Taylor, Jeremy E. "Introduction: Visual histories of occupation(s)." *Visual Histories of Occupation: A Transcultural Dialogue*. Ed. Jeremy E. Taylor. London,: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 1–24. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350167513.ch-001>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 10:38 UTC.

Copyright © Jeremy E. Taylor 2021. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Introduction: Visual histories of occupation(s)

Jeremy E. Taylor

Why occupation?

As ongoing conflicts in the Middle East, the memory of historical atrocities in east Asia, and disputed boundaries in regions such as the Caucasus and south Asia all remind us, 'occupation' remains a pertinent, if highly contentious, milieu in many parts of the world today. While the definition of 'occupation' continues to be debated in legal fora, it is in the realm of 'the visual' that responses to various historical and contemporary cases of occupation are often articulated most clearly. Be it the iconic image of Adolf Hitler posing in front of the Eiffel Tower in German-occupied Paris in June 1940 (Figure I.1), or the evocative works that the British artist Banksy has produced in Gaza and the West Bank, the history of occupation is often written in images (Figure I.2). Little wonder, then, that the very field of 'visual cultures' has emphasized the debt it owes to the study of conquest and occupation in determining the questions it asks and the methodologies it deploys – a point that leading scholars in the field have often acknowledged.¹

Despite all this, few attempts have been made to foster a comparative scholarly dialogue on the history of occupation(s) from a visual perspective. To be sure, interest in occupation has generated a vast literature which addresses a range of important questions. Much of this research is informed by ethical concerns about how 'occupiers', 'the occupied' and others act under or remember the experience of occupation itself. Mirroring the rise in 'insurgency studies' since the early 2000s,² contemporary conflicts have prompted many scholars to revisit historical cases of occupation that have long been ignored. Witness the rise in comparative studies of occupation which emerged following the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, and the parallel rise in politicized debates over the judgement of historical and contemporary actors which this generated.³

However, the question of how people record, respond to, interpret or remember cases of occupation in distinctly visual ways – and in different geographic and temporal contexts – continues to evade systematic analysis. And despite debates about the role

I thank all scholars who took part in the Cultures of Occupation Conference, held at the University of Nottingham in January 2018. Their comments and suggestions, especially during the final discussions, helped to shape this Introduction.

Figure I.1 The iconic photograph by Heinrich Hoffmann of Adolf Hitler posing in front of the Eiffel Tower on 23 June 1940, following the German invasion of Paris. Getty Images. (See Plate 1.)

Figure 1.2 Men taking photographs of artwork by the British artist Banksy on the walls of buildings that had been destroyed during an Israeli attack on Beit Hanoun, Gaza, 27 February 2015. Photo by Mustafa Hassona/Anadolu Agency/Getty Images.

of recent occupations in shaping the very field of ‘critical visual studies’, few attempts have been made to apply such innovations to historical cases of occupation. While a number of scholars have certainly put ‘the visual’ at the forefront of the study of specific occupations (examples of which I will detail below), far fewer have responded to such questions in a comparative or interdisciplinary manner, or asked, in a more general sense, what occupation ‘looks like.’⁴ Opportunities for scholars who study visual practices associated with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to compare notes with their peers who work on the iconographies of Japanese-occupied Asia, for example, remain scant.

This volume represents a first attempt to provide a platform for such interaction. It does this by adopting a deliberately flexible analytical framework which encompasses a number of quite different perspectives and approaches. While a well-theorized debate on the distinction between ‘art history’, ‘critical visual studies’ and ‘visual cultures’ has raged since the early 2000s,⁵ this book includes contributions which adopt what might be defined as more ‘traditional’ art historical approaches, as well as ‘visual culture’-inflected studies of how occupation shape(d) particular ‘ways of seeing’ or wider ‘visualities’. In addition, it includes cultural histories of occupation which preface visual (rather than literary, sonic or legal) texts as their primary source of evidence or explore the visual manifestations of occupation policies.

Rather than ‘choosing a side’ in such debates, this collection consciously adopts a more expansive approach that is often referred to as ‘visual history’. As Gerhard Paul, one

of the main exponents of such an approach, suggests: 'Visual history ... considers images in a wider sense both as sources as well as independent artifacts of historiographical research and likewise looks at the visibility of history and the historicity of the visual.'⁶ Responding to the wider 'visual turn' that has been experienced in the Humanities, as well as the increasing ease with which scholars can now access large numbers of historical and contemporary images, this approach places 'the visual' at the centre of the study of the past. For Paul, visual history 'addresses the whole field of visual practice as well as the visibility of experience and history'.⁷ Most importantly, however, visual history takes as its starting point a simple yet often neglected principle, that is, the need to write 'against the ingrained anti-visualism of the social sciences' and accept – as Sumathi Ramaswamy argues – that 'pictures, too, have stories to show and arguments to manifest, and that images are not just illustrative and reflective but also constitutive and world-making rather than world mirroring'.⁸ Indeed, one of the most fundamental contributions made by adherents of this approach is the belief that images – regardless of the media in which they are produced – can generate an agency all of their own. As Horst Bredekamp suggests, for example, 'Politics requires images, it gives rise to images; but it can also follow where images may lead'.⁹ In this volume, we shall see various examples of precisely this process in the politically fraught context of occupation.

Rather than drawing a clear distinction between 'art history', 'cultural history' and 'visual cultures', then, the 'transdisciplinary research' inherent in visual history can provide a space within which scholars from diverse disciplinary traditions can engage with one another. Indeed, many 'visual historians' have been open to the lessons that parallel approaches, such as 'visual cultures', can provide, for 'visual history' entails not just the foregrounding of images in accounts of the past, but also an acknowledgement (and historicization) of the ways in which wider social and cultural contexts shape *which* images (or groups of images) are seen, *how* they are seen and by *whom* they are seen. Below, we will explore how recent cases of occupation have been instrumental in reinforcing such sensibilities in the theoretical scholarship.

In adopting 'visual histories' in its very title then, this book demonstrates that art historians, cultural historians, visual anthropologists, critical theorists and visual cultures scholars *can* engage in fruitful debate (in this case on 'occupation') without necessarily replicating each other's methods and/or sources. Indeed, while a good deal of scholarship that has been written consciously under the banner of 'visual history' has engaged most enthusiastically with photography in the past, this collection takes a deliberately broad perspective with regards visual sources. It features chapters on photography, print media, cinema, contemporary art, material culture, heritage sites and museums. It also takes cues from 'critical visual studies' and 'visual cultures' by including chapters which interrogate multiple archives (written, visual and material) to pose questions about what is rendered visible and – perhaps most importantly – *invisible* under occupation.

To be sure, a number of collections *have* employed a similarly broad set of methodological parameters to explore region-specific questions of occupation in the past. In an important but much overlooked volume, Marlene J. Mayo, J. Thomas Rimer and H. Eleanor Kerkham map the 'aesthetic life' of Japanese imperialism in Asia (and its aftermath), bringing together essays on Taiwanese painting under Japanese

colonialism and the role of the post-war Allied occupation of Japan in shaping artistic practices in that country.¹⁰ Similarly, in *Narrating Conflict in the Middle East: Discourse, Image and Communications*, Dina Matar and Zahera Harb bring together scholars from media studies, critical theory and literature to examine the ways in which societies that were or are still occupied by Israeli forces – Lebanon and the Occupied Palestinian Territories – have responded to such occupation in cultural (and often highly visual) ways.¹¹ Taking a more ‘traditional’ art historical approach, Lisa Brock, Conor McGrady and Teresa Meade also raise important questions about ‘the role of visual culture in situations of war, occupation, and resistance’ in their special issue of *Radical History Review* published in 2010. Stressing the explicitly political nature of visual culture ‘in any given situation’, the need to address the ‘visual’ in relation to occupation is, for these scholars, linked inextricably to the ‘partisanship’ of the artist, especially in terms of resisting occupation.¹² More recently, the mobilization of artists for and against war and invasion in a multitude of contexts has been explored by Joanna Burke and others in *War and Art* – ‘a visual, cultural and historical analysis of the ways armed conflict has been represented in a range of artistic forms.’¹³ The manner in which the memory of occupation is visualized through museums and historical sites is also starting to generate a new wave of critical scholarship, reflected in a number of forthcoming publications.¹⁴

The questions posed in such research parallel some of those raised by the contributors to this book. More importantly, this book shares with these earlier endeavours a conviction that a focus on ‘the visual’ is necessary if we are to truly understand the impact that foreign occupation has on culture (in every sense of that word); on the lived experience of occupation (for all those involved in it); and on the wider cultural and social contexts in which occupations occur. As we will see in surveying some of the extant literature below, occupation by its very nature involves the imposition of new ‘visual regimes’ of external provenance which entail concealment as well as revelation; which determine what is visible and what is not; and which disrupt many existing visual and artistic practices, while circumscribing new visual cultures unique to the occupation context.

This can best be illustrated when we look beyond specific cases of occupation, and set aside notions of exceptionalism (i.e. in getting beyond the tendency to limit one’s interest to the study of ‘the occupation’ – a phrase which, paradoxically, means entirely different things in different parts of the academy). Earlier collections have often consciously chosen to work within specific geographic and temporal boundaries, meaning that lessons learnt about ‘the visual’ in one case are rarely applied to others. In its wider focus, this volume seeks to foster the comparative study of ‘the visual’ under occupation further by adopting a more ambitious framework encompassing various cases from around the world.

In calling for a comparative study which moves *beyond* regional borders, this book does not argue that ‘all occupations are the same’. Indeed, I heed Laura Hein’s warning about the ‘dangers in assuming’ that one occupation ‘can provide a template for anywhere else.’¹⁵ If anything, the chapters in this book underline the fundamental differences that define occupations across the modern era and in different parts of the world. Nor does this book seek to compile some visual typology of occupation. While

comparative studies are useful, they also remind us that different cases of occupation have had consequences that reflect local conditions, traditions and histories.

Nonetheless, this book suggests that much can be achieved by taking a comparative approach to the study of many situations, periods or conflicts that are often considered in isolation despite sharing the 'occupation' label. In other words, while respecting the exceptional nature of many cases of occupation, this collection sets aside the place- or nation-specific exceptionalism which informs a good deal of the existing scholarship. It does this by including chapters which explore 1930s Manchukuo; Second World War Poland, China and the Philippines; post-war Germany, Japan, Okinawa and the Soviet Union; 1960s Israel-Palestine; and the Middle East, Europe and Australia today. It also includes chapters which, in themselves, explore the value in (and limitations of) a comparative study of 'occupation' per se.

While the idea of 'transnational' history has become common in recent years – including in histories of occupation¹⁶ – this book also encourages what might best be described as a 'transcultural' comparative study of occupation. As an approach that deliberately seeks to underline and examine 'border crossing and entanglement', 'transcultural history' is well suited to a comparative study of occupation.¹⁷ Indeed, while acknowledging the centrality of 'the occupation' to various national histories – including those written from above and below – this book adopts a 'transcultural' approach in an attempt to highlight the cultural influences and legacies of one occupation on others; the temporal and geographic fluidity of images and visual narratives across and between various 'occupied territories'; and the changing historical memories of past occupation in light of ongoing occupations and conflicts today. The nascent field of 'transcultural history' has already demonstrated how such an approach can shed entirely new light on the political and social aspects of historical occupation.¹⁸ And many contributions to this volume adopt, to some degree, a transcultural sensibility to the study of specific cases of occupation. In doing so, they mark out new points of intersection and overlap, identify original theoretical angles from which to revisit studies of specific cases of occupation, and share conceptual, methodological and theoretical innovations derived from vastly different contexts.

While not all chapters in this volume are necessarily transcultural, comparative or interdisciplinary as standalone studies, the collection as a whole highlights the 'border crossing and entanglement' of images, ideas, visual technologies and memories across and between specific cases of occupation; the comparisons that might be drawn between vastly different conflicts in different parts of the world and across the late-modern period; and the benefits of deploying methods and approaches from an array of disciplinary traditions when analysing the 'visual histories of occupation' in a more general sense.

New questions about old ideas

There is already a significant literature in a range of disciplines which aims to define 'occupation'. This includes a body of work in critical legal studies which considers the origins of the 'law of occupation'. Under the Hague Conventions, concluded in

1907, 'belligerent occupation' was first defined as a state of affairs occurring when one sovereign state invaded the territory of another and was obliged to administer the occupied territories of that state temporarily (i.e. until the end of the conflict) – though the need for some internationally recognized legal regime to define and manage such cases dates back to the Napoleonic Wars.¹⁹ While post-Second World War judgements (such as the Fourth Geneva Convention) have refined these earlier definitions, the Hague Conventions remain the basis for definitions of 'occupation' in the legal context today – something which has itself generated extensive debate.²⁰

While the 'law of occupation' remains an important framework, an increasing amount of scholarship now critically engages with the limits of the definitions of 'occupation' that this provides in practice. Some legal scholars have been critical of the tendency to use the 'myth of temporality' inherent in such definitions to obfuscate new forms of domination or conquest, for example.²¹ Others have criticized the inherently Eurocentric origins of 'occupation' – that is, a notion originally developed to define relations between European states (rather than, for example, European powers and areas beyond Europe that these powers subsequently colonized).²² Historians working within a postcolonial framework have sought to move away from such definitions altogether, taking issue with a legally defined occupation/colonialism dichotomy which 'perpetuates a distinction between European and non-European development, but also hinders a useful perspective on both European military history and the history of foreign occupation'²³ – though this approach has also been criticized as an elision of occupation and colonialism in some quarters.²⁴ Such an approach explains studies that draw a direct line between colonialism and the recent military occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan,²⁵ as well as recent conceptual innovations like Salah D. Hassan's notion of 'never-ending occupations', that is, cases in which 'regimes of occupation often project themselves long into the future, averting complete withdrawal and instituting a permanent presence ... through the establishment of garrisoned military bases'.²⁶

In political science, scholars have noted the 'evolving meanings' of occupation, especially in light of conflicts in the Middle East in recent decades. Some scholars have followed a path common in social science research in seeking to establish catch-all definitions, for example, describing occupation as 'a form of government imposed by force or threat thereof'.²⁷ Others have sought more expansive frameworks which cover 'the legally distinct situations of colonialism, foreign occupation, and those multinational states whose disconnected nations regard their rulers as alien', Michael Hechter's category of 'alien rule' being one such example.²⁸

Such work exists alongside more disparate attempts to describe the relationship between 'occupation' and related concepts (such as 'colonialism' and 'conquest') which seek to find a concise working definition for the milieu to which the term 'occupation' is often attached (over and above those recognized as 'belligerent occupation' in international law). Occupation might be 'a condition of compromised sovereignty' for one scholar and a 'new form of empire: a network of overseas bases and informal spheres of influence' for another.²⁹ For Amahl Bishara, occupation is 'one of the most obvious cases in which the politics of sovereignty intrudes, in an everyday and pervasive way, in arenas of life often presumed to be free of state politics'.³⁰ Indeed, as the burgeoning

scholarship on Israel-Palestine suggests (a good deal of it theoretically inspired by advances in postcolonial theory), occupation sometimes has little to do with the control of 'sovereign territory' at all: the mind and the senses can both be 'occupied';³¹ as can the skies above.³² Such definitions are cited here not to discredit or undermine in any way the research with which they are associated, but rather to demonstrate the diversity of scholarly definitions now attached to the word 'occupation'.

Thanks to the emergence of the Occupy movement since 2011, a number of scholars have also explored the origins and multiple meanings of the term 'occupation', as well as the ways in which the very idea of 'occupation' has changed. As W. J. T. Mitchell suggests, 'The clearest symptom of the uncanny reversal in the meaning of the word *occupation* has been its transformation from its principal meaning in the preceding historical epoch, a label for military conquest and neocolonialism.'³³ Yet the practice of 'Occupying Wall Street' in New York or 'Occupying Central' in Hong Kong is not quite as removed from the Hague Convention-understanding of 'occupying' foreign territory following conquest as we might assume. 'You may occupy space in a normal way, as owner or tenant', muses Jacques Rancière: 'But the notion takes on its full meaning when you take possession of a space which is not yours.'³⁴ In other words, the aims of the Occupy movement to 'take back' space (and to transform parks, squares or streets into spaces for protest and debate) have a far closer connection to the sense of 'occupation' as 'military conquest and neocolonialism' than might at first be apparent. As the Occupy movement's development in places such as Hong Kong have shown, these two concepts are intimately linked in their focus on sovereignty, power and spatial control. This is a topic to which I will return in the Epilogue.

It is not the aim of this volume to add to this growing list of definitions. Nor am I seeking to establish a 'taxonomy of occupation' which can be neatly applied across vastly different contexts. All cases of occupation – even within wider regional conflicts (e.g. the German occupation of various societies across Europe during the Second World War) – are unique, and all resist attempts at reductionism. However, it is precisely the impossibility of establishing a catch-all definition of 'occupation' beyond that set down in international law that can serve as the basis for critical discussion about visual expression under vastly different situations labelled with this very term.³⁵ In other words, debates about the meaning of the term 'occupation' can be encouraged and continued, without necessarily allowing such definitions to mark an end point of scholarly enquiry. Such an approach might even allow scholars working on cultural expression or practices in contexts that are denied the very label of 'occupation' (including examples which are *not* covered in this volume, such as Kashmir, Tibet and Western Sahara), the ability to move beyond justifying one's research to sceptical critics.

Such an approach – one which suspends the search for a singular definition of 'occupation' while actively engaging in debates *around* such definitions – may appear vague. However, it has already been applied in parallel fields, such as Genocide Studies. For example, the *Journal of Genocide Research* acknowledges that 'genocide is a contested legal, historical, sociological and political term that is applied in various spheres'. Yet this periodical combines empirical research on genocide with conceptual reflection on the term itself.³⁶ In addition, comparative social histories of 'occupation'

which are not limited to protracted wrangling over legal definitions have already been written: Christine de Matos and Rowena Ward's 2012 volume, for example, compares the effects of military occupation across the Asia Pacific region and the Middle East throughout the second half of the twentieth century.³⁷ In temporal and geographic ambitions, this volume seeks to follow such examples, though with a far clearer emphasis on 'the visual'.

From Manchukuo to Palestine: Approaches to the study of occupation

A sweeping account of all studies of occupation in which questions of 'the visual' have been emphasized would be impractical and would serve little purpose. It is possible, however, to identify a number of key literatures which have often not been considered in comparison with each other, yet which provide contrasting models of how best to embark on 'visual histories' of occupation. In the context of this volume, such a review also serves the purpose of laying the groundwork for a number of chapters which directly address, and critically engage with, such work.

When it comes to visual cultures in Japanese-occupied Asia, for example, the historiography of Manchukuo – the 'puppet state' established by the Japanese Kwantung Army in what is now northeast China in 1932 – remains arguably the best documented of cases. Thanks to the vast amount of pictorial propaganda, cinema, photography and graphic art that was produced by the 'occupiers' in this part of northeast Asia from the early 1930s through until 1945, scholars have been spoilt for choice when it comes to visual primary sources. Digitization projects such as the 'Manchukuo Propaganda Posters & Bills' database (developed through the efforts of Kishi Toshihiko at Kyoto University)³⁸ and major collections of Manchukuo print media held at institutions such as Harvard-Yenching Library have in turn contributed to a rise in the scholarly literature on the 'visual history' of this entity (Figure I.3).³⁹ Much of the resulting work has detailed the seemingly counterintuitive role of Japanese leftist artists in the celebration of this settler-colonial project.⁴⁰ In other cases, scholars have traced the development of visual technologies in Manchukuo, and questioned the role of modern media in shaping not just Japanese rule there, but also the visual memory of that rule.⁴¹ While such research has revealed much about the extent to which Manchukuo's rulers visually re-packaged this quasi-colony through new iconographies, however, it has tended to stress the role of Japanese cultural producers over other groups. In other words, a good deal of this work (though by no means all of it) has tended to focus on the role of the occupying power in 'picturing' a new Manchuria, rather than local responses to such visualities.⁴² Such 'visual histories' have been important, however, in demonstrating that a foregrounding of visual sources and a proper consideration of visual technologies can shape an entire field, and shed light on a period or place that text-based studies are unable to do alone.

This 'occupier-heavy' literature on Manchukuo can be contrasted to the focus on 'the occupied' in histories of Vichy France – another 'puppet state' which temporally overlapped with Manchukuo. While Vichy studies has provided us with much of the

Figure I.3 ‘Wangdao le tu da Manzhou fengsu’ (The customs of Greater Manchuria, the paradise of the Kingly Way); ‘The Life of Manchu’ [sic]: Cover image of a set of postcards from Manchukuo (1932–45). Original image held by the Harvard-Yenching Library of the Harvard College Library, Harvard University. (See Plate 2.)

highly visual lexicon that we now apply to studies of occupation in other contexts (e.g. 'the dark years'),⁴³ it has also generated a significant literature on the cultural life of this wartime regime on its own terms.⁴⁴ Indeed, it remains perhaps the richest of literatures on 'visual histories of occupation', with major studies of 'collaborationist' art, cinema and visual culture being published in French and English in recent decades. Many of these studies are important in defining methods and strategies for addressing the nature of 'the visual' under occupation and sit alongside broader discussions concerning 'the visual' and representational legacies of the occupation experience in the post-war decades in France. Monographs by scholars such as Stéphanie Corcy, Laurence Bertrand Dorléac and others, together with numerous edited volumes dedicated to cultural production in Vichy France, provide a range of templates for the analysis of artistic and visual production in wartime France.⁴⁵ Many such works detail attempts by French artists to defend 'national' traditions under occupation as a means of adhering to Vichy policies while maintaining some level of cultural autonomy and perhaps even defiance.

The iconographies that are Corcy's and Bertrand Dorléac's quarry have also been the subject of major exhibitions, such as 'La Collaboration', which was held at the Archives nationales in Paris in 2014.⁴⁶ Here the history of Vichy was revisited through 'image acts' (such as Philippe Pétain's iconic handshake with Adolf Hitler at Montoire-sur-le-Loir on 24 October 1940),⁴⁷ the fascist aesthetics of Vichy poster art, and the revealing private photographs of '*collabos*' and German officers. Other recent exhibitions have taken a more investigative approach (in line with recent government initiatives) in casting light on a very different 'visual history' of Vichy France – the role of the 'collaborationist' authorities in the Nazi looting of art.⁴⁸

Another lasting contribution of the Vichy historiography has been its emphasis on the gendering of both visual cultures under occupation, and the memory of occupation itself. Writing against the 'gender-blindness' of earlier work, for example, Claire Gorrara has sought to analyse the ways in which women writers in post-1968 France remembered the occupation,⁴⁹ while Hanna Diamond's 'women's history' of the war in France provides a broad overview of the experience of women both living under and working against occupation.⁵⁰ More important in terms of 'visual histories of occupation' is Francine Muel-Dreyfus's close reading of Pétainist archetypes such as the 'Vichy Mother', which were developed not just as conservative responses to the supposed decline of French manhood, but as fully imagined figures on the posters and in the staged rituals of occupation propaganda. In other cases, the highly visualized manner in which French women who had been accused of literally 'sleeping with the enemy' were publicly humiliated at Liberation has opened up new avenues for enquiry around the entanglements of gender, power, memory and visual culture in the aftermath of occupation.⁵¹

Most importantly, however, the Vichy historiography explores the memory of occupation and the manifestations of that memory in various spheres of expression. Perhaps as a collective response to the 'Vichy syndrome', that Henry Rousso described as a 'diverse set of symptoms whereby the trauma of the occupation ... reveals itself in political, social and cultural life',⁵² scholars of Vichy have produced vast amounts of work detailing how the memory of the occupation is articulated in visual representations and

narratives, museums and even the natural and built environments.⁵³ Such approaches continue to inform studies of 'collaboration' in other contexts today.

The ethics of 'collaboration' are approached in a quite different way in the subfield of 'Occupation Studies' which has been such a key part of Japanese historiography since the 1970s.⁵⁴ Since the early 2000s, social, cultural and gender historians – including scholars who contribute to this collection⁵⁵ – have utilized a range of visual materials to compile major studies of what some have laconically labelled the 'good occupation' that was imposed on Japan between 1945 and 1952.⁵⁶ As with much of the above-mentioned literature on Vichy, a good deal of this research has focused on issues of gender. This has ranged from Mire Koikari's work on women in post-war Japan and Okinawa (much of the latter directly examining gendered visual representations of 'the occupied')⁵⁷ to Sarah Kovner's groundbreaking research on sex work under occupation – a topic which raises 'fundamental questions about imperialism and individual agency, political economy and cultural change'.⁵⁸ Both these scholars have argued that occupation, by its very nature, includes a highly gendered set of power relations that fundamentally reshape how an occupied society is represented, and how those living under or with occupation 'see'.

In other instances, however, the occupation is identified as a crucial *period* within which lasting developments in (and – as Jennifer Coates explains in this very volume – scholarship on) visual media and performing arts, such as cinema, photography and theatre, were first developed, often out of attempts to navigate the censorship imposed by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP).⁵⁹ If 'the visual' remains peripheral to issues of power and agency in such work, it is nonetheless an important component of this literature – be it on photographic depictions of occupation-era sex workers or the aesthetics of occupation-era cinema. It is therefore no coincidence that some of the leading names in the field of Japanese 'Occupation Studies', such as John Dower, were also some of the first to call for an embrace of the 'visual turn' in Japanese history more generally.⁶⁰

Interest in the US post-war occupation of Japan was, in many instances, re-ignited as a result of a more recent occupation which, of itself, also inspired a new wave of critical scholarship, including that written from 'visual cultures' and art historical perspectives. The American invasion of Iraq in 2003 generated an entire field of scholarship – conferences, books and journals⁶¹ – across a range of disciplines. Indeed, despite starting two years after the US-led invasion of Afghanistan, the scholarship on the occupation of Iraq soon outstripped that related to Afghanistan in terms of sheer volume. And if for other 'occupations' it has been politics, military affairs or social history which have dominated the debate, for occupied Iraq, visual cultures have emerged as a crucial part of the academic discourse. For Nicholas Mirzoeff, one of the leading scholars of 'visual culture', the American invasion of Iraq was a transformative moment that forced us to confront 'the global imaginary'; after all, 'there were more images produced [during the invasion of Iraq in 2003] – whether on television, as photography or on the Internet – than in any other comparable period of history'.⁶² It is not simply the production of images which made this invasion and subsequent occupation unique, however. The ways in which specific 'visual events' arose from the occupation of Iraq, and how through this conflict the use of images as weapons

of war became evident, have all reshaped how visual culture scholars understand the relationship between image, power, violence, and 'ways of seeing' or 'ways of watching'. It was the release of photographs of the torture of Iraqi prisoners at Abu Ghraib in 2004, for instance, that raised fundamental questions about the control of 'the visual' under occupation, subsequently inspiring broad scholarly responses.⁶³ For Mirzoeff, the concealment and eventual release of these images, and the reaction (or lack of reaction) to them, were all instructive of not simply occupation, but empire and war more generally in the twenty-first century. Indeed, in the fact that such images remained concealed for so long, Mirzoeff argues that we can see evidence of how 'the visibility of war remains profoundly undemocratic'.⁶⁴ Such ideas continue to inform more recent debates about visual cultures well beyond those based on the US occupation of Iraq.

The occupation of Iraq is not the exclusive domain of 'visual culture' theorists, however. Media scholars and art historians have also found in the American invasion new visual histories to write and new questions to ask. The televised 'toppling' of a Saddam Hussein statue in Baghdad on 9 April 2003, and the discovery and subsequent desecration of pre-occupation Ba'athist iconography, have all inspired critical appraisals from a variety of angles, to say nothing of a new batch of 'iconic' images that were designed to propagate particular ideas about the nature of the US occupation⁶⁵ (Figure I.4). Since 2003, a number of scholars have also highlighted the effects of the US occupation on visual expression within Iraq itself, while underlining the extent to which discussion of 'visual culture' and Iraq has seen certain forms of visual expression largely ignored. Nada Shabout, for example, has documented and deconstructed the new forms of artistic expression that were installed in a 'new Iraq' under American rule.⁶⁶ At the same time, she has highlighted the scholarly tendency to erase the story of modern Iraqi visual expression (both before and since 2003), even while the US occupation has inspired so much theoretical exploration of the relationship between war and visual culture more generally. Through initiatives such as the Modern Art Iraq Archive,⁶⁷ Shabout and others have sought to free discussion of Iraq's modern visual heritage from an obsession with the fate of Iraqi antiquities in the chaos following 2003, and with occupied Iraq's place in the theorizing of global visual cultures.⁶⁸

In terms of sheer volume, however, the literature on visual cultures of occupation in Japanese-occupied Manchukuo, Vichy France, post-war Japan and early twenty-first-century Iraq all pale in comparison with the scholarship on the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian Territories. In the field of cultural production, this covers everything from art and cinema to photography and more ephemeral forms of visual expression, such as graffiti and new media.⁶⁹ Indeed, this is a vast scholarship which includes contributions in visual anthropology, critical theory and comparative literature, as well as media studies, art history and visual cultures. Just as importantly, such literature is giving rise to new modes of theorizing, in more general terms, about the place of the 'the visual' when trying to understand the nature of the Israeli occupation, and the broader Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In one recent volume on *Visioning Israel-Palestine*, for example, Gil Pasternak argues for the need to ask 'questions about cultural products and productions of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in order to bring into view the conflict's dynamic and evolving reality that political discussions and public debates tend to suspend for rhetorical impact'.⁷⁰

Figure I.4 The much photographed covering of a Saddam Hussein statue in Baghdad with a US flag in preparation for the statue's toppling by US troops on 9 April 2003. Gilles Bassignac/Gamma-Rapho via Getty Images. (See Plate 3.)

Gil Hochberg's *Visual Occupations* (2015) marks an important watershed in the study of this topic, and provides lessons which remain relevant well beyond the field of Israel-Palestine studies. While Hochberg's book 'explores ... various attempts to expose and reframe the conditions of vision that underlie the Israeli-Palestinian conflict',⁷¹ it also raises broader questions about 'the visual' in relation to occupation which are valid for studies in other contexts. Indeed, Hochberg's simple yet profound set of underlying questions about Israel-Palestine – that is, 'what or who can be seen, what or who remains invisible, who can see and whose vision is compromised' – are entirely valid for cases of conflict and occupation in different contexts. Despite a good deal of her book being dedicated to contemporary art, Hochberg's monograph nevertheless has lessons for scholars of contemporary *and* historical cases of occupation, from present-day Kashmir to Second World War China.⁷² Indeed, her questions about what is 'seen' and 'unseen' under occupation have inspired some of the most innovative attempts to link the visibility of occupations (such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan) with historical conflicts.⁷³ Hochberg's work has even inspired a reassessment of the visual technologies of surveillance that have been developed under different circumstances in recent years: the highly controversial use of drones in the prosecution of war in Afghanistan (and other countries), for example, is now being interrogated with recourse to such an approach, as scholars unpack how such visual technologies shape the very way in which conflict is written about.⁷⁴

The structure of the book

The innovations developed in each of these disparate ‘occupation literatures’ remain entirely valid. Indeed, they inform many of the chapters in this book. At the same time, however, each provides a quite different emphasis on how ‘the visual’ is used as a topic of study vis-à-vis occupation. For Hochberg, the issue is fundamentally about ‘ways of seeing’ under occupation – a consideration of how the circumstances of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict play out in a highly visualized manner, but also how they have a tangible influence on the ways in which people in Israel-Palestine *see* the land and each other. This is an important approach which goes to the very heart of answering the question: ‘what does occupation look like’?

It is for this reason that Part One of this book is entitled ‘Ways of seeing under occupation’, for it includes three chapters which adopt an approach that parallels many of the sorts of questions posed by Hochberg. The purpose of this section, then, is to examine how the very notion of ‘ways of seeing’ might be applied to the study of some of the best-known historical cases of occupation – the occupation of various parts of Germany and Japan by the Allied powers in the years immediately following the end of the Second World War. In Chapter 1, for example, Alexey Tikhomirov shows how the Soviet occupation of Germany heralded a fundamental re-ordering of the visual realm – from colours to symbols – as well as visual practices, as the Soviets sought to overturn the visual regime that had been put in place under the Third Reich. Making use of police, security and Party files from Germany and Russia, Tikhomirov shows how this ironically led to local Germans re-adopting Nazi symbols, icons and visual tropes as a form of anti-Soviet resistance in everyday life. In addition, there developed aesthetic tensions between German communists and their Russian allies, as the latter attempted to impose a Russian vision of a communist, post-war Germany on their former enemies. In exploring the notion of a ‘visual occupation regime’, this chapter marks an important starting point for the book as a whole, but also speaks directly to themes of post-war occupation by other Cold War powers that other contributors (e.g. Oliver and Koikari) explore in later chapters.

In Chapter 2, Emily Oliver examines how the Allied occupation authorities in post-war Berlin provoked outrage by exhibiting David Lean’s *Oliver Twist* (1948) – a film which visualized anti-Semitic stereotypes through its depiction of the character of Fagin. Under this ‘visual occupation regime’, the cultural insensitivity of the occupiers thus played a role in shaping immediate memories of Nazi visual media, and stoked animosity in a city still dealing with the destruction visited upon it in the closing stages of the war. Oliver shows that the transplanting of Fagin from nineteenth-century England to film screens in post-war Berlin raised all manner of uncomfortable memories of Nazi visual culture in the context of rapid social change and conflict. The film even provoked comparisons with the propaganda cinema of the regime that the British were attempting to replace and whose policies they had sought to eradicate.

The notion of a ‘visual occupation regime’ which proscribes certain ‘ways of seeing’ is continued in the third chapter in this section. Jennifer Coates examines the role of the American occupation authorities in post-war Japan as they sought to use cinema

as a means of fundamentally re-shaping Japanese society, especially when it came to the role of women and children. Based on dozens of ethnographic interviews with Japanese cinema-goers from the Kansai region of that country, the chapter shows how this ranged from the actual practice of 'watching a movie' to the content of films themselves. As Coates illustrates, however, the Hollywood archetypes and film stars that were promoted by the Americans to 'occupied' audiences were endowed with quite different significance by local Japanese cinema-goers. Even within the occupation context, then, local audiences had some degree of agency over what they saw, and how they chose to see it.

The chapters which make up Part Two of the book adopt a quite different approach to their study of occupation, and one which might best be described as a study of 'visual and artistic responses to occupation'. All three chapters in this section examine how artists and other cultural workers – including both the 'occupied' and 'occupiers' – have responded through the visual arts to the circumstances of occupation in quite different ways. The chapters in this section also deal, to a greater or lesser degree, with the memory of occupation (and the erasure of that memory), as well as the legacy of past and ongoing cases of occupation in academic and artistic circles today. This section thus underlines the continued importance of art historical methods in coming to terms with both visual expression under occupation, and – perhaps more importantly – the legacies of earlier occupations on artistic activity today.

Baluyut starts Chapter 4 by assessing the wartime and post-war work of one of the most celebrated painters of the Philippines – Fernando Amorsolo. Much of Amorsolo's *oeuvre* from the mid-twentieth century engages directly with gendered representations of the Japanese occupation of the Philippines (1942–5). More importantly, however, Baluyut expands her analysis to look at the ways in which Amorsolo's pictorial depictions of the occupation have themselves been 'occupied', via the international art market, by institutions in contemporary Singapore. As Baluyut argues, Amorsolo's artistic musings on race, class and gender under Japanese wartime occupation take on an entirely new significance when they are transplanted into a postcolonial Singapore. Baluyut's chapter thus speaks to other sections of the book which deal with the Japanese occupation of Asia, but raises wider questions about the trade in visual depictions of occupation today, and the ways in which this trade shapes the cultural memory of occupation.

In Chapter 5, Maayan Amir details an event which has been almost entirely erased from the artistic memory of Israel, that is, the 'Israeli Artists for Security' Exhibition which was partly organized by the Ministry of Defense, and held immediately after the Israeli victory in the Six-Day War of 1967 – the conflict which resulted in the Israeli occupation of the West Bank, Gaza, East Jerusalem, the Golan Heights and the Sinai Peninsula. Involving many of the leading artists in Israel at the time, this exhibition included significant numbers of works which embodied 'abstract representations of the landscapes' of the region, as Israeli artists began to re-imagine their country in the context of the start of the occupation. More importantly, Amir suggests that the nationalism – and the idea of artists creating 'art for security' – that first prompted so many to participate in this event no longer sits comfortably with a more critical artistic scene in the country. Amir's chapter also speaks directly to other chapters in

the volume (such as Noga Stiasny's contribution) which explore Israeli interpretations of 'occupied' landscapes.

The approach adopted by Chrisoula Lionis in Chapter 6 is quite different, for it traces how artists from diverse geographic backgrounds use 'humorous aesthetic strategies for documenting and re-assessing experiences of emergency, crisis and collective trauma that arise from the experience of foreign occupation'. Lionis addresses 'laughter's unique ability to communicate the lived experience of occupation' by exploring the works of artists in the Palestinian Diaspora, in post-Financial-Crisis Greece, and from Indigenous communities in Australia. Conceptually, Lionis's choice of case studies directly addresses the changing definitions of 'occupation' that are explored in this Introduction; at the same time, in her analysis of 'laughter as resistance', Lionis's take on visual responses to occupation underlines the power of humour as a tool of cultural resistance.

In Part Three of the book – 'Picturing Occupation' – contributors adopt methodologies that have typified a good deal of the recent research on Manchukuo, in emphasizing the creation of new iconographies and the deployment of modern media technologies in the process of occupation. This section thus highlights the importance of exploring not just the images that are created in response to occupation, but the specific media through which such images are deployed, with both chapters focusing on photography, photojournalism and pictorials. In each case, however, the contributors show how images can also be subverted for quite different purposes in the hands of 'collaborators' or, indeed, those who resisted occupation. Miriam Arani's close reading of media from Nazi-occupied Poland in Chapter 7, for example, shows not merely how Nazi pictorials in and about Poland reinforced established Nazi ideologies on race, but also how Nazi photography could be subverted by Poles for the purpose of resistance. Mire Koikari also paints a nuanced picture of cultural power relations in her analysis of the Cold War pictorial *The Okinawa Graphic* in Chapter 8. For Koikari, this publication mirrored earlier magazines that had been used by the Japanese empire to promote its own occupation of territories conquered in Asia and the Pacific in the 1930s and 1940s (including those discussed in other chapters of this book). At the same time, however, it evolved into a source of subtle criticism about American representations of Okinawa, even while it sought to recast Okinawa as a compliant (though strategically crucial) corner of the American Asia Pacific (at a time when US forces were deployed here as a means of deterring Chinese communist expansion).

In contrast, Part Four of the book focuses far more directly on the memory of past occupations – not unlike much of the research on Vichy today – as well as the ways in which such memories are visualized in landscapes and institutions. This is important because, as the theoretical literature on 'visual history' reminds us, memory studies as a field is now deeply intertwined with the development of 'visual history' methodologies.⁷⁵ In Chapter 9, Jean Hillier and Shulan Fu contrast the ways in which two quite different built environments within the Chinese city of Harbin – that is, the modernist architecture of the city's pre-war Russian community and the heritage landscape of the Japanese 'puppet state' of Manchukuo – have been interpreted in vastly different ways in a People's Republic of China where the memory of Japanese

occupation is a contentious topic in contemporary politics. While the 'state-sanctioned memory' of Japan's occupation of Manchukuo (now China's 'northeast') stresses the atrocities visited upon the Chinese during wartime, the ambiguities inherent in many of the city's streetscapes mean that 'historical memories are appropriated in order to shape antipathic occupation identities and narratives of conflict'.

In Chapter 10, Katarzyna Jarosz compares museums dedicated to the memory of Soviet 'occupation' in four countries: Lithuania, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia and Ukraine. Despite the fact that all of these societies experienced some form of Soviet rule, the social memory of this experience is quite different in each case. Such museums of Soviet rule – such as the recently opened Vabamu Museum of Occupations and Freedom in Estonia⁷⁶ – are increasingly being focused on as sites for the study of Soviet occupation and its memory.⁷⁷ As Jarosz argues, it is not simply contemporary geopolitics (including recent disputes over sovereignty, and new cases of 'occupation', in the Caucasus) which shape how the Soviet past is presented in such institutions, but also the influence of other cases of historical trauma, which have provided templates for representations of occupation in the post-Soviet world.

This section (and the book) ends in precisely the same location in which the volume starts – Berlin. Noga Stiassny's reflective chapter on the transcultural and transhistorical relationship between imperial German, Nazi, Zionist and Israeli notions of landscape – those that were put into place during the Nazi occupation of places such as Poland (as Miriam Arani's chapter highlights) *and* during the longest occupation in the modern era, that is, the Israeli occupation of the Palestinian Territories – underlines the transcultural aims of the book as a whole. Stiassny examines the ways in which 'remembered' European landscapes, and particularly the forest, informed later (and current) representations of the Zionist landscape, as well as how such ideas continue to shape contemporary Israeli perceptions of what Stiassny refers to as 'Palestina', as it grapples with both the memory of trauma in Europe and the realities of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict today.

In a book of this nature, it is not possible to address all cases of 'occupation'. A conscious decision has also been made *not* to return to certain cases of occupation which have already inspired some of the significant sets of literature outlined above. In other words, just as this collection does not seek to provide a catch-all definition of the term 'occupation', it does not pretend to represent every case of occupation within its pages. While drawing on the methodological innovations developed in studies of Vichy France, for example, I have resisted the temptation to retrace such scholarship by including a 'Vichy chapter' herein. Similarly, the voluminous scholarship produced over the last decade in response to the American occupation of Iraq, while methodologically informing a number of this book's contributions, has not been reproduced in chapter form here. And even when well-researched 'occupations' have been addressed in this volume, an attempt has been made to shift the focus away from the centre of such scholarship. The occupation of the West Bank, for example, is explored in this book through the lens of Israeli artists who were mobilized in favour of it in 1967, and to Palestinian artists living with the consequences of that occupation in the Diaspora. The US-led occupation of Japan is de-centred in discussion of cinematic culture beyond Tokyo and print culture in a contested Okinawa.

What ultimately brings all these individual chapters together is a belief in the need to put the study of 'the visual' at the very heart of discussions about the study of occupation, and to move beyond the exceptionalism and particularities that have so often dominated scholarship on specific cases of occupation in the past. By placing very different 'visual histories of occupation' alongside one another, this book encourages the reader to make theoretical, methodological and conceptual comparisons and connections between what are, in many instances, seemingly incomparable cases of occupation. Indeed, in offering new perspectives on the 'visual history' of occupation from various parts of the world and across the modern era, it is hoped that this collection will provide a model for future transcultural dialogues on occupation and demonstrate how a focus on 'the visual' can help expand our understanding of the nature of occupation itself.

Notes

- 1 On this, see Nicholas Mirzoeff, 'Introduction: For Critical Visuality Studies', in *The Visual Culture Reader*, ed. Nicholas Mirzoeff (London: Routledge, 2013), xxix–xxxviii.
- 2 On this, see Paul B. Rich and Isabelle Duyvesteyn, 'The Study of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency', in *The Routledge Handbook of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency*, ed. Paul B. Rich and Isabelle Duyvesteyn (London: Routledge, 2012), 1–20.
- 3 On the influence of the US occupation of Iraq on debates about the study of the US occupation of Japan (and the Japanese occupation of various parts of Asia in the mid-twentieth century), see John W. Dower, 'The Other Japanese Occupation', *Japan Focus* 1, no. 6 (2003): 1–5; see also John Whittier Treat, 'Seoul and Nanking, Baghdad and Kabul: A Response to Timothy Brook and Michael Shin', *Journal of Asian Studies* 71, no. 1 (2012): 121–5.
- 4 There are, of course, exceptions. The excellent work of Cora Goldstein in comparing the control of visual media across different occupations from various periods is one. See, for example, Cora Sol Goldstein, 'A Comparative Analysis of Cultural Control: The German Military Occupation of France (1940–1942) and the American Military Occupation of Germany (1945–1949)', *The Journal of Military History* 80, no. 4 (2016): 1083–116.
- 5 On this debate, see W. J. T. Mitchell, 'Showing Seeing: A Critique of Visual Culture', *Journal of Visual Culture* 1, no. 2 (2002): 165–81; see also Deborah Cherry, 'Art History Visual Culture', *Art History* 27, no. 4 (September 2004): 479–93.
- 6 Gerhard Paul, 'Visual History (English version)', 2011: https://zeitgeschichte-digital.de/doks/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/792/file/docupedia_paul_visual_history_v1_en_2011.pdf (accessed 6 February 2020).
- 7 Ibid.
- 8 Sumathi Ramaswamy, *The Goddess and the Nation: Mapping Mother India* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 2.
- 9 Horst Bredekamp, *Image Acts: A Systematic Approach to Visual Agency*, trans. Elizabeth Clegg (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 52.
- 10 Marlene J. Mayo, J. Thomas Rimer and H. Eleanor Kerkham, ed., *War, Occupation and Creativity* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001).

- 11 Dina Matar and Zahera Harb, ed., *Narrating Conflict in the Middle East: Discourse, Image and Communications Practices in Lebanon and Palestine* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013).
- 12 Lisa Brock, Conor McGrady and Teresa Meade, 'Editors' Introduction', *Radical History Review* 106 (Winter 2010): 1–3.
- 13 Joanna Burke, 'Introduction', in *War and Art: A Visual History of Modern Conflict*, ed. Joanna Burke (London: Reaktion Books, 2017), 38.
- 14 Constantin Iordachi and Péter Apor, ed., *Occupation and Communism in Eastern European Museums: Revisualizing the Recent Past* (London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming).
- 15 Laura Hein, 'Revisiting America's Occupation of Japan', *Cold War History* 11, no. 4 (2011): 579–99.
- 16 For an example, see Ethan Mark, *Japan's Occupation of Java in the Second World War: A Transnational History* (London: Bloomsbury, 2018). For a guide to transnational history more generally, see Pierre-Yves Saunier, *Transnational History* (London: Palgrave, 2013).
- 17 Madeleine Herren, Martin Rüesch and Christiane Sibille, 'Introduction: What Is Transcultural History?', in *Transcultural History: Theories, Methods, Sources*, ed. Madeleine Herren, Martin Rüesch and Christiane Sibille (Heidelberg: Springer, 2012), 1–10.
- 18 Timothy Nunan, 'The Violence Curtain: Occupied Afghan Turkestan and the Making of a Central Asian Borderscape', *Transcultural Studies* 1 (2017): 224–58.
- 19 Yoram Dinstein, *The International Law of Belligerent Occupation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 8–9.
- 20 For example, the Expert Meeting on Occupation and Other Forms of Administration of Foreign Territory, hosted by the International Committee for the Red Cross in 2012, with findings published in the special issue of the *International Review of the Red Cross* 94, no. 885 (Spring 2012), entitled 'Occupation'.
- 21 See, for example, Aeyal Gross, *The Writing on the Wall: Rethinking the International Law of Occupation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
- 22 Yutaka Arai-Takahashi, 'Preoccupied with Occupation: Critical Examinations of the Historical Development of the Law of Occupation', *International Review of the Red Cross* 94, no. 885 (Spring 2012): 51–80.
- 23 Jürgen Zimmerer, 'The Birth of the Ostland Out of the Spirit of Colonialism: A Postcolonial Perspective on the Nazi Policy of Conquest and Extermination', *Patterns of Prejudice* 39, no. 2 (2005): 200; for a more recent example of scholarship on the Nazi occupation of eastern Europe through the lens of colonialism, see Geraldien von Frijtag Drabbe Künzel, *Hitler's Brudervolk: The Dutch and the Colonization of Occupied Eastern Europe, 1939–1945* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2015).
- 24 Peter M. R. Stirk, *A History of Military Occupation from 1792 to 1914* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 4–5.
- 25 For example, Derek Gregory, *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan. Palestine. Iraq* (Oxford: Wiley, 2004).
- 26 Salah D. Hassan, 'Never-ending Occupations', *The New Centennial Review* 8, no. 1 (2008): 1–17.
- 27 Peter M. R. Stirk, *The Politics of Military Occupation* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 45.
- 28 Michael Hechter, *Alien Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 27.

- 29 Sarah Kovner, *Occupying Power: Sex Workers and Servicemen in Postwar Japan* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012), 5–6.
- 30 Amahl A. Bishara, *Back Stories: U.S. News Production and Palestinian Politics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012), 110. My thanks to Simon Faulkner for bringing this definition to my attention.
- 31 On the ‘occupation of the senses’, see Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian, ‘The Occupation of the Senses: The Prosthetic and Aesthetic of State Terror’, *British Journal of Criminology* 57, no. 6 (2017): 1279–300; on the ‘occupation of the mind’, see Refqa Abu-Remaileh, ‘Narratives in Conflict: Emile Habibi’s *Al-Waqa’i al-Ghariba* and Elia Suleiman’s *Divine Intervention*’, in *Narrating Conflict in the Middle East: Discourse, Image and Communications Practices in Lebanon and Palestine*, ed. Dina Matar and Zahera Harb (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013), 85–109.
- 32 On ‘airborne occupation’ in the Occupied Palestinian Territories, see Eyal Weizman, *Hollow Land: Israel’s Architecture of Occupation* (London: Verso, 2012), esp. 237–58.
- 33 As Mitchell notes in ‘Image, Space, Revolution: The Arts of Occupation’, *Critical Inquiry* 39, no. 1 (Autumn 2012): 12. From 2011 onwards, suggests Mitchell, ‘the word *occupation* took on a new meaning: the reclaiming of public space by masses of disenfranchised people’. On the ‘Occupy Central’ movement in Hong Kong and its links to ‘a consciousness born of the anxieties provoked by the prospect of unification [between what was then colonial Hong Kong and the PRC] in the 1980s and 1990s’, see Arif Dirlik, ‘The Mouse That Roared: The Democratic Movement in Hong Kong’, *Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations: An International Journal* 2, no. 2 (2016): 665–81.
- 34 Jacques Rancière, ‘Occupation’, *Political Concepts: A Critical Lexicon*: <https://www.politicalconcepts.org/occupation-jacques-ranciere> (accessed 10 February 2020).
- 35 The act of labelling particular periods in history, or specific power structures, ‘occupations’ is itself something that a number of chapters in this book directly address.
- 36 <http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCode=cjgr20> (accessed 10 February 2020). See also Alexander L. Hilton, ‘Critical Genocide Studies’, in *Genocide Matters: Ongoing Issues and Emerging Perspectives*, ed. Joyce Apsel and Ernesto Verdeja (London: Routledge, 2013), 42–58.
- 37 Christine de Matos and Rowena Ward, ed., *Gender, Power and Military Occupations: Asia Pacific and the Middle East since 1945* (London: Routledge, 2012).
- 38 http://app.cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp/infolib/meta_pub/G0000021MAN (accessed 8 February 2020).
- 39 Kate Kondayen, ‘Testament to Manchukuo’, *Harvard Gazette*, 23 September 2015: <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2015/09/testament-to-manchukuo-2/> (accessed 8 February 2020).
- 40 Annika Culver, *Glorify the Empire: Japanese Avant-Garde Propaganda in Manchukuo* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014).
- 41 Kari Shepherdson-Scott, ‘A Legacy of Persuasion: Japanese Photography and the Artful Politics of Remembering Manchuria’, *Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 27 (2015): 124–47.
- 42 In contrast to fields such as literature, in which Chinese resistance to Japanese imperialism in Manchukuo has been well documented in major monographs such as Norman Smith, *Resisting Manchukuo: Chinese Women Writers and the Japanese Occupation* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2007).

- 43 A fact that some scholars of Vichy have been happy to draw attention to. See, for instance, the review essay by Brett Bowles entitled 'Illuminating the Dark Years: French Wartime Newsreels on DVD', *Historical Journal of Film, Radio, and Television* 27, no. 1 (2007): 119–25.
- 44 Despite the claim by Frederic Spotts in *The Shameful Peace: How French Artists and Intellectuals Survived the Nazi Occupation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 2, that 'there is no single book offering some idea of what daily life [under German occupation] was like ... across the range of arts and letters'.
- 45 Stéphanie Corcy, *La vie culturelle sous l'Occupation* (Paris: Editions Perrin, 2005); Laurence Bertrand Dorléac, *Art of the Defeat, France 1940–1944*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Los Angeles, CA: Getty Research Institute, 2008); Agnès Callu, Patrick Eveno and Hervé Joly, ed., *Culture et médias sous l'Occupation: Des entreprises dans la France de Vichy* (Paris: Éditions de CTHS, 2009).
- 46 Thomas Fontaine and Denis Peschanski, *La Collaboration: Vichy, Paris, Berlin, 1940–1945* (Paris: Éditions Tallandier, 2014).
- 47 To reference Bredekamp, *Image Acts*.
- 48 Aurelien Breeden, "'We Are Amplifying the Work': France Starts Task Force on Art Looted under Nazis", *New York Times*, 15 April 2019: <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/15/arts/design/france-art-looted.html> (accessed 8 February 2020).
- 49 Claire Gorrara, *Women's Representations of the Occupation in Post-'68 France* (London: Macmillan Press, 1998).
- 50 Hanna Diamond, *Women and the Second World War in France, 1939–1948: Choices and Constraints* (London: Routledge, 1999).
- 51 A. W. Moore, 'History, Memory and Trauma in Photography of the Tondues: Visuality of the Vichy Past through the Silent Image of Women', *Gender & History* 17, no. 3 (2005): 657–81.
- 52 Henry Rouso, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 10.
- 53 For a recent example, see Margaret Attack and Christopher Lloyd, ed., *Framing Narratives of the Second World War and Occupation in France, 1939–2009: New Readings* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012).
- 54 John W. Dower, 'Occupied Japan as History and Occupation History as Politics', *Journal of Asian Studies* 34, no. 2 (February 1975): 485–504; Dower's monograph *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999) is often listed as one of the seminal works in the field.
- 55 See, for example, Mire Koikari, *Pedagogy of Democracy: Feminism and the Cold War in the U.S. Occupation of Japan* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2009).
- 56 Yoshiro Miwa and J. Mark Ramseyer, 'The Good Occupation', Discussion Paper No. 514, Harvard Law School, May 2005.
- 57 Mire Koikari, *Cold War Encounters in US-occupied Okinawa: Women, Militarized Domesticity and Transnationalism in East Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- 58 Kovner, *Occupying Power*, 3.
- 59 Isolde Standish, *A New History of Japanese Cinema* (New York: Continuum, 2006); Julia Adeney Thomas, 'Power Made Visible: Photography and Postwar Japan's Elusive Reality', *Journal of Asian Studies* 67, no. 2 (May 2008): 365–94; Samuel L. Leiter, ed., *Rising from the Flames: The Rebirth of Theater in Occupied Japan, 1945–1952* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009).

- 60 I am thinking here of Dower's work through MIT's 'Visualizing Cultures' Project, the mission of which 'is to use new technology and hitherto inaccessible visual materials to reconstruct the past as people of the time visualized the world (or imagined it to be)'. See <https://visualizingcultures.mit.edu/home/index.html> (accessed 8 February 2020).
- 61 For example, the *International Journal of Contemporary Iraqi Studies* (now the *Journal of Contemporary Iraq & the Arab World*), which commenced publication in 2007 through Intellect Books.
- 62 Nicholas Mirzoeff, *Watching Babylon: The War in Iraq and Global Visual Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005), 12.
- 63 See, for example, the special issue of the *Journal of Visual Culture* 5, no. 1 (2006), edited by Suhail Malik, which included various articles directly addressing these images and their wider cultural and political significance.
- 64 Nicholas Mirzoeff, 'Invisible Empire: Visual Culture, Embodied Spectacle, and Abu Ghraib', *Radical History Review* 95 (Spring 2006): 21–44.
- 65 Florian Götke, *Toppled* (Rotterdam: Post Editions, 2010).
- 66 See, for example, Nada Shabout, 'The "Free" Art of Occupation: Images for a "New" Iraq', *Arab Studies Quarterly* 28, no. 3–4 (2006): 41–53; and Nada Shabout, 'Bifurcations of Iraq's Visual Culture', in *We Are All Iraqis: Aesthetics and Politics in a Time of War*, ed. Nadjie al-Ali and Deborah Al-Najjar (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2012), 3–25.
- 67 <https://artiraq.org/maia/about> (accessed 6 February 2020).
- 68 On this, see Nada Shabout, 'Historiographic Invisibilities: The Case of Contemporary Iraqi Art', *International Journal of the Humanities* 3, no. 9 (2005): 53–63.
- 69 For some representative collections and monographs (not hitherto cited in this Introduction), see Rebecca L. Stein and Ted Swedenburg, ed., *Palestine, Israel, and the Politics of Popular Culture* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); William Parry, *Against the Wall: The Art of Resistance in Palestine* (London: Pluto Press, 2010); Ariella Azoulay, *From Palestine to Israel: A Photographic Record of Destruction and State Formation* (London: Pluto Press, 2011).
- 70 Gil Pasternak, 'Introduction: Encounters at the Cultural Boundaries of Conflict', in *Visioning Israel-Palestine: Encounters at the Cultural Boundaries of Conflict*, ed. Gil Pasternak (London: Bloomsbury, 2020), 3.
- 71 Gil Z. Hochberg, *Visual Occupations: Violence and Visibility in a Conflict Zone* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 3.
- 72 Max Kramer, 'Mobilizing Conflict Testimony: A Lens of Mobility for the Study of Documentary Practices in the Kashmir Conflict', *Social Sciences* 6, no. 3 (2017): 1–21; Jeremy E. Taylor, 'The "Occupied Lens" in Wartime China: Portrait Photography in the Service of Chinese "Collaboration", 1939–1945', *History of Photography* 43, no. 3 (2019): 284–307.
- 73 An outstanding example being Susan L. Carruthers, 'Why Can't We See Insurgents? Enmity, Invisibility, and Counterinsurgency in Iraq and Afghanistan', *Photography and Culture* 8, no. 2 (2015): 191–211.
- 74 Andrea Brady, 'Drone Poetics', *New Formations* 89/90 (Winter 2016): 116–36.
- 75 Paul, 'Visual History (English version)'.
76 <https://www.vabamu.ee> (accessed 6 February 2020).
- 77 Iordachi and Apor, *Occupation and Communism in Eastern European Museums*.