

## Panel 4

### IVSA Conference 2009

#### Appreciating the views: How we're looking at the social and visual landscape

Panel Title	
<b>Military Landscapes</b>	
Description	
<p>This panel aims to explore the full breadth of ideas around the visuality of military landscapes. We are interested military landscapes as visual phenomena, and in the visual practices through which military landscapes are portrayed and understood, whether by military or civilian organizations and personnel, collectively or individually. The definition of military landscapes that the panel will use is a broad one, encompassing the huge diversity of types and functions of militarized spaces and places. These include, but are not limited to, battle-spaces and landscapes of training, landscapes of military preparation and administration, domestic and 'unseen' spaces as well as public, monumental and memorial landscapes.</p> <p>This panel will include four papers all looking at the issue of military landscapes in very different ways. The papers address issues related to theoretical and practical concerns relating to military landscapes as they were seen and understood in the past, in the present and how they may be in the future.</p> <p>The papers look at issues of making military landscapes visible and the problems of making them 'knowable'. These issues also involve questions of visibility, representation and technology. These questions concern both academic debates about the conceptualisation of landscape, and also issues of military and social organization, public understanding and 'professional vision'. The papers explore the ways in which military landscapes are seen in the present, and the difficulties of doing so, as well as looking at military landscapes to see how they were seen in the past by those who created them. These papers also address the politics of the military landscape and the issues of accessing, understanding, representing and theorizing them.</p> <p>The papers all recognise the diversity of military landscapes in terms of scale, context and temporality</p>	
Panel Chair Name:	K. Neil Jenkins and Rachel Woodward, Newcastle University
E-mail address:	<a href="mailto:Neil.jenkins@ncl.ac.uk">Neil.jenkins@ncl.ac.uk</a> ; <a href="mailto:r.e.woodward@ncl.ac.uk">r.e.woodward@ncl.ac.uk</a>

## Final Selected Papers

Name:	Ed Walley, Leeds metropolitan University
E-mail address:	<a href="mailto:e.walley@leedsmet.ac.uk">e.walley@leedsmet.ac.uk</a>
Paper Title	
<b>The Visibility/Invisibility of the Cold War Landscape of Yorkshire</b>	
Description	<p>Yorkshire is littered with the visible remains of the Cold War military landscape ranging from missile sites and airfields to subterranean government Headquarters and food stores. However there are probably other sites of significance remaining to be revealed.</p> <p>The partial process of uncovering this landscape has revealed sites whose visible significance is variable from total survival of original structures to very much smaller and more fragmentary and degraded remains but in still other cases the purposes of extant everyday structures in situ would have been very different had the Cold War ever begun or moved closer in reality.</p> <p>The key questions this paper addresses are (with reference to specific sites structures and linkages) How has this process of uncovering and making visible occurred and how has it been resisted?</p> <p>Here the paper will examine the archaeological, historical and heritage perspectives, exploring their distinctive systems of creating meaning around the visibility of these objects.</p> <p>In addition, it will identify issues of prominence, secrecy and denial which impede these processes.</p> <p>Further, present views of Cold War remains tend to emphasise site specificity and the value of these within broader frameworks of discourse. There is arguably a neglect of view that these form features of an interconnected landscape or how that might be conceptualised.</p> <p>The paper will further address as second question of the way in which this broader issue of visibility can be increased and made more systematic as a form of landscape study through a greater understanding of the positioning of individual sites within specific technologies, perceptual frameworks and structures of power.</p> <p>The paper will discuss these issues by reference to a number of offensive and defensive locations and sites in the Yorkshire and Humber region.</p>

Name:	Matthew Flintham, Royal College of Art
E-mail address:	<a href="mailto:Matthew.flintham@rca.ac.uk">Matthew.flintham@rca.ac.uk</a>
Paper Title	
<b>Salisbury Plain Training Area: Visualising the military production of space</b>	
Description	
<p>There are currently over 450 military sites in the UK and many other temporary or flexible spaces that are far harder to quantify. Since the decline of the Cold War (and its associated defensive structures), the subsequent arrangement of military spaces have become interconnected in ways that may not have been anticipated by those outside the military establishment. Military airspace architectures, designated danger areas, communication routes, garrisons environments and other training estate sites are becoming linked by advances in Geographic Information System (GIS) technology and doctrines such as 'Network Enabled Capabilities' (NEC). In addition, a greater emphasis on joint-service strategy means that military training exercises draw personnel and vehicles from a wider range of military sites around the UK. The state-defined prerogatives of British military training and national defence, and the expedience of recent technologies are constantly shaping, reshaping and connecting military sites and spatial structures across the UK.</p> <p>This paper will stress the importance of visualising or representing these shifting forms of military spatial production as a way of extending military accountability and measuring their true presence across the British landscape. By way of example, this paper will examine Salisbury Plain Training Area (SPTA): an intensively used, multi-faceted arrangement of hazardous spaces and invisible airspace architectures. As the single largest area in the British Defence Estate, SPTA is a military resource which extends beyond the limits of the sizable Ministry of Defence (MoD) holdings into the public realm. This occurs in any number of ways: from troop movement via public road networks, airspace transit corridors, noise pollution and segregated airspace for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles to name but a few. This paper will demonstrate that the challenge to find ways of visualising these immaterial forms of military spatial production is made a great deal easier by recent developments in computer modelling, cartography, GIS and Global Positioning Systems (GPS). It is possible to use these technologies to exploit the limited statistical information available on military activities around Salisbury Plain, and indeed, the United Kingdom as a whole.</p> <p>Not only could these forms of visualisation give an insight into the extending military presence but they may also provide a glimpse into the uniqueness of military spatial forms and the systematisation of space itself</p>	

Name:	Gair Dunlop, University of Dundee
E-mail address:	<a href="mailto:g.dunlop@dundee.ac.uk">g.dunlop@dundee.ac.uk</a>
Paper Title	
<b>Regimes of time and the militarised 20<sup>th</sup> century</b>	
Description	
<p>When we look at the spread of military sites, test zones, response technologies and their consequences in social and physical terms, normal divisions between town and country, centre and periphery, and civil versus military break down.</p> <p>Looking at them as consequences of different regimes of temporality offers different ways to see their inter-relations as part of a 20<sup>th</sup> century totality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• microtime of scientific experiment</li> <li>• reaction time of early warning systems</li> <li>• the endlessly deferred yet constantly rehearsed zero time of apocalypse</li> <li>• mechanised leisure and domestic time</li> <li>• the non-time of suspended confrontation.</li> </ul> <p>Abandoned and entropic remnants of such sites pose challenges and opportunities to artists, archaeologists, cultural theorists and heritage professionals. Indeed, given the secrecy and privacy surrounding large areas of defence, scientific, or industrial property across Europe and beyond, it is arguable that many such environments are at least as unknowable as more ancient relics by traditional site investigation techniques. Interdisciplinary approaches involving artists and archaeologists will be discussed. A genealogy of computerised time can be developed which links cybernetics, ultra- high speed photography, early warning systems, cyborg discourse and the paradoxical nostalgia of the last Jaguar flight simulator.</p> <p>The historical imagery used to convey ideas of progress, hierarchy and modernity can be valuable tools in understanding the social relations involved; interesting mirroring effects become apparent in the use of rhetorical registers. The presentation will show contrasting selections of imagery which allow us to look at some refracted faces of lived Modern experience.</p> <p>"There is an argument that contemporary art has a vital, if largely unsung part to play... acting as an agent provocateur in re-energising spaces which by virtue of their very historicity are in danger of being perceived as sacrosanct." (Feversham and Schmidt, 1999, p166)</p>	

Name:	John Carman and Patricia Carman
E-mail address:	<a href="mailto:j.carman@bham.ac.uk">j.carman@bham.ac.uk</a>
Paper Title	<b>Battlefields as places of experience: the Bloody Meadows Project as a research approach</b>
Description	<p>Ideas derived from phenomenological approaches to 'place' have largely been applied in studying prehistory. The Bloody Meadows Project brings this approach into historical times as part of a comparative approach to studying sites of conflict. We start from the conventional anthropological position that understanding 'place' is a contingent, culturally-constructed set of practices, and that these will vary across time and space. In studying historic battlefields, we abandon the idea that we understand the cognitive processes of soldiers in the past, and instead attempt to gain an insight into their culturally-informed reading of space by examining their use of landscape.</p> <p>In looking at such sites as landscapes, we are interested especially in what kinds of places they are; we believe that choices of locations to fight battles and how they are used can inform us of attitudes to space and place that are different from our own. In doing so we apply what we call 'the archaeologist's eye': the capacity of an archaeologist to 'read' and interpret space in a particular way. Our modern readings and expectations of place can be compared with the activities of others there in the past, highlighting differences in such understandings.</p>