An intervention in virtual violence

The fiction of the power of stalking and strategies of resistance in Pilvi Takala's installation

Admirer

The English utilitarian Jeremy Bentham envisaged the panopticon in 1787 as an architectural system of surveillance. Its power consisted in the continuous monitoring of subjects, first institutional and then internalised as self-monitoring. In the panopticon, power is built upon fiction; the guard who holds control is perceived as having abilities and characteristics that he as a person does not hold. The artist Pilvi Takala deconstructs a fictional panoptic show of power in her installation Admirer.

Admirer (2018) depicts a panoptic fiction of power as an operational principle of stalking. The nine-channel installation is based on Takala's dialogue with the stalker, who is given the name “Anonymous”. Admirer was exhibited at the Museum of Contemporary Art Kiasma in Helsinki from 24.8.2018 to 17.2.2019 as part of Takala's solo exhibition Second Shift. Visitors could enter a dark room to see the installation if they first agreed that they would not attempt to find out the identity of Takala's dialogue partner featured in the installation.

Contact between Anonymous and Takala first arose in the art world. Takala's interactive video work Invisible Friend in 2015 offered the audience the chance to converse anonymously with an imaginary friend through an SMS text messaging service. Having participated in the work, Anonymous continued sending messages even after it was over. (3) The contact started within the context of Invisible Friend between Anonymous and Takala soon took on a life of its own. The rules of social encounter were no longer defined in the frame of an artistic project. Instead, Anonymous started to control the situation by stalking Takala.
According to estimates, some 12-16 percent of women and 4-5 percent of men become targets of stalking at some point in their lives. (4) Stalking takes place in various ways. Three central behavioural models have been identified: 1) the stalker attempts to communicate with the target in different forms, such as through letters, telephone calls, e-mails, social media and via other communication tools and platforms; 2) the stalker seeks to maintain contact and proximity, and 3) the stalker engages in aggressive and threatening, violent behaviour. (5) The definition of “stalking” highlights the experience of the person being stalked: stalking is an activity that understandably causes anxiety and fear. (6)

Communication technology developed quickly in the late 20th century and this appears to have lowered the threshold for stalking behaviour. While technology democratises and creates equality, it also opens doors to forms of violence that were previously more marginal. (7) The cyberstalking depicted in *Admirer* can today be distinguished as a distinct form of stalking, even as several parallel forms of stalking can occur simultaneously. (8) As an example telephone stalking becomes intertwined in the era of smart devices with the stalking taking place on different social media platforms and applications.

Negotiating with the stalker brings an element of danger to *Admirer*. According to studies, there is a severe threat of physical violence for the stalkee, and in the worse case, stalking only ends with the death of the stalkee or the stalker. (9) Negotiating with a stalker is therefore dangerous. To give a concrete example, negotiating with former partners and individuals sentenced with a restraining order tends to increase contact from the stalker. According to research, confronting the stalker is not recommended because it represents a form of contact between the stalker and the person being stalked, sending a message to the stalker that he or she is playing a role in the life of the stalkee, and increases the risk of public humiliation for the stalker – all the aforementioned scenarios can increase the risk of physical violence. Stalkees are, in fact, advised to react "outwards", meaning cutting of all communication with the stalker. (10)

Ending communication needs to be categorical. Helinä Häkkänen has pointed out among others, that if you reply to one message after receiving 100 messages, you may involuntarily signal that a line of communication can be established by sending 100 messages. Therefore ending any and all forms of communication is considered the most efficient way to set boundaries for a stalker.
(11) It is also worthwhile to keep evidence related to stalking, such as saving messages sent by the stalker for a possible police report or judicial process.

While there is an affective dimension at play with all violence, stalking can be characterised to be built especially strongly on affect. (12) Stalking binds bodies together through the experiential nature of violence. When writing about affect, Sara Ahmed references David Hume who uses the term *impression* when discussing emotions. (13) The term refers to 'pressing in' and a mark produced by an action of pressure. In Ahmed's thinking, emotions are therefore conceived as existing between bodies and having an impact on them. They influence the interrelation of subjects by, for instance, drawing bodies towards one another and further distancing them.

Emotions navigate between bodies and shape their relations and potential to act. (14) The paradox is that violent affect need not signify a growing crack and a break in the contact between bodies. Stalking that is based on emotional violence can actually increase the affective tension of violence and therefore also strengthen the bond between bodies. Tension is strengthened through the regulation of the distance between bodies and by maintaining the coupling via various acts of stalking. Musically speaking, such an affective tension could be described as a dissonance that never releases or breaks off completely, but instead tightens and stretches, at times strengthening and at other times abating.

In *Admirer*, Takala acts in contravention of the usual instructions given to stalkees and instead negotiates with the stalker and uses the messages as material for an artwork. The examination of social rules and the testing of their limits form a theme that repeats itself in Takala's oeuvre; by intervening in the scheme of stalking, Takala creates strategies of resistance. The artist explains in the exhibition catalogue published by Kiasma that the resources offered by the museum institution provided protection for her and she did not experience fear as such during the process of making the artwork. (15) Born out of exceptional circumstance, the artwork detangles the dynamics of stalking and discloses the violence that typically takes place out of sight.
The backstory is already well underway as the audience walks into the world of *Admirer*. The installation depicts Takala and Anonymous discussing the making of the upcoming artwork. In the exchange of messages, Takala attempts to negotiate with Anonymous the possibility of using their shared messages as material for the artwork.

The work consists of eight screens arranged apart in the installation room, a five-page contract placed beneath protective glass, and a ninth screen placed at the doorway of the installation informing visitors of the conditions for viewing the work. *Admirer* has a loop format: the storytelling part of the work restarts once it is through. The duration of the installation is 35 minutes. If viewed one after another, the footage shown on every screen lasts one hour and 57 minutes in total. The installed screens have been placed in the room in such a way that the viewer is required to move through the gallery space in order to follow the work. The screens are facing in all directions, from the ceiling to the floor.

The visual and aural form elucidates the mass of messages exchanged between Anonymous and Takala. The messages "pile up" on the screens in such a way that new messages prevent the viewer from seeing parts of previous messages. The messages by Anonymous and Takala are distinguished by their own colour codes. The blue ones by Anonymous arrive far more frequently than the pale brown ones sent by Takala. Some of the screens feature a dialogue. In others, Anonymous carries on their monologue without any response from Takala. The unending flow of messages is accompanied by the sound of typing as the e-mail text body appears on the screen letter by letter. Sound also plays an important role in depicting the continuous stream of messages; the signal tone chimes incessantly with each new arriving email.

A central part of the work is also the contract placed in a glass display by the wall of the installation room. It defines the conditions of the communication between Anonymous and Takala. At the same time, the contract reveals the scale of the interaction. Since 24.12.2015, Anonymous has sent Takala messages from 20 distinct e-mail addresses as well as on Facebook's Messenger service. Anonymous has also approached Takala's contacts on Facebook. When Takala replies to Anonymous on 11.3.2016, Anonymous has carried on a monologue via e-mail and Facebook Messenger for nearly three months already. The dialogue between Takala and Anonymous has a duration of about thirteen months, until May Day 2017. By the time the
contract enters into effect on 22.6.2017, Takala's messages have a total character count of 150,278 and Anonymous’s 236,963. (16) Added up, the text volume is over 190 standard sheets of text.

The messages sent by Anonymous are a blend of suggestions with a sexual tone, affirmations of friendship and proximity, hostile and aggressive threats, declarations of love, and a bitter unfolding of the experience of being rejected. In some messages, Anonymous fantasises about Takala in the nude and dreams of marrying her. Sometimes the messages include fantasies of violence in which Anonymous imagines what it would be like to hit Takala. The Anonymous’s argumentation is jarring and ambiguous. The only rule in its inner logic is repetition: the only certainty is that a new message will arrive and the stalking communication will endure without end.

The contract presented in the exhibition space however sets borders on the communication: Takala is committed to send images of the artwork to Anonymous once the exhibition opens, and to respond to queries by Anonymous about the work with messaging comprising a maximum of 8000 characters. All communication must end on 16.9.2018. Breaking the contract will result in Takala contacting the authorities and submitting the messages to be examined for potential offences according to the Criminal Code of Finland.

**Virtual bodies**

The presentation, dramaturgy and format of *Admirer* communicate about the nature of a technologically transmitted form of stalking. The looping format of the artwork highlights the endlessness and huge volume of the flow of messages – the flow never stops but instead always starts over. At the same time, the installation of the work depicts the violence of stalking and its experience. Placing the screens in different parts of the space and directing the audience to turn in different directions serve a metaphorical purpose; at times the viewer’s body must contract and squat before the messages as if hiding, at other times it feels like the messages are "poured" onto the viewer from the ceiling. The stalking seems omnipresent and the viewer feels approached from all directions. At the same time, the placement of the screens adds to the impression that the stalker is a figure whose location is unclear and undetectable.
Feminist philosophy has often approached technology from the viewpoints of utopia, fantasy and dystopia. Cyberfeminism in specific sees the performativity of the Internet (17) as an opportunity that creates democracy and diminishes the power of real-world structures that create inequality. The online world makes it possible to efface and alter gender, ethnic background, physical presence and the socio-economic framework. (18) Technology permits, in a way, the performance of different bodies through, for instance, masking the natural body and fantasising about the existence of a new, speculative or possible body. At the same time, one can express one's perceived gender and create a whole new performative self for example by "virtual crossdressing". In cyberfeminism, this online "bodilessness" has been seen as a liberating and democratising force. (19) The virtual body has, for instance, been thought of as capable of detaching from the natural body so that physical attributes no longer define how a subject is encountered, and the body can instead exist in a space equally through solely a textual presence. (20)

Whereas masking and hiding the natural body or abandoning it completely can serve to deconstruct norms and bring liberation, it can also be a threatening act and facilitate technologically transmitted violence. The anonymity provided by a virtual body can be used to cover up and hide the tracks of violence. Sexual harassment, racism, virtual warfare, stalking, paedophilia and hate campaigns are examples of technologically transmitted violence that is experienced in the online realm where the violence is either partly or completely masked by an anonymised virtual body. The social rules of the real world do not recede in virtual encounters. They can however become covered partly, making it difficult to distinguish what the encounter comes down to, what consequences it may have, what the social rules of navigation are, how rules are negotiated and how violence is fended off or prevented.

When examining technologically transmitted violence, it is important to note that technology is not necessarily detached from the natural body nor a phenomenon incapable of harming it. Technology should be understood as a continuation of the body and something that addresses it; through technology, we can express identity, construct personal space and maintain social networks. On the other hand, technology can also dissolve the borders of subjects by bringing faraway bodies to be experienced up close and it can bind virtual and natural bodies together.
The technological environment can be perceived as a social space where social relations have an impact on technology and vice versa. The technofeminist viewpoint addresses a reality constructed by technology. Instead of attempting to reduce factors that contribute to the intertwinedness of the world (21), the aim is to perceive what impact they may have on the experience of technology, as well as on technology itself. (22) The process of perception may follow a traditional feminist strategy, the dismantling of binaries. This is how the apparent binaries pitting femininity and technology against one another are structured, such as masculine-feminine, technology-nature, reason-emotion or strength-weakness.

The dismantling of binaries related to technology and the technological landscape have a specific meaning in the examination of the gendered violence that takes place in the online world. Our attention is then focused on counterparts that normalise violence and therefore relate to the perception of violence: real-virtual, physical-spiritual, public-private, open-closed. By examining the drift between these, we can notice how also emotional or virtual violence such as stalking can cause pain and how prone it is to trap the victim of the violence in a cycle resembling domestic violence, where the codes of violence shape the social reality.

**The politics of fear**

The aural-textual body agency of Anonymous in the virtual sphere is based on a concealed identity and ongoing advances. The virtual body covers the true self of Anonymous, along with its characteristics and also human qualities. Anonymous is present through symbols that represent their own subject: text, the sounds of typing and the chime indicating the arrival of a new e-mail all depict the presence of the figure. The concealment of the natural body and a symbolic presence make Anonymous into a figure resembling an acousmatic being.

The Slovenian philosopher Miran Božovič applies the concept of an acousmatic character, meaning a character experienced only through their voice as known from the study of film music and sound, to the perception of the logic of power and control of Bentham's panopticon. In the context of cinema, as theorized by Michel Chion, an acousmatic character is marked by divine or malevolent characteristics: an acousmatic character is thought to be all-seeing, all-hearing,
omnipotent and omniscient. The location of the being is unclear and can be perceived as omnipresent. (23)

As a utilitarian, Betham's intention was to design a penitentiary facility that would impose the mildest possible penalty with the strongest possible deterrent. Božovič remarks that the penalty of the panopticon was more than anything a spectacle where mental images play a more important role than reality. (24) The power of the panopticon lies in illusion, a sort of virtual façade, behind which the inspector can hide. Power is not merely optic, or related to the gaze. It is in many ways also panauratic, or based on monitoring and an aural presence through listening. (25)

Božovič describes how a fiction of god is created in the panopticon through sound and gaze. Both the voice and gaze of the inspector have been removed from their original body. (26) Both also have their respective special function. The gaze gathers information on the subject of monitoring. The voice is however used to communicate the monitoring to the one monitored. Whereas Anonymous uses e-mails and social media and their auditive qualities to communicate their monitoring, in the panopticon, the inspector addresses the prisoners through special tin pipes connecting the watchtower and the inmate cells. (27)

Bentham separates the panopticon from the so-called Dionysian Ear, where the target is being listened to in secrecy, without them knowing about it. The aim of the panopticon is however that the subject believes they are being monitored even when it might not be taking place. (28) This is also the case in Admirer. The flood of e-mails and the technological soundscape of cyberstalking are performative elements, without which the stalking would not exert its power over the target. Unlike a non-personal gaze, sound also depicts the performative personality and characteristics
of a divine figure. This is why panoptic power that relates to stalking can through its characteristics be seen as a communicative and performative variety of power.

There is value in distance, especially when considering how panoptic or panauratic power and control are experienced. A divine character should remain far enough from its target in order to hold on to the illusion of its omnipotence. The distance may however never grow too wide. Distance has a very central significance in the creation of an atmosphere of fear. In Being and Time, Martin Heidegger defines fear as something that approaches its target in a threatening manner – the fearsome surpasses the distance separating itself and the fearful subject. Something fearsome is fearsome if it approaches enough; when remaining at a distance the nature of the fearsome is concealed, but the closer it approaches, the more intensively and spread out over new spheres it is experienced. According to Heidegger, the crucial factor in fear is that the fearsome is yet to be encountered but the approach threatening the subject can be sensed. Regarding the experience of fear, there is no great significance in the fearful subject actually encountering the fearsome or that the fearful subject ends up being harmed. In fact, the uncertainty makes the fear even more fearsome.

Distance need not always signify geographical distance in fear. It is also time-based. The time-space of fear is simultaneously dispersed over the present moment as well as directed into the future. It is a future-oriented experience that prevents a calm and observational attachment to the present. Fear is often described as something immobilising, something that blocks action. In the feminist tradition, fear is paired with a social dimension: fear pinpoints an action between bodies and their power relations. Ahmed describes how a fearful body "shrinks" and a body preparing to flee contracts. Shrinking and contraction can be understood as signs of social organisation. The act of becoming less through fear indicates order and crops the borders of agency and facilities the agency of other bodies – those ruling through fear or those free of fear – along with a wider social space. (31) Fear can therefore limit future orientation and the horizon of possibilities. Fear narrows the perspective, "binds" the body and defines the placement of the subject in the social order.

Fear need not be total. Heidegger defines different modifications of fear, from a subtle shyness to downright terror. Something familiar and threatening that suddenly bursts is called an alarm. A
prolonged and unfamiliar threat turns fear into horror, and when something threatening is encountered in the aspect of the horrible while being alarming and unfamiliar, fear becomes terror. (32) The examination of the intensity of fear can help to perceive a fear-based logic of violence and the strategies of resistance. Regulating the time-space of fear and intensity can also alter the horizon of possibilities.

**The performance**

Researchers of stalking depict stalking as intimate and performative violence. The performative nature is born from the difficulty of understanding the motives of the stalker. The acts seem to oppose everyday logic and are motivated autonomously. Most of all, the acts are the stalker's own personal project, a one-direction performance that is not based on reciprocity. (33) A similar performative nature also belongs to Benthamian power: the panopticon is, at its core, a theatre scripted by the inspectors that constructs a performance of power and force. The panopticon has two audiences: the prisoner being monitored and the society that lies beyond the prison walls. The mission of the prisoner is to bend to the will of the inspector who has assumed divine power in the theatre, and finally learn to self-monitor. The mission of the audience is to believe the theatre and stay outside it.

When examining *Admirer*, we notice that stalking also has a performative nature. The stalker performs power over the stalkee by gathering information on their target, by communicating it and by concealing their natural body. The theatre of stalking is however a reverse one, a theatre of inversion where right is left and down is up. The actor typically accuses the victim of their own acts. Anonymous, for instance, threatened to inform the museum staff what kind of a person Takala is "really" like, if Anonymous’ will is not met. Researchers of violence might describe the situation as reversed shame where the shame of the perpetrator is made into a shame of the victim. (34)

In *Admirer*, the performative nature of stalking is met with action and by breaking the façades of stalking. At the same time, the cycle of fear and the structures of theatre are dismantled. Three strategies of resistance can be identified in the format of the artwork: 1) drawing borders, 2) reclaiming space and 3) revealing the stalking, or bringing it from the private to the public
sphere. At the same time, the technological and discursive space is reclaimed and the hypermasculine aggression is resisted through self-defined new negotiation strategies.

Takala actively defines the rules of communication in her messages: the discussion needs to stay on topic (the production of a possible work of art), no sexual or threatening communication will be allowed, and the sending of images is prohibited. Takala attempts to also control the massive flow of messages by defining when and what kind of messages she will reply to. The format of the work references a desktop or portable computer and in this way communicates the drawing of borders; discussion via small-scale portable smart devices such as mobile phones is ruled out and all communication must instead be handled on a desktop or laptop computer. (35) In this way, personal space is defined in a way that a mobile phone is not a platform for committing the violence of stalking. At the same time, the space-time of stalking shrinks.

The control of stalking is juxtaposed in *Admirer* with work that is only executed on devices specifically meant for work and takes place during designated working hours. This work does not mean only the artistic work related to preparing an artwork. It is also emotional labour that is used to control and work on the violent experience. Emotional labour has a central role in the control of the experience of stalking. Violence, which already in its definition aims at emotional hurt, such as the production of fear and anxiety, is defended against by working on the emotions of fear and anxiety and by breaking apart the practices and structures triggering and maintaining fear.

The cycle of fear and the power relations of virtual bodies change in *Admirer*: Takala breaks the cycle of stalking by redefining the distance between the stalker and the stalkee, and by bringing the stalking from the intimate technological space into the public sphere. In the presentation of the work, the public sphere is represented by the contract and its legal discourse, as well as through the museum institution that represents a broader cultural sphere. The museum institution can be thought also to relate to the legitimation of the experience of stalking violence. Stalking has long remained unrecognised and invisible in the cultural sphere of Finland. (36) When placed inside a museum institution, an artwork addressing stalking violence is placed in the canon of other works addressing violence. At the same time, stalking violence is documented as
part of Western cultural history in the form of an artwork, and this form of violence becomes recognised.

In an art museum context, the invited audience symbolises the society and the public seeing, recognising and witnessing the violence. Through its presentation, the installation communicates that a relationship of violence never forms just between two individuals but it is rather born in a wider socio-cultural practice and must be resolved in that same context. In *Admirer*, the roles of the stalking theatre are symbolically redefined. The omnipotent inspector is stripped of their power, the prisoner breaks out from the prison and the audience, shut outside the façade of stalking, is made into a witness of its events.
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Mietin pitäisikö tässä käyttää perusmuotoa, intervention. Viittaisiko se selkeämmin myös taiteelliseen interventioon, kuten suomenkielisessä otsikossa?

Tämä käänös on suppeampi kuin alkuperäinen: "Vainoamisen määritelmä korostaa vainotun kokemusta: vainoaminen on toiminta, joka aiheuttaa ymmärrettävää ahdistusta ja pelkoa". Käännöksessä pitäisi käyttää sanaa "definition", joka viittaa akateemisessä diskursississa tehtyyn määritelmään. Pelkkä sanaa ja sanan merkityksen viittaaminen ei tarkoita samaa, koska sanalla voi olla mm. arkimerkitystä, etymologista merkitystä jne.


Pitääkö tässä olla ”sending”? En ole varma. Voi olla, että tämä käänös on oikein.

Vai: dissonance

Vai: catalogue

Pitääkö olla violence of stalking and its experience tms? Voi olla, että tämä käänös parempi. Stalker violence hiukan mietityttää.

Onko tämä oikein?

pitääkö tässä selventää: esim: that is a character which is experienced… Tai jotain muuta. Nykyisessä muodossa ei käy aivan selväksi se, että akusmaattinen hahmo koetaan siis vain äänensä kautta/äänenä.

yleensä: film music and sound

omniscient

an

Löytyisikö tälle muuta käänöstä? ”Mielikuva” on alkuperäinen. Image viittaa hiukan liian paljon panoptikonin pelkästään katseen kautta hahmottuvana, jota tässä myös puran.

Käytetty myös sanaa inspector tässä yhteydessä. Tai tämä on se sana, jota Bentham käyttää. Pitääkö siis mainitua inspector (esim. the "inspector" or a guard) ja sitten käyttää guard? Toinen vaihtoehto on käyttää johdannukaisesti kaikissa kohdissa inspector. Guard käy minulle, mutta inspector pitäisi olla mainittu myös.

vai: function.


"Pelottava on pelottavaa, mikäli se lähestyy tarpeeksi.” ”Close enough” ei ole se mitä haetaan, koska pelottavan ei tarvitse tulle lähelle, sen tarvitsee lähestyä. Nämä ovat kaksi eri asiaa. Lisäksi uhkaava on eri kuin pelottava. Tarkistaisin tämän lauseen kokonaan. Pelko
pelottavaksi ja lähestyminen lähestymiseksi. (tuossa aiemmin mainitsemassani käännöksessä tosin threatening on käytössä, saattaa toimia myös tässä)

[SM18] Tähänkin pelottava, ei uhka?
[SM21] Tämä lause antaa väärän kuvan: must be used ikään kuin kehoittaa että on otettava kantaa vainoamiseen. Ehkä voisi lieventää vaikka niin, että yhdistää edelliseen lauseeseen (…is ruled out and the communication is limited/restricted/yms. to the desktop or laptop computer.)
[SM22] Onko scene tässä liian suppeaan kulttuurin viittaava sana? Syntyykö vaikutelma, että kulttuuri/taidemaailma ei ole havainnut vaikka todellisuudessa koko suomalaisessa kulttuurissa vainoaminen on ollut pitkään 2010-luvulle asti näkymätöntä? Ehkä sphere?
[SM23] vai omnipotent
[SM25] ”Teknologian mahdollistamana” on alkuperäinen. Pitäisikö olla enabled by technology?
[SM26] film sound