**Landscape as a Twist of Thought: A Line of Enquiry**

‘It is a question not of imposing preconceived forms on inert matter, but of intervening in the fields of force and currents of material wherein forms are generated.’ (Ingold 1993)

How can an art practice based in lens imaging help us to question landscape as a pictorial category fixed in space and time? This essay proposes that we practice landscape as an ongoing process which always surpasses human spatial and temporal framing while enfolding the activity of the human within it. Starting with reference to a specific geographic, geological and environmental site, the essay tracks a process of situated making using the smartphone camera as the fulcrum of a performative activity. The automatic programmes of digital cameras borrow photographic conventions to produce a particular ‘way of seeing’ (Cosgrove 1984) which maintains landscape as static , grounded and always maintained at a fixed distance, thus setting up subject/object distinctions. In the practice outlined here however, such conventions are disrupted through a series of technological/ kinaesthetic engagements which reconfigure relations of figure and ground, surface and depth. The series of evolving material formations which emerge are generated by a series of recursive steps -a continual process of transitional folding back upon itself through which the next step of the work takes shape, ‘a recursive futurity’ (Massumi 2005: xxvii). In making tangible, the practice has no one definitive object of completion but presents itself as an assemblage of parts, which become ‘relational objects for thinking- in -action’ (Manning 2009). It is through this process that I explore the work’s ‘expression’ (Massumi 2011: 57); landscape is not only performed as an event of ongoing change but is an activity of temporally situatedsharing which can challenge privatised modes of the production and consumption of images.
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**Landscape as a Twist of Thought**

The increasing automation of smartphone cameras providing ready-made programs focus on end result. Activated by fingertip touch they give the impression of instantaneous production. However designed to overlook the complexities involved in the act of looking, these applications increasingly devolve responsibility for decision making onto the gadget. This short circuiting works to lock us into an instrumental relationship with the apparatus. The program designed for landscape photography for example, determines a landscape as a series of pictorial views independent of a viewing subject other than as functionary (Flusser 2000: 28-32; 35). The camera computes viewing distances based upon the horizon as a fixed point of reference, establishing ground as stable and immobile and maintaining landscape as an inert, spectacular backdrop to our presence and activities. (Cresswell 2004; Ingold 2011: 145; Trangmar2019: 44 ).

This essay proposes that the abstract system on which the camera smartphone program is based can be enmeshed with the phenomenological, tactile and temporal experience of making. When the activities of seeing and touching are intertwined as a reflective, durational experience actively engaged with the technology, photography can become part of a processual and embodied practice. With such an approach landscape becomes an active practice of the production of space and a performance of place, which conditions our human potential but also undermines our self centred- ness. Landscape is then a lived relation of flows and disturbances, of one thing caught up in another.

The site of this project, Dungeness, is a coastal peninsula located in the south- east of England, not far from the Channel port of Dover and some twenty miles from the coast of France. Geologically, the promontory of Dungeness is made up of successive tidal depositions of flint shingle thrown up by the sea and has existed for only a few thousand years. (Long, A.J. et al. 2004; Eddison, 2002). The shoreline is constantly on the move, continually growing out eastwards as the force of sea currents erode its southern edge. The shingle banks in their massive accumulation resist the force of the waves but at the same time are continuously falling away at their edges and sliding back into the ocean. Each pebble is shaped by its interaction with another, a vast shoal of mutually defining singularities which make up a moving body. The violent shifting of the geophysical balance between land and sea which forms the coastal topography has been recorded in successive maps of the area showing both these changing contours and accompanying patterns of habitation and ownership of the land. To physically walk across this terrain is to engage haptically with the resistance of the shingle, to work at gripping the rolling uneven surface, pitching one’s weight against the continual grind of pebble against pebble.

Further inland from the beach, the shingle banks solidify into a series of undulating ridges populated by grasses and small plants, burrowed into by animals and overlain by a scattering of buildings and roads. Beyond the fringe disturbance and depositions of human inhabitation, the land becomes heath scrub and further inland, the most ancient of the shingle deposits are bare, supporting only mosses, grasses and lichens. Much of the original shingle ridge formation has been destroyed by industrial extraction of the shingle beds, army occupation in WW2 and the laying down of the railway. Industrial and domestic rubbish has been dumped on excavated land and exhausted coal and mineral deposits litter the line of the now disappeared railway. The residential estate of Dungeness is owned by the French electricity company EDF allowing it to reinforce the security of its nuclear power station; the entire complex is a network of estates with meandering and overlapping borders including a nature reserve and an industrial estate. It is permeated by human politics of ownership, enclosure, natural resource extraction and industrial contamination- disturbances which have led to changing patterns of eco diversity and practices of conservation and management of animal habitats.

In its distance from centres of economic wealth and government, this place is considered to be on the margins, but from the point of view of birds and insects it is a vital stopping off point in their annual migration. and due to its proximity to the French coast, has also become a regular destination point for desperate human migrants.[[1]](#endnote-2) At the same time its increasingly popularity as a tourist destination is encouraged by the attention given to it by a trickle of artists, photographers and writers and the circulation of images posted on social media by visitors, which fix place as image.

Standing in the landscape, the flatness of the topography gives me an almost uninterrupted 360 degree horizon which together with the position of the sun should provide a stable frame of reference for orientation. However, even with the bulk of the power station as a landmark, it is easy to become disorientated for when walking, features in the landscape seem to swing around me as if the ground itself is on the move and the distances between points of reference are surprisingly inconstant. I continually navigate between the perception of extended space spreading out in all directions and the gravitational pull on my body giving me a connected grounding, a grounding which in its proximity is concrete and differentiated. My seeing ranges between one which is primarily optical in calculating distance and direction and a close- range vision which is concerned with being in touch with the ground. These two modes of visuality intermediate through the dynamism of my bodily movement in its forward momentum. In their influential chapter on nomadic space, Deleuze and Guattari (1997: 494-5) map out the imbrication of vision and space as follows:

The first aspect of the haptic smooth space of close vision is that its orientations, landmarks, and linkages are in continuous variation: it operates step by step…. one never sees from a distance in space of this kind….Orientations are not constant but change according to temporary vegetation, occupations and precipitation….Where there is close vision, space is not visual, or rather the eye has a haptic, non -optical function: no line separates earth from sky, which are of the same substance; there is neither horizon nor background nor perspective nor limit nor outline or form nor centre; there is no intermediary distance, or all distance is intermediary.

­

The mobile camera phone accompanies me on my meandering walks round and about as I follow the lie of the land- its contours, growths and encrustations. The rhythm of my walking over uneven ground is amplified in the swinging movement of the instrument within my hand. When a detail of the material surface catches my attention I switch the device into panoramic camera mode. Camera in hand, I slowly sweep my right arm in a lateral curve while recording. The camera optics attempt to maintain a consistent focal point, while the neuromuscular physiology of optical perception is itself immersed in a more complex rotational gesture that incorporates senses responsive to spatial orientation and proximity. My body anticipates, guides and once in motion follows the trajectory of the camera, its sightline affected by the limitations of my arm’s reach, while my vision is blinded by the angle of the sun’s rays upon the screen. The scope of my vision is instead connected to the apparatus through the localized sensitivity of the fingertip on the button and the cradling of the handset in the palm of my hand. Within the orbit of my moving body in space the ‘eye’ of the hand is in touch with and is touched by the smartphone, uniting organic and non-organic electrical currents of energy. There is a reciprocity of affect as body and device are each tied up in and guide the other through a trajectory in space. Prehension as intuitive grasp of action becomes apprehension, a conscious understanding that the world can shape and move us even as we attempt to shape it in moving through.

The panoramic function of the contemporary smartphone camera (like its analogical photographic precursor) is designed to give an illusion of a continuously extended planar space assembled through sequences of still frames, emphasizing seamlessness and consistency of point of view. However, operating on a principle of sensor scanning rather than light-based chemistry, the camera’s optical sensor numerically calculates photons of reflected light and it is the algorithmic processing resulting from these calculations which produces pixels which can be recombined and reorganized in the production of an image.

I pause, press the stop button and review the ‘captured’ image. The camera’s processor cannot match the speed of movement, and the rotation of the camera in space departing from a fixed axis has produced an image with characteristics which are an aberration from the panoramic programme

I have set the device to. Information is registered as a disturbed stuttering of visual coherence. Image stitching is broken or frayed and the resulting image is shot through with dropped or repeated pixels, while the panoramic format is itself sometimes lost. The resulting image has contingency woven into its fabric, as the outcome of the flawed processing cannot be exactly predicted. Coherence fragmented in this way breaks with the assumption of an inherent connection between the photographer’s eye and the ‘eye’ of the camera. The system of perspective which establishes a fixed viewpoint has been disrupted, flattening out perspective or tracing out fragmented curvatures of lines and patches of tone. This kinetic tracing of surface contour integrating geometrics and gesture is an act of simultaneous scoping and scaping to produce an image which is free floating and open to multiple points of view.

Figures 1, 2, 3

Fig1

I tap the Gallery icon on the screen. The processor has reorganized a scramble of data to produce multiple screen based thumbnail images each based upon the same principle of gesture but with differing results in format; depending upon the duration and speed of exposure, the panoramic format has been compacted or stretched. With a pincer gesture of thumb and forefinger individual images can be expanded or reduced, recognizable shapes spreading out to become geometric patterns of colour, patches of light and dark, lines and ragged edges. No matter at what scale or resolution the images expand or collapse into, the kaleidoscopic optical pattern falls into a linear geometry, drawing the eye to pickout rhythms and repetitions and giving the appearance of a series of aerial landscapes divided into an urban grid . This geometry forms a new virtual ground, a mosaic of units which can be shuffled around to re-organize the images *en masse* into a distributive cartography, forming a striated landscape.

When a few of these images are selected, extracted and reprocessed, the panoramic format of the digital files can be re-arranged as a block of strip images. Some of the image files however have taken up a more rectangular format as a consequence of the camera moving in a tighter circuit in space around the subject of my attention, and it is these images which I select for further processing and printing in order to consider them as individual tactile objects. Printing takes place on site in the environmental context of the recordings and the digital processor and printer need to be supplied with electrical power. Delivery of power to the house frequently fails despite the proximity of the power station a few hundred yards away and this is a reminder that the digital image is in a state of continual flux.

Fig2

Reprocessing of image data to make a paper- based print produces a sensuous object with qualities of volume, texture and colour through which I identify and remember. Considering one printed sheet of paper in my hand I can recognize that it has a dual identity. If the printed surface is taken as paramount, the other face becomes the underside, nonexistent. But once the paper is considered as more than a ground for ink inscription, then it is impossible to ignore that this is a three- dimensional object with two surfaces. The condition of the image as surface is the paper and the condition of the paper as substance is the surface, each stabilizes the other while existing in different registers. And if the same image is printed on both sides of the paper, it is as if the paper’s substance has been reduced to a transparent membrane. But this can only be perceived through the turning over of the print in the hand. Furthermore, the co-dependence of image and paper, substance and surface are complicated by the white frame bordering the printed image to give a margin between edge of image and paper edge -a double articulation of an edge, a double identity. The margin is what holds image and object co-present so that we are aware of surface and depth, figure and ground simultaneously. It is also what holds them apart. Visuality becomes a form of sensuous knowledge in which haptic vision and striated space are intertwined (Deleuze and Guattari 1998: 474 -500).

In taking up the paper print I perform the gesture of turning the paper over and cupping it between both palms. The paper seems to come alive in the hand, asking to be curled despite its thickness and resistance.

Rolled up, the paper wraps around itself to form an open cone, pulling the edges together and holding the paper in tension, like a spring coil which could easily unravel and be gathered up into a new formation. This action of wrapping around to shape an enclosure which creates space and light as volume is perhaps one of the most primitive of gestures.

Figure 5 (one continuous image)

fig 3

My hand and my eye are now wrapped up in the world, I am enveloped in it. My gaze then, already enmeshed in the visible, circulates around this curved interior core which I hold in my hands, drawn into and out from the apex of the conical, shell like form which is itself both the source of light and its point of disappearance. It is not that the eye penetrates the cone but rather receives light into its own interior, aperture opening onto aperture. What sort of viewpoint is this? In part, the point of view is my own embodied one, but could it be at the same time the point of view from the interior of a rolling pebble, its softer parts hollowed out by the passage of water sucked in and out? The image object in my hands in both shaping and being shaped, is capable of turning itself inside out. This haptic quality gives the printed image a Baroque turn. It is as if the interface between inside and outside has been dissolved and the space is one of liquid immersal continuously flowing through a middle (media: that which intervenes or middles). As if the image as informational medium is always giving birth to the world.

Turn again, with the cone balanced in one hand, the camera is taken up in the other. The gesture engages the body as pivot around which camera and cone turn – or rather, it is the camera and cone that are the pivots around which the body turns. The cone presents itself to the hand and the hand presents both inner and outer surface of cone towards the lens of the camera poised in the other hand. The camera registers the edge of the paper as it catches the light, and the turning of the cone catching the edge triggers the finger upon the button as a dart of attention. The variability of ambient sunlight reflected off the paper surface itself shapes the visible contour; the cone is touched by the chance of light. And now a new image is drawn out of the three- dimensional object, an image that is unpredictable while retaining a vital dynamic.

This curved planar edge which comes to split the visual field of the image delineates the boundary between inner and outer space and the boundary is one of exchange. Deleuze, (2003 page no) in discussing the pictorial elements in Francis Bacon’s painting, says:

The contour as a ‘place’, is in fact the place of an exchange in two directions: between the material structure and the Figure, and between the Figure and the field. The contour is like a membrane through which this double exchange flows. Something happens in both directions.

The contour as place is one where clear cut distinctions between subject and object dissolve; something rather passesfrom one to the other as a touching *relation*.

Above and below, figure and ground each spill out of the other. Topography convulses to become topology in the making. In discussing the work of Michel Serres, Stephen Connor (2002) writes:

Topology is concerned with what remains invariant as a result of transformation, it may be thought of as geometry plus time, geometry given body by motion… [But] no matter how abstract it may become, topology remains fundamentally bodily… topology marks and maintains the meeting of abstract and concrete, the activities of analysis and the primary operations of touch and moulding .

With each repeated photographic framing of this turmoil, the camera’s sensor draws out from the another embryonic image which when printed on paper and rolled up, once more wraps around itself. Each new formation produces a new cone, introducing new perspectives, edges and contours which are continuously folded back into the work as it develops, multiplying varying viewpoints and disrupting ground as stable and continuous. Three dimensional edges merge with graphic lines entwined around one another, revealing a multiplicity of vortices and complicating the tension between surface and depth.

Fig4

This rolling up of eye into the action of the hand, and hand in turn absorbed by the rolling up the paper, destroys the original copy relation upon which representation depends. Instead, each image thus reveals another inside itself as its own history and its future possibility, its *gestaltung* (its form of self expression). It is also a form of abstraction, not as a reduction but as extraction which carries forward something of what went before. (Massumi 2011,15.)The act of going on always contains within itself a return in order to go on differently, increasing in complexity with each new iteration. This is its style or rhythm of coming into being. In his analysis of Henri Maldiney’s theory of rhythm and its relation to form Ronald Bogue explains that ‘…form is to be understood dynamically as a process of spontaneous emergence and self-shaping. The “appearance” of the artwork, its manifestation, is one with its form, which “is the sudden arising [surgissement] of itself to itself “... “The action of form is that by which *a form forms itself*: it is its autogenesis.” (Maldiney 1973 quoted by Bogue, 2003: 155).

The paper cones are lying on a table. Over time, their contours have been gradually opening out, loosening and succumbing to gravity’s force. It is through this self -transformation that they attract my attention once more. I take up the smartphone camera again, this time in video record mode, and chase the white line which delineates a framing edge, adhering to what is sometimes a graphic line and sometimes a physical edge. In this movement my body is once more the gravitational fulcrum which co-ordinates the integrated action of hand and eye, while the eye of the camera lens mediates the process, tracing a trajectory. While it is not possible for my eye to see in advance what is to come, this is not purely ocular perception, it is a tactile vision which brings body and world once again in touch with one another:

(I) follow (along) withmy eyes the movements and contours of the things themselves*,* this magi­cal relation, this pact between them and me according to which I lend them my body in order that they inscribe upon it and give me their resemblance, this fold, this central cavity of the visible which is my vision, these two mirror arrangements of the seeing and the visible, the touching and the touched, form a close- bound system that I count on, define a vision in general and a constant style of visibility from which I cannot detach myself…’ (Merleau-Ponty 1968: 202)

The movement itself eludes perceptual grasp; it is more that *I feel myself seeing*.

My own embodied viewpoint is incorporated into the vagaries of the line as I track it unfolding along with me. Cousin to the word ‘vague’, vagary’ in English suggests wandering. The word ‘*vague*’ in French also refers to wave- and here the line shapes the curve of a wave as it gives way to becoming a flow. The eye line is nota smooth continuous flow, it is constantly subject to attraction and distraction; the line flows and breaks, changes direction, slips and turns back upon itself, much as I feel my way along a line of thought. (It is also worth bearing in mind that the cranial vagus nerve controls the parasympathetic nervous system, sending and receiving motor and sensory impulses between brain and body organs.)

fig 5

The eyeline as touchline becomes paradoxically, both the centre and the margin, from which image both flows out and returns, taking me with it. This line then marks out a horizon not as a vanishing point but as a limit from which the ground is always moving away and coming close, flexing, convulsing and rolling over like the roiling passage of advance and return of waves in contact with the evolving shape of the shingle coastline. The landscape of the moving image unfolds and shakes out in one place as it simultaneously creases up into ridges in another -evolving through a continual collapse and re-constitution of what is figure and what is ground, always on the cusp of change. Image here is an elastic flow of lines and surfaces, which in having a force of their own, throw consistent viewpoint off course. My activity is part of a topological movement which passes through and beyond my own point of view.

Once the act of filming is completed and the moving image is played back on the smartphone held in the palm of the hand, the image on the screen can be turned around and viewed from any angle; there is no fixed orientation. This is an unusual encounter, for the camera screen is normally employed to be continuously viewed from a fixed aspect. The mobility of the camera phone itself is dependent upon its human host, for it is us which are mobile, not the apparatus. The gadget wanders around with us, we can use it instrumentally or consider it as a site for engaging in reverie and distraction, becoming part of our own changing landscape. The phone camera as the interface between action and reverie generates images as part of a pulse of ongoing change and is active in ‘the creation of relational objects for thinking- in -action’. (Manning: 2009, 226-7). There is an indeterminacy intrinsic to this process which gives it life, purpose and continuity. Landscape understood as literally a moving image (image in movement) which still retains reference in its mode of being to the environmental milieu in which it was first generated, but which nevertheless *in its movement is always otherwise*, *always more than*, makes possible new relations of being.

Figure 8

fig 6

[https://player.vimeo.com/video/373877514?autoplay=1&loop=1&title=0&byline=0&portrait=0](https://eur01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fplayer.vimeo.com%2Fvideo%2F373877514%3Fautoplay%3D1%26loop%3D1%26title%3D0%26byline%3D0%26portrait%3D0&data=02%7C01%7Cs.trangmar%40csm.arts.ac.uk%7Ccbd7047b1faa401f1ae608d7903492d5%7C8c6429c4167f477bb8cb77ee82758d11%7C0%7C0%7C637136427780028954&sdata=LCsKOxuU1Nlgbg7Rf6%2FXS0%2FhKiydxWEgbW46SBaXN10%3D&reserved=0" \t "_blank" \o "Original URL: https://player.vimeo.com/video/373877514?autoplay=1&loop=1&title=0&byline=0&portrait=0. Click or tap if you trust this link.)

The images stored on smartphone cameras are made to be shared; their dispersed exchange across multiple space/times is so intrinsic to the technology that it usually goes without saying. What is perhaps given less attention to is replay which brings the personalised object of the smartphone with its privatised space of consumption into the sphere of shared experience as a situated communal event.Another table, another context.[[2]](#endnote-3) An audience are invited to place their smartphones together on a table. (Some readily oblige, others are reluctant to do so.) The table becomes a kind of ‘landing site’, a temporary grounding. Lying flat, each screen plays out the moving image, and together the screens form a composite landscape; lines and surface patterns circulate, open out, deviate and pass across the frame out of visibility. Turbulence.The moving images are not in synch, images appear at differing stages in the cycle of the film loop. Apart from the formal significance of the work, the value of the gesture lies in the giving up of one’s own device to join with others in a temporary event of

co-incidence, incorporating the contingencies that online technical instabilities introduce. The multiple devices together but playing out of synch, become relational objects for thinking in action; for this slight gesture transforms the smartphone from an individual privatised site of consumption to a site for a public event of slowed down, shared reflection. Such re-orientation of the conditions of image reception allows for a situated event of ‘being in touch’, of sharing of difference in multiplicity, which extracts the film from the storm of online information with which it is caught up. Landscape is no longer something ‘out there’ but takes place through a productive physical engagement which acknowledges that each perspective (with its inbuilt investment of interest) is singular. A lived relation of singularities here and now, bringing about a twist of thought.

**Notes**

1. Channel migrants: https://www.bbc.co.uk › news › uk-england-50451968;

   <https://www.bbc.co.uk › news › uk-england-kent-49225629. Accessed 02/02/20.> [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. Central Saint Martins, UAL. Composting Estate seminar 29/11/19. https://www.sensingsite.blogspot.co.uk
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