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Abstract | War and conflict are one of the dark sides of mankind experiences and are one of the bitterest ones which sometimes seem to be inevitable despite of many attempts to prevent them. This paper aims to discover the war as phenomena and in this way have considered the landscape as not only the setting for the occurrence of conflict but also as a production that helps us to have a realistic perception of war. In such an approach exchanging experiences and concepts of the conflict would be more possible. This study makes a distinction between War and Conflict and argues that there is a dialectical relation between landscape and conflict in which its production in deferent conditions creates and recreates many kinds of “Conflict Landscape”. These categories have been defined in qualitative strategy with an inductive approach. Accordingly, fore type of landscape of conflict defined and recommended: “Pre-war landscape of conflict”, “war landscape of conflict” (also could be named as landscape of war of Battlefield landscape), ”Post-war landscape of conflict”. There are two important concepts in this categorization; first is the concept of landscape Value and the second is the Changeable Ability of Landscape. The first concept is important in the sense of identifying and conserving any kinds of conflict landscape and it needs contextual and interdisciplinary approaches. The second one shows the capability of landscape for converting to and changing from one kind to the other one. For instance, War landscape of conflict can change into post-war landscape of conflict and / or post-war landscape of conflict can experience all of the types during the process of completion and evolution. In this sense, the final condition of landscape will be the frame of reference. From this kind of view considering the Final position of the landscape and having a continuous monitoring checklist for taking any necessary actions, is essential for preservation of these landscapes.
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Introduction | If the organization of war is contextual, then landscape must be more than “setting” for such violence (Snead, 2008). It is in this way that various aspects of conflict, whether urban or military, on a local or international scale, in the present or past, include various specialists. Different specialists understand “conflict” and “landscape” in different terms, however, the historical distinction between “culture” and “nature” is an obvious dichotomy that can be traced in all of them. Generally, sometimes these two concepts come face to face to each other. This has been a matter of dispute for decades, as Simon Schama asserts, landscapes are culture before they are nature; they have been constructed by the imaginations which are reflected to woods, water and rocks (Adderley & Mills, 2014). This paper aims to examine the concept of “landscape of conflict” and its levels, in order to provide an initial framework for typology and mainstreaming the subsequent studies. That is why a distinction has been made between “landscape of conflict”, “landscape of defense”, and “landscape of war,” and many attempts have been made by scholars to specify their implicit and subjective boundaries and determining the amount of overlaps.

Hypothesis
The main hypothesis of this study claims that there are differences between “landscape of conflict” and “landscape of war” and therefore they should be examined separately. Conflict is not limited to a face-to-face military confrontation of the parties involved, and that is why the landscape of conflict is not limited to the “battlefield”. The typology proposed in this article is based on the process of landscape formation (produces and reproduces) and makes a type of “process-oriented” classification between landscape and conflict. The current hypothesis contends that unlike other classifications, process-oriented typology is more definable and its types are easier to evaluate.

Methodology
A qualitative strategy and a deductive approach were used in this paper. The data was obtained from reviewing body of published literatures, some written material sources and after classification it was labeled under new titles; finally, a basic foundation was provided for the proposed classification.

Typology of Relations between Landscape and War
Coming from Latin, the word conflict means quarrel, hostility, and discord. The history of contention can be traced back to the conflicts of Stone Age persisting until today. The word “conflict” is a noun and a verb and is related to ideas, interests, disagreements, and contradictions. Whereas, war is the stage of armed conflict between communities, unlike other types of struggle, war needs an active and organized enemy and involves intentional countermeasures by the parties involved. War is a collective phenomenon, usually serving the interests of a particular political group; and finally, war has legal characteristics that are managed by customary or formal rules (Gaston, 2008). Thus, war can be regarded as a simultaneous conflict between armed forces, popular sentiment, legal prejudices, and national cultures (Botol & Gaston, 1989, from Mazlum Khorasani, 2010: 173).

Looking at conflict through the eyes of landscapes, one faces some challenges when reading it. Through examination of the existing literature in this domain, a basic macro genealogy can be proposed; in these resources, two primary trends are identifiable from “landscape of conflict”; sometimes landscape is “the cause”, other times it is “the effect” of conflict. The struggle of communities for better, additional and suitable natural resources and opportunities has rendered landscape as the cause of most of historical and contemporary rivalries and battles. On the one hand, this argument that landscape also defines the social elements of battle, can be taken a step further, stating that landscape of meaning can be the subject of competition on its own (Snead, 2008). Hence, objective and subjective characteristics that exist in a landscape can be regarded as the cause behind formation of landscape of conflict. On the other hand, landscape can be the channel where the effects of actions and reactions of conflict occur and their face and nature is transformed or influenced. In this sense, landscape is the effect of the process of conflict. In fact, the living experience of mankind indicates that the simultaneous existence of both of these states is not far-fetched. A landscape can be “both cause and effect of a conflict”. In this case, the meaning of landscape is not the same “before” and “after” the conflict. Supporting, precautionary, defensive, social, cultural and even advertising measures are part of the landscape of conflict, and they influence a large region of the landscape geography. Therefore a set of definitions and classifications has been shaped about landscape and war, including:

- Landscape of Conflict: during a conference in Scotland in 2013, three categories of “landscape of conflict” were cautiously identified: A. The landscape resulting from the needs of communities to access resources. Here, the idea of traditional resources (such as water and minerals) has been extended toward infrastructural resources such as open areas used for wind energy supply. In this category, the concept of rights and interests are also important, which are the result of an ancient attitude regarding landscape as community. In this viewpoint, the rights of locale for collecting wild fruits in Sweden and/or the advantage of using geothermal energy or clean water resources in South Asia are significant. B. The landscape of conflict resulting from issues related to cultural identity, heritage, and “place” of landscape. In this category, heritage of medieval battles and heritage of searching for coal and mine in the past are
effective. C. The effect of military conflict on landscape, whether directly or through diverse ancillary activities, resulting from assembly, training, and expanding military power; though these cases themselves are not necessarily topics of war. Barracks of the Great Britain during the cold war of second half of the twentieth century in Rhine is a forgotten part of history and landscape of conflict. Another forgotten instance is the influence that military infrastructures exerted on the heritage and landscapes of their countries (Adderley & Mills, 2014).

- **Military Landscape**: what exactly constitutes a military landscape is a controversial subject. The basis for this naming is a specific definition of landscape, which through its declarative structure and characteristics reflects the effects of military activities, militarism, and militarization. Military landscaping can be strange and uncanny, shown in the complex, interconnected military landscapes, reflecting military demands for land appropriation, space for weapons testing, and alternative visualizations of airspace (Flintham, 2012). Military landscape is also the landscape of those structures that in military advantage show themselves in the format of urban forms, position of residential areas, and urban morphology. In addition, it can be understood and defined in the scale of persons, soldiers, and people. Landscapes of mourning and remembrance for past military events can also be understood as military landscapes (Woodward, 2014).
- **Virtual Military Landscape**: this type is the result of representation of landscape in computer and video games, which is the continuation of traditional approach to analysis of landscape that can be found in representations and reconstructions (Hoglund, 2008). Many military advisors and many military landscape imaginaries are engaged in virtual military landscape due to a vast commercial market. This includes representation of the news of military events and production of multimedia news by computer-generated imagery (Woodward, 2014).
- **Paramilitary Landscape**: non-governmental armed forces and private security forces have created a type of military landscape in the recent 20 years; examples include the visible changes brought to military bases, barracks and training areas. In such cases, landscapes affect the defense environment management of civilian regimes (Woodward, 2014). There are also paramilitary forces that work against central government, not for it. Distinguishing these forces in terms of military landscape, according to their fighting strategies and tactics, and geographical location is the subject of new questions that we are facing.
- **Post-military Landscapes**: are landscapes without a military function in the present but the imprints of their past military function still exists. There have been many attempts at reusing them, designing outdoor museums, playfields and parks around the world. Remnants of the First World War such as shelters, large holes caused by the explosion of mines, tanks, and so on have been converted into lakes and recreational and tourist attractions in a process of designing. Or they are dedicated to cultural centers (Lisa, 2012) and they are a place for war games for citizens.
- **Defensive Landscape**: these military landscapes deserve attention both because of their physical and geographical nature that in some cases result in finding the right position to defend, and because of the experience that the people of those areas possess (Larsen, 2004). Defensive landscape is the result of changing landscape in order to create defensive plans on the land, which includes defensive and other types of conflict, but not the military activities in places, where no conflicts exist (Philo, 2012). One of the problems with traditional analytics regarding fortifications in the beginning of the modern era is that its relationship to the surrounding landscape is not always taken into account, which results in defeat of civilian views related to these constructs (Portocarrero, 2011). Castles and fortresses thereof have been used in a variety of countries. There are numerous examples of this, particularly in Portugal. Several residential and military castles of the ancient Iran were built in natural strategic locations, remnants of most of which are still in place. But the military strategy of defense in the modern era was based on controlling or preventing the relocation of masses in the landscape by passive obstacles and military armament. In this point of view, war is defined not in wide open spaces and vast territories, but as isolated goals (specific locations that must be controlled or kept out of hands of enemies). For example, the threat of a Nazi attack on eastern and southern shores of the Great Britain during WWII was a factor for building a linear network of anti-invasion facilities, called 'stop line', in those locations (Pic. 1). Swiftly built, this defensive network, including concrete bunkers, artillery, barbed wire, and anti-tank bunker, had a tremendous effect on the coastal landscape, and its scattered remains that are stretched along the shores of Britain, require archeological actions and exploration of oral history of the people (Newsome, 2003).

**Proposed Typology of Dialectics of Landscape and Conflict**

Therefore, "landscape of conflict" is a broader concept that includes at least three landscapes: "pre-war landscape of conflict", "war landscape of conflict (landscape of war)", and "post- war landscape of conflict". If the tension between the parties involved lead to a physical confrontation and military engagement, then one can talk about "landscape of war". Formation of landscape of war at the final point and the height of engagement can be called "war landscape of conflict". Now, other types of base can be identified and classified. The proposed types are important in the
sense that sometimes, for any reason, the conflict might stop, leaving the landscape in a specific condition; in such cases the landscape needs identification and rating. What prompted the negligence of researchers in heritage of landscape of conflict lies in this method and criterion of “rating” landscape, which predictably pays attention to post-war and war landscape of conflict, mostly ignoring pre-war landscape of conflict and defensive landscape and putting less effort in their protection and veneration.

A. Pre-war Landscape of Conflict: pre-war landscape can exist both in support-lines, and shortly before hostilities. This landscape often includes a part of war area, which is known as the war zone. It is in these areas that military demands and laws are in force, and their influence transforms the landscape. This area is different from battleground, although it can turn into one. Barricades, tunnels and underground constructions and passive defense methods in these regions use landscape and its natural and
topological characteristics as an opportunity and power in order to support the battle. The transformations that occur in the landscape of these cities are also part of pre-war conflict. Environmental advertising, social events and related ceremonies and rituals are part of such landscapes in cities and villages. Given that defensive landscape is usually closer to the homeland and away from battleground, it is different from pre-war landscape of conflict; however, it is a subset of pre-war landscape.

B. War Landscape of Conflict (Landscape of War): this landscape that can also be called “battleground landscape” happens when it is formed under the direct influence of the phenomenon of war and is affected by reciprocal actions and reactions of the parties involved. The landscape of war persists as long as the war continues. The separation wall in occupied Palestinian territories is an example of urban landscape of war, holding the historical conflict of both parties on each side. Berlin wall, the main symbol of the Cold War, standing from 1961 until its fall in 1989, as the main symbol of the Cold War, was another type of landscape of war inside cities that not only socially and physically separated the citizens, but also included conflict and dispute of two political thoughts (Pic. 2).

C. Post-War Landscape of Conflict: is a landscape that has stopped changing since the external factor (war) has stopped (Pics. 3 & 4). This landscape has become the monument of war where parts of it are preserved as real documents for the future. These landscapes are seen as parts of the ruins of war time, most of which has been lost especially in urban regions through the process or renovation of war-torn areas, but over time they are seen as witnesses to war, worthy of preservation because of their narrative nature.
A set of warzones in Iran has become the host of tourists, called the travelers of light (Rahiyan-e Nour), from around the country, which is an example of such areas that can be regarded as a museum. Post-war landscape also includes shared and common memories of citizens (Muzaini & Yeoh, 2005). The condition of trees as signs of war, recorded in writings, memories, pictures, and posters of World War II, and also graphical signs warning people to keep away from the remaining minefields are all representation of post-war landscape of conflict.

**Conclusion** | Terminology of war and military landscape is very diverse, which is the sign of a burgeoning literature in research. In many cases, disagreement on method of using the terms has created some confusion over the meanings associated with concepts. This paper attempted to overcome some of those confusions by differentiating conflict and war. The landscape of conflict consists of four types of landscape that are defined based on realization of the external factors of ‘conflict’ from ‘war’. This type of landscape (especially defensive landscape) is sometimes a part of historical landscape or cultural landscape. However, landscape of conflict itself can be seen as an independent type of landscape that is ingrained in the past, present, and future of mankind. There are two important, but neglected, subjects for understanding the landscape of conflict; first is the method of ‘rating the landscape of conflict’, which needs textual and interdisciplinary approaches, which will lead to understanding and preserving the existing values, next one is ‘changeable ability’ of this type of landscapes in order to change from one type of landscape into another. For example,
war landscape of conflict can change into post-war landscape of conflict and/or post-war landscape of conflict can experience all of the types during the process of completion and evolution. In this sense, the final condition of landscape will be the frame of reference. However, given that landscape is a dynamic and evolving phenomenon, ‘continuous monitoring’ of landscape, for taking any necessary action, is essential for preservation of these landscapes. The next point is about production and reproduction of landscape of conflict. While war landscape and pre-war landscape of conflict acquire their primary form, or in a sense are ‘produced’, by elimination of the external factor, post-war landscape of conflict, in addition to production, can be ‘reproduced’ through various literary, cinematic, urban, memorial, and other forms and methods. In other words, post-war landscape of conflict, after the removal of war as a factor, can continue to live and affect in various formats and media, creating examples of such art styles and trends, changing the face of cities by graphics, mural, and statues, and acting in the memory of cities by change the names of streets, squares and urban highways or through holding various events and ceremonies. In fact, every kind of ‘reproduction’ of the landscape of conflict is part of post-war landscape of conflict.

Endnotes

* This paper is based on a research project titled “warscape and city” which was conducted by NAZAR research center.
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