

Senne Schraeyen

Roger Raveel: Providing a New Vision of the Complex Rural Landscape

Senne Schraeyen
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
senne.schraeyen@vub.be

Roger Raveel is considered one of Belgium's major artists after World War II. Mainly studied as the founder of de Nieuwe Visie (the New Vision), a stylistic movement adjacent to pop art, or as the artist who was only interested in depicting his rural birthplace, Raveel's environmentalist approach, however, is still insufficiently recognized in contemporary art studies. It is crucial to not separate Raveel's *oeuvre* from the period in which Belgium was falling victim to the chaotic suburbanization of the landscape. Inspired by the slow modernization of his homeland, Raveel depicted modernizing changes with great interest. Yet, he detested them when they were implemented with an unthoughtful, consumerist driven speed because this resulted in the reduction of the rural complexity to a monoculture. I, therefore, argue that Raveel's practices lean towards what scholars define as sustainable or environmental art. In this text, I firstly elaborate on these interpretations of art which contribute to experiencing being a part of the transdisciplinary networks of nonhuman and human actors that perpetually form our environment. Secondly, I focus on the ecological awareness that typified the timeframe when the New Vision was developed. Thirdly, I discuss how Raveel disseminated environmental aspects, sometimes intentionally, sometimes rather subconsciously, through selected case studies. By using bright colors, incorporating mirrors and organic materials and honing a painting style, switching from hyperrealist to abstract, the artist disseminated the ungraspable, complex constitution of an everyday environment through the interactions between natural and cultural things. Through this heightened awareness of all things and depicting their "cosmic charge" Raveel managed to both infuse the mundane into his art and highlighted the infinite aesthetic pleasures that result from observing the complex rural village. This is space which his modern peers neglected because they thought they control it and perceived it as artistically redundant or insignificant.

Keywords: Roger Raveel, de Nieuwe Visie, the New Vision, environmental art, sustainable art, environmentalism, modernism, post-war art

Introduction

This paper will discuss parts of the *oeuvre* of the renowned Belgian artist Roger Raveel, produced between the mid-1960s and early 1980s. Roger Raveel (1921-2013) is a very well-known artist mostly in Belgium. Next to his quintessential position in Belgium's art historical canon, Raveel is readily recognized for his very distinct and accessible visual style, which got dubbed *de Nieuwe Visie* (the New Vision). This helped him to create a consistent work that spans around fifty years. Roger Raveel created the New Vision during the 1960s to return to a more figurative style after his abstract expressionist phase (1956-1962). Notably, the New Vision was a stylistic movement as well as a temporary group of artists who centred around Raveel. The group consisted, amongst others, of painters Etienne Elias, Raoul De Keyser and Reinier Lucassen and poet Roland Jooris. This last one coined the term in one of his art criticism of 1965 (De Geest and Van Evenepoel, 1992, 29). Whilst most of these artists developed their own artistic style during the 1970s, Raveel stayed loyal to this artistic vision.

The artist's vibrant style and implementation of daily objects into art were comparable with the practises of the then-popular American pop-art and the French *nouveau réalisme*. Yet, Raveel was never really content with these comparisons. They were mostly the writings of art critics and curators who aimed to contextualize the practises in the international art world and, therefore, barely highlighted the differences (Raveel, 1968, 152; Ruyters, 2006, 60; Sizoo, 2003, 39). Nevertheless, it was due to these comparisons that the New Vision gained short term international recognition. Raveel was selected to exhibit in prestigious shows such as the Venice Biennial (1968), the São Paulo Biennial (1971) and Documenta 4 in Kassel (1968). Although interested in his international peers, Raveel, however, was rather apathetic towards promoting himself to international actors, making his international career a short one. Moreover, he found the inspiration and the core meaning of the New Vision in his rural hometown, Machelen-aan-de-Leie, where he resided almost his entire life (Ruyters, 2006, 26-28).

By mainly depicting the life of this rural area, Raveel was called the "Master of Machelen". Raveel's legacy, therefore, is also that of a painter obsessed with de-

picting the life of a typical Belgian village. After a while, his art became criticized by some as too local, outdated or as the navel-gazing of a repetitive artist (Spillemaekers et al., 1978, 36). On the contrary, I would argue that the “world view” Raveel disseminated with the New Vision has actually a very broad societal message and has a lot in common with what scholars define as “sustainable or environmental art”. With his lifestyle, recently emphasized as ecological before it was fashionable (Demets, 2021, 27), I argue that Raveel’s artist practices still teach us more about how to intensely experience the constitution of our close environment, which we often neglect as too ordinary. Therefore, the research question proposed here is: which aspects of sustainable or environmental art are disseminated through Roger Raveel’s New Vision?

How to Define Environmental and Sustainable Art

With the terms “environmental” and “sustainable” art, I refer to interpretations of art that contribute to experiencing the intertwined, transdisciplinary networks that constitute our environment. Environmental art, in recent scholarly studies – among others those by Bruno Latour – is exemplified by artists who integrate their scientific and sociological knowledge of natural elements in their practises. They illustrate how our living environment is formed by and is dependent on the interaction among different human and nonhuman organisms and materials. But apart from depicting these intertwined networks, some artists are also conscious of how human acts can deplete the intrinsic qualities of nature in favour of a human controlled monoculture. Environmental artists accordingly create proposals for a reconsideration of humanity’s hierarchical position in the complex networks that perpetually create our environment (Latour B. et al., 2020). Some scholars define these practices also as aesthetics of sustainability.

Without falling into the trap of closed cybernetics, sustainable artists propose to counter modernist or reductionist world views where humans tend to control and know everything about their environment by dissecting every phenomenon or situation in an enclosed, artificially re-created network. In such a controllable network, natural actors that are not deemed necessary for the infinite economic growth of society will be neglected. This overtly modernist world view

tends to estrange humans from the poetic, mental and corporal beneficial qualities of experiencing a diverse natural landscape. Therefore, sustainable art should help us to re-experience our different connections with diverse nonhuman actors within complex, ungraspable and mobile systems. This art could demonstrate the importance of sustaining and fostering this natural diversity in a cultural setting (Kagan, 2011, 232-240). Importantly, the environmental and sustainable artists of today have much in common with the iconic political, scientific and system-like environmental artworks from the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.¹ This is also the period in which Roger Raveel became the most intensely engaged with the New Vision.

The Time Frame wherein the New Vision Blossomed

It should come as no surprise that environmental and sustainable art was created in this time frame. Already from the mid-1960s onwards, a consciousness of the world as an intertwined, material, network grew. Manmade catastrophes in the natural world, such as oil leaks or the exposure of the poisoning effects of pesticides, made people realize that technological and economic growth had a destructive side effect on the diversity of the living environment. But more importantly, studies such as the 1972 rapport *Limits to Growth*, which warned that the material capacities of the world would not be able to support Western lifestyles and population growth, made it obvious that the natural world influences our lifestyle and that a reconsideration of our relationship with the environment was necessary.

These environmentalist studies and disasters also mobilized different countercultures within the western middle class. During the mid-sixties, protest groups, who acted against the reductionist and modernist growth-oriented lifestyle, grew in Belgium. People started to realize that the toll of (seemingly) infinite economic growth and the controllability of their life and the environment by technological and economic models are troubling. They concluded that the landscape is being cultivated to a facilitator of wealth for their State or for an enclosed nuclear family. They noticed this in the destruction of their local environment (e.g. waste disposals and traffic increase) but also in its suburbanization to concrete and scattered settlements (Florizoone, 1985, 102; Van der Windt and Bogaert,

2007, 7). Some activists claimed that this modernist ideology caused humans to become estranged from each other, from their close environmental and from the interwoven, holistic, composition of the world (Braem, 1968, 18-19, 24, 36). Working as a vicious circle, the estrangement from their landscape would, of course, make people less resistant to its extensive cultivation.

It is crucial not to separate Raveel's works from a period in which Belgium was falling victim to chaotic suburbanization of the landscape. To this day, Belgium is typified by a very allotted and concrete-filled landscape. The saying that Belgians are born with "a brick in their stomach", is partly based on Belgium's unregulated suburbanization during the 1950s and 1960s. In order to both stimulate economic activity and to keep people close to their rural hometown, Christian Democratic governments provided grants to build (nearly unrestricted) in rural municipalities. This policy resulted in chaotic ribbon development and traffic roads that cut through rural areas and historic city centres. It also implemented modern lifestyles in these rural municipalities, which became akin to suburban areas (Vanhole, 2007, 60, 64). However, policies for safeguarding the environment in these newly cultivated landscapes were nearly non-existent (Van der Windt and Bogaert, 2007, 7), which resulted in the pollution of the living environment and a seeming disregard for the unique natural components of the landscape. Raveel's hometown was not left untouched by this modernization.

The New Vision, or How to Picture the Rural Nature-Culture Intertwining

The way in which the new materials of modern life appeared in Machelen contributed to the creation of the New Vision. Notably, Raveel's figurative practices from the fifties already show that he was very sensitive to all things that happened in his modernizing environment. Originally, Raveel meant to contest his academic teachers. They namely focused on bourgeois imagery, on overtly romantic aesthetics to paint rural life as a premodern space and shunned any form of kitsch or "low culture". By contrast, Raveel searched for a visual style that portrayed how new modern lifestyles influenced contemporary life, both mentally and materialistically (Raveel, 1968, 150). Raveel, therefore, became interested in how modern, manmade objects infiltrated rural life and how, at the start, nature and culture

were dialoguing with each other. Both the billboard and the car as well as the cattle and the wheat are worthy of observation according to him. Raveel took inspiration for his art from his fellow villagers around the Leie River because they still had this "holistic" view of things and living. They did not interact with materials solely due to their aesthetic value (like artists did) but also due to their usefulness (Raveel, 1968, 150-152). Gradually, the artist became more interested in discussing the interactions between "the things" in his surroundings ("*human-things, human-animal, plants-things*") than in disseminating his inner psyche (Alleene, 2006b, 672).

Moreover, the New Vision's vibrant aesthetics and keen interest in the interconnectedness of materials also come from Raveel's interest in scientific advancements around the 1960s. His acquaintance with radar studies that proclaim that all materials radiate certain wavelengths, convinced the artist that all nonhuman things have more capacities than what most people thought: they actually play a significant role in influencing the character of a space. In 1963, the artist claimed he experienced a sort of force, unnoticed by his peers, that radiates from all things and so generated the unique atmosphere of a specific environment as they intermingle with the wavelengths of other things: "if a human would enter my room the things then change because there is an extra presence [...] then there is a spirit (to say it traditionally) which causes a tension in the room between the things" (Jooris, 1975, 47-48).² Raveel also states for example how he was inspired by the way chickens ran in front of a concrete pole (Alleene, 2006a, 188). The stillness of the grey pole in contrast to the active chickens gave both things a specific meaning in the environment. If there was a flower or a person in front of the concrete, the concrete would dialogue totally differently with the rest of the environment for Raveel. Hence, Raveel is aware that all environments should be deemed distinct and dynamic. Because as one observes them, they start to focus on the interactions between all unique natural and cultural materials that constitute it. The artists of the New Vision thus took their inspiration from the manner in which different things appeared to them as thing *an sich*, but also in correlation to other things and in the environment they appeared in (Sizoo, 1982, 5).

In order to discover what constitutes life and what it means, Raveel claims that he has to intensely observe all the things that surround him (Klusters, 1974). Even the seemingly negligible and mundane. Therefore, Raveel declares his practices as cosmically charged ("kosmisch geladen" in Dutch): everything that constitutes life should be participating in his works (De Man, 1974, 60-61). To register the cosmic charge of the things, Raveel started to make assemblages of everyday objects (a cart wheel, barbed wire, a pitchfork, etc.) and integrate them into his poetic, painterly vision on the rural life to highlight their contribution in constituting daily life with other things. Together with bright, radiant colors and a painting style switching from realist to abstract to cartoonish, sometimes all in one work, the lively contemporary rural village is perpetually captured in his art. In this way, he highlights its infinite, surprising, aesthetic pleasures which sprang from observing what constitutes its environmental complexities.

Moreover, in his search for the cosmic aspects of things, Raveel is conscious that all things that constitute and influence an environment are so diverse and expanded that one could never capture them all in an enclosed or immobile art product. Hence, he also uses floating squares, which seem to interrupt, hide and mystify, and mirrors, which incorporate the mundane and elevate it to art or elevate art to the qualities of daily life (Raveel, 1968, 152; Jooris, 1975, 59-61). The composition of the artwork is malleable and ungraspable just as the world it is inspired upon, as the sustainable artists would proclaim. Clear examples of these ideas are in the painting *De muur* (The Wall, 1966), where two white spaces cover parts of a realistically painted grey wall and an abstract, vibrant shrub, and in his assemblage works like *Neerhof met levende duif* (Farmyard with living pigeon, 1964), where a moving pigeon is just as important as the other aspects of the painting it is dialoguing with (Spillemaeckers, 1970), *Het Venster* (The window, 1962), where the window of an old farmhouse is mounted before an abstracted orchard (De Man, 1974, 61) or his *Karrertje om de hemel te vervoeren* (Bicycle cart to carry the sky, 1968) where a small bicycle trailer is painted and a mirror is mounted on top.

Raveel, just as the environmental or sustainable artists, does not condemn technology or manmade culture an sich. He is interested in how the modernization of his Heimat benefits his artistic vision and influences local lives. Through his

(the New) vision, which focuses on the intertwining of subjects that constitute the daily environment (natural and cultural), Raveel wants his audience to rediscover and to intensely experience their not-so-simple mundane environment. However, what the artists also have in common is a sceptical turn to modernization when they notice that a holistic and open-minded vision of the world is threatened due to modernist values such as fragmentation, artificiality and reductionism. Ecological degeneration caused by the modernist ideology of infinite growth increasingly concerned Raveel as he got older (Alleene, 2006b, 636).

Raveel's Subdued Ecological Critique

From the 1970s onwards, the artist was more explicitly troubled by how a complex environment is threatened to be reduced to an artificial monoculture. Unsurprisingly, Raveel lived a very holistic lifestyle. To safeguard his health throughout his life, his first wife cultivated a vegetable and fruit garden where every kind of pesticide was banned and they bought only organic products. The artist also placed great importance on experiencing his close, natural surroundings, as he took early morning walks barefooted in his garden (Demets, 2021, 27; Schraeyen, 2021a; Schraeyen, 2021b).³ With these anecdotal details on what we could consider an "alternative" lifestyle, Raveel could not be left untouched by the earlier discussed environmental and social degeneration caused by modernization.

One of the few moments where Raveel publicly called out an unthoughtful modernization was during his inauguration speech as honorary citizen of Machelen in 1979. Here, Raveel saluted the artist and people who "fight against [...] the idiotic and reckless ways in which we are destroying nature only for short term profit [and against] the spiritual enslavement of men to make them solely a useful element in our technological society" (Raveel, 1980, 99). This is a critique of the negligence towards the environment which is comparable with the counter-cultures discussed above. Notably, two years before, he also participated in a caravan protest to prevent the transfer of 330 hectare of Machelen's natural landscape to the neighbouring city that planned to construct a ring road (Schraeyen, 2021a).

Ironically, Raveel said in 1970: "Does the artist have a calling like a missionary [to be socially engaged]? No." But when asked if one should react to abuses,

he responds: "If [an artist] senses them, he will respond automatically" (Uytterhoeven, 1970, 61). Raveel rarely, if ever, tried to persuade his audience with programmatic slogans or images in his art but rather by using his visual language to intensely experience the unique environment. The painter was convinced that art could influence people more effectively by providing a new, challenging, visual language as a tool to look at the world than by depicting a contesting theme (Uytterhoeven, 1970, 62).

The work *Protest* (1964) (fig. 1) is a clear example of how the New Vision can provide a change in attitude towards the perception of the mundane environment. We see a painting halved by a vertical line. One side shows a typical Raveel-like space, a paved backyard with an abstracted shrub, yet the shrub is



1 Roger Raveel, *Protest*, oil on canvas and mirror, 1964

covered by a black smudge with a white center. On the other side, we see a white space with a real mirror. On the lower side of the mirror there is an abstracted arm and fist painted on it. Originally called *Koer met spiegel (Courtyard with mirror)*, the buyer (Belgian diplomat Georges vander Espt, a close friend of the artist) thought that the right side symbolized nature (the shrub) obstructed and pushed back by pollution (the black smudge). The fist on the mirror, then, is a protest sign to halt pollution by human interventions. When Raveel was confronted with this thesis, he allowed the title change (Schraeyen, 2021b; Vander Espt, 2017, 18). The work thus caused one to contemplate humanity's position in a modern environment and make them conscious of its precarity. However, Raveel is hesitant to call his artworks "protest" or "environmental" works because he does not want them to be reduced to solely that. The aspects of environmental art are thus only a part of his practices. Only in a few artworks does Raveel provide an ecological criticism of landscape management, but always in a more subdued manner. In the remainder of this article, a selection will be discussed.

The work *Schilderij met cactus maar zonder titel (Painting with cactus but without title, 1983)* (fig.2) depicts three humans kneeling before a wide oval space. Mounted on this white space is a plank with a real cactus on it. The painted figures thus seem to be worshipping a real cactus. Raveel gave strict instructions that the plant could only be a cactus. It would depict a dystopian world where most of nature is destroyed and earth is so polluted that only cacti could survive (Schraeyen, 2021b). In this depiction, the humans thus seemed to be worshipping the last species of flora left. The painting *Bouwgrond te koop (Construction ground for sale, precise date unknown, 1970 or older)* is also worth mentioning. We see a floating square billboard presenting a construction ground in front of an abstract forest and paved road. This is a recognizable theme from a Belgian landscape. However, when asked if the work represents a protest, Raveel reacts lukewarm: "It was indeed something like that, but it was almost meant as a joke. I never had the pretence that it would change something" (Uytterhoeven, 1970, 61). However, five years after this interview, Raveel made the silkscreen *Kom in het bos wonen (Come live in the forest, 1975)*. Here, we see a vibrant shrub before a realistically, geometrically drawn brick wall. An ironic remark can be read on



- 2 Roger Raveel, *Schilderij met cactus maar zonder titel* (Painting with cactus but without a title), acrylic paint on canvas and mixed media, 1983

the billboard on the wall: "Construction ground for sale. Permission to cut all trees". This makes a clear reference to the Belgian mismanagement of natural open spaces.

Lastly, I will focus on two installations of Raveel in the public space, both from 1971. Here, Raveel tried to disseminate his artistic vision towards a wider audience but the precarity of an environment also was emphasized. The first public practice to be discussed is the protest happening *Raveel op de Leie* (*Raveel on the Leie*, 1971). Around 1970, Raveel joined a protest against the plans of local policy makers to straighten a part of the Leie River to facilitate water transport. The highly polluted meander that could then be circumvented, was proposed to be reclaimed as developing grounds. Whilst adversaries admitted that the straightening was a legitimate idea, they opposed the reclamation of the meander and instead wanted it cleaned.

The event consisted of an artwork of Raveel sailing down the meander. The painting depicted a vibrant version of the Leie's riparian zone as well as a red flag that boats were required to have to sail the local waters. The raft was enclosed by blue plastic sacks. One could compare the painting to both a sort of magic looking glass that captures the surrounding and turns it into art, or as a painting that disappears in reality. Moreover, by including a small mirror in the painting, the real environment is also included in the art work and not a romanticized version, as Raveel's academic peers would depict. The mirror highlighted the polluted water of the Leie, in contrast to the painted clear water.

During the protest, Roland Jooris recited poems about the Leie from a boat that accompanied the work. He also redacted a pamphlet that was handed out during the manifestation. Here different protesters (fisher guilds, water sports groups, artists but also a biologist) emphasized the importance of the meander and the landscape it was part of (Jooris, 1971). It signified the unique biological, communal and art historical aspects of the Leie landscape and how it is thus more than an economic actor.

The idea to create a raft artwork, was actually a concept that Raveel wanted to execute already in 1969. Originally without the painting of the flag, a giant blown-up blue sack with two painted blue squares was supposed to drift on the Leie between two blue poles mounted on each side of the riverbank. A picture

of this moment was supposed to represent a new contemporary artistic vision to observe the water of the Leie and thus redeem the Leie from the faux romantic view that Raveel's artistic predecessor attributed to it (Raveel, 1971). The eventual artwork raft also represented a contemporary vision on the landscape but got an additional social meaning in the context of the happening (Holsbeke, 1971). The audiences were thus meant to experience the Leie almost as a contemporary artwork, as one of the things that co-constitute their unique daily environment as the New Vision likes to emphasize. If fellow villagers experienced the different benefits of the meander for their living space, they would prefer to save it instead of cultivate it into a concrete space. Even here, Raveel tried to persuade his audience not with programmatic slogans or images but by using his visual language to intensely experience the unique environment. Although Raveel would later claim that "people were flustered [by the happening]. Thousands of people. Never had an artwork dialogued in that manner with the people" (Klasters, 1974), the advocates of the reclamation were not convinced. It was also through the lobbying of the protest group that the meander was eventually saved and cleaned (Alleene, 2006c)

The last example that needs to be discussed in detail is the public installation: *Zwanen van Brugge* (*Swans of Bruges*, 1971). This installation was part of an art exposition which was hosted in Bruges, both in a museum as in the public space. Bruges is one of Belgium's most popular tourist destinations because of its well conserved medieval city scape. Swans represent important historical actors there as they live on the Minnewater. They have been present there since medieval times and have been assessed as the symbols of several historic events and city legends. They are thus important *things* that shape the unique environment in Bruges. For his work, Raveel made four wooden swans with a small square hole in them. The idea was to let the wooden ones drift between the real ones. With the hole in the swans the water would be visible and thus incorporate the artwork in real life and vice versa. This also happens with the blending of the real and 'artful' swans ("*Zwanen*", 1971). Here again, Raveel highlights the unique things that give shape to the unique environment and "elevate" the daily to something artful.

What is important here is that there were no real swans for the work to integrate. Due to pollution and neglect, the Minnewater became uninhabitable for the animals and a stinking stream in the city. The wooden swans, now, highlighted the absence of the real ones and, in turn, highlighted the polluted waters. The artwork, unplanned, showed that the unique environment was disrupted by the absence of one of its defining things, the swans. When the work was presented, the city council was confronted by an increase of complaints about the pollution. Instead of acting on these complaints, they decided to remove "the swans" because "the contemporary works harmed the historical character of the city" ("Zwanen", 1971). However, Raveel swiftly reintroduced them when he reclaimed the confiscated work, but they were removed once again because "they fulfilled their promotional function for the art event and should thus now be better exhibited in the museum" (Raveels zwanen, 1971). The whole dispute attracted media attention, which highlighted the polluted state of Bruges even more. Under continuing pressure, the city council cleaned the Minnewater to host the 'real' swans again (Alleene, 2006b, 376-377).

Comparable to the work *Protest, Swans of Bruges* managed to disseminate (subconsciously) a sustainable vision. We can compare the *Swans of Bruges* in particular with the sustainable artist's practice of using mundane and natural objects and showing how all actors (natural and cultural) interact in a network to constitute a specific environment and give a more-than-economic-meaning to it. Moreover, they also coincide by showing how the constitution of a unique environment is disrupted if one of more actors are not sustained (here the polluted water causing the swans to disappear) and to incite the agency of the audience to influence this constitution.

Conclusion

Although some critics proclaimed that Raveel's aesthetics are too inward, local and behindhand, the contrary was augmented here. I would like to conclude that the oeuvre of Roger Raveel should thus not be read separately from the social and political context it was made in. Just as environmental and sustainable art is defined today, Roger Raveel tried to disseminate with his accessible aesthetics a

heightened awareness that a contemporary environment is a complex interplay of unique natural and cultural actors.

However, the main difference with most environmental and sustainable artists is that Raveel stays true to an idea that art should keep an aesthetic and painterly feeling whilst they mostly opt for more conceptual and installation methodologies (Ruyters, 2006, 62). When Raveel thought that an art critic who prefers more conceptual approaches accused him of embellishing reality, he responded: "I believe that I always tried to stay as close as possible to reality by constantly letting it decide the form of my paintings as well as trying to let my paintings flood over in reality. Through my art practice, I want to make reality more present" (Spillemaeckers, 1970). The artist disseminates an observant and holistic view of the mundane environment through his plastic or visual art.

Ultimately, the New Vision still manages to facilitate sustainable attitudes. Firstly, we should never stop with intensely observing the precarious, ungraspable complexity of our mundane contemporary environment, which goes beyond solely human centered interactions that constitutes its unique qualities. Secondly, this complexity should be sustained in order to prevent it from becoming a rationalized, manmade and dull monoculture due to unthoughtful modernization. This is clear in Raveel's 'protesting' works but also in his seemingly apolitical works where he highlights the cosmic charge of the things.

Endnotes

- * This text is a result of my research on the fundamental research project supported by the Research Foundation - Flanders (project 1138321N). This doctoral project is conducted within the research group *Histories of Art, Architecture and Visual Culture (VISU)* of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel.

- 1 See for example the works of Hans Haacke (such as *Bowery Seeds* from 1970 or *Rhinewater Purification Plant* from 1972) or from Agnes Denes (such as *Wheatfield* from 1981).
- 2 All quotes in this text are translated from Dutch by the author.
- 3 A Flemish and Dutch tradition called “dauwtrappen” which is comparable to “earthing” or “grounding”.

References

- Alleene C., *Een verschrikkelijk mooi leven 1*, Deinze, 2006a.
- Alleene C., *Een verschrikkelijk mooi leven 2*, Deinze, 2006b.
- Alleene C., *Raveel op de Leie (1971-2006)*, Deinze, 2006c.
- Braem R., *Het lelijkste land ter wereld*, Leuven, 1968.
- De Geest D. and Evenepoel S., Enkele achtergronden van het Vlaamse Nieuw-realisme, in *Nieuw-realistische poëzie in Vlaanderen Ontstaan, doorbraak en profilering van een literaire beweging, Spiegel der Letteren*, 34, 1992, pp. 22-34.
- De Man J., Roger Raveel schildert de verdwijnende identiteit, *Weekblad De Haagse Post*, 16 March 1974, pp. 58-61.
- Demets P., Life is Everywhere, in: *Roger Raveel. Retrospection* (ed. F. W. Kaiser et al.), Brussel, 2021.
- Florizoone P., *De groenen: Ideeën, bewegingen en partijen*. Antwerp, 1985.
- Holsbeke A., Kunst en contestatie op en voor de Leie, in: *Raveel op de Leie*, Vosselare, 1971.
- Jooris R., Voor het eerst bij Raveel, *Yang*, 11, 1975, pp. 39-65.
- Jooris R. (ed.), *Raveel op de Leie*, Vosselare, 1971.
- Kagan S., *Art and Sustainability*, Bielefeld, 2011.
- Klusters J.B., Ik ben de goedkoopste schilder van de wereld, *Dagblad Het Parool*, 21 March 1974.
- Latour B. et al. (eds.), *Critical Zones. The Science and Politics of Landing on Earth*, Karlsruhe-London, 2020.

- Raveels zwanen opnieuw uit het Minnewater verwijderd, *Dagblad Het Laatste Nieuws*, 10 August 1971a.
- Raveel R., Ontwerp voor een plastisch gebeuren op de Leie te Machelen, in: *Raveel op de Leie*, Vosselare 1971.
- Raveel R., Roger Raveel in gesprek met mezelf, in: *1947/1967 Kontrasten. Schilderkunst in België* (ed. J. Buyck), Antwerpen, 1968, pp. 150, 152.
- Raveel R., Toespraak Roger Raveel, *Kreatief*, 11, 1980, pp. 98-100.
- Ruyters M., *Raveel. En de Nieuwe Visie*, Ghent, 2006.
- Schraeyen S., *Interview with Luc Levrau*, 2021a, unpublished.
- Schraeyen S., *Interview with Marleen Raveel-De Muer*, 2021b, unpublished.
- Sizoo H., *Richard Simoens, Agnes Maes, Antoon De Clerck, Danyel Debruyne. Vier schilders van de Nieuwe Visie*, Venlo, 1982.
- Sizoo H., Raveel 1921-1965, in: *Roger Raveel. Het verschrikkelijke mooie leven. Schilderijen 1934-1967* (eds. C. Krings et al.), Brussels, 2003.
- Spillemaeckers F., Vragen aan Roger Raveel, *Dagblad Volksgazet*, 12 March 1970.
- Spillemaeckers F. et al., *Ooidonk 78. Belgische kunst 1969-1977*, Deinze, 1978.
- Uytterhoeven J., Interview met Roger Raveel, *Chronos*, 4, 1970, pp. 59-66.
- Vander Espt G., *Roger Raveel. Een vernieuwend kunstenaar & trouwe vriend*, 2017, unpublished.
- Van der Windt H. et al., Vlaamse en Nederlandse natuurbeschermers op zoek naar een betere natuur; discoursen en strategieën in de periode 1945-2005, *Jaarboek voor ecologische geschiedenis*, 2007, pp. 133-164.
- Vanhole K., Hoe het land versteende, in: *Wonen in welvaart. Woningbouw en wooncultuur in Vlaanderen (1948-1973)* (ed. K. Van Herck et al.), Antwerp, 2007.
- "Zwanen" van Raveel komen terug. Brugs stadsbestuur geeft toe, *De Nieuwe Gids*, 14 august 1971.

Illustrations

- Fig. 1 Roger Raveel, *Protest*, oil on canvas and mirror, 1964, 120x150 cm, private collection, foto-archive: Atelier Roger Raveel, © RAVEEL - MDM / SABAM, Belgium, 2022.
- Fig. 2 Roger Raveel, *Schilderij met cactus maar zonder titel (Painting with cactus but without a title)*, acrylic paint on canvas and mixed media, 1983, 195x145 cm, private collection, foto-archive: Atelier Roger Raveel, © RAVEEL - MDM / SABAM, Belgium, 2022.