



NEW WARS AND THEIR VISUAL REPRESENTATION

Dead Bodies Without Graves/Mourne

BETÜL YARAR¹, TUNCAY ŞUR²

¹ University of Bremen, Germany

² Ehess-Paris, political Science, France

KEYWORDS

*Power
Violence
New Wars
Dead Bodies
Representation
Visual Images
Middle East*

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to understand why there has been an increase in photographic images exposing military violence or displaying bodies killed by military forces and how they can freely circulate in the public without being censored or kept hidden. It aims to analyze this particular issue as a symptom of the emergence of new wars and a new regime of their visual representation. Within this framework, it attempts to relate two kinds of literature that are namely the history of war and war photography with the bridge of theoretical discussions on the real, its photographic representation, power, and violence. Rather than systematic empirical analysis, the paper is based on a theoretical attempt which is reflected in some socio-political observations in the Middle East where there have been ongoing wars or new wars. The core discussion of the paper is supported by a brief analysis of some illustrative photographic images that are served through social media under the circumstances of war for instance in Turkey between Turkish military troops and the Kurdish militants. The paper concludes that in line with the process of dissolution/transformation of the old nation-state formations and globalization, the mechanism and mode of power have also transformed to the extent that it resulted in the emergence of new wars. This is one dynamic that we need to recognize in relation to the above-mentioned question, the other is the impact of social media on not only delivering but also receiving war photographs. Today these changes have led to the emergence of the new machinery of power in which the old modern visual/photographic techniques of representing wars without human beings, torture, and violence through censorship began to be employed alongside medieval power techniques of a visual exhibition of tortures and violence.

Introduction

This article dwells mainly on the changing socio-political meaning of war photographs, particularly those which expose dead bodies. In modern totalitarian regimes, war and mass massacres are commonplace, despite the denial of the states and prevention of their public visibility. Strong censorship works mainly through the invisibility of these devastating effects of wars or the states' violence on people's lives. Under these circumstances, making them accessible and visible to the public is the main counter-strategy of those who are critical about military policies of the states and want to reclaim back the truth by showing wars' devastating effects on human lives. However, today, what we observe is that wars and their inhuman outcomes are more openly exposed and images representing these are circulating everywhere across the world. At this point, it is worth asking why this is the case. Why is it a lot easier to come across visual images exposing bodily tortures and physical violence during the war and why such images are so widespread? Is this related to some changes in the power game or in the game of war? If so, what are the impacts of these changes on the balance between visibility/invisibility of war images? Under which circumstances do the dead bodies turn into displayable political objects or images of wars? How does the exposure of these pictures, particularly through social media as a new medium of communication, become possible and popular? In line with this, one can also ask if the counter-strategy of reclaiming the truth back by making every devastating effect of wars on human life visible is still a valid counter-strategy. What kind of other counter-tactics can be employed against the present strategies of power groups as overtly representing the new wars through visual means particularly through the social media? This article seeks to find out some answers to these questions.

For the modern history of war, the common discussion was concerning such events as massacres and its other destructive impacts and the state was denying them. However today there is another denial which counts heavier. This is the denial of the existence of ideological and political conflicts and war. Instead, today the claim that we are living in the age of liberal

democracies and post-politics is widespread. Within this context, even the military attacks are legitimized and defended as being for the sake of democracy and conceptualized with new terminology that defines the new wars as conflicts. These discourses that make use of the concept of democracy operate as "mental frameworks" which make new wars inconceivable despite their visibility. As opposed to these discourses, it should be emphasized that today war is still a central ontology of the world politics, although they have been regionalized and pushed out from the doors of Europe or the Northern part of the world and defined as conflicts rather than wars. These changes in the sociological and political nature of war can only be defined as the process of the emergence of "new war" but not their disappearance. What makes murdered bodies exposable is the same as what makes the wars unrecognizable, unseen and invisible to the public eyes and conscience. The exposition of violence used by power groups is also related to changes in the techniques of conducting and consolidating power in the context of new wars. Here it is also important to address the role of the social media that plays a huge role in partnership with the forces of new wars. The main aim of this article is to understand these newly emerging socio-political dynamics of the present global capitalism that are reflected in the mode of visual representation of wars (i.e. photographs of tortured and dead bodies uploaded into the social media by military forces in different sources).

The article starts with a theoretical discussion concerning the relationship between power and violence. Here the visualization and public execution of torturing the bodies of marginalized/vagabond subjects is an issue that requires specific attention. This theoretical part starts with a discussion on the political importance of photographic images in constructing the truth and for the truth claim of power groups. It later continues with a brief review of the Foucauldian notion of power. Here, in contrast with those theories which define Foucault's concept of power as opposed to domination and associating it with disciplinary power while dismissing its connection with bodily violence, we like to underline how power and domination or discipline and violence are intertwined and merged into each other in their functions. For

Foucault, bodily violence might not be the core substitute of modern power but it is still an important part of power mechanisms, particularly in respect to its function in controlling those who are not considered as subjects but classified as marginal/outsider (and sometimes oppositional) others. Within this context, the questions of why power kills and even beyond killing why it continues torturing the bodies after being killed and creates public shows out of its violent acts is discussed at theoretical levels.

The theoretical discussion proposed in the first section reaches a sociological analysis in the second section. Here, proposed arguments concerning the relationship between power and domination, discipline and violence, and visual representations of violence are discussed within the context of new wars that emerged in the phase of present global capitalism which is informed by the crisis that capitalist states are encountering. In this respect, the transformation of old wars or the emergence of new techniques and technologies of communication are particularly considered in order to understand the present processes that we are going through. In this section, the main argument of the paper is supported by a brief analysis of some illustrative photographic images such as the iconic photographs of Che Guevara after his death and the corpses of two Kurdish Guerillas killed by the Turkish Military Troops in 2016.

Discussion on the Concept of Power in Relation to Censorship and Violence

Photographic Techniques of the Truth Production and Expansion of Visual Frames of Perception on Wars through the Social Media

It is well known that to analyze a photographic image, there is a need to place it into its socio-historical context. As John Berger states, analyzing a photographic image is a form of reading which requires deciphering not only cultural but also photographic codes that are embedded in the image. In this respect, one should consider the influence of various visual-photographic techniques and traditions as well as culturally important frames of expressions

(Burke, 2003). A photographer can intervene in the process of representing reality by choosing the angle from which he/she takes a photo or by organizing the actual scene in a photograph. He/she also uses various photographic techniques in doing so. Therefore, the mode of intervention, position, and perspective of the photographer is one dynamic that is counted in the analysis of a photographic image.

Producers like to capture the attention of the receiver in a cognitive sense. But, the cognitive apprehension of the war through its visual image, which restricts how or what we see in visual terms, is not exactly the same as dictating a storyline. Instead, it is a way of interpreting in advance what will and will not be included in the field of perception. In "embedded journalism", as Judith Butler states, "the very act of the war is meant to be established by the perspective of the power group, who orchestrates and permits to ratify, what will be called the reality of the war" (2009: 66). It frames the reality which we perceive. The regulation of perspectives thus suggests that the frame can conduct certain kinds of interpretations or visual representations. Constructing a frame of perception can be achieved through many visual images and interpretations. As Edward Said (1979) had once put it, this requires a work through a complex *field of discursive practices where repetitive recurrence of the "other" in various forms takes place*. Messages (effective or cognitive) of photographs can only be analyzed on this cultural and historical basis. We need also to look at the reception process since receivers cannot be considered as passive aspects of visual narratives. Therefore, the social position of the recipient and receiving process as a moment relatively independent from the intended message can take place as a third stage of the production of the social meaning. If these three stages are accorded with each other, it can be said that the meaning is relatively stabilized and gains the power of the truth or claims to be the truth. Sometimes there might be some texts surrounding the visual image that is under scrutiny (Campbell, 2004: 62).

Peter Burke analyses some war photos from the Spanish Civil War in his book entitled *Eye witnessing* (2003), in which he questions the relationship between photography and reality. One of them is Robert Cappa's *The Falling Soldier*. However, this photo had later been a subject of significant discussions, due to some

arguments on Cappa's open interventions into the screen. But for Burke, what is more, important is not the distortion of reality through apparent interventions of the photographer, but its reconstruction and representation through the employment of more subtle and delicate photographic techniques, genres or artistic traditions. These techniques function in reconstructing the history through a new mode of representation which mimics the reality itself. In this, photography plays a really important role since it represents a moment stolen from real-time and space (Berger, 1988). It speaks to its audience through the language of the truth and aims to substitute it. Examples of specific photographic techniques of representation are low shot, shooting from above, black and white or color prints, etc. Also, in a photo frame, what is excluded is as important as what is included.

Butler brings the notion of "embedded reporting" or "embedded journalism" into the discussion on war photographs.

"By regulating perspective in addition to content, the state authorities were clearly interested in regulating the visual modes of participation in the war. Seeing was tacitly understood as linked with the occupation of a position and, indeed, a certain disposition of the subject itself (...) The camera angle, the frame, the posed subjects, all suggest that those who took the photographs were actively involved in the perspective of the war, elaborating that perspective, crafting, commending, and validating a point of view." (Butler, 2009: 65)

Here, it appears, there is a need to pay attention to the continuity between the content, perception and subject position. Butler, in reference to Susan Sontag's book *Regarding the Pain of Others* (2005), reminds us of the campaign that was held during the occupation of Falkland Island (1982), during which only selected journalists were allowed to enter the region within the restrictions of the government. Eventually, this became a commonly accepted practice in journalism which is called "embedded journalism".

In her work, Butler goes one step further and discusses not only the content of embedded journalism, but its impacts on constructing such frames that operate on the grounds of certain norms defining the truth and shape our perceptions of who is recognized as subjects and differentiate the lives.

Subjects are constituted through norms which, in their reiteration, produce and shift the terms through which subjects are recognized... How such norms operate to produce certain subjects as "recognizable" persons and to make others decidedly is more difficult to recognize. The problem is not merely how to include more people within existing norms, but to consider how existing norms allocate recognition differentially. (...) What might be done, in other words, to shift the very terms of recognisability in order to produce more radically democratic results? (Butler, 2009: 4-6).

Therefore, she suggests for expanding democracy we need to abolish the frames and norms that differentiate the lives and make various subject positions more recognized, instead of enlarging and multiplying categories of recognition. Hence she opens a new gate for us to go through in our discussion on what certain photographic images of the war do to us. They do not only conceal the war, but they play with our own recognition through their impacts on our own feelings and perceptions about after whom we can mourn and whom we can ignore of recognizing as beings who deserve life and recognition or who can be brutally murdered in front of public eyes with no hesitation. However, it is also true that life cannot be deduced from its knowledge produced on the basis of such norms.

Even when life and death take place between, outside, or across the frames by which they are for the most part organized, they still take place, though in ways that call into question the necessity of the mechanisms through which ontological fields are constituted. If life is produced according to the norms by which life is recognized, this implies neither that everything about life is produced according to such norms nor that we must reject the idea that there is a remainder of "life"-suspended and spectral-that limns and haunts every normative instance of life. Production is partial and is, indeed, perpetually haunted by its ontologically uncertain double. Indeed, every normative instance is shadowed by its own failure, and very often that failure assumes a figural form. The figure lays claim to no certain ontological status, and though it can be apprehended as "living," it is not always recognized as life. In fact, a living figure outside the norms of life not only becomes the problem to be managed by normativity, but seems to be that which normativity is bound to reproduce: it is living, but not a life. It falls outside the frame furnished

by the norm, but only as a relentless double whose ontology cannot be secured, but whose living status is open to apprehension (Butler, 2009: 7-8).

Frames of perception and recognition can never completely possess the living. In other words, there are living figures which are left uncontrolled or exceed the frame of life. "To frame the frame" or "to call the frame into question is to show that the frame never quite contained the scene it was meant to limn, that something was already outside, which made the very sense of the inside possible, recognizable" (Butler, 2009: 8-9). Therefore if one thing is to deconstruct the norms that categorize lives, the other is to disturb the frames of perception by referring to what is excluded from our frames of perception which never quite determines precisely what it is we see, think, recognize, and apprehend. Those which exceed the frame trouble the dominant sense of reality, since they do not conform to the established mode of understanding things. Also, because of all these uncontrollable dimensions of the living, the processes of producing frames and attempts to transform the visual perception into a regulated space has a high tendency to fail. As Butler states, a certain leakage, contamination or contextual shift makes this process more fallible than it might at first appear. But we argue that it is not only the leakages that make the invisible visible, but also the leakages that propose new futuristic perceptions, which destabilize dominant norms and frames, and provide new lines of flights, are and must be in the play.

As Butler states the technical conditions of reproduction and reproducibility of war images, even if it does not fully deteriorate it, produce a critical shifting in the context. There is an important impact of global media in this respect. The frames that are deployed during times of war by dominant media sources enter into circulation from contexts to contexts. So that after being produced in a context, the image surely lands in new contexts and creates new contexts by virtue of that landing. Hence it becomes a part of the very process through which new contexts are delimited and formed (Butler, 2009: 9-10). Those images, which leak from the general frame or which are sent from the original context to new ones, can disrupt or cause the dissolution of intended purposes, which motivate a certain frame of perception. These can become viral and disrupt existing

perceptions of reality. According to Butler, the ones that circulate through various contexts or fluid in time and place are not merely those that are disconnected or leaked from the frames, but the frames themselves. The success of a frame depends on its capacity of circulating around or having temporal or spatial fluidity as well. However, at the same time, this makes the frame fragile. Today under the impact of social media, the speed of this circulation is rather high and has got various effects. This flexibility of frames and meanings is also in the use of various new power groups (including radical counter social movements) who keep struggling to turn social media into their own space and for their own benefits.

It is generally known that social media strengthens the temporal and spatial fluidity of visual images. Networks of social media make the circulation of the visual image easier since they are partially or sometimes completely free from the conventional controlling mechanisms. The broadness of its network including many receivers and producers makes it difficult to be controlled. Therefore, social media results in technical inefficiency of censorship and control mechanisms as it broadens the boundaries of temporal and spatial fluidity in the circulation of knowledge. However, social media with these characteristics does not open a new sphere for counter social movements, but also for dominant or counter-power groups and military forces to manipulate the public view and feelings. The scientific knowledge produced by certain institutions is one sphere through which the truth is produced. But today it seems that social media has emerged as an even larger and influential sphere that shapes not only the norms of truth but also how we sense the so-called reality surrounding us. Connecting this power of social media with the technique of preventing or censoring information pressed through the mainstream formal institutions and channels is not as easy. But this new combination of war mechanisms explains why social media has become one of the most important machinery (coming even before the academic knowledge produced informal institutions) which is turned into a site of a new mode of political struggle. In parallel to these shifts in the context of truth production as well as in the constitution of the truth itself, the rules of visual representation of such events as war gets also into a process of change.

And before forwarding some arguments on the transformation of war and its visual representation, we would like to answer another important question: "why power kills". This explains also why it is important to power the public torturing bodies of its subjects and why there is a need to turn this activity into a public show or exhibition. All these points require us to go further into the deep inside of other questions related to the connections and differences between power and violence as well as its need for such visual representations.

Why does Power Kill and Torture Death Bodies? The Cultural Meaning of Death and Being Graveless

Why power kills and in which contexts the public exhibition of bodies of those who are killed becomes a common act among power groups in? We know that sometimes the power is symbolized through corporal punishments which do not confine itself simply with assassinating someone but continue to confiscate the body even after its death. Although, at the first glance, the relationship between violence and power seems extremely "natural", Foucault dwelt on this and posed a striking historical analysis of power by comparing this method of punishment with modern ones. In his book *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault analyses modern technologies of transforming individuals into subjects of power in their continuities and discontinuities with disciplinary techniques of the Middle Ages and Early Christianity alike. In this context, in line with his genealogical approach, he compares different techniques of punishment which belong to these periods. He particularly focuses on the comparison between public executions of the Middle Ages, which were based on cruel torture on and the death of the body, and modern prisons. For Foucault (2013), the former is a legal and political ritual, which not only manifests but also reconstitutes the absolute sovereignty or 'sovereign power' of the king. In these executions and tortures, which turned out to be a kind of spectacle in front of the popular masses in the periods of the 17th and 18th centuries, bodies represented the limits of power or its extent to which it could act out.

However, the modern economy of power and system of punishment which substituted the traditional mode of sovereignty was not to punish less but to punish better. Foucault (1977: 77-78) argues, "it was an effort to adjust the mechanisms of power that frame the everyday behavior, their identity, their activity, their apparently unimportant gestures; another policy for that the multiplicity of bodies and forces that constitutes a population". This modern mode of power has come out of a series of reforms needed due to the crisis in the penal system and power relations in the 18th century. In this new economy of power, the social order would be secured throughout the social body more effectively. It is at this juncture that the discovery of the concept of the population (the social body) coincided with the discovery of the body in the individual/subjective sense. The novelty of these new techniques of modern power relations drives from specific methods and techniques that are exercised over 'economic' and 'political' forces of the body. Both of them are ultimately based on the life, the life of the body as an individual or life of the population as the social body. According to Foucault, the emergence of prisons and the discovery of new techniques of punishment have developed on this ground and the main aspect of the modern power based on discipline and control is the "non-corporeality" of its forces. Therefore, the modern system of order and the political economy of power to punish and judge aims "a bodiless reality" (Foucault, 1977). They are corporal to the extent that they do not desire death but more concerns the life of the body. That is to say that non-corporeal forces discipline and control the body from a "distance" as in the case of the panopticon model of discipline (Vigarello, 1995). Along with this line, an important issue in the process of the growth of scientific rationality and the constitution of scientifically (rather than politically) managed social spaces (Turner, 1991). Within these processes, with Foucault, it is the body that becomes the site of materialization of regulatory social norms. Education of the body means also the education of the soul (Foucault, 1977; Sheridan, 1994). Also, with Foucault, the emergence of modern mechanisms of power or what Foucault calls apparatuses of power are an important turning point in the process by which power began to diffuse and operate very smoothly throughout

the social body without being limited to the question of sovereignty (Foucault, 1980).

The apparatuses are the ensemble of heterogeneous practices such as discourses, institutions, regulatory decisions, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral propositions, architectural forms, etc. Rabinow summarizes his schema of three modes of objectification of the subject. The first model refers to "dividing practices" like the medicalization, stigmatization, and normalization of sexual deviance in modern Europe (Rabinow, 1991: 7). As Rabinow notes, these dividing practices are the main subjects of his earlier books, *Madness and Civilisation* and *The Birth of Clinic*, as well as later ones like *Discipline and Punish*. The second mode is called "scientific classification" (Rabinow, 1991: 8) which concerns objectification of certain modes of subjectivity such as the "knowing subject" or "productive subject" (as in labor-power in economic analysis). This might also be called the process of transformation of certain subjects into legitimate objects of knowledge. Foucault's third mode of objectification represents his original contribution, the conception of power as a positive and constitutive force. Rabinow calls it "subjectification": "It concerns the way in which a human being turns him or herself into a subject" (Rabinow, 1991: 11). Rabinow states, the dividing practices, broadly speaking, are techniques of domination and have been applied mainly to vagabond populations, the working classes and those defined as marginal. In such instances, the person who is put into a cell or whose dossier is being compiled is basically in a passive, constrained position. In contrast, with the third mode "subjectification". Foucault looks at those processes of self-formation in which the person is active (Rabinow, 1991: 11). This looks very much related to the process of constructing certain subject positions as recognizable, as Butler states, through certain frames of perception and various norms/forms of knowledge. Those who are subjects of classificatory practices of domination (rather than power) are also those who can be put in spaces of closure (camps, prisons, etc) and who might be easy subjects of torture (applied by the state or individual). They are the ones who are not recognized as subjects according to the dominant norms of knowing and perceiving. Therefore, more disciplinary power concerns mainly those who are considered as valid

subjects. All these begin to explain why there is still a strong tendency to use brutal violence to make people obey the rules, despite all these discoveries of new techniques of disciplining individuals or the emergence of subtle mechanisms within the whole machinery of power. According to Foucault, bio power is also a powerful mechanism determining who is to be locked or killed or left alive in a space of closure under its biological surveillance and control (Mbembe, 2016: 2031). In this system, the population is categorized and the most significant instance of it is race-based categorization. It is possible to see examples of it in colonial practices and fascist regimes. In the race-based categorization, sovereignty is constructed in an extra-legal space where mostly biopower, siege (Mbembe, 2016) and violence (Fanon, 2013: 66) coexist. Death or murder of a member of the colonial population is not subject to any law, since they are categorized as those who are not worth living but on the contrary worth to be killed for the sake of securing the life of subjects. However, here, the mere act of killing (in sense of demolishing) is not enough, it occurs together with biopower and being sieged at the same time.

For Butler just like the body, life is also a product, a form that is socially and politically constructed. In this sense, the ontology of the body is a sociological ontology. The body continues living and existing only by means of language, practice, and desire. In the same way, life can be considered as a socio-political ontology, not as a biological or spiritual one. Therefore, the problem is not only who is alive or who is included in social life or life, which is shaped on the basis of certain norms. What matters also is that whose life is important, whose life is considered worthless on the basis of the norms which determine our own perception of diverse subject positions in parallel with social inequalities.

Even beyond death, power requires some practices not only aiming to control life and death but also what to do with the dead bodies which might still carry some socio-cultural and political meaning. One thing that shows that the dead bodies are not biological but cultural entities is the practice of burying them. Being human and the practice of burying the dead are two deeply connected cultural terms. Describing humanity with a reference to this practice brings the issue of the temporal and spatial

continuity of the bodies after death. The dead body which could not be buried does not belong anywhere in temporal and spatial terms. To put it in Özsoy's words, in purgatory sense, as long as they are not buried, they can be considered as alive and as non-cultural objects rather than culturally accepted or defined subjects. This makes them free of time and space of culture.

The ones who are in purgatory are not only dead people. Those who are left behind are hung restlessly among different times and spaces. While the hope that "one day s/he will come back" turns into a cruel melancholic state of doubt, when there is no corpse, mourning never ends for those who are left behind, the state of death becomes constant. Neither those who are not buried can completely die, nor the ones who are left behind can continue their life. A brutal state of squeeze between life and death, a brutal condition of being in which life and death are intertwined (Özsoy, 2012).

It is this cultural aspect of death that turns the dead body into a field for not only a bunch of cultural practices but also a power struggle. What is aimed to be controlled here, in fact, are the psychological state and collective memory of a community. Through certain torture over dead bodies belonging to the community, anger and hatred are sustained and a sense of nothingness, non-existence, and placelessness are intensified. Here, one of the most concrete cases of placelessness is gravelessness. Therefore, beyond being just a place to keep individual memory alive and render mourning possible, a grave is a place to keep history and memory alive in a "historicity which surpasses the moment" (Bozarslan, 2014).

Changes in the Machinery of Power, Wars and Their Photographic Representations

Not Concealing, But Revealing the Devastation and Violence

The depiction of war through photographic images dates back to the end of the 17th century. In the mid-1800s, right after the development of the camera, the first Mexican-American War (1846) and the Crimean War (1853) were photographed. Roger Fenton, who shot 3605 photographs in the Crimean War,

was not the only photographer, yet he was the first person who monitored and photographed the battlefield systematically for the first time in history. On the other hand, Fenton's photographs were far from showing the destructive dimension of war. This mode of photographic representation of war as without bodies and violence goes parallel with the modern power which concerns the life of the population rather than destroying it. Another photographer in the Crimean War was Felice Beato. Contrary to Fenton's photography, which represented the war without human beings or in an unmanned manner, Beato photographed devastating effects of the war. The same name witnessed the Indian Rebellion of 1857, Second Opium War (1860), Colonial Wars (1855) and took photos reflecting the terror of war. According to Sontag (2005: 53), these are the first photographs to portray the devastation caused by war. For that reason, we would call them the first photos aiming to defend the truth or to claim it back.

At the beginning of the American Civil War, the societal power of photography had become already known. After these wars, especially the Crimean War, in Burke's words, there has been no war that took place "without its own photography troops or television companies" (Burke 2003). Thus, using war photography as a tool of propaganda based on complex techniques has become important. In the early years of WWI, Helmut Herzfelde, and George Grosz, by inventing the technique of photomontage, revealed how photography could become an effective tool of propaganda clearly (Berger, 2016). But again, all these techniques were used to delete the war from the public eyes and to make it invisible. Apart from the photos concealing the devastating aspects of war, it is possible to find examples of critical photography of the same period which exposed the reality and falsify the dominant perception. The most famous of them can be seen in Ernst Friedrich's book *Krieg dem Kriege* (War against War), published in 1924. Friedrich demonstrates the painful and destructive face of war which was not mentioned in the narrative of the political-economic interests, victories and defeats, and national heroism of WWI. But despite these critical images, the first and the second world wars were periods in which visual images that legitimize and justify war through modernist, nationalist, colonialist and racist

discourses sprang significantly and turned into means of war propaganda. Moreover, during these periods, visual images were mainly built over classifications such as "us"/"them", and "victory"/"defeat", and they functioned in the process of concealing the devastation of wars through unmanning the battlefields or censoring the war images.

This period has a binary characteristic in terms of the correlation between war and photography. On the one hand, the "talismanic" effect and power of photography, which stems from its attachments to reality, had already been noticed at the very beginning of the 1840s and what is more, photography had become a part of managerialism of power only on propaganda level. On the other hand, throughout the twentieth century, which Eric Hobsbawm calls the "age of catastrophes" (2013), states have established visual-semiotic regimes through photographic visual images represented by "embedded journalism", which mainly functioned for making destructive aspect of war invisible and turned it into a heroic stories of those soldiers representing "Us". For the continuity of these kinds of regimes that are bodyless in Foucauldian sense of the term, control over the photographic representation of wars was very important. Here the main official tool was the censorship to conceal the destroying effects of the state violence and war.

Precisely for this reason, photographs showing the devastation of the World Wars could come to surface only years after the end of the war for the sake of confrontation and revelation of truth. Like hundreds of photographs of the colonial world, photographs of the Armenian genocide, the first modern genocide of the world history, reveals the secret memory or the censored reality of the so-called "civilized" world, which surfaced from archives after decades. As we have mentioned before, these periods appear different from the present, since photos of violence were more hidden, covered by the states and turned into state secrets. These photographic images were like an extension of the totalitarian regimes of the states of the 20th century. So, while the most important way to control the photographic image is censorship and omission of the devastation of war from the scenes, counter-strategy worked through the disclosure of what is concealed for the exposition of counter-truth or bringing photographs of the war to the public

more or less as it happened without censoring its destructive impact.

The power of photographic images as footprints of reality has increased the desire of power groups to control this new form of visual representation (Barthes, 1996; Berger, 1988, 2016; Burke, 2003; Sontag, 2008). In the period, which started with the invention of photography up until now, the photographic techniques have evolved tremendously. In line with these, wars have been framed and reframed with the help of many different and emerging photographic techniques. Hence, photographic images of wars as well as mechanisms of such representation have become more complex and involved new methods other than simple censorship. The game between visibility and invisibility of war scenes through these photos began to be played by power groups in rather complex ways and by employing strategies other than censorship. Here, the evolution of what Kaldor calls "new wars" in parallel with the emergence of new communication technologies and social media as the mediums, through which these photos were circulated and are turned into objects out of time and space, had also an important impact. While these new technical means made the circulation of war photographs easier, the control over them has become more meticulous not only due to the less controllable character of social media but also because of the fragmented nature of new wars. This we will return later to.

We know that during "the first and the second Gulf War", there was strict control over the visual images, not by enforcing a specific storyline, but by determining what is to be included or excluded from the camera angle and this varied with the usage of many different visual narration techniques. The development of communication technologies increased the capacity of controlling the receiving process by evolving new strategies applied in the narration process. For example, as Baudrillard stated, digital broadcasting and satellite receivers allow the continuous and simultaneous representation of war just like a video game in which deaths, murders, explosions, bombings, armed attacks have turned into digital games and images (i.e. the simulation of war) (Baudrillard, 1995). This has been one way of making the war visible rather than invisible but in a very unmanned manner. It is not censoring the war but a new mode of transferring it into a

spectacle event. Here one should also take political discourses or frameworks into account as factors which allow this transformation.

Today, power mechanisms, through which the truth and our sense of reality are produced, get more and more polycentric. This requires power groups adapting themselves to this new machinery of knowledge and which affects production by inventing and implementing various strategies at once. For instance, power groups are capable of both using old censorship techniques when formal fields of knowledge production are involved, while using other techniques of publicity over the images circulating on social media with the aim of manipulating public feelings and emotions. Here the complex machinery of power produces a truth about war which denies either its reality or its impact on people's lives. But on the other hand, it operates also through other techniques of reframing physical violence and the devastating impacts of the war, and hence lead us into apathy, particularly when this violence is against a certain group of people who are out of the dominant norms. It is possible to see different photographs that include images of war and physical torture of the military forces and that might be leaked from the dominant frames of perceptions. For example, during the American invasion in the Gulf War two, the photographs of tortured war prisoners that were taken with amateur cameras with the help of digital technologies, became easily accessible on the Internet. However, on the other hand, this has not shaken or destabilized the "truth regime" of the officials. In fact, the cyclical relationship, which is created between "the effect of reality" through visual images, their production, organization, and circulation, takes place within the same framework of power relations (Foucault, 2005: 84).

Our age, as Derrida puts it, is the age of tele-techno-mediatic modernity (Derrida, 2002). At this point, according to Derrida, the success of the capitalistic-techno-mediatic power of international newspaper in generating a worldwide effect of truth or post-truth is beyond the extent of the imagination of a common man. Here, the truth is not twisted, but a certain kind of truth is proposed through some representational practices or a new model of truth is generated which aims to replace all other ones. War scenes are not hidden anymore, but rather the emotional and psychological

effects of such images are manipulated through various frames of perception, which are constituted through long-lasting discourses that are genealogically combined with the old colonial, racist and orientalist memories concerning some images and narratives. On the other hand, power groups still cooperate with the state institutions in producing the truth within the dominant frameworks of formal ideologies. The result of all these technical and discursive practices reminds us of the period of totalitarian regimes, which Koyre examines (Koyre, 1945). But this time, the attempt of power groups is to protect the claim of and monopoly over the truth by filtering it through the logic of imaginary phantasm or symptomatology of unconscious. In this latter field, social media works better.

From Old to New Wars

We could not guess that in the Vietnam War (1955-1975), also called the Second War of the Indochina, which caused Vietnam to break into the North and South, one photography, which engraved into the memory of all, was the sign of a future where such images would become widespread, mundane and ordinary. Today many similar images of murdered people during present wars and conflicts are circulating around without being able to find a place to be stored in our memories. We are a generation of people who are witnesses to beheadings, faces that grin while holding the heads cut off, and premature burials. The topics of public debates have become people whose bodies were left waiting in the freezers or whose bones were sent to their families by the Courier during ethnic conflicts and wars in the countries like Turkey during the intervention of Turkish military troops in Kurdish cities (HDP, The Cizre Report, 2016). The photos of these events have taken place in the mainstream media, but more in the social media through which they circulated around the world. How did such pornographic representations of violence in war become so norm, so widespread and common? However, when photographs of the Holocaust or of damage done by the bombs used in Japan or Vietnam are taken into consideration, this hypothesis about the increasing social visibility of war photographs in recent times loses its importance. Maybe, neither the severity of war

nor its photographic representation through the pictures of dead bodies has changed. But what might have changed maybe the wars rather than their political impacts and importance. Reflections of these changes of wars or the emergence of new wars can be traced in their visual representations which are entering into our lives through various mechanisms that have been explained above.

The increase in the circulation of war images in public communication processes is certainly related to these technical and technological transformations in photographic and representational media techniques and technologies. However, it is also important to recognize that we entered a new period when the relationship between power and war has differentiated. In exploring these changes, we left the large literature on the history of war, since this is not the main focus of this work, but we focus very briefly on Kaldor's theory of "new wars". According to Kaldor, today, wars have undergone significant changes under the influence of new identity movements and the process of globalization. Here it is important to emphasize the complex circumstances that are caused by the interaction of social dynamics that force nation-states to get into a process of being dissolved. Today, it is considered that wars are not explicitly between nation-states, they are within or above them. In this sense, they are regionalized, while the nation-states are still acting as important subjects of these new wars by provoking the old fashion nationalisms. As opposed to national armies, what we have are supranational-regional military forces which include various national troops. The increasing number of local organizations-militia and guerrilla movements under nation-states is also the case. The nation-states under the impact (sometimes even the rule) of ultra-nationalist, militarist and radical conservative groups responding radically against the forces which are operating in the way of dissolving them. The former act against these counter groups on the ground of neoliberal and authoritarian state strategies and by building up new national and international coalitions. Here, the main aims of these power groups in employing technocratic and authoritarian state regimes are to be effective in economic terms by opening up new spaces for market relations and for exploitation while acting harshly against social oppositions in any form. Tensions that result from these

strategies do not lead to the wars between military forces of two states, but rather new wars, which are taking place within or above the nation-states. They gain more ethnic and religious forms. As a result, compared to old wars, they target civil masses, rather than military forces.

There are obvious differences in the period between the 17th century and the end of the 20th century with respect to not only the wars but also general power mechanisms. Kaldor (1999) tries to categorize the wars as "old" and "new wars". In his classification, when we look at political actors of the wars, we see that in the 17th and 18th centuries wars are directly between the empires, in the 19th-century actors are nation-states and in the 20th century, they are among the power blocks (Kaldor, 1999: 14). Furthermore, she argues that the aim of wars, the format and techniques of armies as well as their economies have also changed. For instance, when we compare the battles that took place at the end of the 20th century with the ongoing battles of the 21st century, it is possible to observe a new polycentric and multipurpose space of war which emerged under the influence of the rise of identity movements on an ethnic and religious basis. While long-lived neoliberalism resulted in certain changes in state bureaucracies and led it to be dissolved, the military forces had been replaced with "deep states", paramilitary forces, mafia groups, and other similar organizations which are armed and autonomous. On the other hand, in parallel to the dissolution of nation-states, various ethnic and religiously based counter-guerrilla movements could gain power in different ways. Hence, today, we witness new actors getting involved with wars together with national military forces: i.e. militant ethnic or religious groups that hold on to the nation-states in order to consolidate their power or some supranational alliances among various nation-states operate in the battlefields more than individual nation-states. It seems that national militaries cannot move independently from these actors taking place below and above them. While these new actors are making use of the official bodies of the nation-states, their existence is also an important sign of their dissolution or transformation. All these also led to some changes in the forms and representation of violence that the new wars caused.

Similar to the wars in foundation years of the nation-states, present new wars, which take place as part of their crisis and dissolution, target again civil communities, who are considered as threatening their constitution or consolidation. It is obvious that there has been a crisis of Arab nation-states (as in the case of Syria, Iraq or Afghanistan) and this crisis has led to a process of transformation and reconstitution which want to be directed by the force of superpowers. Hence the crisis of Arab nations was turned into an opportunity for global powers, which are involved in the battle in the name of some national, sub-national and regional interests. Thus, in this new space of war, where actors, as well as the basis and techniques of wars, are under tremendous change, temporal and spatial limits of these wars become so ambiguous and get blurred. The new wars of the 21st century appear as permanent and continuous as well as targeting civilians. They are part of the everyday life of people living in the conflict regions.

With the dissolution of the nation-states, modern bio-political power and its concern of life of the population is replaced with a new mode of power which balances discipline and violence on a new balance favoring new security regimes of the period. Under the impact of these new regimes, bio-political issues have been redefined and functions of the states began to be identified more in security terms. Furthermore, partial and multi-centered authorities dislocated wars from the usual spaces of nations and turned them into continuously operating industries without specific time and space as well as objects or subjects. In other words, this organization of war, independent from space and time, with no beginning or an end, can aim at everyone and can be conducted everywhere. In line with this, the body uncontrollably becomes a tool of production of war. Body, in different contexts, whether tortured or killed in a suicide attack, has become the most significant part of the strategies employed in new wars. The bio-political contract, concerning the state and subjects, has dissolved and corporal aspects of power returned. In our opinion, there is a direct connection between the changes in the public exhibition of brutal impacts of war and the changes in war strategies as well as communication technologies. We are going through a period in which the traditional technique of representing the absolute power of

power blocks like the kings has become once again important and these groups have begun to use such medieval techniques along with modern disciplinary techniques involving dispersed modern institutions. What is striking here is the return of the technique of public executions and public exhibitions of physical violence by military power groups. We suggest that under the impact of the crisis of nation-states, both the emergence of social media, polycentricity of power mechanisms and diversity of power groups have led to the return of these old power techniques. To remember all the scenes, that we have come across throughout the last 20 years since the beginning of the Gulf War in Iraq, makes it possible to state that the old method of public execution as a form of punishment. This is what Foucault defines as medieval and claims that had never truly disappeared. Now it has even strongly emerged back and began to be used more often than before. It seems that this phenomenon is the sign of a new age of power struggle at national, regional and interregional levels as it is also the sign of the rise of new authoritarian regimes. With respect to the publicity of these images, these new authoritarian regimes look in some respect like Nazi regimes of the 1940s. But in some others, it reminds us also of the sovereign power of the medieval times. Furthermore, the spread of social media on the global scale and increasing interactive communication among different geographies have strengthened the war and anti-war political stances. Therefore, these mediums that increase the power of visual images have led to the new wars being fought in virtual space.

Challenging the Norms that Not Recognize the Life of Some and Reclaim the Life Back: Getting out from the Prison of the “Now”

In line with the above-mentioned changes both connected to war and communication technologies, especially after the 2000s, the states and other authorities began to lose their control over the circulation of visual images. As a result of the emergence of new communication technologies and social media channels, visual images are now circulating around as floating signifiers beyond and over old borders of nation-states and under the

control of various subgroups which operate on the basis of different power norms. The social media has opened a new space of counter politics, which is alternative to the official or mainstream media and increased our access to the images exhibiting the state violence and devastating effects of wars over civilians. On the other hand, the states have learnt how to use this new space of social interaction in manipulating public feelings, fantasies, and desires, and in challenging or at least making alternative truth claims of counter-hegemonic groups noneffective.

There is an aspect other than the social media that needs to be tackled here. We have to underline the process of dissolution of old nation-states and shifts in old national and regional boundaries over which the emergence of new wars had also advanced impact (Brown, 2010). All these changes brought new machinery of power into being in which the old modern visual/photographic techniques of representing war without violence and torture such as censorship begin to be employed (even if not together) alongside the medieval techniques of visualizing, exhibiting tortures and violence of the powerful.

It seems that the dissolution of old nation-states has strengthened the search for reclaiming sovereignty among new power groups which are aiming to take place either over, under or against the existing nation-states. Today, the negative effects of war and crimes against humanity are not kept secret anymore by the states as long as they are manipulated properly through dominant frames of perception. Beyond such act of ignorance or denial of such visual images, radical militant groups and sometimes the states began to use these photos as proofs of their power which might also be used to destroy bodies of "others", if necessary, even in the name of securing democratic life and life of those who deserve living. For instance, in the Middle East during the gulf war, homogeneous and sterile visual images have been produced and spread by hegemonic power groups for re-constructing the old fashion orientalist and Islamic Otherness. They were employed for the sake of military invasions seeking to safeguard "the liberal regimes of the West" as opposed to "the despotic regimes of the Middle East".

While the Middle East in the 2000s has turned into a battlefield, there were also (radical

conservative or liberationist) counter-movements with military forces resisting against national authoritarian regimes or/and interest-oriented regional/international forces. In social movements that started to evolve in the Arabian geography in 2010, visual images were placed into public circulation with the help of new communication technologies. For instance, with the start of the Syrian Civil War in 2011, in contrast to the images that are framed by the themes of freedom and change, visual images of violence used by the ISIS have circulated through social media by this conservative radical group for different purposes. ISIS frequently used such visual images in strategic areas of propaganda in order to spread some fear, tyrannize and abolish the psychological resistance of people from the counter groups.

However, despite the increase of violence and their visibility in and through the media and social media, how can one explain the global silence of people? The reason why public silence is so strongly connected to the frames of perception as defined by Butler (2009 and 2013). But we argue that it is also strongly connected to changes in the frames of representation of wars that occur in parallel to the emergence of new wars that are explained above. It seems that law or moral boundaries are not working in the same way as they were working in the old wars with respect to the public visibility of devastating impacts of wars and the use of violence against civilians. Of course, there are still national secrets, but it seems that powers groups (including the state powers) are less hesitant to make their violent practices visible to the public. They can ditch out war photographs (e.g a photo of killed and tortured guerrillas or militants), when they think it is necessary. They use them openly as part of their propaganda to manipulate mass psychology. This situation explains the wide public silence in response to present wars and conflicts.

In the present, all nation-states, which are at risk of falling into deep crisis, are involved into these ongoing wars and war crimes at different levels. This makes the legitimacy of such violence, which they use with the desire to reconstitute their sovereignty, less questionable. It is also true that there are some actors who are responsible for such violent acts are beyond the control of the states and international organizations (if not in cooperation with them).

While those who deserve to have a better life can leave (of course on the basis of disciplinary techniques of subjectification), those who deserve to die are led to live with continuing violence of some military and paramilitary forces. The transparency between the two populations is limited to the use of visual framing and frames of perception. While sometimes the war and its destructive results are exhibited, some other times, they are kept secret. In the first case, the general message of many photographic images becomes that "they deserve to be killed". Visual images that show not only tortures over people but also over their dead bodies can be circulated on the basis of these reasonings or what Butler calls frames of perceptions. In short, today, in the context of the new stage that war and visual/representational technologies have come, there seems to be a transition of visual representation of wars and torture/violence used against the "Others". Nowadays, there is a new economy or language through which "outrageous" photographs (Butler, 2013), that decipher the devastating impacts of war and violence, is explicitly shown.

There are many different examples in the history that shows the official approach to the visuality of tortured/dead bodies of counter-guerrilla movements for instance. One of them is a photograph of Che that was released worldwide on October 10, 1967. The purpose of the officials in bringing this photograph to the public was to prove that the guerrilla commander Che Guevara was killed by the Bolivian army in Higuera, a village in Bolivia. Guevara's half-naked dead body was exhibited in a barn in Vallegrande and photographed. Being served as a spectacle, this photo, by implying the fate of the body that once refused the authority of the existing state, was used as a symbol confirming the absolute sovereignty of the state over its loyal subjects. This transformation of punishment into a ceremony, which involves the ostentatious show of destruction of the resisting body and torture, is a message to all rebellious population, underlining the compulsion to obey the power. Berger comments on the Guevara example: "what is intended is the exhibition of Guevara's identity and the so-called absurdity of his revolution" (Berger, 2016: 26). According to Berger, there existed photos showing the massacres until that day; however, none had turned into such a show as in this example

(2016: 23). We think that if Berger had seen the war photos of today's world, he would have written more elaborate critiques concerning how war can be turned into more painful and absolute shows.

In this example, the photo of Che Guevara, that was constructed from a specific perceptual framework was intentionally leaked to the press by the army. The photo of his "humiliated" (half-naked and with unbuttoned blood-stained trousers) death body was to represent the defeat of his and his followers' resistance. Berger compares Che Guevara's photo with Andrea Mantegna's Lamentation of Christ. The form of an exhibition of Che Guevara and the drawing of Christ in Mantegna's painting have similarities. However, Christ's eyes are closed while Guevara's were open. This image, according to Berger, is the symbolization of mourning (since there are two women mourning in the picture including the Christ's image). However, in the photo of Che, leaving his eyes open means that Guevara was not allowed to be mourned after and was subjected to another symbolic violence. Following Butler's arguments, he wanted to be recorded among the ones that do not deserve funeral and mourning. Therefore, in fact, it can also be claimed that Guevara has never died, despite being killed. His body has turned into a symbolic object which is out of time and space. In fact, the power groups want to deny his life and claim that he never lived as a proper subject. However, this impossible mourning has the potential of both circulations of an unfinished story and a body that could be buried to have a cultural end in his life story. An unburied death body can have the danger of being impersonated as a kind of "ghost" farting around in between life and death zones. In these cases, such figures as ghosts can turned in subjects of mythos of new rebels.

In our opinion, it wouldn't be wrong to say that the Middle East is the most affected geography by the above-mentioned new type of wars. It is possible to find examples of such identity movements which are very conservative, radical and tend to use violence in very brutal ways. Today, it is well known that the most striking example is ISIS. On one hand, the iconic visual images, which this new war machine produce, gives the message that "I am the truth". On the other hand, the same images prove the divinity and absoluteness of power that is acquired through corporal violence. The

social language of the organization that proves the absolute authority to the imagined homogeneous society while excluding life, heterogeneity and consolidating its supporters is built on war and violence. At this point, in order to create a war society, ISIS ideologically uses new communication technologies or social media in a highly professional manner. Undoubtedly, the most important part is based on the production and circulation of visual images (Deutsche Welle, 2015). What is presented here is not the brutality of war but the absoluteness of power.

As it is mentioned above, in modern capitalist societies, torture and violence are no longer visible methods of punishment. In this new period, though punishment has evolved into practices of disciplinary state such as confinement, surveillance, control (Foucault, 2013: 39) while physical violence like torturing or killing bodies are covered by the walls of power and turned invisible. In terms of disciplinary power, the body is no longer an object of punishment through torture, it becomes an object that needs to be kept under constant control and surveillance (Foucault, 2013: 60-61). However, as noted above, even in modern societies, there are people who are left outside the normative frameworks and are recorded as those who deserve to be pushed out of a society and into the category of those who deserve the death. Their death is legitimate for the life of others. But, the brutality of this should be hidden. So, disciplinary power aims at a particular population and those who do not fail to conform to this definition are coded as those who deserve death. Nevertheless, in certain contexts in which disciplinary power is dominant, the exhibition of people's murder in the name of the lives of others is difficult.

As we see the increasing images of brutally tortured bodies mainly through social media, one starts asking certain questions concerning the changing balance between disciplinary and violence in the mechanisms of power in contemporary societies. It can be concluded that in the capitalistic-techno-mediatic societies which centralize the neoliberal global power battle, the medieval mode of representing violence over bodies of its subjects in order to show its absolute power by making its torture and murder publicly visible came back this time for strengthening its power over not all the

subjects but against those who deserve death as being non-subject. Those who deserve discipline and those who deserve death and torture are treated as separate groups, or they are treated as "two nations" in some cases as Jessop and others put it (Jessop et. al, 1989). In addition to that at the national level, at the global and regional levels, power has been very polycentric now. Finally, the rapid change of today's technology further expands and multiplies the norms and strategies of representing war and violence.

Women guerrillas, as in the example of *Ekin Van* in Turkey and many others who were tortured through their genital organs after they were killed, are clear indicators of how the war is a gendered form of violence. New wars provide new contexts in which gendered norms are used for the dehumanization of certain ethnic groups and communities as in this example. In wars, female bodies are turned into lands to be invaded by male military soldiers. The feminine body turns into a battlefield of nationalist ideologies which have always been intertwined with sexist codes. The imagined audience, in other words, "subjects" are the others who are not part of a population that should be kept under discipline for the sake of their life. Therefore, here, as Foucault noted, the lives of "us" which are under protection provide the basis for the legitimacy of the state violence. "Subject" acquires an identity and life through violence on the other over whom violence appears as legitimate and requires no censorship. Here the exhibition of such violence starts to be used as a visual tool to consolidate the boundaries between the two or more populations.

Especially after the September 11 attacks, war has become "continuous rather than the exception". Here the war has turned into a form that does not have boundaries and places. In this new era called "war against terror", the military policies are defended in the name of "democracy". The "absolute loyalty" on behalf of the power is required from those who deserved democracy, but until it is provided in the ongoing war circumstances, an exception has become the norm (Balta, 2016: 150). Continuity of war and its temporal-spatial ambivalence renders actors of war or violence more heterogeneous. The act of murder is no more a monopoly of states or central authority. Any community grasping the control in a particular

space gains the right to kill and practices it. In this space, law, which gives the legitimacy of violence to the states, is now suspended. Rather heterogeneous (mini)powers now conduct a war in their name or on behalf of others easily. Violence organizations or war machines, as Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari name, may emerge in different circumstances for different purposes, and commit violence themselves or on behalf of other hegemonic states (Mbembe, 2016: 255). In this context, defining the geography of the Middle East, which has turned into an actual and continuous violence area, as a praxis area for the above-mentioned new strategies of war and violence would not be wrong. It is possible to consider ISIS and other of its counterparts as "war machines". Hence, inspired by the polycentrism of states, in an era in which authority on the image does not come from one single source and the production, distribution, and circulation of visual images have become quite easy. In such a situation, it is quite impossible to talk about any absolute authority on the visual images of power.

Under these circumstances, it seems important to go beyond claiming the truth back by using the images which leak from the dominant frames but to establish new possible images about the future which encourages and mobilizes not only our feelings of hate but also our hopes for the future. These images might work as the line of flights referring not only to the present but also to the future, escaping not only from the dominant frames of perception but also from the dominance of the permanent "now". As a counter-strategy, what really matters is the power of claiming the life back and abolishing the norms which distinguish those who deserve to die and those who deserve to live, instead of deciphering destructive effects of war and state violence. As Butler states, we need to render the frames of perception which makes us apathetic against the violence which is used to on the people no matter who is targeted. We need to reevaluate their lives, without forgetting that everyone deserves to live and die in respectful ways. This means that everyone deserves to be buried and mourned after he/she dies. Instead of engraving the unfair death of an unfair life in the memories of a shattered or tortured body, one can emphasize on the memories that reminds us how unique person and life he or she had. These memories remind also that she had not only lived, but also

deserved it like everyone else. It is meaningful to remember those people by sharing lively photos, instead of sharing their photos exhibiting their tortured dead bodies in the name of claiming the truth back. Also, to claim their rights to burial and being mourned can also be another way of claiming their lives have subjectivities back. In this sense, the photographs of Hacı Lokman Birlik, whose dead body was tied to the back of an armored vehicle after being killed by the security forces in Cizre, Şırnak, have relocated its subject positions back into life and in the category of those who "lived". These positive and constructive photographs of the late or deceased can be considered and presented as powerful alternatives against those photos represented and framed by the dominant perception. While the former concerns the life later concerns the death. This requires activation of a counter political language which calls the importance of life and claims the lives of the excluded Others back into our frames of perceptions as opposed to their official representation as people who deserve to die. In addition to claiming the truth back, it is important to reclaim the life. In addition, opposition to the masculine language of war photography is also significant for our counter-strategies. It is important to develop a counter-feminist language which subjectivizes women and not moralize them. These alternative life centered photos can be counter representative as they are addressing the living and resisting subjects rather than referring to the honor of a community, which is appropriated through a set of masculine vocabulary.

Conclusion

Foucault argues, the regime of punishment that directly works over the body has been used since ancient Greek times. Also, before the invention of photography, torture, and ill-treatment of both dead and alive bodies had been practiced and presented as a kind of spectacle for a proof of its ultimate power or sovereignty to its subjects. However, with the emergence and dominance of modern power, the main tendency of the formal authorities became to conceal their ill-treatment and torture of bodies of the "Others" by using censorship mechanisms along with new propaganda techniques. The main subject of modern power had become the individual and

social body through which it claimed life. This has been the case particularly from the 19th century onwards when the classical form of war that took place between the nation-states was dominant as well as ethnic gentrification of the nation was on their agendas. In the same period, the photography was invented and was used for the first time by the state and its police or military forces for the better operation of power throughout the social body for recording criminal activities and as part of the official propaganda techniques which were concealing its destructive forces over the life. It was the period when the control held by authorities over the visual space.

However, today with the emergence of the new wars and the increasing impact of social media, devastating impacts of war/conflicts and physical violence of military power groups and states began not only to leak to the public view easily but brought a new mode of photographic representation into being. In other words, representation of military powers and their brutality had begun to be used as a common denominator of their power which they want to use both as the sign of their claim for sovereignty and as a way of channeling popular desires and feelings in an age when hatred is one of the most dominant modes of politics (Rancier, 2006).

Departing from the observation that there has been an increase in publicity of violence in war, this paper studied following questions related to the visual representation of physical violence used by the military forces and groups in the context of war: Why have we started seeing the state or military violence so often? Have such photographic images of violence or torture on the bodies of dead bodies become common and ordinary? What do all these say about changing the relationship of power, violence and their visual representations? Can we just explain this new situation by stating that as the violence increased so the images representing them as well? What about the ethical-political counter positions that led us to respond to these images in certain manners? Seeking to find some conclusive points about these issues by developing some theoretical arguments and discussion, this paper aims to read the literature on new wars, social media and visual representation of war in relational terms from a new angle. It sees the emergence of new wars that have an important impact on

the machine of power and the expansion of new social media as a new sphere of truth production as the main phenomenon which requires to be studied from a new perspective and with new questions. Therefore, the paper reads the empirical phenomena that are the increasing expansion of photographic representation of military violence and tortured dead bodies as a symptom of all these changes. In other words, as the authors of this article, we followed a theoretical path to explain the above-mentioned questions concerning concepts of power, violence, war, death and their visual representations by breaching two distinct literatures: the literature on war and on the photographic images of war and physical violence of the armed forces represented through new media technologies. Within this theoretical debate, we made use of the analysis of various photographic images ranging from the iconic photograph of Che Guevara after his death, to the corpses of two Kurdish Guerillas (Hacı Lokman Birlik and Ekin Van) killed by the Turkish Military Troops in 2016 and found out historical continuities and discontinuities that could be traced in these images and in their modes of representation.

Conclusively, we argue that power and violence are always intermingled, while the balance and forms of interaction between these two phenomena might change. It is this connection that relates to political changes both in wars and their visual representation through for instance images of violence used by the military forces. And the main socio-political dynamics that need to be counted here in understanding these coexisting changes are the emergence of new power mechanisms in line with the dissolution of the nation-states which led to the emergence of new wars. What is argued here also that the rise of visual images exposing devastating impacts of wars can be read in parallel to a shift from the technique of censorship to a new technique of representation and mode of power. The latter combines censorship with the exhibition of violence and transformation of violent acts into public events with the use of social media. This reflects some changes in the mode of power as the latter regime of visual representation requires the old medieval practices of public executions to be brought back.

Within this context, we finally ask if there is also a need to change counter-tactics of

resistance against the official approach to wars. Our answer is simply yes. We need to go beyond the revelation of the truth about the devastating effects of wars on human lives and the official use of violence. Of course, the polycentric character of communication is the case not only with respect to power but also in resisting groups. In this context, the later might also need to go beyond the simple method of disclosing and uncovering destructive effects of power in the aforementioned circumstances. We pointed at the need to develop alternative strategies which aim to demolish the norms through which dominant frames of perception are constituted. These frames concern certain groups are who are under attack of the

powerful. These tactics to reclaim the life seems as urgent as attempts revealing the truth. Rising our hope for a better life including different groups, the former points at lines of flight which have the potential of getting us out of the prison of the “now”.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank to *Carol Mann* (Universite Pari 8, France) not only for inspiring with her ideas on the issue of war, but also for supporting us personally in our most difficult times when Turkey was in a political turmoil. For all these reasons we like to dedicate this work to her.

References

- Alpkaya, Gökçen. (2016). Anayasa ve Yasalar Karşısında Ölü-Beden ve Ötekiler, Evrim C. İflazoğlu & A.Aslı Demir (der), Öteki Olarak Ölmek, Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları, 163-172.
- Balta, Evren. (2016). Ölü Bedenlerin Siyasal Yaşamları, Evrim C. İflazoğlu & A. Aslı Demir (der), Öteki Olarak Ölmek, Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları, 145-161.
- Barthes, Roland. (1996). Camera Lucida: Fotoğraf Üzerine Düşünceler. Çev., Reha Akerçakaya. İstanbul: Altıkkırkbeş Yayınları.
- Berger, John. (1988). O Ana Adanmış, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Berger, John. (2016). Bir Fotoğrafı Anlamak, çev, Beril Eyüboğlu, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Boudrilard, Jean. (1995). Gulf War Did not Take Place, Bloomington and Indiana Polis: Indiana University Press.
- Bozarslan, Hamit. (2014). Sunuş, G.Çeğin & İ. Şirin (der), Türkiye’de Siyasal Şiddetin boyutları içinde, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 9-30.
- Brown, W. (2010). Walled states, waning sovereignty. New York: Zone Books.
- Burke, Peter. (2003). Afışten Heykele, Minyatürden Fotoğrafa Tarihin Görgü Tanıkları. (Original Name of the Book: Eyewitnessing The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence), Trans. By Zeynep Yelçe. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.
- Butler, Judith. (2009). Frames of War, London: Verso.
- Butler, Judith. (2013). Kırılğan Hayat: Yasın ve Şiddetin Gücü. Çev.,Başak Ertür. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Campbell, David. (2004). “Horrific Blindness: Image of Death in Contemporary Media.” Journal for Cultural Research. 8 (1): 55-74.
- Derrida, Jacques. (2002). “History of the Lie: Prolegomena”, Without Alibi in, (ed) Peggy Kamuf, Stanford University Press.
- Deutsche Welle. (2015). Who is the ‘Islamic State’? <http://www.dw.com/en/who-is-the-Islamic-state/a-18853223> [Access: 10.11.2016].
- Fanon, Frantz. (2013). Yeryüzünün Lanetlileri, çev, Şen Süer, İstanbul: Versus Yayınları.
- Foucault, Michel. (1977). Discipline and Punish, New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, Michel. (1980). "The Confession of the Flesh" in Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault, C. Gordon (ed.), Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, Michel. (2005). Özne ve İktidar. Çev.,Ergüden, I., & Akinhay, O., İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Foucault, Michel. (2013). Hapishanelerin Doğuşu, çev, Mehmet Ali Kılıçbay, Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Grossberg, Lawrence. (1992). Dancing In Spite Of Myself: Essays on Popular Culture, Durham: Duke University Press.
- HDP. (2016). The Cize Report, April 17, Ankara.
- Hobsbawn, Eric. (2013). Kısa 20. Yüzyıl Tarihi, çev, Yavuz Alogan, İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.
- Jessop, B. and K. Bonnett, S. Bromley, T. Ling. (1989). Thatcherism: A Tale of Two Nations, London: Black Well.
- Kaldor, Mary. (1999). New and Old Wars, Organized Violence in Global Era, Standford University Press: Standford.
- Koyré, Alexander (1945) “The Political Function of the Modern Lie” (Contemporary Jewish Record), the American Jewish Committee New York N.W.
- Mbenme, Achille. (2016). Nekro Siyaset, çev, Abdurrahman Aydın, Evrim C. İflazoğlu&A.Aslı Demir (der), Öteki Olarak Ölmek, Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları, 223-270.
- Özsoy, Hişyar (2012), Arafta Kalmak: Tarih Mezarla Başlar, <http://politikart1.blogspot.nl/2012/05/arafta-kalmak-tarih-mezarda-baslar.html>
- Rabinow, Paul. (1991), The Foucault Reader, P. Rabinow (ed.), Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Rancier, Jaques (2006), Hatred of Democracy, London and New York: Verso.
- Said, W. Edward (1979), Orientalism, Vintage Books Edition.
- Schmidinger, Thomas. (2015). Suriye Kürdistan’ında Savaş ve Devrim: Rojava’dan Sesler, Analizler. Çev., Sevinç Altınçekiç. İstanbul: Yordam Yayınları.
- Sheridan, Alan. (1994). Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth, London: Routledge.

- Sontag, Susan. (2005). Başkalarının Acısına Bakmak. Çev., Osman Akınhay. İstanbul: Agora Yayınları.
- Sontag, Susan. (2008). Fotoğraf Üzerine. Çev., Osman Akınhay. İstanbul: Agora Yayınları.
- Taştekin, Fetim. (2016). Rojava, Kürtlerin Zamanı, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Turner, Bryan, S. (1991). "The Discourse of Diet", in The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory, M. Featherstone, M. Hepworth and B. Turner (eds.), Sage.
- Vigarelo, Georges. (1995). "The Life of the Body in Discipline and Punish", Sociology of Sport Journal, 12, pp. (158-163)