodily interruption in situations that call for a certain amount of flow. The still-act acts because it questions the economy of the use of time and reveals the possibility of agency within a regime that controls capital, subjectivity, labour and mobility (Lepecki 2006, 15). For instance, in situations where things seem to move inevitably towards a new conflict or disaster, the mere act of stopping, to enable reflection, can be a strong political act.

Stillness as action creates, according to Lepecki, the possibility to understand the self-criticism of contemporary experimental dance as a critique of the political ontology of dance. To use stillness in dance, as well as various techniques of slowing down movement and time, is a way of proposing that we think of action and mobility in other ways, through still-acts rather than through constant movement (Lepecki 2006, 15). To open up the unquestioned association of dance and movement with the help of stillness shapes anew the dancer's participation in movement. Stillness can function as a performative critique of complying with the general economy of mobility, which controls, supports and reproduces the ideological formations of late capitalist modernity (Lepecki 2006, 16).

The important aspects of Lepecki's ideas for my own work are, firstly, the critique of an independent subjectivity that is ontologically severed from the world, or, to put it in another way, acknowledging the dependency of the subjectivity with regard to the environment. Another important idea is the notion of stopping, interruption or stillness as critical action. When I focus my attention on the small changes in the environment and juxtapose a human being with the elements of a landscape, like cliffs or trees, I emphasise interaction with the environment, and on an experiential level, I engage with it as well. Nevertheless, stillness obviously has a different meaning in relation to the tradition of dance, where it is more of a provocation and an exception, than within the tradition of performance art, where it is one of the basic tools, beginning with Emma Hamilton's poses in the 19th century or the living sculptures of Gilbert & George (Howell 1999, 4). However, within film, and

partly within video art as well, the use of a static camera can be considered almost an anachronistic exception, or then a reference to Andy Warhol's movies.

We could claim that the task for an artist is to show the spectator where to look, to direct the gaze of the viewer. We can understand art making as making something special, as making it into something worthy of attention. Sometimes a mere stopping will be sufficient for that. By placing oneself like a pointer, a hunting dog pointing in some direction, one can hope the viewer will direct his or her attention that way, too. By standing still, one can show one's refusal to participate in the dominant culture of mobility, for a moment at least. Following Seremitakis' and Lepecki's ideas, it is in principle possible to generate a space of questioning and critique with a mere interruption. However, virtuosic performances of immobility by street artists, who manage to win money from a surprised bystander through some trick, like posing as a sculpture which merges with a building, only to suddenly cock its eye, are only jokes among others; a way of earning one's living comparable to that of street musicians.

The tradition of still poses or so-called living sculptures within performance art could be combined with the tableau vivant fashion of the 19th century, as well as with the development of the art of posing through painters' use of live models. One possible way of narrating the history of performance art is to see it as a development from model to author. As the legacy of the Renaissance, the artist-author composes his image and places his models in front of him as he pleases into a tableau and then documents what he sees by painting. In the twentieth century the artist-author can use himself or herself as a model in a tableau, rather than use somebody else, and invite a photographer-assistant to document the work (rather than paint a self-portrait), or even invite the audience to come and see the pose as a live performance. What remains when we move from composing people (or things) into an image to placing oneself in the image, is the act of posing – arrest and stillness.<sup>188</sup>

### 11.3 STILLNESS AS AN ELEMENT OF PERFORMANCE ART

Anthony Howell, a poet who began as a dancer and became an influential figure in the development of British Live Art, suggests in his "The Analysis of Performance

<sup>188</sup> Nora Lähtenmäki (later Rinne) writes about posing in her MA thesis "Tunnustuksia Omakuvasta: narsismi, oma kuva ja katse esityksellisessä omakuvassani" [Confessions of a Self-portrait: narcissism, image of self and the gaze in my performative self-portrait] and refers to Craig Owens's text "Posing" (1994). (Lähtenmäki 2007)



Art – A Guide to its Theory and Practice” (1999), that performance art or action art has lacked a grammar because it became independent as an art form only in the latter half of the 20th century. The Futurists and Dadaists were still creating ballets, not actions or performances.

*As an art-form, it liberated action from being muffled:*

*by speech – which is drama*

*by music – which is dance*

*by illustration – which is mime*

*by effect – which is conjuring*

*by purpose – which is sport*

*All the above are either mixed media or they serve two purposes. It has been necessary for performance art to become an unmixed medium, serving only the specific dictates of action, in order for it to become evocative and resonant – that is, in order for it to become a language. (Howell 1999, 155)*

Howell has identified the elements of action art and devised a theory for creating performances. He developed a grammar for action art, with colour theory as his model, in a manner that does not begin with imitation or representation but with an analysis of the elements of action. As there are three primary colours in painting that can be mixed to create all other colours, there are, according to him, three primaries of action in performance art – although one of them can be considered the basis for the other two – and these can be mixed to create other actions. The basic actions are stillness, repetition and inconsistency (Howell 1999, xiii). Interestingly, he understands stillness both as the basis for either repetitive or inconsistent action, and as one of the three elements of action together with repetition and inconsistency. As it is corporeal, embodied and performed, stillness is always an action that demands concentration and strength. A human being can be naturally still only in a horizontal position (Howell 1999, 6–7).

Howell discusses stillness, repetition and inconsistency in relation to psychoanalytic theories and also Deleuze’s critique of psychoanalysis. When discussing concepts of performance art in light of psychoanalytical concepts, he stresses that he approaches the various schools of psychoanalysis as a layman. For instance, repetition is a term much used in psychoanalysis, whereas inconsistency is not used as a concept in the same way. In psychoanalysis repetition is linked to obsessions, and the example used by Freud – a child’s fort-da play (in order to sublimate the absence of the mother with something controllable) – led to the notion of transference. Howell wonders what notions like inconsistency and stillness could mean in psychoanalysis. He refers to the term “difference” used by Gilles Deleuze, noting

that difference is not the same as inconsistency, but rather something that repetition needs in order to be considered repetition (Howell 1999, xiv). Difference taken to the extreme becomes inconsistency, he adds.

Although inconsistency is not a fundamental concept in psychoanalysis, it is one of the primary elements of action in performance art because action can develop out of inaction either in a repetitive or in an inconsistent way. We could say that pure inconsistency (or contradiction) is impossible, and the same goes for repetition. Behind our inconsistencies there is always repetition, starting with our heartbeat and breathing. Repetition is plural, while inconsistency refers to a singular action. Inconsistency can be formed through a sequence of singular actions, but in that case we are repeatedly (or consistently) inconsistent, which is a different thing than repeating something (Howell 1999, 72).

Howell calls his approach creative psychoanalysis, a performer's investigation of psychoanalysis and an analysis of action art. The theory includes practical exercises and it is interesting as a "recipe theory" for performance art, as an attempt to juxtapose terms of performance practice with terms of interpretation, as well as in its striving to understand performance art and its history. The work is intended as a handbook for performance art and I have often used it in my teaching. I have not applied it directly in my own artistic practice, but the examples I describe could be evaluated through the primaries of action as well.

Here, I will not problematize or further contextualize Howell's rather modernist theory, which emphasizes the specificity of art forms and their so-called own language. In my examples action is not developed into a language or turned into "an unmixed medium, serving only the specific dictates of action" (Howell 1999, 155). Rather, the three elements of action can, if translated into basic principles, be understood as tools in performing landscape and concretising time. My examples are mainly linked to stillness, so I will present Howell's ideas on that element more in detail.

### 11.3.1 STILLNESS IN PERFORMANCE

Stillness does not refer to exactly the same quality as immobility or silence; it is related to arrested stillness as well as to tranquillity, which represents a certain aspect of stillness. There is a Zen dimension to stillness, stillness gone into itself, a meditative mode. Zen stillness is related to a state that deepens when you take a position that is easy to maintain (Howell 1999, 1).

From the point of view of a performer, stillness can mean arrested stillness (when you stop performing, doing something), or the stillness of a witness (when you watch and listen). A spectator can associate stillness with the stillness of death and collapse, the stiffness of madness, and so on. From a performer's perspective, moving out of stillness is important (to leave a meditative state, to rise from exhaustion or collapse). We can also emphasise the difference between a peaceful stillness and other types of stillness such as the stillness of being stuck, stillness due to constrictions, the stillness of catatonia or the shivering stillness produced by a dynamic tension between different muscle groups (Howell 1999, 2).

In a performance stillness can form the background for actions. Howell speaks of stillness as a stillness/emptiness continuum, into which the performance is poured – like a painter who begins with an empty canvas or a composer who begins with a sequence of silence, that is to say, it is the ground against which the action will appear. The performance artist begins with empty space<sup>189</sup> and a specific duration of stillness within which the actions will take place. Moreover, a performance can contain moments of stillness, which structure the actions like the pauses in music. Thus, we can consider stillness as the foundation or ground that supports the two other elements of action, repetition and inconsistency (Howell 1999, 6–7). Often, the best way to begin working with a performance is with a minute of stillness (Howell 1999, 12).

We can develop a performance by simply adding one action after another without defining any special spatial or temporal continuum as a limit. Or, we can define a limit for time and space and then insert actions into that specific area. According to Howell, painters often "insert", whereas many sculptors "add". Inserting is safer, the limits have been defined, while those who add can enlarge or diminish their works accordingly (Howell 1999, 6).

My examples are actually mixtures of adding and inserting. After beginning with an action, I add material by repeating the same action in the same place and video recording it in the same way without knowing exactly what I will do with the material in the future. On the other hand, I am really inserting, since with the first performance I have already defined the limits within which I will act, chosen the place to return to, the action to repeat, the point of view of the camera, and so on. These choices determine my actions during the following cycle. These kinds of limitations could be frustrating if I would not regard them as a safety structure and support, as an enabling meditative basis, as a halting of other possible options and choices.

189 Empty space can here be understood as relative, since actually there is no empty space, not even neutral space.

Stillness can also be an action, a performance. It is actually hard to perform stillness, except while lying down, since the simplest action can become exhausting if one arrests it and tries to keep it. We must distinguish between time and stillness in a performance, Howell stresses. Whereas time is durational, stillness, in performance terms, is physical. Stillness and arrest are always performed, enacted as it were, regardless of how still they are. That is why stillness can be considered not only as the basis for, but also as one of the primaries of action, which we can use to form secondary actions (Howell 1999, 6–7).

Stillness can be interpreted as uncanny. On the one hand, it can be a pause, a break in the conversation, a kind of lack. On the other hand, it can refer to many kinds of meanings, which in this case contain more than just a Zen dimension. Stillness can be linked to physical or psychotic entrapment, to violent constriction and a break-out from that. Stillness can mean trance or sleep, or then it can mean an embodiment of a painting or the denial of theatrical conventions, like dialogue and plot development. Stillness can refer to coldness, the stability of sculptures, and to timelessness. But stillness can also be seen as a mere demonstration of physical endurance (Howell 1999, 5–6).

Howell makes an interesting observation when he notes that stillness enables the viewer to watch a performance in a way that resembles watching a painting. The spectator does not have to “follow” the action, but can develop her or his own thoughts in the same way as when watching sculptures. Stillness in performance provides the spectator with the possibility of an active thought process, of letting the mind wander on the surface of the performance. It offers the spectator a chance for contemplation (Howell 1999, 9–10).

Stillness for Howell is linked to Artaud’s sense of a “body-without-organs”, which was further developed by Deleuze and Guattari, or to the shield that a turtle carries with it. In order to enter its shell, the turtle has to pull back its head and feet, to withdraw from the world.

*A sudden catastrophe rips us out of the humdrum world into a state of shock, inertia or enlightened meditation. The Zen of stillness is forever balanced by that other stillness, which is death. (Howell 1999, 10)*

To function as a witness, to watch somebody else working in rehearsal or in a workshop, is also a form of stillness. At the same time, it is a condition, one which includes listening and watching and often also means being seen.

*What, then, do we look like? What, then, do we sound like in this preliminary stillness in which we look, listen and consider our appearance? In the emptiness of this preliminary stillness there is no performance except us looking, and in this there is already fullness. (Howell 1999, 9)*

#### 11.4 AS WITNESS IN THE LANDSCAPE

Small performances repeated in the same place and documented on video could be analysed as a type of witnessing as well. While performing landscape, I function both as performer and viewer; through the camera I act as a witness to myself. First and foremost, I witness the changes taking place in the landscape by looking and listening (and sometimes also by thinking about how I look). I perform a repeated still-act in the same place while the wind moves my scarf and while the changes in the weather, season and time of day transform the environment. I witness the world changing around me. In these small projects of a long duration, witnessing or being still (in practical terms, standing or sitting) repeatedly (once a week for a year or with two-hour intervals for a day and night) form the only action. Principles that are comparable with stillness provide the guidelines for video recording (static camera, fixed framing), while repetition guides the editing process (synchronised image durations, non-stop loops) and the display of installations (versions of the same images juxtaposed).

The basic elements of action - stillness, repetition and inconsistency - could be translated into the question, "what is changing, what remains the same"? Or, formulated in a more specific way: what remains (stillness), what recurs (repetition), and what changes (inconsistency)? What aspects are maintained or repeated as similarly as possible, with the sense of being static or even still? What aspects are allowed to change, move, shift and produce surprises? What is one's attention focused on? Thus, the third element of performance art, inconsistency (surprise or catastrophe) comes into play through chance. When certain aspects are fixed, either by arresting or by repeating them, attention will turn to those aspects that change, which otherwise would remain secondary or in the background. In these examples, I have tried to fix and make static my dress, my pose, my actions and the action of the camera in order to focus attention on changes in the landscape.

When I place myself in the landscape I do it as a body, in a corporeal, embodied way. Depending on the landscape and my placement in it, I react in various ways. During different years, I have chosen different modes of being and played with slightly different approaches. The very first tests I did by walking into the landscape away from the camera and finally out of view. I walked along a path next to a field or fence in Ireland, and along the circling footpaths, which resemble mountain brooks in the Pyrenees (as described in Chapters 2 and 4). Repeating an image framed in the same way and video recording it from the same place, I did for the first time in a monastery on Mount Randa in the autumn of 2000, when I wanted

to record the constantly changing colours of the sky (as described in Chapter 5). I stepped in front of the camera, into the image, in order to show the movements of the wind and to create a diary of sorts. I created a sequel to the diary on Harakka Island and experimented with standing at two different distances from the camera: standing closer to the edge of the image, like a shepherd leading the viewer's gaze into the landscape in a classical landscape painting, or then deeper in the image, as a smaller but central figure, a focal point. In the last images on Harakka Island, I finally walked along the path out of the image. I wrote a text for the video and used it later as a recorded voice-over speech in a performance. After these experiments, exploring changes in light and weather conditions, I decided to document a full year and thus to record the seasonal changes in the landscape.

#### 11.4.1 *STANDING NEARBY, SITTING FURTHER AWAY*

*Year of the Horse* 2002 (edited and shown in 2003)<sup>190</sup> was the first work where I video recorded the same action in the same place once a week for a year. I chose to investigate distance, scale and the relative position of the human figure in the image. The changes in the colour of my blue scarf became important, too. I exaggerated a close-up by standing on the stairs in front of the camera, covering half of the image with my back. As a contrast, I walked down into the landscape to sit on a rock, as a tiny figure in a wider image. While editing, I removed the walk and combined the images into two cycles: all of the standing images into one cycle and all sitting images into another.<sup>191</sup> The first one uses an exaggeratedly subjective point of view; the human being, the viewer, literally covers the landscape. The second one uses a point of view that seems more objective, with the camera recording the human figure in the distance, merging with the landscape.

190 The synopsis for *Year of the Horse* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows: "Part 1. I am standing with a blue scarf on my shoulders close to the camera, obscuring part of the view from the cliff, on Harakka Island, 64 times, approximately once a week from January 2002 to January 2003. Part 2. I am sitting with a blue scarf on my shoulders on a rock in the landscape below the cliff, 64 times, on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) The work was shown for the first time in the exhibition *Year of the Horse on Harakka* – diary and performance documentation, in the Telegraph on Harakka Island from 3 to 16 June 2003. <http://www.harakka.fi/arlander/hevosenvuosi/yearofhorse.shtml> (11.10.2012)

191 I thought that standing and sitting could be shown juxtaposed as two projections, but the materials video recorded with automatic light balance had such differences in colour shades that I preferred to show them in sequence.

When I posed with a blue scarf on my shoulders in front of the camera, I watched the landscape below and the path in front of me, enjoying the view and the open vista before me. I walked down into the landscape and sat down on a big rock. In my very first explorations I utilized the stairs and played with each step as a deliberate action. When I looked at the test images,<sup>192</sup> those controlled steps, those stepping performances, stood out from the simple structure of the images. Why make such a fuss about the stairs and create an act of walking on them if my aim was to document changes in the landscape? Later, I walked down to the rock as simply as possible. And while editing, I finally removed the walks altogether. Thus, an illusion of a yearlong stillness was created; I was sitting on a rock for a year while the seasons were changing around me. I have since then repeated this practice, which I began on Mount Randa – the figure remains stationary because the act of entering and exiting the image is not shown – during other years.

Besides the cycle of the year, I wanted to show the cycle of a day and a night, and brought the camera closer to the rock for *Day and Night of the Goat*.<sup>193</sup> Now the act of sitting and the way in which I was sitting took on a new meaning. I was no longer a tiny speck in the landscape, an outgrowth in the shape of a Buddha statue on the rock, but a human figure with a back showing her attitude and mode of being, with the neck and the messy hair revealing the tiredness of a sleepless night. On the rounded rock I could sit as if on a chair, high enough above the ground, which afforded stillness, tranquillity. At night, it was a clearly recognisable and safe place. In the night landscape, I was moved by the shrieks of spring birds, scared by the infrared light of the camera, the ghostly lights of a ferry to Sweden passing by, the cold radiating from the ground. I wrote a short text of my experience and the length of the night, "*Sitting on a Rock*"<sup>194</sup>, to be listened to with headphones on that same rock or in the exhibition space together with the videos. Some notes that I wrote during the night after each session were also displayed in the same space.

192 Usually, I watch the material only when the whole year has been recorded, in order to be able to concentrate on the performative and experiential dimension, sensing the environment, and not to think too much about the possible final outcome.

193 The synopsis for *Day and Night of the Goat* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows: "I am sitting with a blue scarf on my shoulders on a rock in the landscape, 13 times during a day and a night, with two-hour intervals, during Easter, April 20 noon to April 21 noon 2003." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012)

194 The text for "*Sitting on a Rock*" was later added to a video as well, *Sitting on a Rock (Rock with Text)*, spoken in Finnish with English subtitles. The text is actually a process description. For the full text in translation, see footnote 92.

Later, I video recorded sitting on a rock in various tourist resorts, wrapped in the same scarf, and placed a crystal ball on the same rocks as well. From these experiments, mainly the images in which something is repeated, for instance sitting on a similar kind of square landmark provided the possibility to focus on changes in the environment and to create a meaningful whole.<sup>195</sup>

#### 11.4.2 WALKING AND STANDING

The *Year of the Goat* (edited and presented in 2004)<sup>196</sup> was a sequel to the *Year of the Horse*, and this time I started to look for a landscape resembling a landscape painting on Harakka Island. I chose the well-known romantic, nearly abstract painting by Caspar David Friedrich, *The Monk by the Sea* (*Der Monk am Meer*, 1809), as a starting point; the human figure is tiny and the horizon is low, with a light foreground and a dark sea and sky. I found a relatively bare cliff by the shore at the southwestern tip of the island and decided to experiment with simple movement. I walked in line with the shoreline, with the horizon and the image frame, moving across the image from left to right, towards the North (or Northwest), that is, I circled around the camera on the shore and passed the camera twice at two different distances.<sup>197</sup> With the help of a camera and with the aid of editing, I managed to turn myself into a perpetuum mobile, to condense my walking into an eternal wandering. During that particular year, I consciously looked for spectacular changes in the landscape and often went out to video record the performance when the sky had an interest-

195 From these materials, I compiled the two-channel video installation *Crystal Ball* for my inauguration performance *Kristallipallo* [*Crystal Ball*] at the Theatre Academy on 7 November 2003.

196 The synopsis for *Year of the Goat* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows: "Part 1. I am walking with a blue scarf on my shoulders from south to north (or left to right in the image) past the camera on Harakka Island, 54 times, approximately once a week from March 2003 to March 2004. Part 2. I am walking with a blue scarf on my shoulders past the camera but a little further away from it on Harakka Island, on the same occasions. Part 3. I am standing with a blue scarf on my shoulders on the shore on Harakka Island and looking out to sea, on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) The work was on display for the first time in the exhibition *Vision and Mind* in the Museum of Contemporary Art Kiasma from 29 May to 26 September 2004 as a three-channel installation *Year of the Goat – Harakka Shore* 13:28 min.

197 Only after video recording for a while did I realise that my horizon was much too high compared to the horizon in Friedrich's painting, but I did not interrupt the project. In later experiments I used a lower horizon, though.



ing colour or when the weather conditions were somehow exceptional, though still approximately once a week.

Did the shoreline invite me to walk along it? Perhaps it did so by affording me a direction, although, by moving, I wanted rather to demonstrate time passing. The landscape moved me through changes in the weather. I quickly learned to know the uneven surface of the cliff, its holes and bumps. Sometimes, however, they turned into pools that froze or disappeared under the snow. A small hollow in the cliff was a sign for where to stand and look out to sea. A boulder where the grass began marked the spot for the camera. The marker to help keep the framing constant – this time I tried to keep the horizon strait – was a small rock on the cliff (down to the left in the image). With the snow, only the largest signs in the surroundings were of any help. The various elements of the landscape shaped my movements. When a family of geese landed in the pools on my route, I had to wait for them to pass slowly before repeating my performance, and I realised (or perhaps realised again) what I wanted to show with the video – the landscape is not uniform, singular or static, but varied and always different. It is constantly changing and full of events, even when the site is only a bare cliff without any vegetation.

In this work, too, repeating my stillness while standing, using the same framing of the image, the same point of view, the same distance, the same place to stand, the same pose and facing the same direction were prerequisites for showing changes in the landscape and the environment, and tools to focus on those changes. I ended up editing the work into four cycles, with the same images having the same duration, so that I could show them next to each other in synchronised form. I chose the duration according to the longest walk. Immediately when the figure disappears to the right, the image changes and the figure re-appears on the left. For the viewer it might seem that the horizon moves me, since the shoreline determines my movement. As an experience, while performing the horizon was important only when I stopped and stood looking out to sea.

I video recorded a day and a night on the same site during Easter in 2004, and brought the camera closer. I called the work *Day and Night of the Monkey*.<sup>198</sup> At night,

198 The synopsis for *Day and Night of the Monkey* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows:

"Part 1. I am standing with a blue scarf on my shoulders on a cliff on Harakka Island and looking out to sea, for a day and a night during Easter, 12 times, with two-hour intervals, from April 10 at 19:00 to April 11 at 17:00 in 2004. Part 2. The same shore filmed 12 times, on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) An installation version, *Day and Night of the Monkey (Installation)*, juxtaposes the two parts. The work was on display for the first time in the same exhibition *Vision and Mind* in the Museum of Contemporary Art Kiasma as the *Year of the Goat*.

I did not walk past the camera, but stood still looking at the sea, feeling cold, breathing and waiting for daybreak. My new camera provided a surprise: the night view function was not based on infrared light reacting to temperature, so the night images show nothing but darkness, the flickering lights of distant buoys and lighthouses, and of course the sound.

#### 11.4.3 SITTING IN A CREVICE

*Year of the Monkey* 2004 (edited and presented in 2005)<sup>199</sup> was a sequel to *Year of the Goat*, and the first performance where I utilized a literary text for inspiration. The children's book *Tomtebo barnen* [Children of the Forest] by Elsa Beskow depicts the seasonal changes during one year in the forest (and the conventional ideals of family life of the time, 1916). I changed into a red scarf, searched for a new site on a cliff ledge and sat down in a crevice, as part of the landscape, (as described in section 10.2). This time I tried to be more exact when repeating the framing and I included some vegetation to increase the impact of the changing seasons. I could not anticipate that my wishes would come true beyond my wildest dreams. The thistles grew that year to be exceptionally tall and covered me during summer like grass that covers the ruins of old buildings, but revealed me again in the autumn when withering away.

The action that I repeated was the following: I put on the red scarf, went to the ledge, placed the video camera on a tripod in the same place using a root as a marker and tried to keep the framing as constant as possible. I stood in front of the camera with my back to it, always on the same spot (my ankle against a small stub), looked out to sea for a while, went further down on the ledge and sat in the crevice for a while, returned to the camera and stood for one minute beside it, while letting it record the "empty" view. I repeated this sequence of actions once a week, usually on Saturday or Sunday, for a year. But I started at the Spring Equinox rather than at the time of the Chinese New Year. In reality, there were only 43 repetitions, since

199 The synopsis for *Year of the Monkey* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows: "Part 1. I am sitting with a red scarf on my shoulders on a ledge on the northwestern shore of Harakka Island, 43 times, approximately once a week from April 11, 2004 to March 20, 2005. Part 2. I am standing with a red scarf on my shoulders on a cliff on the north-western shore of Harakka Island and looking out to sea, 43 times, on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) The work was presented in the exhibition *Tomtebo – Apinan vuosi Harakassa* [Tomtebo – Year of the Monkey on Harakka], in the Telegraph on Harakka Island, 20 – 31 July 2005. <http://www.harakka.fi/arlander/apinanvuosi/> (11.10.2012)

at times the ice was too fragile to walk on and too strong to row through, so I could not go to the island. I edited two versions of the video material for the exhibition in the Telegraph of Harakka.

Besides a yearly cycle, I wanted to include a day and night. This time I chose Midsummer, the lightest time of the year.<sup>200</sup> I video recorded a single day and night while sitting in the same crevice, again with two-hour intervals, and using two cameras simultaneously, recording from slightly different perspectives. The duration was open; I sat for as long as I felt like. For the exhibition, I edited a version for four monitors with images lasting five seconds. I called the work *Midsummer of the Rooster*, since I recorded it during Midsummer 2005, in the year of the rooster, just before the exhibition. The character of the work changed, since now I did not sit with my back to the camera. In my flowery summer dress and wrapped in my scarf while sitting in the crevice I looked like some fisherwoman mourning her husband lost at sea. The landscape turned into a backdrop.

#### 11.4.4 WALKING, STANDING AND SITTING

*Year of the Rooster* 2005 (presented in 2006)<sup>201</sup> represented a kind of combination of the two previous years. I walked past the camera, stood at two different heights on

<sup>200</sup> The synopsis for *Day and Night of the Rooster* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows:

"Part 1. I am sitting with a red scarf on my shoulders on a ledge on the north-western shore of Harakka Island, during Midsummer, for a day and a night, with two hour intervals, from June 24 at 14:30 to June 25 at 12:30 in 2005. Part 2. The same situation filmed with another camera from a different position, on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) The work was on display for the first time in the exhibition Tomtebo – *Apinan vuosi Harakassa* [Tomtebo – *Year of the Monkey* on Harakka] in the Telegraph on Harakka Island, 20 – 31 July 2005.

<sup>201</sup> The synopsis for *Year of the Rooster* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows:

"Part 1. I am walking with a red scarf on my shoulders past the camera from left to right, from South East towards North West on the western cliffs of Harakka Island, 48 times, approximately once a week 8.1. – 31.12. 2005. Part 2. I am standing with a red scarf on my shoulders with the camera behind me on the western cliffs of Harakka Island looking out to sea 48 times, on the same occasions. Part 3. I am standing with a red scarf on my shoulders with the camera behind me further down on the western cliffs of Harakka Island looking out to sea, on the same occasions. Part 4. I am sitting with a red scarf on my shoulders with the camera behind me on the western cliffs of Harakka Island looking out to sea, on the same occasions. Part 5. The cliff on Harakka Island, video filmed 48 times on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) The work was on display for the first time as a three channel installation *Year of the Rooster* (installaiton) in the exhibition *Year of the Rooster* in the Ammunition cellar on Harakka Island, 19 July – 6 August 2006. <http://www.harakka.fi/arlander/kukonvuosi/> (11.10.2012)

the cliff looking out to sea and sat on the cliff. I chose a place where I could walk in line with the horizon, as I did in *Year of the Goat*. I sat with my back to the camera on a cliff with some vegetation; a small birch almost dead from drought functioned as a landmark, support for the framing and marker of seasonal changes. The red scarf stayed with me, but I was careless with the rest of my clothes. Only while editing did I realize that I had walked fairly close to the camera and that my constantly changing dress would draw unnecessary attention. I was no longer a part of the environment or a figure performing the landscape, but walked as a protagonist, with the landscape as scenery.

I edited the work to form a triptych, somewhat resembling *Year of the Goat*, but now the combinations were changing cyclically. Five parts, each approximately six minutes in duration, alternated in various combinations, with the human figure sometimes moving and sometimes not. Schematically, the changes could be presented thus (with “landscape” referring to images without a human figure):

*Walking – standing – standing*  
*Standing – standing – sitting*  
*Standing – sitting – landscape*  
*Sitting – landscape – walking*  
*Landscape – walking – standing*  
*Walking – standing – standing*  
*And so on*

When I saw the work with three projectors for the first time, I realized the power of movement. As long as the walking figure was visible in one of the projections, it drew all the attention. Immediately when the movement stopped, the figure was almost like an element of the landscape, a tree among trees. This was probably influenced by the fact that the duration of the images was timed according to the walk. In any case, movement in the image, especially human movement, catches the attention of the viewer.

As *Day and Night of the Rooster* was already video recorded at the site of the *Year of the Monkey*, I chose Christmas, the darkest time of the year, to record a single day and night at this site and create *Christmas of the Rooster*.<sup>202</sup> A book of fairy tales from

202 The synopsis for *Christmas of the Rooster* in the catalogue of the AV - archive is as follows:

“Part 1. I am standing with a red scarf on my head and a light in my hand with the camera behind me on the western cliffs of Harakka Island looking out to sea, 13 times, at Christmas time from 25.12. at 3.p.m. – 26.12. at 1 p.m. 2005, with two-hour intervals. Part 2. I am standing with a red scarf on my head and a light in my hand further down on the western cliffs of Harakka Island looking out to sea, on the same occasions. Part 3. I am sitting with a red scarf on my head and a light next to me on the western cliffs of Harakka Island looking out to sea,

my childhood, found by chance, contained Viktor Rydberg's poem Tomten (The Gnome), which I decided to "illustrate". I wrapped the red scarf around my head as a substitute for a gnome's red cap and bought a small candle lantern. I walked with the light in my hand so that something would be visible in the darkness of the night. The site, the actions and the distance to the camera remained the same as when recording throughout the year. Due to cloudy skies (the snow and the clouds reflect the lights of the city), and because of the direction (lights from the western harbour), the night sky of Helsinki turned out to be a spectacle of orange-coloured streetlights.

During the year of the rooster, I turned fifty years old and realised another project, where I returned once a week to the summer cottage of my childhood, in Kalvola, to sit on an old birch tree. *Sitting on a Birch*<sup>203</sup> was on display in the same exhibition as *Year of the Rooster*. I also did another project in the same place, called *Secret Garden*<sup>204</sup>, where I walked up the old stone steps in a garden of lilacs, vanished among the trees, turned around in the woods and returned down the same steps.

These projects moved me, literally, although the movement cannot be seen in the final works. Once a week, on Sunday mornings, I travelled by local train from Helsinki towards Tampere, to Iittala station, walked on the road or by the rails 4-5 kilometres to Koivumäki (Birch hill), video recorded a sequence with me sitting on the birch and walking in the garden of lilacs, then walked back another 4-5 kilometres to the station and returned by train to Helsinki. When I began this task, I imagined it would be a meaningful way to relate to an important place in the past. In actual fact, the work turned into a strange sports endeavour, which really dis-

on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) *Christmas of the Rooster* was on display as a three-channel installation for the first time in the exhibition *Year of the Rooster*. There it contained the poem "Tomten" by Viktor Rydberg spoken as a voice over and translations into Finnish (Yrjö Jylhä: "Kotitonttu") and English (Judith Moffet: "The Gnome") as subtitles. The version in the AV-archive is without text. A short version for screening, including only the walking part, is called *Christmas of the Rooster – walk* (trailer).

203 The synopsis for *Sitting on a Birch* in the catalogue of the AV - archive is as follows: "I am sitting with a red scarf on my shoulders on a birch tree trunk in Koivumäki, Kalvola, 48 times approximately at noon on Sundays 22.5.2005 – 14.5.2006." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012)

204 The synopsis for *Secret Garden* 1+2 in the catalogue of the AV - archive is as follows: "Part 1. I am walking with a red scarf on my shoulders and the camera behind me up the stairs in Koivumäki, Kalvola 48 times approximately at noon on Sundays 22.5.2005 – 14.5.2006. Part 2. I am walking with a red scarf on my shoulders and the camera in front of me down the stairs in Koivumäki, Kalvola 48 times on the same occasions." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) A version for screening, *Secret Garden* 1, includes only the first part.

tanced me from that site of my childhood summers.<sup>205</sup> Nevertheless, I continued by walking there once a month to lean on an old pine tree during the year 2006, as part of that years project.

#### 11.4.5 SITTING IN A TREE

During *Year of the Dog* 2006 (edited and presented in 2007),<sup>206</sup> I performed the landscape by sitting in a tree, (as described in section 10.1). There are several twisted pine trees on the cliffs on Harakka Island and I chose the biggest one, which is situated in the middle of the southern part of the island. The large crooked pine tree was strong enough for me to climb onto its lowest branch to sit. I chose another pine tree as well, one on the shore, which I video recorded from two opposite directions. I repeated a few simple poses on the cliff, and video recorded them once from both directions. When I checked what my movement looked like, I noticed that I was too far away from the camera (actually behind a cliff) in one of the images, for my lying as a shadow to be visible. But I continued the actions in any case. Was I not performing for my own pleasure as well, and not only for the camera? Although I was not always sure whether I was creating a video work or doing a devotional practice, there was no reason to stop. I was interested in recording the two opposing landscapes. In one image the sea and a small bush are on the left and the cliff and the pine tree are on the right, with the city in the background. In the other image the sea and the small bush are on the right and the cliff and the pine tree on the left, with the open sea in the background. The two images differ regarding their atmosphere, although they contain mostly the same elements. This sequence of images was probably the most mobile of all those that I had made so far – there was a lot of stretching, throwing myself onto my stomach into pools and snow, and so on.

The yellowish scarf was smaller than the scarves of the previous years. I played with it on the cliffs in various ways, since its colour resembled the meandering pat-

205 I have described this project in "Performing landscape as autotopographical exercise" CTR 22:2, 2012. (Arlander 2012 b)

206 The synopsis for *Year of the Dog – Sitting in a Tree* in the catalogue of the AV - archive is as follows: "I sit with a yellowish scarf on my shoulders in a pine tree on Southern Harakka island 54 times, once a week 7.1.2006 – 11.2.2007." [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012) It was shown in the exhibition *Three Pine Trees in the Year of the Dog* in the Telegraph of Harakka 4th – 22nd July 2007. [http://www.harakka.fi/arlander/kolme\\_mantya/three\\_pine\\_trees.html](http://www.harakka.fi/arlander/kolme_mantya/three_pine_trees.html) (11.10.2012)

terns in the granite, and turned those images into a separate work *Lying on a Cliff*.<sup>207</sup> In these works I changed from somebody experiencing the landscape into a body tumbling around in it. The step towards a performance activity removed from everyday actions was significant mainly from my point of view. To lie on the cliffs with one's head downwards and watch the horizon upside down is stronger as an experience than as a video image filmed from afar.

### 11.5 WHAT IS REPEATED, WHAT IS CHANGING?

The five works described above – *Year of the Horse*, *Year of the Goat*, *Year of the Monkey*, *Year of the Rooster* and *Year of the Dog* (as well as the one I was working on while writing this, *Year of the Pig* 2007) form only half of the cycle of twelve years. The project began almost by accident with some experiments and has developed and transformed year by year (see appendix 5). Thus, it is not a deliberately planned whole. So far, all the works have been video recorded on Harakka Island, and so far all of them had as a starting point some kind of sea view. A personal geo-biography turning into a documentation of the changing climate is only one possible development on this journey of gathering material.

Regarding the works described above, we can consider the following questions, which are related to method or procedure: Is the performer more or less the focal point? What is the unit of time or repetition? What is the character or quality of the environment? What seems to be the crucial variable that changes in each case? One such variable is the colour of the scarf that I wear.<sup>208</sup> Not only does the quality of stillness or the temporal cycle of repetition provide variations, but the editing principles and the techniques of display do so as well. The question “what is changing, what stays the same?” can be applied on all levels.

How the elements of action art (stillness, repetition and, in some sense, inconsistency) can be used as principles is perhaps best illustrated with an example. *The*

<sup>207</sup> The synopsis for *Lying on a Cliff* in the catalogue of the AV-archive is as follows: “Part 1. I am lying with a yellowish scarf covering my head fourteen times on the rocks on the western shore of Harakka Island. Part 2. A yellowish scarf is lying on the rocks on the western shore of Harakka Island on the same occasions.” [http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander\\_en/](http://www.av-arkki.fi/en/artists/annette-arlander_en/) (11.10.2012)

<sup>208</sup> In my first experiments I used a black silk scarf. In *Year of the Horse* and *Year of the Goat* I wore a dark blue scarf, in *Year of the Monkey* and *Year of the Rooster* a similar red one. For the *Year of the Dog* I chose a yellowish scarf of the same material, which was unfortunately much smaller. And during the *Year of the Pig* I used a thicker grey scarf.

*Shore*, which was part of the exhibition *Vision and Mind* in Kiasma,<sup>209</sup> consisted of three separate video installations, which I compiled out of performance documentations realised with the same method. I video f recorded the main work, *Three Shores*, in three different tourist resorts during three different trips. It was on display as a triptych for three projectors (32 min.) without sound. The *Year of the Goat*, described previously, was shown as a triptych for three monitors (13 min.), with headphones providing the sound, and with the title *Year of the Goat – Harakka Shore*. A third work, *Day and Night of the Monkey – Kiasma Shore*, consisted of two parts and had the same duration (13 min.) as the previous work. In it, I juxtaposed *Day and Night of the Monkey*, video recorded on Harakka Island during Easter 2004, as mentioned before, and *Kiasma Shore*, the video documentation of a performance that was repeated outside the museum every Sunday at 1 p.m. for the duration of the exhibition, with a video re-edited once a week.<sup>210</sup>

These three (or actually four) works had as their starting point the theme of the exhibition “what does being an artist mean” as well as the text “*Eye and Mind*” by Merleau-Ponty, which had given the exhibition its name, *Vision and Mind*. They were of course also sequels to my previous works. I had already started to work on *Year of the Goat* when I was invited to participate. The basic premises of the exhibition, the situation and the site nevertheless influenced the form of the works. I wrote a text related to all three parts as a score or recipe in the spirit of Fluxus (Dezeuse 2002, 78–94) only after video recording the material. In this case the realisation preceded the instructions, since I wrote the recipe as a description of a work that had already been completed (as described in section 10.2). In the exhibition I placed the score next to *Day and Night of the Monkey*:

*Take a scarf, / Go to the shore, / Stand at the shore.*  
*Look at the horizon, / Look at the water’s surface, / Breathe.*  
*Until your eyes rest, / Until your mind rests, / Until you are cold, tired, having enough.*  
*Take the same scarf, / Go to the same shore, / Stand at the shore.*  
*Look at the horizon, / Look at the water’s surface, / Breathe.*  
*And so on.*

209 *Silmä ja mieli – Vision and Mind* was open in the Museum of Contemporary Art Kiasma 29.5 – 19.9.2004. The curators were Marja Sakari and Otso Kantokorpi.

210 The duration of the video remained the same, but each week I re-edited a new version of it, where I added a fragment from the latest performance. During the week of the opening, the right monitor showed a 13 min. video of the performance video recorded between 9 May and 16 May (6 min. 30 sec. of each). The following week a fragment from the performance on 30 May was added to the video in such a way that all three fragments were now 4 min. 20 sec. long. And, in this way, I continued during the whole exhibition; the total duration remained the same, but individual images became shorter when new images were added.



My main action as a performer was stillness. In all these works I stood motionless on the shore. In *Three Shores* I included passers-by in the images and in *Year of the Goat - Harakka Shore* I walked past the camera, too. In *Kiasma Shore* I stood on the edge of the pool outside the museum. As a pair to that work, I video recorded *Day and Night of the Monkey* on Harakka Island. In every performing and recording situation, I tried to repeat the same action, the same image, the same direction and place as exactly as possible, in order to have the landscape or the environment be the only thing changing according to season, time of day, weather conditions or occasional passers-by and traffic. I did not stick to a specific time, however, except in *Kiasma Shore*, which was created during the exhibition.

In addition to the movement in the landscape, I video recorded the movement of fellow human beings in *Three Shores*, which was produced in three tourist resorts during three weeks in 2004 – Puerto de la Cruz in January, Agya Napa on Cyprus in March and Playa Blanca on Lanzarote in April. Instead of editing out passers-by and other “disturbing” elements, I became interested in watching people and started video recording longer and longer sequences in order to be able to include as many passers-by as possible. The strangest creatures were passing along the shore and in the weirdest ways.

In all of the works I used the same basic principles of action, though with a slightly different emphasis each time. Stillness and repetition formed the basis for video recording; in using a static camera on a tripod, I strived to repeat the same framing of the image. In terms of action, the same scarf, the same pose with my back to the camera and the same look at the horizon were repeated (with the exception of the walks).

With regard to the action of the performer, stillness was realised in various ways:

1. In *Three Shores* I stood still in the same place, while the passers-by were walking;
2. In *Year of the Goat* I stood still in the same place or walked across the image in the same place;
3. In *Day and Night of the Monkey* I stood still in the same place, while in the dark, too;
4. In *Kiasma Shore* I stood particularly immobile in the same place for a defined period of time (15 min.).

The scale of the repetition varied as well:

1. In *Three Shores* the performance was repeated 2-4 times a day for a week, during three separate weeks;
2. In *Year of the Goat* the performance was repeated once a week on the weekends for one year;
3. In *Day and Night of the Monkey* the performance was repeated with two-hour intervals for one day and night;
4. In *Kiasma Shore* the performance was repeated once a week on a defined day and time of day for the duration of the exhibition (nearly four months).

The performer was more or less in focus in the image:

1. In *Three Shores* the performer stands in the centre or to the right and seems to be a very small figure with regard to the size of the image;
2. In *Year of the Goat* the performer is strongly in focus due to the walking, either closer or further away from the camera, or then standing as a small figure to the mid right in the image;
3. In *Day and Night of the Monkey* the performer is tall and centrally placed in the image, although she/he is invisible in the night shots;
4. In *Kiasma Shore* the performer is tall and centrally placed in the image.

*Kiasma Shore* was created because I wanted to include something literally site-specific and something more clearly like a performance. I ended up standing by the pool outside the museum, with the building site for the extension of the parliament as the horizon. The wall of the museum defined the distance to the camera and I thus necessarily became a rather tall figure in the image. I video recorded the day and night on Harakka Island to function as a pair with *Kiasma Shore*, at the same site as *Year of the Goat*, and moved the camera closer in order for the human figure to be the same size as in the image by the pool. I edited *Day and Night of the Monkey* so that it would be of same total duration as *Year of the Goat* (13 min.) in order to be able to have them synchronized, if needed. Thus, the same duration of material was required from outside the museum. I stood by the edge of the pool on Sundays at 1 p.m. for fifteen minutes, and video recorded the “empty view” for fifteen minutes as well.

My standing was not a public performance in the sense that the time would have been announced to the public. Since the place was a public space, my standing was nevertheless understood as a performance. This was further accentuated since I stood in a strange place by the pool and was deliberately immobile. At a short distance, performed immobility is clearly visible. I performed stillness as a living sculpture next to the riding statue of Marshal Mannerheim. (I did not perform a lifeless statue, however, although I tried, for instance, not to shift my weight from one foot to the other.) The time was defined as fifteen minutes (I held a timer in my hand). Performed in a public space, this action turned into a still-act of sorts.

In these two videos, *Day and Night of the Monkey* and *Kiasma Shore*, which were presented together side by side, a sea view and the city horizon, stillness and performed immobility, were juxtaposed. On the shore, I allowed the landscape to stop me and to silence me; by the Kiasma pool I actively performed the arrest.

### 11.5.1 ENVIRONMENT AND CHANCE

Stillness or stasis and repetition were consciously used as tools. Inconsistency or chance was added through the environment. In all of the works I was on the shore, by the water, and in all of them (except outside Kiasma) the horizon was emphasised, though the nature of the environment varied:

1. *Three Shores* was created in suburban environments populated by tourists. The first one was video recorded with the camera facing north, and the second and third ones with it facing more or less towards the south, which had an impact on the colours of the sky;
2. *Year of the Goat* was created in a more or less natural environment, on Harakka Island, which is officially within the Helsinki city limits. The place is relatively deserted; passers-by were seen on the ice only in a few winter images, and those I cut out while editing. The camera was facing west;
3. *Day and Night of the Monkey* was created in the same place as *Year of the Goat*, with the camera closer the human figure;
4. *Kiasma Shore* was created in an urban environment, in the centre of Helsinki, in front of the museum of contemporary art, with the busy Mannerheim Street and the building site of the parliament in the background. The shore was constructed by the edge of the pool, the buildings hid the horizon and the camera was facing west.

Variations were produced by the following factors:

1. In *Three Shores* the passers-by and changes in the weather provided surprises. Inexactness in the framing and shifts in the standing position might seem like surprises as well;
2. In *Year of the Goat* the cassette or the battery was sometimes finished unexpectedly and thus some part of the performance remained unrecorded. While editing, I filled these gaps with "empty" landscape instead of walking or standing, and this functioned as a surprise, a break in the otherwise orderly repetition;
3. In *Day and Night of the Monkey* my new camera did not work with infrared light reacting to the temperature, so the night shots consist mostly of complete darkness;
4. While performing *Kiasma Shore*, the setting up and taking down of the stage for the URB festival provided a surprisingly dramatic change and some young girls rehearsing a dance were included in the image.

The inconsistencies and possible "surprise-catastrophes" produced by chance were in most cases rather small. The changes of season and the time of day, as well as the small variations produced by nature, the weather and passers-by, were accentuated due to simplicity and repetition.

### 11.5.2 PRINCIPLES OF EDITING AND DISPLAY

While editing, I followed the same principles in all the works. I retained the original order and the chronology of the images and used all the “bad” images as well. On the one hand, I cut out my entering and exiting the image in the performances where I was standing still. This creates an illusion of immobility, an artificial stillness, a fiction of sorts, as I had discovered when sitting on a rock in *Year of the Horse*. On the other hand, I divided the takes that consisted of several actions into parts in order to present variations simultaneously and to emphasize the horizon. I formed the parts in various ways depending on the work:

1. *For Three Shores*, I edited five versions of each performance: a) passers-by before the still-act, b) the still-act (standing still), c) passers-by after the still-act, d) the largest number of passers-by and e) the shore when it was as empty as possible. The result was five series of video images of equal length, which could be presented in synchronised form. For the final work, I chose to use the three first ones, that is, the still-act (in the centre) and the passers-by before (on the left) and after (on the right) the still-act to form a triptych;
2. *For Year of the Goat*, I edited four versions of each weekly performance: a) walking past the camera close to it, b) walking past the camera further away from it, c) standing and looking out to sea and d) the landscape without a performer. Thus, four series of video images of equal length, which could be presented in synchronised form, were created. In the exhibition the first three were shown together;
3. *For Day and Night of the Monkey*, I edited two versions of each performance made with two-hour intervals: a) one while I was standing and b) the other of the landscape without a performer. I condensed both of them to fit the total duration of *Year of the Goat*. Only the standing version was used in the exhibition;
4. *For Kiasma Shore*, I edited two versions of each weekly performance during the exhibition: a) one while I was standing and b) the other of the view without the performer. Only the standing version was used in the exhibition.

An unremarkable beginning and ending was added to all videos, that is, a short fade from black or into black without texts, so they could be shown as nonstop loops. I added small cross fades between all of the images to soften the sound changes and to make the synchronisation easier. The main question was whether to edit the images according to the length of the action or to use a fixed duration to produce a regular rhythm. The duration of the images was determined differently in each work:

1. *In Three Shores* the duration of the images followed the duration of my standing and differed from performance to performance. I also tried to include as many passers-by as I could and, if possible, to show their movement in its entirety;
2. *In Year of the Goat* the duration of the images was determined by

*the slowest walk and varied from performance to performance. The aim was nevertheless to make the rhythm as tight as possible;*

3. *In Day and Night of the Monkey the duration of the images was basically determined by the length of the standing and varied each time. I shortened them to modify the total duration to equal the duration of Year of the Goat;*
4. *In Kiasma Shore the duration of the images was fixed according to the length of my standing and the total duration of Day and Night of the Monkey. I edited a new version of the work each week and always kept the total duration of the work the same. When the number of performances increased, the duration of each image became shorter. In the beginning I used one image for the whole duration, the next week two images of half the duration, then three images, and so on. The images in one edited version were always of the same length and were not related to the image changes in Day and Night of the Monkey.*

When displayed, the videos were placed next to each other and synchronised so that the images changed at the same time.<sup>211</sup> This could be understood as a variation on the repetition. The same landscape image was repeated three times horizontally in both triptychs. By placing the projections or monitors horizontally, the horizon in the images was extended and emphasised. (I had in mind a scale that would equal the museum visitor for the projections, which turned out to be a complete miscalculation.) The aim was to produce stasis via repetition. All of the videos were running nonstop as loops without a marked beginning, end or rhythmical development, and they were thus adapted to the viewing conditions provided by the exhibition. The technique of display varied:

1. *Three Shores was presented as three large projections next to one another horizontally from left to right: the images recorded before standing, while standing and after standing on the shore, without sound;*
2. *Year of the Goat was shown on three monitors placed horizontally from left to right: images of me walking nearby, walking further away and standing. Sound was audible through headphones;*
- 3 & 4. *Day and Night of the Monkey and Kiasma Shore were displayed on two monitors that were next to one another but not synchronised. They were placed facing in the same direction as the view in Kiasma Shore. The same landscape, the performance site, could be seen from the nearby window.*

Other things influenced the display of course, like the wooden monitor stands of the exhibition architecture or the choice of whether the viewer should have the possibility to sit down or not. As these examples demonstrate, stillness and repetition

<sup>211</sup> At least they were meant to change at the same time, but there were unexpected technical problems with the synchronisation. The guides re-started the works presented on the monitors every day, but they could not reach the video players for the projectors.

can be varied in many ways. Despite all the stillness, movement was a prominent factor in the images. The passers-by had the leading role in *Three Shores*. The figure walking in two of the images defined the whole in *Year of the Goat* more strongly than the small figure standing and looking out to sea in the third image. And the passing traffic was quite dominating in *Kiasma Shore*.

#### 11.6 PERFORMING FOR A LIVE AUDIENCE

What about performing landscape for a live audience? How does stillness function in live performance? With the exception of *Kiasma Shore*, my examples so far have referred to the perspective of an exhibition viewer and to a performance related to producing a representation by way of the action of performing landscape, enacting or executing it, as it were. I have combined these video recorded representations of performances with live images projected in real time from a camera showing a similar action taking place there and then. I have combined real-time performing (either live or through a camera) with the cycle of a year or a day and night recorded on video. The combination of material previously recorded elsewhere and condensed through editing with material projected live on site in real time (roughly combining representation and presentation) enables a juxtaposition of various levels of time as well as of different landscapes.

My first experiment and perhaps the most ambitious performance was *Tuulikaide - Wind Rail* (described in Chapter 5). I combined video images of myself in the landscape and images of “mere” landscape with live performing, posing immobile in relation to the moving image. This performance forms a kind of prototype for my future explorations. In the performance *Pikkukivet - Pebbles* (described in Chapter 3), I used stillness combined with recorded material in another way. I had video recorded pebbles on a light table and added fragments of sound recordings made for a radio play. My stillness as a performer alternated between listening (with a pebble in my hand next to my ear) and looking (with a pebble in my hand next to a lamp) and was more active than the stillness in my other performances.

The performance *Kristallipallo - Crystal Ball*<sup>212</sup> consisted of a talk, a fragment of a radio play with projected subtitles, and a video of me performing landscape, in which I sit wrapped in a blue scarf on landmarks resembling armatures on the islands of

<sup>212</sup> *Kristallipallo - Crystal Ball*, inauguration lecture and performance, Theatre Academy, Helsinki, 7.11.2003. The program included an official speech, a fragment of the radio play “Ecce Homo – Om bildningens land” from 1983 and the *Crystal Ball* performance. The speech was called

Lanzarote and Fuerteventura during Christmas 2002–2003. I placed the crystal ball on the same armatures as well. The material was edited into a two-channel installation (2 x 20 min). In the image on the left I sit in the landscape on the armatures, and in the image on the right the crystal ball is video recorded on the same armatures from various distances. In the live situation with the audience, I sat in front of the two projected images on an armature built to resemble the ones in the images, wrapped in the same scarf and holding in my hand the crystal ball, with a small spotlight directed at it. I announced to the audience that I would try to see into the future, and suggested that the spectators either participate in my attempt or then relax and enjoy the landscapes, that is, the video installation behind me. Thus, the performance was not a still-act or a performance of stillness in a strict sense (nor a combination of real-time and recorded video images), but functioned nevertheless as a kind of interruption in its context. The performance was part of my inauguration lecture as professor of performance art and theory at the Theatre Academy in Helsinki.

The first live performance related to "The Years" was *Istun kivellä Muussa - Sitting on a Rock* at Muu (Muumaanantai/ live, Muu gallery, 14.9.2003) In it, I juxtaposed the videos *Year of the Horse* and *Day and Night of the Goat* with a real-time image of me sitting on a rock by the sidewalk in Nervander Park outside the gallery. There were two video projections on the wall in the gallery: *Year of the Horse* on the left and the real-time video image from the nearby park on the right, and below them a monitor showing *Day and Night of the Goat*. At the beginning of the performance, I distributed a leaflet to the audience with the text "*Sitting on a Rock*", started the video players and went out to sit on the rock in front of the camera. In the end, following the duration of the edited videos (12 minutes), I returned to the gallery to turn off the video players. In this way I juxtaposed three different times – a year displayed with rapidly changing images, a day and night with fewer image changes and the real-time, unedited live image from the street. In all of the images the performer was still, immobile, while the world around the performer was moving and changing.

In the performance *Mene rantaan - Go to the Shore* (at the Fluxee club in Turku, 27.11.2004), I continued exploring the strategy I had used in the performance at Muu. I combined the videos *Day and Night of the Monkey* and *Kiasma Shore* with a real-time image of me standing by the riverside. In the performance with three projectors and a performer, I juxtaposed recorded images and a real-time image of myself standing in a landscape that resembled the recorded one. This time I uti-

"Valoa ja ihoa kristallipallossa" [Light and Skin in the *Crystal Ball*] when published in the magazine Teatterikorkeakoulu-lehti 2/2003 (Arlander 2003 d).

lized the edited “empty views”, too. In the performance the video from the shore on Harakka Island and the Kiasma shore were shown one after the other, not simultaneously as in the exhibition, and both of them were coupled with an “empty view”.

The structure of the performance was as follows: three video projectors were placed next to each other horizontally, the ones to the left and in the centre showed images from two DVD players and to the one to the right showed a real-time image from the camera placed by the dark riverside approximately 60 meters away. In the image on the left I stand still in the landscape – in the centre image the same landscape is shown without a human figure – in the image on the right I stand still in real time along the riverside. The chronology of the performance was as follows: first a prologue,<sup>213</sup> followed by the video *Day and Night of the Monkey* (13 min.), then *Kiasma Shore* (13 min.) and, finally, an epilogue. After a brief presentation, I took the scarf, spoke the recipe-text, started the video players and walked out to the riverside. I stood there for 26 minutes, then walked back to stop the video players and to say thank you. Due to the cold weather and the darkness of the evening, the stillness of the performer was emphasised as an action and an idea, less as a visual effect – the human figure was barely visible in the real-time image.

Using the same logic, I performed small demonstrations related to lectures in Tampere and Kuopio. In Vapriikki, in Tampere, I sat for the duration of *Year of the Monkey – Tomtebo* (22 min.) wrapped in a red scarf next to the Tammerkoski Falls, which partly simulated sitting on the ledge on Harakka Island. In the Talks and Deeds event organised by the contemporary Art festival ANTI in Kuopio, I combined the second part of *Wind Rail* – a performance video recorded on Harakka Island (15 min.) – with a real-time image of standing outside the library next to a bronze sculpture depicting “Pohjan akka” [The Hag from the North]. These lecture demonstrations were not performances in the same way as the previous examples, although they utilized the same technique of juxtaposing recorded and live images combined with stillness as performance action.

The performance *Tuulenpesä – Noidanluuta / Wind Nest – Witches’ Broom* at the Amorph! Festival (described in Chapter 8) differed from the previously mentioned

213 As prologue, I spoke the same text that was presented as a score in the exhibition *Vision and Mind*:

Take a scarf, / Go to the shore, / Stand at the shore. / Look at the horizon, / Look at the water’s surface, / Breathe. / Until your eyes rest, / Until your mind rests, / Until you are cold, tired, having enough. / Take the same scarf, / Go to the same shore, / Stand at the shore. / Look at the horizon, / Look at the water’s surface, / Breathe. / And so on.

In the video adapted for the performance, the text was added as subtitles in Finnish and in English in the night images.



performances, though it was an interruption or a still-act as well, albeit not in a public space. A video image of me sitting on a cliff with a witches' broom on my back looking out to sea (20 min.) was projected onto the back wall of the gallery. As a kind of replica, in the live performance situation I sat with the same witches' broom on my back looking at the projected image in front of me. Both the performance documented on video and the live performance was based on stillness. Sound added a mobile and interactive dimension to the work: whispers were audible from eight pairs of earphones with long cables. I distributed them to the audience and suggested that they could be passed around. The performer was still in the video image and in the live situation, while the audience was moving and exchanging earphones with surprising eagerness.

These performance explorations have been additional experiments to my longer projects performed for the camera in a particular landscape. They all have in common the use of stillness, which is emphasized by the expectations of a live audience present at the site, a public urban space. They use stillness as a performance, as an action to be displayed, though stillness can of course produce concentration and a silencing of the mind as a side effect. To what extent I have produced real still-acts, interruptions in the historical flow, in the sense Seremitakis and Lepecki suggest, can be questioned. According to my own estimation, the interruptions created by these performances have been modest, but nevertheless present.

#### 11.7 SUMMA SUMMARUM

So what? How does landscape move me? As the previously described examples have shown, it mostly arrests me. My working question has been "how can I perform landscape?" and I have tried to respond to that question in various ways. Often, my decisions have been made on the spur of the moment, but I have been faithful to them. The problematic behind my choices are as follows: What can I do that has intrinsic value and is good for me? And the subsequent question, what can I do that I could imagine anybody else doing? Although my starting point has been to do something beneficial for myself, I have also considered what I could unreservedly recommend to somebody else. The question can be linked to the philosophical, political and very practical question posed by Lepecki: "What can a body do"? And furthermore: What is this body, my specific body capable of doing?

This kind of work can be understood as a personal devotional or contemplative practice, but it could be utilized for political action as well, as a way of using one's

body as a focusing tool in a community that is discussing, for instance, some hotly debated environmental issues. Perhaps this kind of activity can be seen more generally as an ethical challenge to art: How can one create action models for viewers, which they could potentially utilize and repeat in their daily lives? Probably that is to demand too much of art.

Here, I have pondered how landscape moves me and how to perform landscape by letting oneself be moved by it. After referring briefly to some notions of landscape, geo-biography and urban nature, I considered stillness and still-acts as a way of commenting on the contemporary culture of pervading mobility, and of modernity's being-towards-movement. I mentioned the illusion of the independent subject of modernity analysed by Lepecki, which forgets that all subjectification must take its energy from somewhere. I also mentioned the possibility of resistance produced by stillness or interruption.

I looked at stillness as action in performance with the help of Anthony Howell's three elements of action and emphasised his distinction between stillness as the basis for all actions in performance and stillness as a performed action. I presented the video works where I have video recorded myself on the same site in the same landscape once a week for a year and repeated the same image and the same framing of the video image in order to give space to changes in the landscape. I compared some of the examples with the elements of action (stillness, repetition and inconsistency), understood more broadly as principles of action to be used in video recording, editing and display.

With the help of my examples, I distinguished between on one hand stillness as a kind of resting in the landscape and, on the other hand, stillness as a performed immobility, a still-act. In these examples, stillness as resting or contemplation, becoming silent in the landscape, was central in the cycles of a year, while stillness as a performed action was emphasized in the live performances due to the presence of a live audience and the use of public space.

A future task for others to explore is to investigate the possible socially interesting forms of stillness, and to study how still-acts or interruptions that resemble acts of resistance could produce a common space for moments of reflection in the midst of our culture of mobility.

I have tried to demonstrate how stillness can be used to focus attention on changes in the landscape. I proposed that the changes will come to the forefront on one hand by repeating the same image and a fixed framing and, on the other hand, by the stillness of the performer, against which the slow movement and gradual changes of the landscape become visible. By focusing on the small changes in the

environment and by juxtaposing the human figure with elements in the landscape, the interaction of the performer and the environment is emphasised and also made possible on an experiential level.

Based on these experiences, what can be said of the corporeality of site-specific performances? As I proposed in the beginning of the chapter: although the environment is often experienced most strongly by moving through it, in order to experience a corporeal connection to a site it can be useful to remain repeatedly still in it for a while.