UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS   University of Sheffield   UNIVERSITY of York

Where War Inhabits. Reflections on Spaces of War

Sarah Maltby and Katy Parry

Everyday language is replete with war's spatial metaphors. Talk of a 'no man's land', 'frontline' or 'homefront' whilst evocative of traditional warfighting boundaries are more commonly used to describe spaces of quotidian non-military activities. More obviously, spatial metaphors have been used in the enactment of war but often in nebulous and intangible ways, for example, 'war zone', 'battle ground', and 'global war on terror'. Media theory also provides us with various conceptualizations of space which hold underlying normative perspectives, in some cases more explicitly than others. When we speak of the mediascape (Appadurai), mediapolis (Silverstone), new media ecology (Postman), or mediatization (Cottle) in the context of conflict we are envisaging structures, processes, feelings and power relations. In this sense, our understanding of the relationship between space and war is both historically grounded, theoretically informed, ever present and constantly evolving.

What we have tried to do in this book, however, is broaden our ability to think about space as a concept that is distinct, unique and has utility; to move the reader beyond singularly focused studies of media, politics, memory, and so on, to consider the wider, messier whole that constitutes the complexities of how the relations and practices of war and media are conditioned by space and create space.

<u>(B) Space as Dynamic</u>

As part of this endeavour we take the position that both space *and* time are critical dimensions for building explanations and understandings of war and media. Scholars producing comparative case studies of different conflicts or media systems may provide temporal snapshots in which a full space can be seen; a web of relationships at that given moment which produce similar or different outcomes in the different cases. But taking 'slices' of spaces like that can only take us so far (Hay 2002; Massey 2005). Process and change matter too. Central to our mandate here then is the task of explaining and creating understandings of the role of media in initiating, sustaining, ameliorating or preventing war and conflict. These occur through time; either synchronic snapshots of one or more spaces or diachronic narratives of a singular process through time. As a field, we need to build both and, through collaborations, begin to find ways to build combinations of how we treat space and time together.

Essential to this is the notion of process. Indeed, recent scholarship in media philosophy has emphasized that analysis is enlivened when we consider we are always in the middle of any process. As Grusin quotes of Emerson: 'Where do we find ourselves? [...] In a series of which we do not know the extremes … We wake and find ourselves on a stair; there are stairs below us, which we seem to have ascended; there are stairs above us, many a one, which go upward and out of sight' (Emerson 2000: 307, cited in Grusin 2015:129). There is never a wholly new media space; websites initially looked like newspaper front pages, television broadcasting struggled for decades to escape the conventions of radio and theatre. 'Old media rarely die', writes John Durham Peters, 'just recede into the background and become more ontological' (Peters 2015: 23). Any 'digital' space will thus contain continuities with prior

spaces and will contain the seeds of whatever 'post-digital' space is created next. No system is complete, no process wholly exhausted. Space is always unfinished (Massey 2005).

This insight bears upon how we can treat space as dynamic. A space rests upon matter already existing and it will leave traces and layers that form the conditions of emergence for the next space. But how this works varies. Whether we take the internet or a forest, both are always evolving through the interactions of uncountable entities and actors, both may feature sub-spaces in which humans intentionally carve out a site for specific gatherings and purposes, both leave layers of searchable detritus, and both are open to continual change to come. Moreover, that change does not just happen. Instead, we can explain what aspects of those spaces -- whether topographic material features or topological feelings, perceptions and relations -- are or are not conditions for change or how they are instrumentalized for change through interactions determined by hierarchies of power.

In this concluding chapter then, we reflect upon *how* the contributions in this book have enriched our understanding of war and media through the foregrounding of dynamic spaces in which war is encountered, enacted and contested. Critical to this is thinking through how the dynamic quality of spaces are altered and shift according to the various actors who inhabit them, their motivations for doing so, and the accrual of their inhabitation. Below then, we return to the spaces mapped in the Introduction – *institutional spaces, public spaces, resistant spaces, ambivalent spaces* – to review how the contributions in this volume speak to issues of process and inhabitation. It is noteworthy that we do not intend these typologies to be definitive, mutually exclusive or exhaustive. Rather, we offer them as a useful framework to examine how mediated encounters with war are shaped by certain infrastructures, practices and bodies (both human and non-human) in space.

(B) Institutional Spaces

We start with *institutional spaces* which are loosely defined by the inhabitation of institutional actors, namely militaries, governments, policy makers and the media. For all of these actors, battlespaces were traditionally discerned by physical space – land, air, sea and (outer) space – with the introduction of information and cyberspace as a fifth domain of war in the 1990s. In the conceptualization of this latter domain, the threat of violence and disorder has led to growing uncertainty regarding the boundaries of battlespace. This is evident in the characterization of multidimensional or 'full spectrum' warfare where increased security, policing and surveillance capabilities are harnessed as preventative and containment strategies in what Gregory (2011a) defines as 'the everywhere war': 'Far from making the battlespace transparent, this new apparatus actively exploits another grey zone, the space between civilian and combatant that is peopled by the spectral figures that haunt the landscape of insurgency' (Gregory 2011: 242).

There are ethical and legal questions raised by 'everywhere war' and it is within this context that Aday (Chapter 6) and Foster's (Chapter 5) exploration of institutional spaces are most resonant. Both explore them as spaces in which legitimation strategies for war are conceived and enacted, and moral authority asserted. What emerges most from their analysis however is the persistence, stasis and endurance of particular power dynamics in these processes, particularly because war is 'everywhere'. For Aday (Chapter 6), it is in the relational power of institutional spaces inhabited by policymakers and media that moral affirmations are made through carefully constructed 'culturally congruent' (and strategic) narratives, built upon shared meanings of the 'past, present and future of international politics' (Miskimmon et al.

2017: 6). Here, Aday points to a 'kind of meta-institution comprised of interconnected sub-institutional entities including mass media, government, think tanks, and political parties […] that combine to define and promote these legitimizing national and cultural myths and identity' despite the harm generated in others spaces as result. His observations not only suggest to us that is it the sustaining of legitimacy that characterizes these spaces, but that the sustaining of traditional, hierarchical, authoritative, political logics through which this can be achieved is of critical importance.

Similarly, for Foster it is the organizational and cultural logics of traditional military institutions, with their emphasis on conformity, centralization and traditional hierarchical structure, that has undermined the effective integration of social media and digital platforms into military work. Comparing the Australian Deference Force and NATO-led initiatives with those of the Israel Defence Force and insurgent groups like Al Qaeda and ISIS, Foster not only draws our attention to the importance of spatial power relations – in the form of blurred civil-military relations – in the effective conduct of information war campaigns, but also the capacity of enduring and accessible narratives to mobilize support. Overall, in Aday and Foster's work we see a re-entrenchment of the defining powers of war, where organizational war logic remains central to the ways in which we spatially encounter war.

But there are other contributions in this volume that suggest otherwise, articulating a more dynamic, fluid – and at times reconciliatory – dimension to institutional spaces. Culloty (Chapter 4), for example, turns our attention from notions of power and influence, to that of distrust and suspicion. Seeking to understand the appeal of conspiracy theories, specifically around Syria, in the global 'ecology of war media', Culloty finds that the uncertainty brought about by 'conspiracy thinking' has also engendered a counterbalancing force: social media

verification expertise, which is becoming an 'institutionalized practice' in its own right. This has generated a space of alternative plausibility and competition over claims (and official narratives) that is ever changing.

Similarly, through her work investigating Russian and Ukrainian journalists and documentary makers, Voronova (Chapter 11) suggests that the institutional spaces of media can, over time, be reconciliatory despite the conflicting and competing claims that may circulate within them. Here, like Massey (2015), Voronova resists the tendencies to think of space through the specificity of place by showing that it is *only* when Russian and Ukrainian journalists are taken out of their local environments and put in a neutral and 'uniting' space that more textured understandings of each other's respective positions are formed, the outcome of which has wider global impact. Both of these chapters, whilst not necessarily suggesting neutrality, highlight the extent to which institutional spaces are not always constrained by static hierarchical power, but rather *can be* dynamic spaces of mutation, dialogue, co-production and unification.

(B) <u>Public Spaces</u>

We noted above that institutional spaces are predominantly populated by those actors who are *directly* engaged in the enactment and mediation of war (militaries, governments, policy makers, journalists, and so on). What then of broader public engagement in spaces of war?

When using the term 'public' here we acknowledge how contentious this is. What, after all, delineates a public actor from, say, an insurgent, a civilian, an activist and so on? Similarly, when are war spaces/spaces of war *not* public? Even when accounting for hierarchies of

power, it would seem to us that we are *all* public actors who are *all* inhabiting public war spaces at one time or another, under varying conditions, with varying consequences. Despite this, a notional use of the term 'public' – as both actor and space – has utility here in unpicking some of the contributions of this book to our understanding of space, precisely because it allows us to consider actor inhabitation in broad, generic ways, that other terms may not. In so doing we are able to not only shift the focus away from actors who have particular power relations in the enactment and communication of war – like the military, government, media – but also shift the notion of inhabitation away from the communicative (as above) to the affective and the invested, to the emotional and the resonant; to the participatory.

As Crilley and Chatterje-Doody argue (Chapter 3) it is how media audiences give meaning to, build upon, and are 'affectively invested' in representations of war that deserves critical attention. Here they consider 'audience' interactions with disparate and epistemologically incongruent online narratives of chemical attacks in Syria, across different genres. As part of this endeavour, they discern the significance of popular culture forms in world politics (see also Dodds 2015; Shepherd 2013), particularly with regard to the 'blurring' of boundaries between factual and entertainment media formats. They also speak to issues of connectivity, highlighting how conflict conspiracy theories can be deployed strategically by powerful actors, where in-group and out-group allegiances facilitate aggression and overt anti-Semitism, often framed by opaque motivations. More than this however, they extend our understanding of actor inhabitation beyond notions of spectatorship to show how audience endorsement of and affective investment in online 'public' war spaces is not only expressive of identity and community but accruing in the meaning it generates. It is in these 'public' spaces, inhabited by 'public' actors, that we are able to see the interconnections of

institutional and public in a manner that forms the conditions and emergences of new spaces and new identities by virtue of the traces and layers left behind by inhabitation.

In a similar vein, but referring to a quite a different space in terms of physicality and materiality, is Friend's photographic work on Salisbury Plain (Chapter 9). Friend's writing and photographs convey the 'complex and ambiguous space' of The Plain, both the largest military training area in the UK and a conservation area, which, in her own words, is a 'strange conjunction of beauty and violence'. Friend's visual assessment of the military presence on Salisbury Plain as pervasive shows it scarring the countryside and forming 'constructed landscapes' with woodlands designed for hiding tanks and a 'ghost village' that now attracts tourists. But beyond this assessment is the insight she offers about those who literally and metaphorically inhabit the physical space of The Plain itself. Here, she writes of the habituation of the 'public' and the residents to military presence ('part of the wallpaper of the place') and the sensorial consequences that result, especially the sound and feel of army presence. There is an emotional resonance in her account (of their accounts) that is at once suggestive of identification and struggle, investment and dispossession, all of which are layered with meaning of past, present and future imaginings of The Plain. It is perhaps here in particular, in Friend's work, that we can most clearly identify the 'traces' of dynamic war space that have both accrued meaning and generate meaning.

(B) <u>Resistant Spaces</u>

For all those spaces that are inhabited by actors with seemingly vague motivations, there are also those where the inhabitation is clearly defined, purposeful and accumulative. Based on the contributions in this book, we are terming these Resistant Spaces; spaces in which

activists and artists, among others, attempt to challenge dominant narratives of war and where their expressed concerns about corruption or injustice are transformed into action. As war and media scholars, we tend to focus on how media intervene in war, as an amplifier of certain messages which might exacerbate conflict; but here we draw attention to how media and artistic practice can also emphasize the continuing harsh realities for those trying to live in, and with, war. Alongside institutional and public spaces, resistant spaces are transformative spaces, but deliberately so. They are inhabited by actors whose inhabitation is wholly contingent on their desire to affect change as a justice project. In this sense, these spaces are decisively ethical and moral in dimension, made possible through the inhabitation of the space itself.

Take, for example, Matar and Helmi's work on the women behind *Enab Baladi*, an alternative protest media initiative that emerged following the 2011 uprising in Syria (Chapter, 7) in which Helmi herself is one of those activists operating in a context where a lack of access for western journalists in Syria offers her a 'brokering' role. Employing the optic of *liminality* – referring to the quality of disorientation, where norms can be contested in moments of transition – they explore the extent to which the inhabiting of new media platforms by Syrian women would or could 'provide new fields of possibilities' for the women as authorial voices and actors in the imagining and construction of their political and social subjectivities. Whilst Matar and Helmi note the precariousness of these possibilities – by virtue of the protracted nature of the conflict and the ability for those with power to suppress dissent – the possibilities are themselves transformative in the spatial configuration that made them thinkable. Key to this is Helmi's own 'present' role in the relational configuration of this space, where Helmi becomes simultaneously actor, activist and potential power broker. Roles that we would suggest also extend to her writing for this book.

The utility and power of actor inhabitation is also apparent in Gibbon's work (Chapter 10) where she actively attempts to disrupt the physical spaces she inhabits as part of her art. Employing Dada methods, Gibbon enters the globalized defence industry by visiting arms fairs, masquerading as a security consultant. Here she collects gifts provided for delegates – stress-balls in the shape of bombs, mini rubber tanks, toffees – and subsequently puts them on display in galleries and museums. In so doing, she attempts to emphasize the commoditization of weapons (through the 'readymade' artefacts) but also make visible the 'deceptive veneer' of the respectability of the arms industry – who usually prefer to remain secretive – through the displacement of the objects into more critical spaces. There are real transformative qualities in the methods Gibbon employs here if we are to think about them in 'space changing' terms. Not only does she generate visibility from invisibility (of space, of object, of reputation) but she also generates potential for the disruption of the space in which she is no longer present; the arms fair.

And it is through this role of absence that Barsdorf-Liebchen draws our attention to spatial power relations apparent in the enactment of abhorrent and illegal violence in ordinary, everyday spaces (Chapter 2). Here she examines the work of artist and photographer Ed Clark who forensically visualizes civilian locations of torture and rendition in ordinary looking neighbourhoods, home interiors and commercial airports. He places those visualizations alongside declassified documentation. For Barsdorf-Liebchen, Clark employs a 'cadastral way of seeing', where cadastral maps are typically used by town planners to record property boundaries and so embody a quotidian, legal and bureaucratic dimension lacking in other maps. He focuses on specific 'owned' spaces of war with the viewer invited to investigate further in their own 'sleuthing' of sites of hidden human trauma. Again, we see

issues of accessibility and place here where the 'black sites' of the CIA during the war on terror were inaccessible and once deniable places, but which only work through the corporate-militarist co-ordination of the CIA, private contractors and security firms in global, complex infrastructures. And by presenting building plans of sites of rendition, imprisonment, and torture in particular cities, she reminds us that something as abstract, global and alienating as the war on terror was something ultimately enacted locally by humans in concrete locations amid ignorance or indifference from local communities passing through the same streets and transport hubs as those rendered. The local is a site of horror here (Cavarero 2009). Thus, in her characterization of Clark, Barsdorf-Liebchen, like Matar, Helmi, and Gibbon, serves to emphasize the role of the actor as seeking the possibility of transformation (of space, narrative, experience, understanding) both in the space they inhabit but also beyond.

(B) <u>Ambivalent Spaces</u>

Whilst we have considered both Gibbon's and Barsdorf-Liebchen's work under the category of Resistant Spaces in the above, it is noteworthy their work also traverses what we term here *Ambivalent Spaces*. In marking out ambivalent spaces, we are drawing upon Wendy Kozol's notion of ambivalent witnessing where visual witnessing is 'the relational process between the photographer or artists, subjects of the image, viewer, and surrounding contexts' rather than a one-way mirror (Kozel 2014: 12). As Kozol writes, 'ambivalence calls attention to the instabilities inherent to boundary-making between self and other that has long been a cornerstone of Western cultures' (ibid.). For Kozol, there is also a continuing ambivalence for scholars and practitioners about the ethics of making visible violence and human suffering,

especially as witnessing practices take place in a globalized media economy prone to reasserting hierarchies of difference in race, gender, sexuality and class.

War artists often occupy ambivalent spaces, commissioned by military bodies or museums to document war through expressive means but simultaneously disturbed or even traumatized by their own (complicit) role. The contributions of artists are often contrasted with the overly-familiar tropes of photojournalistic images of conflict. As Quinn writes (Chapter 1): 'Art which enables us to see the nature of war, and which releases its meaning slowly can shed a new light on our understanding of conflict. It has found ways of showing subterfuge, surveillance, secrecy and distortion'. There is both temporality here – of the time required to produce art and for contemplation to appreciate its message – but also the sense that art reveals something that would otherwise be invisible. There are echoes of Gibbon here too, but Quinn demonstrates an interdependent relationship between media images and artistic interpretation through the artistic re-imagining of war images. Whether created from a smiling selfie-taking Tony Blair or the kneeling figure in an ISIS video, war art interrogates the 'value systems involved in depicting conflict and its effects', she argues.

Similarly, it is the ethical and methodological challenges that artists inhabit in ambivalent spaces that are at the centre of Brunt's work (Chapter 8) on vernacular images of Kashmir insurgents. Here Brunt argues the limitations of a traditional photojournalistic approach which, often devoid of context and humanity, can lead to a reductionist, simplistic portrayal of subjects and their history. Utilizing a meta-photographic approach, Brunt integrates professional and vernacular material (online images and video of insurgents) in an attempt to better understand and represent the fragmented history of the region and those who live it. Like others who occupy ambivalent spaces, Brunt draws attention to the uncertainties of the

self and the other, the relational process between photographer and subject, but also the ambivalence – in Kozol's terms – of the hierarchies and ethical challenges apparent in making the violence and suffering of others visible.

But for Brunt, it was the recontextualization of what he calls 'intimate autobiographical' images (as well as traditional photographic imagery) in a Western gallery space that was as ethically demanding as the process of accumulating the images. His ambitions for the *#shaheed* exhibition were to acknowledge the limitations of a singular viewpoint, to challenge audiences to think more broadly about issues of the visibility/invisibility of individuals in radical insurgent groups and understand them as complex multi-dimensional human beings. His work echoes Quinn in this regard in its aim to reveal the hidden nature of war, but one in which the artist inhabits the process in order to realize its ethical potential.

Jolle Demmers, Lauren Gould and David Snetselaar also pose a question about how the hidden realities of warfare can be 'made visible', in this case by activists contesting the narratives of precision and care in 'remote warfare'. Watchdog organizations such as Airwars employ technologies like geolocation analysis to counter the Coalition claims about the number of civilian casualties in airstrikes and drone attacks. But by co-opting the knowledge and methodologies of these organizations the Pentagon have been able to assimilate the discourses of a more ethical warfare into their own rhetorical approach, thus conducting a 'perfect war' that depoliticizes the violence and hopes to 'save lives'. In appearing to respond to dissenting voices, the critique is folded into the Coalition's own discursive strategy.

(A)   Where Does This Leave Us: Bodily Inhabitation?

Let us be clear: none of the spaces suggested above are singularly distinct from each other. All overlap in one way or another, all co-constitute each other. And there are resonant themes that traverse them all: accessibility, connectivity, ethics, justice, authorship, power, and visibility to name a few. Similarly, all our contributors return us to the centrality of time in our understanding of space, where dynamic process and change is critical, extending our understanding beyond temporal 'snapshots' and comparative histories, to spaces that are never wholly finished or complete. In this regard, the narratives and actions that permeate all the spaces discussed above (as both temporal *and* spatial) are ever evolving (through and with information systems and actors) with different outcomes at different times and in different spaces. And thus, we come full circle because in turn, this is transformative of the very 'battlespace' in which war is enacted. Battlespaces are no longer 'everywhere' – in Gregory's sense (2011a) – that is, in all places or directions. They also have temporal dimensions of continuousness, repetitiousness, routineness and even statis: they are, as noted throughout here, open to continual change.

But what really emerges from the evolving spatial and temporal dimensions of the spaces described above is the overarching theme of *bodies* and the fundamentally embodied nature of war and its relationship to space. We noted in our introduction, for example, how war spaces are central to the ordering of the lived human war experience (that is, soldiering, refugee movement, radicalization among others), but we can also see above that war spaces are also ordering of a more vicarious war experience (as spectator or participant). As Sylvester (2013: 5) reminds us 'everyone has war experiences' by virtue of the interconnectedness of global politics, media and migration. In this sense, the inhabitation of spaces of war (through bodily presence and absence) is a profoundly corporeal experience. And, if we take as our starting point Mensch's (2009) contention that there is a direct

338

correlation between bodily enactment and our ability to make sense of the world and our place in it, then the corporeal reality that is felt, lived and enacted in the inhabitation of war spaces has significant resonance for our understandings of war.

There are two key ways which we suggest we could think about this in relation to the spaces discussed in this volume: **bodily presence/absence**, and **embodied participation**.

(B) Bodily Presence/Absence

When considering the extent to which bodies are both present and absent in spaces of war, we are also exploring the implications of bodily presence and absence in relation to the dynamic transformative properties of the space itself. Let us take, for example, the distinct absence of bodies in some of spaces described above, particularly in Foster and Aday's work. Similarly, in the remote warfare practices discussed in Demmers, Gould and Snetselaar's chapter, contestations of 'truth' are articulated through (disputed) counts of dead bodies, or the removal of combatant bodies in the spaces were war is enacted. All of these spaces speak to a de-corporealization of war as an outcome of the abstract, technological focused, rational strategic thinking required to legitimize war (see Norris 2000). There is a disavowal of bodily injury here and the corporeal reality of war (Scarry 1985; see also McSorley and Maltby 2012). Instead, the body is *only* present when it has utility as a vehicle through which political imaginings can be articulated and realized (Butler 2009; Maltby and Thornham 2012). It is thus the militarized body, the civic body, the technologized body that inhabits these spaces as an outcome of institutionalized authorship.

In contrast, some spaces in this book are defined wholly by bodily presence and embodied enactment. Here we see the *use* of bodies in both the orientation of the actors, and the articulations within the space, and in a manner where bodily absence can be understood very differently. We think of Helmi's activist body (among other Syrian women) inhabiting the resistant space of *Enab Baladi*, where she is 'being' in the space, living her experience through her inhabitation. Similarly, we think of Gibbon's performative, radical and embodied employment of the Dada method. Like all Dada artists, she uses her own body to disrupt the space (in this case arms fairs) and make an activist/artistic statement about it (see Maltby et al. 2012). Critically however, this disruption continues when her body leaves the space, particularly because she also removes objects from it, redisplaying them in another space. Like Helmi, she leaves her own bodily trace. Here then, bodily absence takes on a different significance. It is, what we might call, '*post-inhabitation'*; a post-bodily presence that is critical to the metamorphosis of space.

There are of course traces of bodies and post-inhabitation in nearly all of the spaces discussed in this book. Brunt's photographs of Kashmir martyrs whose bodies (dead and alive) once removed from combat sites take on renewed significance in the spaces of social media and galleries. Friend's photography and oral testimonies where the bodies of soldiers, and once Salisbury Plain inhabitants, cease to be present but leave a militarized trace for, among other things, tourist consumption. But it is bodily absence and the post-inhabitation of the spaces in Barsdorf-Liebchen's work that is most striking. The bodies that were once present and tortured in these everyday spaces are now absent but traceable. Here, the corporeal reality of war – mutilation, injury, even death – becomes unveiled in a manner that is antithetical to the power relations exhibited in institutional spaces that attempt to de-corporealize. There is a reclaiming of bodies in the work Barsdorf-Liebchen discusses, indeed even an invitation for

us to engage in our own embodied investigation that is both powerful and dynamic. Bodily trace begets more traceable bodies.

(B) Embodied Participation

That the bodies in Barsdorf-Liebchen's work are made visible to others through new mediated spaces – that *we too* can trace the absent tortured bodies that once were present in these maps - is testament to the extent to which mediation is critical to the collective corporeal experience of war through, in and with all these dynamic spaces. This is particularly so when digital and media technologies intersect with concept of space. We noted in our introduction how the emergence of digital spaces has generated a proliferation of mapping (Oates and Gray 2019; Wilson et al. 2018) that directly intersects with where bodies are located (as those in combat, those fleeing, those connecting). We also noted the transformative qualities of technologies such as drones and wearables that can, for example, alter and accentuate our corporeal sense of risk and our own sense of body in space(s).

There is little then to dispute the corporeal impact of technologies, and the embodied use of technologies in the context of war spaces. Indeed, we know that bodies are transformed in digital and media technologies spaces through the collapse of distance and proximity, detachment and intimacy, often where the affective and sensorial become privileged. Whilst we may not literally smell, touch or taste war in these spaces, we *can* see and hear war, and we can *feel* it as an embodied extension of our spatial engagement; as pain, grief, shock, horror, fear or even elation. As McSorley (2012) notes in his concept of 'somatic war', a key aesthetic idiom through which we now understand war is through the multi-sensorial corporeal experience. Referring to our engagement with helmet cam footage – through,

341

television, online and gallery installation – he argues that the feelings and intensities we experience as a result 'may be complex, contradictory and, at times, sober […] but it is through this regime of sensory engagement and affective labour that the war is increasingly felt, and potentially undermined or sustained' (2012: 56).

Crucially then, war spaces invite us – in one way or another – to participate in the embodied enactment of war. This is resonant in most of our chapters here, but especially in Quinn and Crilley and Chatterje-Doody's work. Whilst the employment of digital and virtual reality technologies (including flight simulator joysticks) in Quinn's artwork can be understood differently to the audience interactions of Crilley and Chatterje-Doody's work, both spaces are inviting participation in the form of sensorial and affective engagement and are, in effect, bodily extensions into the enactment of war.

Of course, we are not all refugees or drone operators, nor are we all cadastral mappers or Dada artists, but we are, by our very engagement and participation in war spaces, active in the spaces themselves and their evolution. As Scarry reminds us, war is the 'most radically embodying event in which human beings ever collectively participate' (Scarry 1985: 71). And we are participating. Thus, it is incumbent upon us to not only understand *how* (ours' and others') bodies inhabit and develop spaces of war, but what the consequences of such engagement are for ourselves, for others and for the space itself.

We finish this chapter with the following opening from Friend's chapter:

Sometimes my grandfather would be sitting there silently, an array of guns displayed around him on the green walls. A quiet man, he had fought in the second Boer War and the First

World War. My mother remembers how, on a couple of occasions, he entertained her with animated discussions of military strategies in the First World War, pushing a silver salt cellar and pepper pot around on the white damask tablecloth to demonstrate manoeuvres. Other than that, he was silent about his experiences.

We include this here because for us it encapsulates everything we have tried to discuss above. It is an account of an embodied (re)enactment of war, articulated through sensorial spatial and temporal dimensions. It is here that we see most clearly how the body is the site through which the war is felt, expressed, understood, where dialogue has become contingent on simulation and a corporeal re-living of embodied memory. The scene portrayed here is both evocative and unsettling, revealing and elusive. The very qualities that speak to all of the spaces we have discussed in this volume, and the very questions that we need to be asking of them and other spaces of war.

References

Butler, J. (2009), *Frames of War*, London: Verso.

Cavarero, A. (2009), *Horrorism: Naming Contemporary Violence*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Dodds, K. (2015) 'Popular geopolitics and the war on terror' in Caso, F. and Hamilton, C. (eds), *Popular Culture and World Politics: Theories, Methods, Pedagogies. E-International Relations*, 51-62, Bristol: E-International Relations.

Emerson, R.D. (2000), 'Experience', in B. Atkinson (ed), *The Essential Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, New York: Random House.

Gregory, D. (2011a), 'The everywhere war', *The Geographical Journal*, 177(3): 238-250.

Gregory, D. (2011b), 'From a view to a kill: drones and late modern war', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 28(7–8), 188–215.

Grusin, R. (2015), 'Radical Mediation', *Critical Inquiry*, 42(1), 124-48.

Hay, C. (2002), Political analysis: a critical introduction. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hoskins, A., and O'Loughlin, B. (2010), *War and media: The emergence of diffused war*. Cambridge: Polity.

Kozol, W. (2014), *Distant Wars Visible: The ambivalence of witnessing*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

McSorley, K. (2012), 'Helmetcams, militarized sensation and "Somatic War"', *Journal of War & Culture Studies*, 5(1): 47-58

McSorley, K. and Maltby, S. (2012), 'War and the Body: Cultural and military practices', *Journal of War & Culture Studies,* 5(1): 3-6,

Maltby, S. and Thornham, H. (2012) 'The dis/embodiment of persuasive military discourse', in Special Issue 'War and the Body: Cultural and Military Practices', *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, 5(1): 33-46.

Maltby, S., Pratt, S. and Gibbon, J. (2012), 'The War and Body Exhibition: showing, sharing, shaping', in Special Issue 'War and the Body: Cultural and Military Practices', *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, 5(1): 105-15.

Massey, D. (2005), *On Space*. London: Sage.

Mensch, J. (2009), *Embodiments: From the Body to the Body Politic*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Miskimmon, A., O'Loughlin, B., and Roselle, L. (2017), *Forging the World: Strategic Narratives and International Relations,* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Norris, M. (2000) *Writing War in the Twentieth Century*, Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Oates, S. and J. Gray (2019), '# Kremlin: Using Hashtags to Analyze Russian Disinformation

Strategy and Dissemination on Twitter', SSRN. Available

online: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3445180 (accessed 1 November 2019).

Peters, J. D. (2015), *The Marvelous Clouds*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scarry, E. (1985), The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World, Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Shepherd, L. (2013), Gender, Violence and Popular Culture: Telling Stories. London:

Routledge.

Sylvester, C. (2013), *War as Experience*, London: Routledge.

Wilson, T, K. Zhou and K. Starbird (2018), 'Assembling Strategic Narratives: Information

Operations as Collaborative Work within an Online Community', *Proceedings of the

ACM on Human-Computer Interaction,* 2(183): 1-25.