Pushing the Body

-In Search of the ‘Real’
When live art involves the extreme body, involves personal power, it is all about the experience of the then and there, the unpredictability of that unique moment that can never be felt or happen again with the same impact to the individual; audience or artist. Art of this nature then raises the issue of the reason for these works, ‘why do these artists inflict such pain on themselves’, and ‘what does it mean to put your body through such extremes of physical and mental pain and endurance?’ Because these works, like all of art, come from the human mind and thought processes, for me, it is important to discuss these issues through psychology, and more specifically psychoanalysis in an attempt to grasp some kind of reasoning as to why an artist would choose to perform using pain. When the artist involved in extreme body art cuts or burns their skin, outwardly it is not unlike what a self-harmer does to their body, but how similar are the reasons? And what drives a person to perform such acts?

From the view of the artist

Chris Burden said of his work, ‘The violent part wasn’t really that important…it was just a crux to make all the mental stuff happen’¹. This is probably true for almost all work that involves pain and self-harm, the physical pain has very little to do with the piece, it is a means for the emotion to be released, emotion that is stronger than can be achieved in any other form, in any other media. In traditional psychology, when a self-harmer cuts themselves, the act is not about pain, it is a means of releasing emotional trauma without
having to confront it verbally. Many self-harmers say they do not even feel the physical pain as all other pains and feelings, the psychological pains, are so much stronger.

It wasn’t pain I was feeling, it was like an injection of Novocaine…it makes the pain go away even though the needle ‘pricks’…And because I controlled the pain, there was no fear with it. So maybe it’s not real pain.²

The arts in general have always been about the artist, composer, dancer, et cetera, exploring emotion through a non verbal form; in a way self-harming does a similar job. When being able to talk about psychological issues within the self is too hard to face, there becomes the need to release these feelings in other ways and for many people to cut the skin allows the internal trapped emotions to become external communications to the outside world. Physically this happens through seeing the blood flow from the body, which can then be translated into a mental form of emotionally externalising the internal. Franko B describes his experience of watching and feeling the blood flow from his body as ‘transgressing the boundary between inside and outside’³. This does not necessarily just mean the physical transgression but also the mental, allowing his mental self to become part of the outside world too, so that the world can know experience and enter the internal.

When an artist performs these works in front of an audience they are exploring their psychological demons as well as perhaps worldly issues as a comment and reaction to major things around them. As Kathy O’Dell believes
If moderation in *masochistic performance* [as O’Dell terms these pieces] by the mid-1970s might be linked to the end of the war (as two situations that call for contractlike negotiations), what might current trends away from masochistic extremes in performance say about the war on culture and the war on AIDS of the 1990s? 

O’Dell talks of relating the end of these ‘*masochistic performances*’ in the 1970s to the end of the Vietnamese war. She also wonders towards the question of the re-emergence of such works in the late 80s and 90s and then decline of the late 90s in relation to the war on AIDS. Bob Flanagan, one of the most notable artists using pain that crossed over from the Sadomasochistic world died in 1996, after a life-time of pain from cystic fibrosis, which may have marked a decline in such works, but artists such as Franko B and Ron Athey continue to use pain and blood. Are they reacting to something else or is this ‘war on culture and the war on AIDS’ actually still a relevant issue? What ever the reason,
these artists of the last forty years have been reacting to themselves and the world around them and they want the public to see it too.

Disease, the AIDS virus Ron Athey contracted in the 1980s and the genetic disorder of Cystic Fibrosis that Bob Flanagan was born with, has meant that the two have spent a large amount of time in their lives with the idea of death hanging over them in a very real and potentially imminent way. Athey describes those days of fear,

in the 1980s, I thought that I would die of HIV but it didn’t happen. I learned that the shadow of death cannot run my life… I am not experiencing a voyage toward death, I am only moving through a reality made up of tortures, redemption and survival.  

Flanagan lived his whole life expecting not to live past that decade and constantly in involuntary pain. Through being the person to control extra physical pain through his SM practices (even though he is not the dominant one in most of the scenarios) he takes control and can find pleasure in it. If you only experience pain as your main sensory stimulus, perhaps eventually through the Pleasure Principal you will find the need and ability to derive pleasure from it.

When Gina Pane cut parts of her face with a razor blade, as she has done in many pieces, as well as continuing her experiences of the violence in Vietnam as a protestor and empathiser for the troops, she was also showing her feelings of femininity and the masculine gaze in a society that was still very male dominated and in the midst of another surge in feminism and search for female control. In seeing her body as just ‘artistic
material, a mere object on which to work, she saw and reduced it down to something feminists would argue men do—flesh for the dominant to act upon. In cutting the skin on the face, however, rather than beautifying it for male pleasure, she turned away from the expectations of men to show her own bodily independence, control and dominance. This type of behaviour is also seen in victims of abuse who continue to mutilate the parts of their bodies that had been abused long after the attacker has gone. Instead of forever feeling that their bodies are controlled by that other person, they can take back that dominance by continuing the pain by their own hand under their own terms. A patient in the book *Cutting* describes how she reacted to the feeling of loneliness after her father had stopped beating her after she became ill.

“One day I found my father’s largest belt, the one he would hit me with… I picked it up and took it to my room… Now I had control of it. “I turned it, fingering each corner [of the buckle] for its sharpness. I held it in my right hand and thought about how awkward it would be to cut myself on the butt as he had often done by hitting me with the belt. Besides, I wanted to see the cutting myself. So I cut my left forearm… My feelings of loneliness went away.”

Tracey had fused attachment with pain.
By doing what has been done to them before, or going against what is expected socially of them, they take physical and supposed mental control back. Through this new found feeling of control they may feel uplifted for moments and be able to feel once again connected with themselves and the world.

Ron Athey is another artist who has come up against the problem society has with harming the face especially.

One of the things I really do mutilate on stage is my face, and people really can’t disassociate themselves from the face, it’s almost like you can beat your body to death, but not your face.⁸

In pieces like Martyr’s & Saints Athey replicates the thorns of Christ by piercing his head and face with needles, he even says of some of the tattoos on his face that they are ‘definitely…a fuck-you statement’.⁹

In today’s society especially identity, individualism and beauty are essential. Supermodels will starve themselves, sometimes literally, to death because to be thin is to be beautiful and cosmetic surgery has become a huge western business. Initial identity and beauty comes through the face, and that is why everyone’s face, not just women’s now, has become so sacred. To violate the face is to violate identity and acceptance. By scarring,
through cutting, piercing and tattooing, you effectively turn round to the world and do say ‘fuck-you’ as Athey admits. To do something that harms yourself, or your supposed normality and wear it on your face, your first point of contact with other people, is to do a huge thing against the beauty obsessed world.

Through these pieces the artists explore and confront many of these taboos in a truly genuine and immensely powerful way, challenging social and personal constraints. Pane’s work, and many aspects of Athey body, react to social beliefs, and Flanagan’s and Athey’s work reacts to their own personal situations and struggles.

A person who cuts themselves will also relate the experience to feeling ‘real’. A defence mechanism for psychological trauma is to repress and forget it, to become numb to the feelings, this can then lead to the problem of feeling dead and de-humanized. When a self-harmer cuts themselves it is to feel; to feel and especially to feel pain is feeling something. To feel and importantly to be able to control this pain, this something, is to feel alive, to feel ‘real’.

One of the arguments against the extremes of violence in the art works that are about exploring pain and human boundaries is that given today’s technology, why do the artists not just fake it, why put your body through the trauma? After all, the audience would not know. These pieces are not solely for the audience, they are not about shock, it is a piece for the artist, a need for the artist to explore something within themselves, but there is a difference in environment between how these reactions occur and that is significant and that does involve the audience. When a person cuts themselves, hidden away from the world, they show themselves that they are real; when an artists does it in front of an
audience they are showing the audience that both the artist and audience are real. By sharing the space with someone when they perform these acts, they also share the experience and emotion.

If I’m suicidal I want to die, I have lost all hope. When I’m self-injuring, I want to relieve emotional pain and keep on living. Suicide is a permanent exit. Self-injuring helps me get through the moment.¹⁰

A piece such as Franko B’s *I Miss You*, 2003 Tate Modern, where he walks up and down a ‘catwalk’ naked, painted white and bleeding through catheters on his arms, could be read as a hint towards death. The risk of dying is there at the artist’s own choosing, but he never chooses to overstep that mark. The pieces are so carefully choreographed and supervised. He has doctors to make sure he is fit to do the performance, calculating the needed interval between pieces and how long the body can endure for the piece. These doctors

---


Blood drips continuously from his arms onto the covered fabric floor. He is painted white, covering his extensive tattoos, presented as ‘normal’ male.
are also close by during the performance to monitor him and care for him after the piece to get him back to good bodily health. Franko B knows how far he can push the body and he knows when to think about stopping. As Lindsey says of her self-injuring, it is not about dying, far from it, it is about living, experiencing and feeling; through the pain and reality of blood you can feel everything.

My blood is my body. When I feel it, it gives me a sense of freedom.\textsuperscript{11}

Part of the controversy the public have about these works is about their inability to accept these works in relation to the pain, to separate themselves from the immediate idea of the physical. Since the invention of antibiotics and anaesthetics, the human race has tried to suppress pain, to rid it from our lives completely. When an artist cuts themselves they inflict pain on their own body, something that may seem very wrong to the audience. My question here comes as to whether the belief that there is physical pain is justified. Are the artists really hurting themselves in that physical way?

Part of the reason for me, why these pieces are not about the physical pain, not about pushing the body in purely physical pursuits, is the belief that when a self-harmer cuts themselves they rarely feel the physical pain in that immediate moment. The emotion of what is happening or has happened overrides the pain and the feeling can almost become complete euphoria and understanding of the self. How can an action, or a piece of art, be about physical pain of that moment if little physical pain is felt? The emotional pain and feeling expressed and released in that moment far outweigh any physical pain. That is just part of the feeling afterwards, the same as tiredness might be after an endurance piece lasting many days. If the idea of the performance is about the moment it happens, then the
after-effects should be of little concern, especially to the audience. As quoted above, the physical pain is ‘just a crux to make all the mental stuff happen’\textsuperscript{12}, releasing the body from its physical constraints through suffering and so allowing mental values to overwhelm the self is to show what is ‘real’. The real of being, the real of everything the artist has and has himself experienced. By transferring physical pain into mental pain the artist is able to explore something much deeper than their immediate selves (Just as certain religious orders use the triumph over physical pain and the body through fasting or flagellation in order to meditate and bring themselves closer to God). Through going beyond the boundary of the skin the artist is able to explore the real inner mind instead, and hopefully transferring these heightened emotions to the audience as well.

For the artist and the audience, what you are seeing is real blood, real pain, real emotion, the real; to fake the piece is to deny all of this and to deny the extremity of the emotion that will naturally be a part of it. Perhaps instead of referring to these pieces as ‘extreme body art’, they should be called ‘extreme emotion art’. For me, what any movement or group of works is called means nothing to the artist; it is a description of the pieces for theorists to be able to talk about them more easily. In this instance though, perhaps it would also allow the audience a greater understanding and a way into the piece. When the audience first sees these pieces they see the body. If they cannot get over this initial physicality of the body into an emotional relationship to what is happening, then they have perhaps completely missed the point. Even though for the artist the works may be primarily about themselves, the works must be closely linked to the audience because of the close setting in which most of these pieces are performed. An attuned, open member of the audience will feel the psychology of the piece and transmit that ‘real’ aspect of the artist onto themselves. Performance art has such an intimacy with the audience it would be
impossible to think that what happens in that space to the artist would not have and would not mean to have a profound effect on the people who view it.

This sense of ‘Real’ in self-harm can be about a physical real, knowing pain and so feeling, knowing you are alive, but also realising and understanding identity. To know you are alive, to feel, is to also understand yourself as a person with an identity, even though for some this identity can become blurred with another persons’, like Tracey with her father’s belt. Where these pieces explore feeling and emotion, knowledge of the self, the artist limits and boundaries, learning how they react to situations is all about discovering more of themselves.

Ron Athey, 2000, shown with hypodermic needles in his head, face and arms. The centre image is his representation of a Christ like figure wearing the crown of thorns. The use of the needles piercing his arms confronts his battle with drug addiction.
Ron Athey’s work explores religion, sexuality and masochism, things that are intrinsic to his identity, upbringing and more importantly his struggle with these factors throughout his life.

I had no choice…to treat these topics. I was born a homosexual into a fundamentalist Christian family…they lived with a constant fear. As far as I am concerned, I was a heroin addict for seven years, involved in destructive sexual practices: I contracted HIV and hepatitis C…The struggle for how we see our life and the determination to set it forth in a different light are the two single most important things to me.\(^{13}\)

As Bob Flanagan explores his life of pain and need for relief, control and ultimately pleasure in his work, Athey too explores his life and tries to understand it. Through such deeply personal works the artist is able to fully understand aspects of themselves, to recognise their lives and identity; their ‘real’ inside selves, perhaps in doing it publicly they are also asking for acceptance from the public, an acceptance that these difficult or extremes of lifestyles rarely find.

For me, it is this sense of ‘real’ in the works that makes them ‘beautiful’. Many people will wonder how can these works that people often find grotesque or offensive be considered beautiful, they are hardly aesthetically pleasing. How can there be beauty in pain?

The word beauty to me has a much greater meaning than ‘a quality pleasing to the senses, especially to the eye or ear’\(^{14}\). It is more about an inner beauty, part of the definition of ‘beautiful’ is ‘having an appearance or qualities which please the senses or give rise to admiration in the mind’\(^{15}\). To show beauty in a person is the ability to truly give and the
idea that through these works the artist gives the audience everything, their physical and emotional turmoil, their knowledge of themselves and this sense of real for the audience to be able to transmit onto themselves, must surely be true beauty. When Franko B performed *I Miss You* one writer remarked ‘No one fainted, but a lot of people cried’.16 Another remarked

As he walked past us, I was unsettled by the intimacy of the piece. Franko seemed honestly vulnerable, noble, and, somehow, very alone…I also felt lonely and helpless…

When Franko walked out of our view and the lights went up, I was overcome by tears-not by gentle tears, but by a wave of feeling so intense it threatened to take me over with racking sobs-the kind of crying that makes you shudder.17

In those fifteen minutes of the performance, the audience members who were brought to tears, more importantly felt

the scared, the beautiful, the untouchable, the unspeakable…the pain, the love, the hate, the loss, the power and the fears of the human condition.18

Franko B was able to touch them in such a strong way through bearing all to the audience, inside and out, physically and mentally. Would he really have been able to do that if the
piece had not had a sense of the real or truth and self-sacrifice to it? To me, this truth in the work gives it the power to be considered beautiful.

Through these works the artist is able to show truth, beauty and the real, surely some of the most amazing things to be able to show the world, especially in a world riddled with war, violence and lies.
From the view of the audience

It is amazing how time allows the radical to be absorbed into orthodoxy when it is no longer seen as a threat.  

A large amount of art of the past was considered ‘radical’ or controversial at the time, surely one of the points of art is to push the boundary of acceptance by making the public more aware of the world around them, allowing them to see it in a different way, so that once it is ‘no longer seen as a threat’ it can be accepted, it becomes the norm. Performance work generally outside of the theatre is still a genre of art that seems to confuse, sometimes even outrage the public as to its merits as ‘art’. Extreme body art especially is still mostly unaccepted, even though the initial performances of the late 60s and early 70s happened nearly forty years ago. Why is this work still such a problem to the general public?

A large amount of the general public still consider the height of art to have been the grand realistic landscapes in oils or pretty watercolours of the nineteenth century or the Renaissance, works that are attractive and inoffensive, which would be pleasing to hang on their wall. These works are easy to look at, to appreciate the workmanship with no need to see anymore into the piece. Extreme body art challenges the viewer in a graphic and unashamed way to see the world not as simplistically scenic and beautiful, but as traumatic, violent and abusive to a lot of people, from the private abuse in an individual's life to global issues of war, disease and oppression. Where the arts are often seen as pleasurable, an art gallery as somewhere to amuse on a wet afternoon, these works are often not immediately offering pleasure. Violence, especially that which is real is a very
hard thing to watch, even though people who do go to these performances do watch and more importantly watch as passive voyeurs. The notion of someone physically attacking themselves is a hard thing for anyone who has not had close experience of it and the reasons for almost the need for it, to understand. To attack your own flesh is to attack your living self and your own rational and moral humanity.

Freud believed, although unsure of how far, of a ‘repetition compulsion’ he termed the ‘Death Instinct’, the desire ‘of an organism to [return to] its earliest state, that of non-existence’, death. This belief came from the observations of people re-enacting moments of trauma, often through the physical body, the most obvious of these being ‘compulsive and repeated suicidal attempts’, in this case, also the repeated self-harming of the person’s own body.

When faced with the anxiety produced by the death instinct, the ego deflects it. This deflection of the death instinct, described by Freud, in Melanie Klein’s view consists partly of a projection, partly of the conversion of the death instinct into aggression.

That aggression can either be pushed out onto other people, as men tend to do, or onto the person’s own body, as women tend to do. In the circumstances of Ron Athey, Franko B and to some respects Bob Flanagan, their feminine traits of their sexuality and how they show themselves to the world not as the dominant male, but largely as the submissive, leads them to turn the aggression onto their own body, the need to sacrifice the self, rather than to react against someone else. Perhaps the male trait of outward aggression is still present in their work, in an overt way in the occasional cutting of another, like in Athey’s
work and in the physical presence and staging of the pieces in front of an audience. Just by showing these works before a group of people rather than them just being films screened in a more standard cinema situation means that the aggression can be outwardly shown. The action does not need to be physically inflicted on another, it is instead mentally and emotionally inflicted upon the audience.

People are far more accepting of the idea of the Pleasure Principle: the drive to seek pleasure (despite later learning to defer it because of the inevitable pain in reality) and avoid pain. The notion of the Death Drive contradicts this completely. If it is hard to accept why we would go against the more easily understandable views of the Pleasure Principle, the idea of someone intentionally bringing themselves into harm will always seem strange and uncomfortable. Perhaps this is still too much of a close threat to the majority of people for it to ever be accepted and no matter how much time passes and how used to seeing it we become, there will always be a sense of uneasiness and unnaturalness about it. After all when someone sees the scars of a self-harmer they will often move away from any potential conversation of it, will not look or talk about it, will not confront it; they are scared to know the truth that someone could go against what is supposedly part of natural and basic humanity. These artists confront these issues of trauma by making the public see, making them watch and acknowledge it, questioning what and why society states certain things as the norm and asking those that see the pieces to re-examine these conclusions.

Barbara Smith wrote that artists ‘show how they feel in their own being and/or in alternative ways, formalized into event-like occurrence that transcend their personal dilemmas’\(^\text{24}\). For all artists their work is a method of expressing themselves generally in a non-verbal way. If, when an artist uses such extremes of expression such as violence to the body or
endurance and abstinence, it is some much deeper trauma that they need to release from their inner-selves, and the audience are there to bare witness to this; as a psychotherapist is there to listen to the patient so is the audience to the artist.

When the artist cuts themselves they show the audience that both the artist and audience are real. If the pieces were solely to do with the artist's emotional problems it would not be so important if anyone saw it, they would just hide away like many self-harmers do. To me, the role of the artist generally is to allow the viewer to think about and confront something they would not do normally, and performance work especially gives the audience that sense of real, intimate and direct time in order to think about themselves and the world more deeply, as Christians do when meditating on the suffering and death of Christ. Perhaps extreme art has developed as religious belief fades and there is no longer religious belief to help with life's pains, a thought Athey has contemplated in and around his works.

Performance work is about that moment, that space and time, and in that time that the artist gives, the audience can switch off from the outside world, only the artist and audience exist. In that time and solidarity the individual audience member has the time to focus on the self in relation to what the artist is showing them. When an artist shows you everything of themselves the audience sees it both in the artist and in them. For me, when performances like these work well, it allows me the time, the encouragement and the support to look into myself and feel. The piece is there for the audience to use as well as the artist. Perhaps it is through a sense of guilt that the public dislike these pieces in the idea that the artist and the audience are experiencing and benefiting from these pieces but it is only the artist who is being truly hurt, who is having to truly confront themselves. The
audience watch the artist potentially in pain but are generally unable or unwilling to do anything to help but they are still being touched and challenged by the emotional traumas that will inevitably be felt in these pieces. Guilt also comes from the idea that those watching just would not have the needed strength to be able to explore the things that the artist does, especially in such an open way.

When the audience watches these pieces they are watching someone physically harming themselves. In this physical and mental pain, the audience are watching someone feel everything. Even though this can be a very hard thing for someone to understand and perhaps even accept people who do choose to watch them, more importantly watch them passively. As Kathy O’Dell has commented on the audience in a piece by Chris Burden,

> the events were accepted and allowed to occur by observers who remained silent. Although such acceptance by silence is a feature of almost all performed works of art, its implications are particularly poignant when a performance such as Burden’s involves an inert body in a dangerous situation.²⁵

Chris Burden ‘claimed that all those in the gallery were implicated in this act of self-inflicted violence by their failure to intervene.’²⁶ An inbuilt part of how we see art is seeing it passively; we look but do not touch. By being in the gallery the audience in extreme body art pieces continued this passivity, allowing the work to happen uninterrupted, forming a ‘contract’ between artist and viewer. Burden pushed the notion of this passivity further, believing that it was not just a passivity, as by not intervening they were in fact
participating, by allowing, affirming, giving their consent. An idea Marina Abramovic pushed even further in the conclusion to her *Rhythm* series in *Rhythm 0*.

Instructions.

There are 72 objects on the table that one can use on me as desired.

Performance.

I am the object.

During this period I take full responsibility.

*Duration*: 6 hours (8pm-2am)

1974

Studio Morra, Naples.

The objects consisted of a wide variety of things including a gun, bullet, whip and scalpel to a brush, feather, chair and grapes.

In this piece Abramovic handed control of the piece over to the public, completely transforming her body back into an object, no longer for her own control and experimentation as most of these pieces are about, but for a complete mental exploration. In giving control to strangers of her body she
was bringing herself back to almost a childlike state of dependency. Some gave her that comfort, as one of the most powerful images shows another woman drying her weeping eyes, but some did not as the piece was stopped after 6 hours by concerned onlookers when someone put the loaded pistol in her mouth.

In *Rhythm 0* the public physically as well as mentally participated in the piece, they were not just present, they were Abramovic’s own hands. They became what she had been doing to herself throughout the *Rhythm* series without her needing to do anything. She showed the love and cruelty of humanity by letting humanity show it to her directly. The works of all these artists have the strength and ability to share the true realities of the world and personal human emotion with the audience in a way that few other works would be able to. This is only possible through the close interaction, intimacy and truth that the audience are shown.
Performance art especially is nearly always about communicating the experiences of the artist to the audience non-verbally. Through these works that use pain the artist is reflecting the pain and trauma that has already happened to them, exploring past personal experiences or their uneasy social context they find themselves in. The artist is not ‘creating’ in the present but they are externalising the past, making sense of it to themselves and allowing the audience to be a part of it as witness and therapist, and to develop their own self-awareness exploring their own traumas.

On initial perception of these pieces the artist is pushing the physical body, but the notion that in these works of someone pushing their body physically, seeing how far they can take the pain, concentration and endurance, and the exploration of their immediate selves has to be about so much more than just the physicality. It is about pushing the mind and pushing the emotions, theirs and that of the public. Pushing the acceptance, releasing the trauma and bringing people back to our basic necessities, questioning why we do things how we do, questioning why we are. Through these pieces we search for the real. This also leads to discovery of our own hidden identities through understanding the limits within ourselves. In pushing their bodies they explore themselves in their physical limits but also their mental limits and so starting to truly understand themselves, their identity. The time and intensity of the pieces allows the artist, but also the audience to fully explore and share themselves and where they have come from.

As William Blake wrote in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell,*
The road of excess leads to the palace of wisdom…

You never know what is enough unless you know what is more than enough. ²⁸

Through pushing the body, we find the real, and through seeing the real we see beauty.
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