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CONCLUSIONS

Työn teoreettisena pohjana käytetään ennen kaikkea Michel Foucault’n valtateoriaa sekä sosiaalipsykologian sosiaalisen konstruktionismin paradigmaa. Lisäksi kirjallisuudesta hyödynnetään mediatutkimusta sekä visuaalisen kommunikaation teorioita. Metodologiana käytetään lisäksi haastattelujia, kyselyitä ja havainnointia.

Foucault’n valtateorian keskiössä on valta suhteena eikä ominaisuutena, sekä sen erottamaton yhteys tietoon ja tiedon rakentumiseen. Näiden lähtökohtien valossa rakennetun ympäristön rooli instituutioiden vallankäytössä on kaksipuoleinen: se sekä kohdistaa konkreettista valtaa tilallisten rajoitteiden ja mahdollisuuksien kautta että tarjoaa instituution representaationa sen toisaalla käyttämälle vallalle legitimiteettiä luomalla instituutiosta tietynlaista julkusuuskuvaa. Yhteiskunnalliseen muutoksen vedoten, kyseisenä puolannan kuitenkin Foucault’n teorian kritiikittömän soveltamisen nykytodellisuudessa. Puolustusvoimien yhteiskunnallinen asema ei kuitenkaan nähdäkseni ole muuttunut sen arkkitehtuurin näky-
vyyden vähentyessä, sillä julkisuuskuvaa muokataan nykyään laajasti moin muin keinoin (erityisesti sosiaalinen media). Samoin arkkitehtuurin fyysinen asema vallankäytössä näyttää säilyneen ennallaan. Sen sijaan arkkitehtuurin yhteiskunnallinen rooli ja merkitys on vähentynyt esitettyjen yhteiskunnallisten muutosten myötä (liikenne, media, elämäntapa, teknologia).

Pyrin myös avaamaan keskustelua arkkitehdin ja rakennustaitteen keinoista vaikuttaa niin sosiaalisin, hallinnollisiin, kulttuurisiin kuin yhteiskunnallisiin-kin arvoihin ja tapoihin. Rakennetun ympäristön visuaalis-psykologisista vaikutuskeinoista ei olla nykyisellään tarpeeksi tietoisia, jotta omaan ajattelun ja toimintaan vaikuttavat tahot pystyttäisiin ymmärtämään ja niiden välittämät arvot ja toimintamallit käsittelemään kriittisesti. Lopputuloksena arkkitehtuurilla vaikutetaan ihmisiin heidän itse sitä tietämättään, ja usein jopa valtaa käyttävienkään sitä ymmärtämättä. Asiaa ehdotetaan ratkaistavaksi arkkitehtien koulutuksen sekä yhteiskunnallisen osallistumisen kautta.
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ABSTRACT

In this work I discuss the transformation of the societal power-status of the Finnish Defense Forces as the function of military architectures’ s visibility between 1917-2017. The goal of the study is to address, how architecture and its existing visibility as a part of societal reality and transformation is affecting the national power status of an institution—in this case the Finnish Military Forces.

The main research questions are (1) How does architecture affect the power status of an institution inside a society and what is the role of an overall visibility in this relation? (2) Are the traditionally accepted theories concerning architecture as communication still essentially valid in the transformed societal conditions, where everything from transportation to maintaining of social relationships has drastically changed along with technological development? (3) And ultimately how conscious planners and users are of their rights and responsibilities concerning the conveyed power-relation in built environment?

As a theoretical base I use the studies of Michel Foucault and the social constructivist paradigm of social-psychology. Also media research and visual communication theories are applied here. The main methods include interviews, surveys, observations and existing literature.

In the core of Foucault’s power theory is power a relation, not as an attribute and its inseparable connection to knowledge and its construction. Based on these, the role of built environment in regard to the execution of power is twofold: it simultaneously targets power through spatial restrictions and possibilities, and creates legitimacy to the institution of which the building is a representation of. However, due to the dramatic societal transformation of past few decades, I question the uncritical application of Foucault’s theories to modern society. It seems, though, that the societal role of Finnish Defense Forces has not changed in relation to the decline of architectural visibility, as their public image is being created widely in other medias (especially social media). As well, the physical role of architecture as the conveyor of power has not changed. Instead, the societal role and meaning of architecture seems to have decreased
due to the presented societal changes (transportation, media, lifestyle, technology).

The thesis aims to open discussion concerning the possibilities of an architect and architecture to affect the social, cultural, governmental and societal values and traditions. Architecture’s visual-psychological means are generally insufficiently acknowledged, which prohibits the possibilities of an individual to assess the actors affecting one’s behavior and emotions. As a result architecture is being used to convey power often without planners and users even being aware of it. The issue is being proposed to be corrected through the education and societal participation of architects.
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Architecture is communication—they say. Architecture conveys power and reinforces dominance—they say. Architecture shapes us—they say. But what they do not say is, how.

Symbols of power surround us in diverse areas of public life. They are present from curbs to grand monuments, creating concrete expressions of abstract concepts, such as churches for religion, shopping centers for economy and parliament buildings for democracy. As these abstractions are translated from solidities into ideas, they powerfully dominate the collectively accepted and adopted beliefs, traditions and discourses concerning the hierarchy and structure of social affairs. Similarly is the abstract concept of defense forces realized in military architecture.

Architecture has traditionally been recognized as a part of the realization and emphasis of power and dominance (Höfler 2016, 9; 29). However, in the modern architectural practice these kind of connections and meanings seem to have been widely denied and replaced with purely objective, functionalist and visually impressive attributes of architecture. While, quite paradoxically, the relationship between built environment and its users is highly treasured and emphasized. The contradiction here ultimately arises from the fact, that essentially there is a power-relation in every relationship. (Foucault 1977, 27; 177; Foucault 1998, 93). And especially the relationship between a ruler and an individual—the one exercising the power and the one on whom it is exercised—has been in the core of architecture throughout its history. (Foucault 1977, 171-172; Sudjic 2005, 3).

With this study I wish firstly to address the ways visual and environmental practices of architecture serve the institutional conventions, and how an institution actually uses buildings as tools to affect people—in other words, to use its power. And secondly, to open discussion concerning the means of built environment and the possibilities of a single architect to affect the social, governmental, societal and cultural values, norms and habits in various levels of action—in order to challenge some possibly outdated traditions and paradigms and to promote more desirable ones.
In the following pages, I will also try to answer the vast how question concerning the interaction between people and architecture, posed in the very beginning, by seeking the answers from various fields of study. However, quite soon it will become evident that the answer is by no means absolute. The interdependence between built environment and people is mediated through the prevailing societal reality, which is definitely not a stable or unambiguous structure. The ways society changes, inevitably transforms the ways we perceive our environment both physically and conceptually—which then affects the way we design, build and behave. In this complex interaction there are countless variables and societal sectors that all play a role in the entity. However, due to the length of the study, only the most crucial of them in terms of architecture are taken into consideration here. They are presented and analyzed in a compressed manner in the context of Finnish military architecture, Finnish society and their interplay in establishing the power status of Finnish Defense Forces nationally and internationally in the transforming societal reality between 1917 and 2017.

The main research problem, I am dealing here with is, how architecture and its existing visibility as a part of societal reality and transformation is affecting the national power status of an institution—in this case the Finnish Military Forces.

This requires discussing issues deeply intertwined with several levels of society and consequently several fields of study. Therefore, the thesis can be seen covering four main entities: the visual-psychological construction of power, architecture as communication, Finnish Defense forces as a part of national and international relations, and societal change in terms of urban life, transportation, ways of living, values and media. This is why the structure of the study is divided into three sections, each discussing the entity from a specific viewpoint.

Something, too, to be noted here are the choices and confinements made concerning the theoretical paradigms. Firstly, from all of the philosophical schools, I am using the foucauldian tradition to define and analyze power-
relations inside the society. Secondly, I rely on the social constructivist paradigm of social-psychology to argue for the findings. And lastly, from the field of architecture, I have chosen to use the generally under studied genre of military architecture as an example and subject of application.

These are mandatory choices naturally creating exclusions, but which of I am aware of, and will deal with in the *Possible critique and action plan* part. However, I feel it is important to explicitly acknowledge this positioning of my work in the intersection of vast amount of variables and factors, in order to be able to read the study, as it was written: as an opener for free discussion and conscious argumentation, not as a finished theory or ultimate truth.

The main research questions, that I wish to provide some comprehensive answers to are the following: (1) How does architecture affect the power status of an institution inside a society and what is the role of an overall visibility in this relation? (2) Are the traditionally accepted theories concerning architecture as communication still essentially valid in the transformed societal conditions, where everything from transportation to maintaining of social relationships has drastically changed along with technological development? (3) And ultimately how conscious planners and users are of their rights and responsibilities concerning the conveyed power-relation in built environment?

The main methods used to give answers to the research questions include interviews, surveys, observations and existing literature. Through them, I seek to provide a comprehensive and synthetic overview of indirect power-relations, built environment and the changes in lifestyle and perception in relation to the status of Finnish Defense Forces in the Finnish society. As a material and a concrete implementation I am using the building stock of the Finnish Military Forces built during Finland’s independence.

As mentioned, the thesis is divided into three sections; *Architecture as a means of power*, *The independent Finnish military architecture* and *Time to rethink Foucault*. To make the work as approachable as possible for professionals of any discipline, each section is written so that it can be understood as a
separate unity. However, best understanding is naturally reached when they are all seen as an entity and supplementing each other. Therefore I courage everyone to explore each section, despite its possible seemly familiarity or unfamiliarity.

The first section of the thesis presents the theory base for the entire study. It explains the traditional and prevailing perception of architecture as a tool for conveying power in the society based on the French philosopher Michel Foucault’s power theory and social constructivist paradigm of social sciences. It discusses the role and responsibility of an architect and the multidimensional effects built environment has on people as individuals and as groups from a philosophical and social-psychological point of views. The notion of architecture as communication is dealt through traditional visual communication theories, and in the end of the first part, there is also a chapter explaining the methodology and basic preconditions of the study.

The second part introduces some of the central material, ergo physical, Finnish military construction projects and built environments between 1917-2017. This part is divided in two sections based on the construction activity of the Defense Forces. As exemplary cases between 1920s-1940s I have chosen to present the Santahamina Military Academy, Töölö car-company garrison and Niinisalo Lamella barrack. From the more recent building stock, between 1950s-2010s, Säkylä garrison, Vekaranjärvi garrison and Santahamina House are introduced. The projects are linked to the concurrent societal circumstances as relevant. Hence, this chapter will give the theories a context, a grip to the realty and walk the reader through the building stock of Finnish Defense Forces and hopefully help to adapt to the application of the previously mentioned theories in practice.

The third section discusses the societal transformation affecting the visibility of architecture from transportation’s, technological development’s and media’s point of views. It poses the question “Do the prevailing social and societal reality respond to the supposed basis of traditional theories concerning the role of architecture in terms of power-relations?”. This question is contemplat-
ed in relation to Foucault’s theories on power and knowledge. The final section of this part is then the analysis; the final mash up of all the above; the theory and concreteness. It addresses the problematics of applying the centuries old theories of architecture as medium and mediator of power into the prevailing society, where ways of living and overall mentality are far from the circumstances of the times when these ideas were originally presented. It also discusses the possible critique and gives some concrete proposals concerning the established issues with the final discussion being divided under subject specific topics: user, architect, the Finnish Defense Forces, architecture and society.

I wish this thesis succeeds to point out the fundamental issue between architectural planning and social reality, and hopefully raise wider discussion over it. Simultaneously I aim to raise awareness to the often disregarded part of architecture—thus military architecture—, and to encourage everyone—professional or not— to take a bit more pervasive look at their environments in their everyday life.
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ARCHITECTURE AS A MEANS OF POWER
In this first part, I will point out how spaces and buildings work as mediators of power; creating and enforcing statuses—legitimate or not. And furthermore; how do they function in emotional and cognitive ways and on conscious and subconscious levels. The main interest concerning the interaction between human and built environment here is the power-relation, and how its representations are often overlooked or unseen by the user and planner. The following will also briefly explain the main concepts and methods used in this research to theorize power and the relationship between people and built environment.

Michel Foucault’s take on power

As a theoretical base for discussing power in built environment, I use the studies of a French philosopher Michel Foucault. According to Foucault, power is profoundly a relation, and not an attribute. Hence, power should be interpreted more as a strategy than a property—it is exercised rather than possessed. Consequently power is not assumed from top down; from the dominant class upon the dominated class, but power (Foucault 1977, 26-27; Lemert & Gillan 1982, 136.) To put simply, a power-relation is ultimately a set of possible relations between interacting forces, which all constitute of unique elements, dispositions, maneuvers, tactics, techniques and functions. It is at the same time absolutely indiscreet, since it supervises the very ones who are entrusted of supervising, and discreet, for it functions permanently and widely unnoticed. (Foucault 1977, 26; 177.)

The decision to use only Michel Foucault’s power-theory is naturally a subject of possible critique. But to me, the foucauldian tradition of assessing power extensively as a dynamic relation between people, institutions, discourses, practices and knowledge represents the kind of thinking that makes it possible
to evaluate the power-relations created by architecture and built environment. Therefore, in order to fully understand the viewpoint this research takes, it is crucial to see power as an overall effect of the strategic positions of the dominant class, not as an acquired or preserved feature of it.

Foucault also challenges the concepts of *causality* and *continuity* in traditional history. According to him, this is essential in order to be able to step outside the traditional and customary practices, which are ultimately integral part of creating and enforcing power-relations and statuses in build environment. In short, working between the *Annales* school and Bachelard, Foucault states a materialist critique of metaphysical history; of histories which assume a causal relation between great men, great civilizations or great events, or alternatively, assume a meaningful continuity founded in some transcendental subjects. Therefore, Foucault perceives history as “that which transforms documents into monuments”. (Foucault 1969, 3-10.) Consequently Foucault notes that historical documents are too often transformed into a stiff monumental text and related to other texts, and not interpreted as a manifestation of human intentions (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 11).

This seems to be a typical paradigm in architectural discourses and practices too: built environments are often concisely perceived only as linear parts of historical and stylistic continuums, products of their time and planners. What is neglected, is the role of discontinuity: its transition from an obstacle into a working concept. (Foucault 1969, 9). In terms of Foucault: if any long-term phenomenon would reduce the unjustified privilege of the human in history, it would be an event as discontinuity or rupture. It only is capable of preventing structures from emerging as unidirectional determinants of human action (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 13). This highlights the typical need to see continuums and logic in places where it does not belong. Simultaneously it helps sustaining the prevailing traditions, practices and relations of power; as they are seen as justified parts of the linear development and overall coherent continuum. Discontinuity is not a general concept, but a working tool that helps to challenge the existing behavior and state of affairs. Therefore, discontinuities themselves can only be analyzed concretely with respect to a field of events to which they
belong and which they sometimes transform or reverse. (Foucault 1980, 112.)

What then are the forces and relations which allow us, from time to time, to observe and recognize regularities in the variance of the historical world? Foucault tackles the problem without relying neither on the essence of rules nor on the empiricism of statistical averages. In stead, between the two extremes of overly structural and overly positivistic histories, Foucault aims to explain the apparent consistency through concrete practices. (Foucault 1977, 297.)

Deriving from the thought of Foucault, practice in architecture is not architecture or built environment as such, but something among the practices of institutional power-relations and ideals that lead to the manifestation of them. Therefore practices are not abstractions. In their concreteness, they are not arbitrary, accidental effluents of free motives, but regulated. Practices are not regulated by the enforcing power rules, nor by the inner control of knowledge, they are regulated by power and knowledge; both simultaneously. Hence, both power and knowledge rule and regulate. For Foucault, practices are therefore neither articulations of knowledge, nor epiphanies of power relations. (Foucault 1977, 293.)

Foucault uses the concept of discourse widely in his production. However, as well as the whole production of Foucault, also the concept of discourse has various tones and accents from publication or statement to another. Discourses, defined by Foucault, are ways of constituting knowledge together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power-relations which belong to the knowledges and relations between them (Weedon, 1987, 108). Concurrently, they are also a form of power that circulates in the social field and can attach to strategies of domination as well as those of resistance (Diamond & Quinby, 1988, 185). They are therefore, to be ultimately interpreted as forms of order and inclusion/exclusion of statements. These derive essentially from enunciative modalities, meaning a certain institutional conditions of knowledge within which it is possible for statements to appear. (Hirst 1993, 52-53.) In other words, someone needs to be in a particular state to be able to make statements characteristic of definitive discursive formations.
According to Foucault, a document is a practice of discourse and produced by the same conflicts and struggles which have produced all social practices, like those in architecture or social interaction. Hence, they can only be read at their limit; only by reconstructing the regulating forces which produced them in the first place. The space between practices and rules, is therefore the space in which social relations determine what can and cannot be said in a discourse. (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 37-38.) Power is, thus, exercised within discourses in the ways in which they constitute and govern individual subjects (Weedon 1987, 113).

Put into the context of built environment, a building is fundamentally a document. Documents are visible and perceivable, whereas practices are regulated by specific relations at a specific time, in which relations are the regulating and regularizing forces of society. Therefore, the above mentioned societal regulation is responsible for both imposing of forces prohibiting certain practices and a grid of forces included in practices. (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 39.) In simple terms, society—and architecture as an inseparable part of it—does not just rule out certain practices, but it works because the actors accept and maintain, in their actions, what is known to be acceptable action. Hence, power excludes what is not to be said, and it selects what is to be said—as built environment dictates what is to be done and in what terms. Similarly, knowledge is about that which is excluded and which is said. As practices they are both only understandable by means of the concrete historical conditions that rule and regulate, exclude and include what is to be done or said. (Foucault 1977, 176.)

**Power-knowledge in built environment**

Intuitively, practices are visible, but rules are not. Is power then visible or not?

According to Foucault, rules are not the action of society on actors, but the conditions within which action takes place. Power, thereby, is not rule imposition, but practices, as well as knowledge, which is not a passive attribute of social competence, but practices too. Power, because it cannot be separated
from knowledge, is both that which dominates and that which selects: because it is practiced it is visible, because it regulates it is not clearly visible. (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 39.) Therefore Foucault has established the term power-knowledge, in which I will base the majority of the theoretical part of my thesis. Therefore, in order to explain practices central to planning of and behaving in built environments, the regulating effect of the so called power-knowledge must be described.

For Foucault, power and knowledge are not seen as independent entities but inextricably related: knowledge is always an exercise of power and power always a function of knowledge. Power, hence, reproduces knowledge by shaping it in accordance with its unknown intentions, and creates and recreates its own fields of exercise through knowledge. What is important to note, is that both power and knowledge, for Foucault, are decentralized, relativistic, ubiquitous, and dynamic social phenomena and therefore power-knowledge is perceived simultaneously as productive as well as constraining. Thus, power-knowledge does not only set limits for our behavior, but also provides new ways of acting, thinking and feeling. (Foucault 1998, 98-99.)

In terms of power-knowledge, the real and fundamental conflicts of history are not the great events, but those that extended throughout the levels of a social formation. They are the conflicts created and conveyed in daily talk, in communiqués and messages, in orders, in orders denied, in rumor, and so on. (ibid, 41.) Therefore, discourses are produced both directly and indirectly by discursive practices, technical processes, institutions, patterns of general behavior, forms of transference and pedagogical forms which at one, impose and maintain them (Foucault 1971, 200). Due to this multidimensionality and layered character of discourse, knowledge and power formation and transformation, all dimensions of society do not change uniformly at once. (Foucault 1977, 138; Lemert & Gillan 1982, 41).

For instance in the in the early 17th century a soldier was seen as someone who could be recognized from afar; a lively, alert manner, an erected head, broad shoulders, long arms and thick thighs—to name a few characteristics.
However, by the 18th century, the soldier had become something that can be made: an unqualified body could be gradually corrected into a machine required. (Foucault 1977, 135.) Similarly, the change from power that was visible as the king’s body and necessary for the functioning of the monarchy—not metaphorically, but physically—, to the body of society, which needs to be protected, became the new principle in the 19th century (ibid, 55). Power was no longer identified with an individual who possesses or exercises it by right of birth, but as a machinery that no-one owns. (ibid, 156.) Hence, power is currently perceived to function through knowledge and subjectification: self-governance by which the individuals turn themselves as subjects for collective normalizing power. (Foucault 1982, 212.)

This leads Foucault stating that our society is the society of discipline; the society of space. In our era everything and everyone needs to know and have their own place and space. Here he brilliantly explains the western society’s obsessional urge to classification, hierarchy and status: In the beginning there is always the physical reality, for example the actual place for men to learn to wage war, that is followed by an abstract concept, in this case military institution. And in between of this kind of evolution from actual to abstract is knowledge. (Foucault 1984, 97.)

The above is also closely tied to Foucault’s concept of dispositive, which in general refers to the dynamics of the thoroughly heterogeneous entity consisting of institutional, architectonic, discursive and administrative mechanisms, knowledge structures, philosophical, moral and scientific propositions, said and un-said. In short: a system of relations that can be established between these elements—discursive and non-discursive traditions—, which of enhance and maintain the exercise of power inside a society. (Foucault 1980, 194-195.)

Here the term dispositive is used to refer and describe the heterogeneous entity, which consists of not only the Finnish Defense Forces as an institution, but also of the discourses, architectonic arrangements, laws, administrative procedures, scientific dictums and philosophical and moral arguments attached to them. Simply put, dispositive is a social net that forms between all this said
The change in power-relations Fouault has described.
and non-said. (Foucault 1977, 299). Similarly to Foucault, I shall here use the term to conceptualize and highlight the entity of strongly intertwined traditions and their relationships in both architectural and societal practices and discourses.
Social-Psychological Effects of Architecture

Urban planning plays an important part in our emotions and behavior. Buildings and spaces between them enrich or enervate our lives, affecting how we perceive, think and feel. How houses, public buildings, streets and parks look and how they are arranged therefore matter—not only aesthetically, but socially and psychologically (Keedwell 2017, 7-8). People arguably prefer certain aspects of architecture over others, but developers often build based on the interests of commerce (ibid, 9). This is why it is up to us planners and users to make sure that built environments work for us. But how? If only motive was enough to cause behavior, it would be quite simple. But this is unfortunately not the case. We need knowledge and power to accompany.

Michel Foucault’s historical studies are therefore exemplary efforts to create some distance to the practices that dictate our thinking, affect our behavior and imperceptibly construe both our thoughts and perceptions (Foucault 1978, 540). This perception of culturally and historically tied, pervasive affect of society on an individual works as a contact surface to some of the shared views of main social-psychological paradigms concerning social cognition, socialization, attitudes and behavior regulation. In the following I shall suggest interpretations concerning the social functions of architecture. However, it should not be perceived as an attempt to build a solid theory, but more of an interpretation among many other possible ones.
Power as socially negotiated environment

Architecture is traditionally seen as the unification of technology, artistic creativity and functionality, where ideological manifestations and culturohistorical indications are joined together in a concrete and tangible manner. Images of control and ownership of public space have a great impact in conducting social, political and cultural affairs in everyday societal life. The significance of this for the collective, cultural and social consciousness and societal values and norms should therefore not be underestimated. Otherwise we are facing the typical phenomenon of last few centuries, where architecture is being detached from its holistic function and background. Which in turn, has led to a situation where architecture is perceived superficially as a system pointing only at itself; a system which of values, content and meaning rise from the system itself and not the society around it. (Perez-Gomez 1990, 4).

To support this view of socially negotiated reality and practices—immediately related to the use of power—there are several well-known studies inside the social constructivist paradigm of social-psychology. They include among others Lev Vygotski’s Social Development Theory (1930) and Serge Moscovici’s Social Representation Theory (1966). In general, social constructivism emphasizes that all cognitive functions from thinking to driving a car are dependent on interactions with others and therefore socially negotiable.

This perception of the character of power and authority is also supported by the traditional study of the history of architecture. For instance, strict pacing, magnification, pure exaggeration of buildings and tight controlling of masses have been widely used to ”naturally” emphasize the architectonic experience of a single person in a manner advantageous to the one using the power (Höfler et al. 2016, 9). However, studies on this matter seem to settle for stating noting more about this causality.

Architecture as functional background

Symbols of power surround us in diverse areas of public life. From seemingly
insignificant street signs and restricted areas to grand monuments and great buildings. Concrete expressions of abstract conceptions are regularly translated from these solidities into ideas, for the most part unconsciously. Images of control and ownership of public space in everyday life have great significance in the conduct of social, societal, political, cultural and economical affairs. They dominate our generally accepted beliefs, attitudes and perception concerning the overall and detailed order of things. (Kapferer 2012, 1.)

For example, as one moves through and around one’s work and leisure places, memorials, and construction sites or military bases, one rarely pauses to contemplate the symbolic or cultural meanings nor the evolutionary or biological magnitude of these spaces. In stead, one takes the fact of their actual forms for granted; simply operating on the epistemological unconscious. Foucault uses epistemes to describe the set of basic and fundamental assumptions underlying the configuration of knowledge in that given period of time. Epistemes are, so to say, so obvious, that they are often invisible to people operating within them. (Foucault 1980, 197.) Therefore the physical and psychological responses to these culturally, symbolically, biologically and evolutionally charged spaces and places are simply ignored in conscious level, and therefore become merely an unquestionable quality and content of it. This is why, it would be important to recognize the factors of the surrounding environment influencing one’s behavior, such as decision making, actions and emotions.

The above also demonstrates the force of so called social imaginary, a fundamental concept in understanding the conception, formulation, design, and cultural accumulation—the imagining—of institutions and social constructions that are manifested in the built environment consciously and unconsciously; intentionally and unintentionally. Power and its aestheticization in various forms of representation and technical construction both embody and transform the dimensions of the socio-political orders in which they ultimately achieve their expression. This dimension of built environment as an integral and interactive part of the cultural and social reality is in many respects active in constituting both the way the environment and space is perceived and the
kinds of conception that are regenerated in their presence. (Kapferer, 1.) This leads to the responsibility of a planner to actively contemplate the visual and spatial messages embedded in the construction.

Before the 18th century architecture corresponded to the need to make power, divinity and might manifested. Its development was for long based on these requirements. But in the late 18th century new needs arise: it becomes a question of using the disposition of space for economic-political ends. This leads to a specific type of architecture, where the previously undifferentiated space gradually becomes specified and functional. This development of assigned functions sets norms and fixes the whole morality and behavior of dwellers and users in these spaces, which in turn translates into all-encompassing transformation of a mindset and discursive practices. (Foucault 1980, 124; 148-149.)

However, military architecture as representation of the armed forces and the state should not be misinterpreted as the direct exercise of power by these institutions. Accordingly to the power-theory presented above, space certainly affects people and indirectly directs power on the users, but does not work in the same way as subjectification of individuals or normalizing or power in Foucault’s social theories. Buildings work merely as representations of their institutions and thus build legitimacy to the actual social execution of power somewhere else.

Architecture as visual signs

The emeritus professor of communication theory in University of Illinois, Donald Ragsdale, has established an interesting theory concerning architecture as concrete and coherent visual language. In his works he has extended some of the most universal communication process theories outside the traditional speech dimension and analytically applied them to architecture.

Ragsdale has used the semiotic system of Charles S. Pierce (Buechler 1955) as adapted by Paul Messaris (1997) to provide a typology of visual signs. The orig
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inal division of Messaris does not, however, make it possible to assess the difference between discursive and non-discursive visual signs. Therefore, Ragsdale has introduced a term *discursive sign* to refer anything with a clear parallel in language (such as relics or frescos) and *non-discursive sign* in the case of intended representation of something more abstract (such as the use of color, space or light). Another distinction that is especially significant and useful in describing the differences between discursive and non-discursive visual signs, is the division between central and peripheral processing of a visual sign. Here, central processing involves deliberative thought about the content of a message, while peripheral processing is more impressionistic. Hence, the discursive ones could be placed on a level with central processing and non-discursive ones with peripheral processing. (Ragsdale 2011, 2-3.)

It is also interesting to make a notion about the situations where one is acting on peripheral or central processing of certain visual signs. I guess, everyone might relate to the fact, that when moving around in familiar places one rarely stops to deliberately contemplate the surrounding visual strategies or signs—unless they are strikingly impractical or unsafe. Whereas, when on a vacation or in other ways new place and space, one often consciously assesses and explores one’s environment—hence, uses central processing.

While parts of some buildings may be discursive, architecture is probably best conceived as a non-discursive visual sign and in most cases processed peripherally. Visual literacy, or architecture in this case, requires an awareness of both the fundamental elements of visual communication and the ways in which these components may be put together. Through conjoining these components—such as color, texture, shape, scale and direction—, it is possible to create various effects, or complete *visual communication strategies*. Majority of these strategies are certainly familiar to any architect; Balance—Instability, Symmetry—Asymmetry, Regularity—Irregularity, Simplicity—Complexity, Boldness—Subtlety, Depth—Flatness and Sequentiality—Randomness. (Dondis 1973, 111-121.) But to my mind, too rarely explicitly analyzed from any other than aesthetic point of view.
In the following chapter I shall present some arguments supporting this claim and both consequences and possible remedies of this kind of one-sided practice.

**Architect constructing power**

As Winston Churchill has famously stated in 1944: “We shape our buildings, and afterwards, our buildings shape us.” (O'Toole 2007, 161). The quote highlights how a building is first of all a result of the realization of architect’s ideas, but over time, after the building has been occupied, people who live and work in it take the quality of the buildings into their actions and integrate that to the society. This is what makes planning built environment such a delicate profession: to find the *caesura*\(^1\) which would enable the culture affect architecture, which then would affect culture to develop into the desired direction. Since after all, there is no architecture unless it is occupied by people; there are no cities unless people inhabit them (Barber 2017). But as soon as people do occupy the environment, it affects them and they affect the whole of society.

On the other hand, one of the fundamental features of architecture is its ability to offer shelter. This is the original function of a single building and through collaboration and synergy benefits, the original function of a city. They both offer possibilities to produce, distribute and to survive. But at the same time they always set boundaries for the very same survival. Nowadays, it would be more suitable to describe architecture as offering possibilities of doing something inside the covers of a specifically designated building or space. However, simultaneously it inevitably rules out possibilities. Already Foucault has noted this and stated that from the big scale communal strategies to minute decisions of interior design, a whole history remains to be written of *spaces*—which would at the same time be the history of powers (Foucault 1980, 149). Already where the walls are and which is the way out are in many ways the preconditions of everyday life. Hence, simply walls, doors and windows express an extre-

\(^1\)Caesura as used by Walter Benjamin is an instance of critical power that prevents the parts and levels that it is dividing from becoming mixed. A caesura keeps them simultaneously separated and together. (Benjamin 2005, 21.)
mely strong and concrete act of power. But who is using the power? Is this power-relation recognized by the user? Or the planner? Is it too close? Too self-evident to even question?

As Foucault has put it: “In order to resist, we need to realize”. (Foucault 1977, 72) So, as indicated above, in general there is little questioning that structures and buildings are communicative and even persuasive (Ragsdale 2009a; 2009b). But interestingly, buildings are not the ones analogous to a speaker in the process of communication, but the architect (Ragsdale 2011, 2). But how aware of this are we as planners or users?

Power in built environment is established in countless forms and levels of representational constructions. However, they do not declare what they are or how they are to be interpreted; rather, their potency draws force from engaging perceivers into an interactive, dynamic and mutually participatory act (Kapferer 2012, 2). This encapsulates the essential difference between architecture and art; the difference between the responsibility of an artist and that of an architect; the role of architecture as unavoidable art.

On top of architecture’s role as an unavoidable background, its permanent nature gives architecture the power for its message or messages to be repeated again and again across the ages in various contexts. Architects should, therefore, be more aware of their creations and their undeniable effect on people, social relations, cultural traditions and societal values and traditions. As Leland M. Roth writes in Understanding Architecture:

“Every moment, awake or asleep, we are in buildings, around buildings, in spaces defined by buildings, or in landscapes shaped by human artifice. It is possible to take deliberate steps to avoid looking at painting, sculpture, drawings, or any of the other visual arts, but architecture constantly touches us, shapes our behavior, and conditions our psychological mood.” (Roth 1993, 1.)

Architects are obviously very aware of this omnipotent and comprehensive character of built environment, but what Roth states later on in his book is
something that I feel is rarely truly acknowledged:

“Architecture is shelter, but it is also symbol and a form of communication. . . . [and] is a physical representation of human thought and aspiration, a record of the beliefs and values of the culture that produces it” (ibid, 141).

We might ’know’ this, but how often do we actually acknowledge it—especially in the context of power-relations? The purely aesthetic appearance or economical boundaries of a building or a space seem to overrule the psychological, communicative and cultural meanings too easily. This is where the issue seems to lie: architects are not genuinely aware of the effects their constructions have on individual people and societal entities such as economical, cultural and political discourses and practices.

Therefore it seems to become relevant to ask, what is knowledge and what it means to know something? Is it enough that one understands what is being taught or should one be able to critically assess the soundness and meaning of it? Should one be aware of how his/her intellectual convictions rooted in the society and its power structures? Does one need to know what are the constants he/she is operating on in terms of arguments, values, knowledge and ideals?

The strong master-apprentice tradition inside architectural community might have something to do with this practice of traditions. As the master-apprentice setting is based on passing on the prevailing ways of thinking, talking, perceiving, valuation and practicing of the profession, it does not offer the students or young professionals a genuine possibility to independently evaluate the taught material in a wider frame of society, its possible social, psychological, ethic or such other issues. If students are socialized in a manner that prohibits them to develop the cognitive and social dimensions of their psyche that would allow them to contemplate the value charged meanings and worldviews related to their professional or personal position, traditions and knowledge, the consequences are far visible in various contexts and levels inside society. (Puolimatka 1995, 138-140).
THE INDEPENDENT FINNISH MILITARY ARCHITECTURE
Military architecture is often perceived as a narrow field only covering fortifications and castles. However, in the following military architecture is considered to include all of the building stock constructed for military use—let it be political, practical, national or international. I shall also consider the Finnish military architecture as a separate unit of Finnish architecture tradition due to its provably distinguished features (Mäkinen 2000).

Each country has unique defense forces, that directly affect the perception of that particular country’s domestic and foreign policy. The perception of the defense forces, for one, is communicated nationally and internationally by the quality of weaponry, level of education and the amount of troops and their reliability. (Kronlund 1988, 47-48.) Consequently, it is also affected by ideological and political views, media relations, competitions, publications and building stock—to name a few. (ibid, 508.)

**Building white Finland (1917-1950)**

After the emancipation of Finland in 1917 and the civil war between 1917-1918, the young state started to make alignments to develop its independent armed forces. The winning white side led the development of Finnish Defense Forces by following the model of Western European military forces. This application of international architecture influence into Finnish conditions is concretized especially in the construction projects conducted between 1930s and 1960s, but is visible throughout the building stock of Defense Forces. (Terä & Tervasmäki 1973, 28; Halila et al. 1967, 77; Kronlund 1988, 47-48.)
In 1918 the Finnish troop locations were mainly set by the available barracks and old Russian garrisons (Kronlund 1988, 508). The buildings were widely in bad shape, due to the simple and ascetic planning and building, constant relocating of Finnish troops and negligent attitude of Russian revolutionists (ibid, 514). In the beginning, the buildings were repaired only superficially by the troops themselves. Therefore, the main issue concerning the Finnish military building stock was not the amount, but the condition. As a partial answer the state set up an office to be responsible for the building of new garrisons in 1919. (ibid, 265.)

The gradual stabilizing of state conditions led to several complaints concerning the bad shape of the barracks, but the repair budget was simply diminutive until the end of 1930s (ibid, 514). Only few building projects were executed by the Defense Forces during the 1920s. They were mainly spaces for newly established troops units, such as air forces. (ibid, 508).

However, when setting the operative plans for Finnish army in 1938, it very soon became clear that the existing building stock did not enable adequately distinct focus for the peacetime troops to be created. Decision to build new garrisons to the Karelian Isthmus was quickly made and the garrisons of Kiveniemi, Jaakkima and Viipuri were soon established. New barracks were also built in Helsinki, Tuusula, Lappeenranta, Imatra and Koria during this period. (ibid, 515.)

In the following, I shall give a brief overview of some of the most notable construction projects of Finnish Military Forces from 1930s to the 21st century, these include Helsinki car-company garrison (1934), Niinisalo Lamella barrack (1935), Santahamina Military Academy (1939), Säkylä garrison (1966), Vekaranjärvi garrison (1975) and Santahamina House (2015). In addition to the architectonic facts, I will try to demonstrate the main societal and economical reasons affecting the projects and their final outcome.
Helsinki car-company garrison

Helsinki car-company garrison was planned by architect Martta Martikainen in 1934 and located in central Helsinki. The building was finished the next year. (Mäkinen 2000, 96.) The barrack represents typical 1930s functionalism with white plastered facades and cylindrical forms. The economical aspect is visible among other thing in the small windows, which were easier to replace than bigger ones if necessary. (Niemi 1934, 341-342.)

The building constituted of two rectangular wings with a connecting mass. The barrack was side aisle based and curved from Mechelininkatu to Hesperiankatu forming a rounded corner. The staircase is expressed in the exterior with vertical window ribbons and the horizontal movement of the side aisle with horizontal ribbon windows. The verticallity of the staircase in the Hesperiankatu side of the building is furthermore emphasized with a flagpole, that has stylized lion and helmet themes and an emblem on it. The function of the building is definitely not left unclear. (Mäkinen 2000, 97).

The car-company barrack is clearly inspired by the movement of cars and people: when cars move, they need rounded shapes, whereas the movement of the staff needed straight pathways. Helsinki car-company barrack is considered as the first one to implement the new designing principles of functionalism into appearance, space organization and detailing. Additionally the building fulfilled all the norms and characteristics set for a modern military barrack with its appearance, functionality and users—the new and highly modern branch of service of Ford driving and maintaining conscripts. (ibid, 98-99.) New types of weaponry was, however, not sufficient: it needed new types of structures and hierarchies, its inspections, exercises and methods of training and conditioning to accompany (Foucault 1977, 148). The distribution of power through drills, discipline and built environment is therefore in central state and visible here.

The exceptional representativeness of the car-company barrack was due, not only to the architectural expression, but its location in the capital and inside city structure. The building was the embodiment of the ideals of modern barracks and therefore a great representation of the defense forces in an exceptionally visible location. (ibid, 99). This naturally gave plenty of positive attention to the Construction Bureau of the Ministry of Defense and furthermore to the Defense Forces itself (ibid, 100)

**Niinisalo Lamella barrack**

Niinisalo garrison was built as a national refresher course center into the urban area of Niinisalo, in Kankaanpää, in 1930s. The area is flat moor, which fitted well as practice terrain. (Mäkinen 2000, 101.) Currently it serves as a garrison for artillery brigade and its subordinate units.

The head planner for the project was architect, construction foreman Kalle Lehtovuori who drew the plan for the garrison area and all the central buildings. First of these buildings to be finished was the Lamella barrack in 1935. The original plan was long and narrow due to the existing esker. This determined the central buildings to be limited only to the barrack and a dining hall,
that were placed diametrically. (Mäkinen 2000, 101-102.)

Niinisalo garrison represents the progressive 1930s architecture of the Finnish Military Forces, which addresses the endeavor to build image of dynamic and modern military forces especially with functionalist architecture. Military buildings from the time of autonomy and 1910s reminded of the presence of Russia and its military power. Therefore the new building stock needed to represent the defense capability of independent Finland and its nation. Functionalism did not only differ totally from the previous military architecture but was practical and economical as well, and therefore fit excellently to the purpose. Especially the ascetic functionalism of 1930s with its plane plastered white facades has been in significant role in highlighting the modernity and western influence inside Finnish society.

_Niinisalo Lamella barrack. Picture by Pentti Pere._
Even though functionalism as style varies from architect to another, Lehtovuori has managed to keep the appearance of buildings in Niinisalo exceptionally puritan functionalism. (Bonsdorff 1998; Mäkinen 2000, 23.) Unadorned, white plastered surfaces with cylinder-like staircase volumes, standardized building parts such as windows and railings, separation of functions into their own masses and hygienic, easy to clean surfaces indoors were the trademarks of Lehtovuori’s architecture. (Kuosa 1985, 35.)

The architecture of Niinisalo garrison borrows clearly from the German and Dutch Siedlung-architecture of the late 1920s (Mäkinen 2000, 102). Characteristic for this is extensive use of industrial production, elements and rectangular coordinate systems—often the final result being simply a white box. (Strausa, 2018) By using functionalism as a tool of combining his educations as an architect and construction foreman, Lehtovuori managed to design cost-effective, efficient and highly standardized but good quality architecture. This was extremely important for the image and operation of the young Finnish army. (Kuosa 1985, 35.)

Planning of the most famous building at the site, the Lamella barrack, was mainly defined by practicality, functionality and above all small construction budget. The Lamella barrack differed from the rest of 1930s barracks with its exceptionally large accommodations and ascetic trim. The accommodation capacity of the barrack was up to 4000 men, but the building did not, for instance, have any communicating doors or actual bathrooms—all urinals with light sewers. (Mäkinen 2000, 101-102.) Once again the space layout imposed the power of internal monitoring on the individuals themselves: the ones supervising are the ones being supervised (Foucault 1977, 147).

**Santahamina Military Academy**

Building of Santahamina Military Academy started in 1939 and it was from the beginning a solid part of preparing for the 1940 olympic games in Helsinki (Museovirasto, 2009a). The modernistic plain buildings, monumental school, dining and assembly hall buildings and smaller barrack, course center, residen-
tial building and a stall surround the large yard filled with tall pine trees. (Nieminem 2012, 333.) Defense ministry’s architect Olavi Sortta was responsible for the architectonic entity of the area with the help of architects Kyllikki Halme and Irma Paasikallio (Mäkinen 2000, 204).

Even though the Military Academy ends nicely the planning era of Defense Ministry, the buildings are at the same time a great example of the increased supervision and execution of power of the National Board of Construction in state construction. The board namely intervened with Sortta’s plans early in the sketching phase: for instance, in stead of ribbon windows, the rooms should have two separate smaller windows and the centre aisle of the school building was to be narrowed down. This was obviously the most typical and extinguishable form of power, the state lead power, in use. The openings in the facade of the Military Academy, indeed, resemble considerably the rest of the late 1930s government buildings. (Mäkinen 2000, 204-205.)
The dining hall building is hierarchically, functionally and locationally the most central of the Academy buildings. Therefore its outer and inner architecture is clearly the most articulated in the area. The interior of the dining hall indicates to J.S. Sirén’s Parliament building (Eduskuntatalo) with its monumental concrete beams, space layout and architectonic handling. However, the articulation in the dining hall building is more plain and less decorative than in the Parliament house, due to the modernism ideals. (ibid, 208-209.) And assumably due to the implicit status difference between the state and military forces as a part of it.

The Academy’s swimming hall summarizes the whole of the entity’s 1930s modernistic appearance: the space is constructed out of clean basic forms, bearing and supporting parts, light is emphasized and functions are divided into own building volumes. Decoration is extremely scat and themes are traditionally masculine and martial symbols of soldiers, helmets and lions. (ibid, 206-207; 209-210.)

Accommodations at the school were organized in two room units with four men in each (ibid, 206). Privacy and being alone with someone were hence ruled out, which transferred the surveillance of moral and order from a third party to an inner pressure of the group (Foucault 1980, 195). Also the typical arrangement of serial spaces with corridors and small rooms, and distribution of individuals based on their rank or advancement support the military discipline with rows, examinations, alignment of groups and constant movement over a series of compartments. (Foucault 1977, 147.)

As a whole, the Military Academy represents modernistic, abstract appearance and interpretation of classical masculine military building, where horizontal lines, plain plastered surfaces and sophisticated light serve as the central components.

**Modernism in Finnish military architecture (1950-2017)**

To accompany the modern defense strategy, new military bases from the 1950s onward were planned with functionalist open city plan, which enabled
of the Ministry of Defense decreased but control increased. (Mäkinen 2000, 101). In practice the Ministry of Defense and Military Headquarters editorialized only the strategic and functional dimensions of the construction. The architectonic expression and visual decisions were left to the architect. However, implicitly it was unquestionably expected that the planner understood the societal context of the buildings and their role as a part of Finnish military architecture. (Lappo, 2017.) Therefore Finnish military architecture has not been uniform, but mere a synthesis of various architects’ ways of interpreting the national and international emotions and values in this context.

The Defense Forces started a renewal of organization aiming for distributing the troops and brach of services into regional administrative units in the beginning of 1950s. Soon, the Ministry of Defense gave a decision to start building so called forest garrisons (Korpivaruskunnat) around Central Finland. These garrisons were built outside urban structure and they were planned to work as independent communities and built as employment work during wintertime. Because of the maximum amount of handmade labour on site, the barracks and other general buildings were planned with highly standardized parts. However, due to natural conditions and some unique architectonic decisions with the central buildings, the garrisons have formed out to be quite distinctive entities. (Lappo 2017; Mäkinen 2000, 101.)

The forest garrisons were planned and executed by the Construction Bureau of the Ministry of Defense. In the overall project one of their main goals was to apply the general societal trends into public construction. The social development of 20th century was visible among other things in the accommodation and operational spaces in garrisons: their hygiene, amenities and functionality. The garrisons built after the wars developed therefore into diverse centers of living and action with barracks, staff housing, communal spaces, leisure activities, high quality sport amenities and work spaces. (Mäkinen 2000, 107.)

**Säkylä garrison**

Säkylä garrison and its vast residential area were built in Satakunta in 1966. They all represent the modern but ascetic architecture of their time in a high-
the new branches, such as air force, to be located apart from the urban structure. (Halila et al. 1967, 442.) Modernism as a building style fit well both the functionalist needs of new building stock, financial standardization and as a propaganda tool to emphasize the modernity and westernization of Finnish Defense Forces (Mäkinen 2000, 191).

Despite the law from 1936 assigning the National Board of Public Building to supervise practically all government construction, were individual architects largely in charge of planning. Especially from 1950s onwards private architects were able to plan garrisons more freely as the planning of Construction Bureau classed manner. (Uusi-Seppä 2009, 28). The central buildings of the garrison are part of concrete brutalism tradition and planned by architect Osmo Lappo, barracks and other utility spaces by architects Pekka Rajala and Timo Penttilä. (Lappo 2017).

The central buildings, dining facility, canteen and sports hall, in Säkylä are arranged around a square with entrances on this side and other logistics from

*Säkylä canteen building. Picture by Jenni Merinen.*
the outer side of the buildings. All of the buildings create a clear horizontal and ascetic feeling, similar to uniform military arrangements and formations, but at the same time they form a highly distinguished architectonic entity. The central square is situated close to the main gate and therefore functions as a semipublic and connecting space between the garrison and civilian world.

The obvious assigning of designated spaces for particular functions makes it, according to Foucault, possible to supervise the individuals more efficiently (Foucault 1977, 147). Hence, the specified and functional space prescribes a form of morality for the individual, which then is executed by the individuals themselves (Foucault 1980, 149).

All of the buildings surrounding the central square are large (canteen serves 500 people in cafeteria use and 900 people in assembly hall, the dining facility for one 1120 people) and massively horizontal with only small openings to the square (Lappo 1968, 40). However, there are relatively large windows towards the sports track in the West and woods in the North, which is, in terms of the economical restrictions of that time, exceptional. According to the architect, the buildings in Säkylä were planned monumental on purpose, to represent persistence. (Lappo 2017.) Especially, the exceptionally small opening towards the central square are a close reminder of the Panopticon, a prison type developed by the 18th century philosopher Jeremy Bentham (Roth 2006, 33). Could this be about the intuitive association of the total institutions and realizations of the power monopoly of the state by the planner? Or pure coincidence? Or result of similar requirements in terms of budget, functions and construction? Nevertheless, garrisons and prisons both combine all of the fields of life into same physical space under a strong authority and through this aim to erase the familiar concept and identity of ’me’ (Goffman 1959, 55).

The buildings of the area are concrete cast in situ and facades upholstered with white limestone tiles. This combination did not please Lappo himself, but the head architect of Ministry of Defense of that time, Viljo Noko, commanded that Säkylä must become a white garrison—in contrary to Kajaani garrison that was simultaneously under construction with red bricks. (Lappo 2017.)
Vekaranjärvi garrison

Vekaranjärvi garrison is a part of the so-called forest garrisons project and a highly representative example of the 1960s constructivism. It is, too, planned by architect Osmo Lappo. In Vekaranjärvi Lappo has emerged modern concrete architecture with contemporary art and national defense. Architects Pekka Rajala and Timo Penttilä planned the utility spaces and barracks—as in Säkylä and Kajaani garrisons too. (Lappo 2017.) The Vekaranjärvi area borrows a lot from Säkylä and Kajaani garrisons in terms of visual expression.

The area was planned and executed by the Construction Bureau of the Ministry of Defense. In the 1960s it was the biggest construction bureau in Finland and built all of the garrisons itself. (Halila et al. 1967, 456.) Vekaranjärvi area was built between 1966-1975 as employment work like the rest of the Forest garrisons. The barracks are arranged in a row on top of a ridge and the central square is bordered by the main buildings of
the area: sports hall, canteen, dining facility and movie theater. (Lappo 1975, 41.) In the end of 1960s Vekaranjärvi was one of the biggerst garrisons in Finland with almost 3000 conscripts and 600 staff members (Museovirasto 2009b).

**Santahamina House**

Santahamina House, the largest individual construction project in the reform of Finnish Military Forces, was introduced in February 2015. The building supplements the Military Academy campus while serving as a gate and open building for civilians too. (Saarinen 2015, 6.) It is a rare project, since the Finnish Defense Forces have commissioned only a handful of buildings between 1970—2017 (Koivula 2017).

The Santahamina House has two main facades. The northern facade looks out toward the Santahamina gate and together with the rocky surroundings encloses an entrance for civilians. (Saarinen 2015, 6.) The facades clearly follow the
Finnish military architecture tradition as an intensively horizontal mass with mainly small and raised openings. Many of the windows are also covered with claddings, which makes it possible to see out, but not into the building. These are too the basic characteristics in panopticon in use: someone standing outside can feel being observed, but cannot see who or how they are being watched (Roth 2006, 33). Also the darker ground floor constitutes a pedestal for the rest of the building. This is another and well used trick to enhance power and create distance to the user.

The ground floor of the three-storey building is reserved for public facilities: an auditorium, and the library of the Military Academy. The first floor houses teaching and studying facilities and the second floor accommodation facilities. Despite its exceptional status as a new construction and a semi-public piece of military architecture, there has only been three relatively small articles with a mention of it in Helsingin Sanomat (HS 12.9.2012 and HS 23.2.2015).
Military architecture is not only about the actual Defense Forces, but foremost about state constructing images of itself. The image is mediated through architecture to national and international subjects, both individuals, groups, civilians and decision-makers (Mäkinen 2000, 25-26). Ultimately, in the core of military architecture is the architectonic representation of defense forces as a part of its public image. Who and what affects the final appearance is only touched here, as it is significant to the representation, but not highlighted. In this context I shall, too, only discuss the visual language and spatiality of architecture, not any specific architectural writings or discourses.

**Military architecture inside Finnish society**

Propaganda by definition is a means to affect one’s actions and is founded on manipulation of various representations. They can be either oral, literal, visual or auditive. (Lasswell 1934, 13.) The Finnish Defense Forces has always modified its public image diversely with propagandistic activity—architecture being an essential part of it. Since the buildings of Finnish military forces were traditionally noticeably constituted in news papers and books showcasing the armed forces with texts and images, it is justified to consider architecture as communication between the Finnish Defense Forces and national and international public. (Mäkinen 2000, 26.)

In 1935 Suomen Kuvalehti, a weekly Finnish language family and news magazine, collected all the elements that made the newly constructed Töölö car-company barrack ‘modern’ into a photomontage (Mäkinen 2000, 99). Let it be unintentional or intentional, photomontage is a highly efficient tool in propa-
ganda. Since, by combining various images it is possible to create totally new significances which any of the individual images lack, and therefore it is possible to highly effectively manipulate the perception of the audience (Diederich & Grübling 1979, 123).

When it comes to actual encounters with military architecture, garrisons are of course one major way to this. Also the bureau buildings of the Ministry of Defense and the Defense Forces in urban environments are central. But they do offer quite different associations to the institution: as the bureaus are typically prestigious, distant and authoritative in their traditional and polished expression, Finnish garrisons on the other hand bring the reality of action closer; the forested and unrefined environments with ascetic concrete barracks from Santahamina to Sodankylä are masculine and far from urban or park-like milieu.

Architecture as a representation of Finnish Defense Forces

In Finland military has a special role in the society, as majority of all men will complete military service. This is becoming increasingly rare internationally speaking. (Koivula, 2018). And so is the fact that in Finland garrisons and barracks are definitely more familiar to the citizens than in countries with professional armies, due to the more common and natural encounters with military architecture. (Hoikkala & et al. 2009, 192.) Most men, and some women, serve in a garrison or other state institute, where their parents, siblings and girl or boyfriends go to see their oaths and meet them during their service. Hence, military architecture is more familiar to someone living in a country with military service than in a country with professional army (ibid, 41).

Buildings of the Defense Forces are naturally government construction, which makes them state governed. Therefore, military architecture is both political message and medium which the state has monopoly over (Mäkinen 2000, 23). The buildings are directly interacting with users (such as conscripts, cadre, civilian staff and civilians), national and international media and indirectly with the stakeholders of the previously mentioned. The primary goal of military architecture is basically to attach it to the desired public image of the Military
Forces. Mass media has, therefore, been in a central state in creating national symbols and bringing them as part of citizens everyday life. This has been harnessed to build cultural coherence and to reinforce the national defense ideology. (ibid, 28.) Therefore, it is crucial to make the state visible to citizens by separating it from other nations with symbols and ceremonies (Smith 1991, 77).

In the context of Defense Forces this means above all creating a unique military tradition with related visual symbols, such as flags, emblems, insignias and architecture. These then become an inseparable part of the everyday environment of conscripts and cadre and represent the military to the “outside” world. Architecture, especially, has therefore through out time been a typical means to bring ideologies to the everyday life level. (Billing 1995, 10.)

National and international communication could therefore be seen as the metaphysic objective of architecture. However, in-group communication differs slightly from out-group motives, but in practice the message is the same: we have a strong nation with will and capability to defend its existence. Here it becomes evident, that military architecture is above all communication about the credibility of defense—not aggression. Its aim is to keep up authority, not take it away from others. (Hughes 1974, 8.) Only the name Defense Forces highlight the primality of securing ones own national independence rather than violating others.

People and institutions with enough money to build large, imposing and monumental buildings, always have had power over others. (Sudjic 2005, 23-27) And so does military architecture communicate the defense politic situation and the overall values and credibility of the society and defense forces (Mäkinen 2000, 13). Additionally the local military architecture has inter alia been defined by the organization of the army, branches of service and military hierarchy. Likewise the function of a specific building naturally directs the architectonic expression and spatial planning of an individual space.
Functionality and appearance

In order to understand a person, one needs to understand the person’s goals (Carver & Sheier 1999, 553). As well, in order to understand a building, one needs to understand the building’s goals.

In the core of military discipline is repetition, hierarchy and homogeneity. In other words, eliminating individual rhythms, paces and other differences. Body movements, gestures and facial expressions are all under tight control and instructions. (Hoikkala 2009, 41.) Same kind of obedience is visible in military architecture. It is consistent, well articulated, explicit, tightly paced and in line with authority statuses. Simple and even ascetic, building masses reinforce the homogeneous entity that the uniform dressing and code of conduct maintain. At the same time the buildings suggest something bigger in terms of power and strength, that would have been necessary structural engineering wise. Hence, both massive appearance and functionality add to their effectivity. Similarly, pomposity of architecture and even actual ominousness appeal to human emotions extremely fundamentally. This setting lifts the one in power to a pedestal, which conveys the place and status of the rest without words or other explicit signs. (Höfler et al. 2016, 4.)

Also the question of budget is always relevant in the context of military architecture. The most important object of investment in the Defense Forces is definitely not the building stock per se, but the machinery and competent staff. This sets significant limitations to the construction naturally.

From my point of view, architecture still succeeds to support the obedience necessary in military environment. The neutral and generalizing form emphasize the unquestionable hierarchy and embodied power. The foundation of this discipline and use of power lies in a certain space and time, it is restricted to military personnel and to garrisons. (Deleuze 2005, 118.)
In the following I will take up few of the past decades major transformations in terms of society and lifestyle concerning the possibilities of architectonic visibility. These include ways of transportation, means of communication, allocation of time, change in values, competing objects of interest and over all knowledge and savor concerning built environment. The reasons and results behind societal transformation during the past hundred years are so complex, overlapping and dynamic, that it would be impossible to explicitly analyze such a vast entity as one phenomenon. This is why I shall only contemplate some of these most distinct and central changes that have affected the role and possibilities of architecture as communication inside the Finnish society between 1917-2017. Through these notions, I will demonstrate the changes in the prevailing reality that possibly affect the complete implementation of traditional architectural or social theories.

Change in lifestyle

Change in lifestyle here refers to the over all mindset and ways of doing things in a specific time and space. However, in this context I will only briefly demonstrate two major aspects of it: the change in ways of transportation and the change in ways of communication. Hence, it is noteworthy that in modern western societies life eventually presents itself mainly as an immense accumulation of social relations mediated by images. In other words, increasing share of that which was previously directly lived has moved away into a representation of it. (Debord, 1967, 4.) This concerns architecture and built environment
too, as the amount of its visibility is increasingly based on images mediated in various mediums—not actual encounters.

At the same time, the concrete urban environment has gradually changed from traditional European city milieu with plenty of parks, plazas and pedestrian streets towards more American buyer centered car city (Söderlind 1998, 258). Simultaneously these big cities are becoming even bigger. The world has become urbanized extremely rapidly: in 1950s about 30% of people lived in cities and rest on the countryside, but by the year 2050 these numbers are estimated to turn around. (Liimatainen et al. 2017.)

The change of urban planning from walking based into car based does not only concern the distances and location of services. What is notable in terms of cityscape, is the shift from small scale details into big scale signs. As I see it, this is mainly due to the increased speed of transportation and distances covered by car. The development leads to impoverishment of the built environment which in turn furthermore encourages the use of private cars and makes walking or cycling more difficult or at least unpleasant. (Crupi 2018.) And what is the consequence of faster and more isolated transportation to the significance and role of architecture? When alleys and streets are turning into highways and tunnels, people are spending more time indoors than ever before and buildings are no longer planned to be viewed from close distance and slow pace. In order to preserve its role as efficient communication, I feel, architecture needs to either serve the needs of the prevailing transportation methods—which means bigger buildings, bigger signs, bigger parking spaces and less details—; it can stay the same, follow the traditional planning theories and practices, but due to the lack of visibility simply become increasingly insignificant; or invest in urban planning that allows the traditional practice to flourish in the prevailing social reality. The latter one means mainly tightening the city structure, limiting car use and providing services and vivid urban life close to housing—to make it possible and tempting to see the art of building.

Another central societal transformation is the unimaginable development of communication technology. Smartphones, Internet, Wi-Fi, social media, inter-
active platforms, games and virtual realities are just a few results of this development. They all compete for our attention from the moment of waking up until going back to sleep. This is why it is easy to see that the attention architecture craves is clearly threatened. However, the constantly expanding social media also offers countless new possibilities to react to, present and discuss about architecture. Nevertheless, the prevailing social reality where everything is fast, convenient and personalized, architecture might feel too arduous to even try to concentrate into. One might like a post of a pretty facade without even stopping the scrolling motion on one’s smartphone screen or have a video call to the other side of the world when walking around a city.

A short empirical observation of people in public spaces indicates the conventionality of moving in space without paying any attention to it: people are talking on their phones, sending messages, scrolling through social media, taking selfies, looking for a parking place or running to a buses. The only ones actually paying attention to the environment seem to be tourists. They are in a new place with time to spend. This is the central feature of life we seem to have lost in our everyday life: time to be and time to recognize what is. What becomes evident here, is the fact that the overall time allocation of residents would become easier in a small scale city structure. There would be no frequent hurry to a bus or problems to find a parking spot, if functions and services were located in a compact and centralized instead of isolated manner (Söderlind 1998, 7). Then architecture would be observed in the context it was planned to, the environment generated would encourage walking and spending time in the space, which in turn would spring more of the small scale detailing and pleasing city space. To me this is architecture communicating at its best: stimulating behavior that is natural, healthy and self-fulfilling.

**Transformation of media**

In the beginning of 20th century, media simply meant press. And audience meant largely homogenous group of people—especially in the case of Finland. Therefore the public image of an institution was relatively easy to manage. Media was also highly dependent on personal affairs. (Kantola 2011, 122.) To
give an example, the Finnish Defense Forces sustained and reinforced the national will to defense with consistent information services especially in the 1930s—mainly by setting up some special arrangements with the press. In 1929 Defense Forces even established their own press, whose main task was to monitor the national press and guide it towards more national defense favorable attitude and content. (Kronlund 1988, 508). This was the era, when Defense Forces was also able to exhibit their building stock in movies and other entertainment productions due to the virtually monopolistic status of the national public broadcasting company (YLE).

However, the communication between the military and the media has been affected by the rapid development in the technology of communications, and by the considerable changes inside society and military (Hooper 1982, 209). With the rise of private broadcasting companies and social media, the content of media is not as easily manipulated as before. As the amount of companies increase, the amount of viewpoints increase as well. This obviously affects the presentation of the news, as the editor and all the stakeholders give prominence to what pleases them and their motives. (ibid, 19.) This leads to the increased depth and intricacy of an institution’s public image and therefore makes the promoting of their agenda more complex.

Since watching television is one of the most popular pastimes of modern society, this would appear to be one of the best mediums for keeping the public in touch with the public image of an institution communicated through buildings (ibid, 71). Another very common media is the social media, which offers countless creative ways to affect general image of an institution. Here the Finnish Military Forces, for instance, are actually quite active: they have several accounts for various subdivisions in Instagram, Facebook, Snapchat and Twitter, to name a few. But is the potential of social media truly acknowledged in terms of architecture and image building? In what ways could social media actually be used to promote the role of built environment in reality?

People substituting buildings in media and entertainment

Between 1920s and 1960s it was common that the new Finnish military const-
Ruction projects were presented demonstratively in various magazines, newspapers and movies. It was a typical means to shape the public image of the Defense Forces advantageous for their agendas, since public was not allowed to many of the sites, but the architecture of those areas was meant for propagandistic use. (Mäkinen 2000, 31.)

For instance Jaakkima barrack for Vyborg regiment in Karelian Isthmus was planned by architect Herbert Holmberg and finished in 1933. The barracks served as the stage for a movie “Rykmentin murheenkryyni” (The Regiment Nuisance) in 1938. Jaakkima garrison was considered as a representable example of the modern Finnish barracks and therefore the Defense Forces was willing to represent it to the public. (Mäkinen 2000, 96).

Also the completing of Helsinki car-company barracks in Töölö in 1935 got the attention of the media. The press noted the exceptionally “beautiful and appropriate style” of the barrack, that had been designed by a young female architect (Sotilashallinnollinen aikakauslehti 1935, 323). Also Hufvudstadsbladet, the main Swedish-language newspaper in Finland, and Suomen Kuvalehti published articles of the project. This was indeed apt to distribute the image of liberal and modern Defense Forces nationally and internationally.

However, it seems that the media imaginary has changed quite drastically over the past decades. I went through the inserts of 400 news stories concerning the Finnish Defense Forces published between 2010 and 2017 and out of these only 102 had something else than people as illustration, and out of the 102 only 31 had Defense Force buildings pictured. Typical picture was a small group of people pictured or cropped so that the face was not identifiable. Whereas the majority of the inserts picturing something else than people were mainly military equipment, such as airplanes or armours. In social media, out of the 597 Instagram posts of Finnish Defense Forces only 8 had buildings in them (13.1.2018). The rest were about field exercises or recreational events.

Even though, the buildings are still there, they are not only as visible anymore. This is why I ask: does architecture communicate outside the immediate user group without media attention? Does architecture work as propaganda, if it is
not visible to the public? Is architecture sexy anymore? Why do we prefer people over buildings? Is it due to the western individualistic worldview that feels more comfortable with faces than buildings representing a faceless institution? Does a person convey authority and power better than buildings?

**POWER RELATION AS A FUNCTION OF VISIBILITY**

According to Foucault, power is profoundly a relation, not an attribute (Foucault 1977, 26). A notion he made already in the 1950s. Foucault assumes a certain kind of society and a certain type and amount of visibility for architecture in his studies. However, I suggest that the changed societal and social reality must have affected quite drastically the interaction, discourses and relations between buildings, institutions and people in the past 70 years. Even the way we perceive buildings, media, defense forces and other institutions may have changed dramatically. The way physical space imposes restrictions and conveys power has not fundamentally changed since the 19th century, but the way buildings work as abstract representations of these institutions may have. This is why I see the need to revise the way we think about architecture as inducement, its visibility, limitations and possible new roles.

**Foucault’s principles in current societal reality**

The most drastic change from the days of the notions above, is possibly the manner modern civilizations are organized and acted out: the dramatic transformation from a concrete operational environment with distinctly defined institutions, leaders, functions, spaces, positions and statuses to the modern information society, where social connections, political and economical actions, discipline and environments have become practically imperceptible.
As it has become irrelevant or even impossible for an individual to analyze the origins of one’s actions, thoughts or emotions, it is becoming increasingly tempting to content oneself with the existing order—and this applies to both planners and users (Huhtinen 2002, 35). Yet, this makes the collective and individual awareness and responsibility over one’s behavior, and ultimately the overall societal development and increased wellbeing, a contradiction in terms of built environment.

It is relatively easy to resist—or at least acknowledge—a visible, embodied and determined use of power—and this might be the reason why it has decreased wildly inside modern societies and become substituted by so called invisible power of global information technology. The latter one easily expands over all parts of society as an impersonal background force. It touches everyone, everywhere and is difficult to challenge. (ibid, 26.) However as noted above, architecture and spatial planning are still the realizations of the previous one. They physically exercise power in terms of movement and functions and therefore affect the ways of thinking and perceiving too. Most of the western societies, nevertheless, live in a paradoxical belief where the abandoning of discipline and visible use of power would have lead to a more free, equal and individual treatment of human beings. However, in the contrary, currently no one knows why thousands of surveillance cameras or satellite locating applications follow us daily and who uses the information provided by them. (ibid, 26.) In other words, the invisibility of power usage makes power totalitarian and global, while the concept has nearly disappeared from public, private and professional discussions outside state governed institutions.

Foucault has always assumed a possibility for an individual to resist power. According to him, if power cannot be executed as immaterial relation, it becomes violence. (Foucault 1991, 27.) Does this then make architecture violence? Or ultimately simply a symbolical representation of an institution or power, but not the execution of it?

The prevailing reality of information technology is definitely something Fou-
Foucault could not have even imagined in the 1950s. To me, this makes it relevant to ask, has the main characteristic of power changed since then? As concurrently the physicality of our world is clearly decreasing as more virtual realities and platforms are becoming more common, is power ultimately a relation anymore? Has it become more of a condition or simply violence? Should the surveillance cameras or cookies be interpreted as the materialization of power, and therefore violence or purely as the modern immaterial execution of power? Do we have power, in terms of Foucault, left if it is hidden, invisible and thus impossible to resist? Is then all we have violence?

Foucault does not believe that the world could ever be purely and simply only immaterial discourse. There is always a body to govern, there are always concrete practices to conduct. Discourses can be imposed, maintained, created and understood only by physical forces of space-time. (Foucault 1971, 200.) And this is still valid in architecture, military and the everyday life of any of us.

**Possible critique**

Here I will present some possible counter arguments to the previous. I want to start with reminding once again how vast phenomenon we are talking about, and how it is therefore impossible to take every aspect in consideration here. However, just as one pixel does not tell much, but as they gather up, one starts to see the picture, I feel, I am only presenting some pixels of this huge image here and hope that someone else might get motivated to fill in some more.

Lets start with the fact that I have mainly used the thoughts of Michel Foucault as a theoretical background. Foucault is generally a credible and popular theorist when it comes to analyzing power-relations. He has above all studied the relations affecting power and behavior in various contexts and levels mainly from the subjective point of view. This is why I found his research the most suitable for this context of architecture and human behavior.

However, Foucault has naturally received some critique concerning his theo-
ries and especially the way he has written them down and argued for them. Frankly, he has even been accused of willful obscurity. (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 9.) Hence, one might say that Foucault’s thoughts are so inconsistent and ambiguous that it does not form a solid theoretical base. But if Foucault creates the impression of obscurity, it is for a reason (ibid, 9). One reason for the impression might lie in the fact that he has constantly questioned himself and revised the theories. Therefore, there is no distinctive Foucault, but several Foucaults.

But of course, by choosing Foucault, I inevitably ruled out other theorists and their views, such as Max Weber (1922), Robert A. Dahl (1969) and Steven Lukes (1974). However, I feel that their theories are not as dynamic and comprehensive, and therefore not as implementable to this practical and concrete case of built environment, as Foucault’s. Since, Foucault’s thoughts also typically discuss the issues in a wider societal context and not just as isolated segment of power, it was a natural choice in this case.

Then content-wise: Foucault has admittedly some vagueness concerning even his main concepts. One being knowledge, in power-knowledge, which he actually never explicitly defined. Another one is visible practices and abstract discourses, and their relation. Namely, one might as what is the described space of discourses behind and in tension with visible practices. Is it a place of secrets, that a historian or researcher could interpret or reveal? I doubt, since, to interpret is to comment on the visible, and to comment on the visible is to give a supplementary estimate, which presents deeper meaning hidden in the original event, document or space. This issue of interpretation in fact defines the limits of Foucault’s method. Hence, is anyone actually in such a role, where this kind of ”revealing behind original events” is possible? Analyzing is one thing, but interpreting assumes that the visible object or document has inadequacies which the historian or researcher is capable of reconstructing a deeper meaning to. The error is that the primary object might lose its specificity as it becomes mere signifier of meanings (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 33). However, as I see it, as life itself, everything in this socially defined reality we live in is ultimately based on interpretation. Hence, the whole truth is not told by a
document or a building, but it is still all that is there. Yet it is insufficient.

Another possible subject of critique might lie in the field of military architecture. As it is not widely established as a separate field of architecture, there might be questions concerning the special characteristics of it. However, due to the consistent characteristics and functional needs, I feel, it creates a solid and distinguishable field of architecture, and is recognized especially among the architects involved with it. Also based on personal discussions with professional military personnel and civilians, military architecture is not familiar term-wise, but content-wise: majority of the people have a clear intuitive image of what military architecture typically looks and feels like.

A third point of view might concern the actual transformation of society, and the society itself. Has the society genuinely transformed that dramatically as proposed? Has it happened uniformly everywhere or only in some regions or cities? Is the transformation after all that fundamental for architectural visibility? Is architectural visibility that fundamental for power status? Are the social-psychological means so evolutive that the transformation from walking to cars matters? These are all possible issues, that I cannot provide solid answers to, but I wish the viewpoints and documents provided above offer enough prove of the existence and extent of this phenomenon to motivate the contemplation.

Action plan

In the following I will explicitly discuss the possible solutions and ways of improvement concerning the issues raised. I wish to provide some ideas and concrete tools to possibly develop one’s own practice, perception and this discussion further.

I start with asking, would it be possible to update the image and role of architecture by actively promoting it in social media or other mediums open to wider audiences than professional magazines, for instance? Would it be possible to truly make it the art of people again? To inspire people to collaborate, discuss and take part? Would it be genially welcomed by the professional com-
community? Would societal participation of architects raise the awareness of other professionals and amateurs to interest in architecture and its possibilities socially, ecologically, economically or academically?

Any of the above would require foremost a change in attitudes inside the architectural community and in the education. In order to increase the visibility of the field, architects and students would need to realize their possibility to affect the society in terms of societal participation, academic discussion, research and planning.

Indoctrinating teaching in this sense is something that should be abandoned and moved more towards openminded, transdisciplinary and academic approach together with planning, ecological, social, economical and societal skills. These are again issues that need to be solved on the practical level, but through revising course contents and practices I believe it would be fully reachable.

In terms of professional architects, understanding the wider societal, psychological and social consequences and power of their constructions, we would be able to affect people’s behavior and health in a manner that would benefit them, us and the society as a whole. Also actively bringing architecture back to public discussion, would make it easier to open conversation and mutual understanding between planners, users, other professionals, institutions, state and other stakeholders, in order to create better functioning environments that are healthy in terms of nature, psyche and physical wellbeing.
Especially in the context of architecture, I feel the most important thing rarely is to reach a solid answer—which in this case is often practically impossible—but rather the process one has to go through trying to find the answer. Therefore, in the following, I will discuss some of the emerged point of views divided into separate focus groups. I am not proposing a solid entity of answers here, but questioning the prevailing paradigms and traditions that might hinder a truly meaningful and comprehensive architectural practice, theory and research and on the other hand user experience and wellbeing.

In terms of a user

As old traditions are taken apart from their historical context without knowing the traditions and culture behind them, they turn into shallow and self-evident habits, that function as tools for power—such as squares, monumental stairs or unnecessary huge interiors, in the case of architecture. However, as it becomes evident, the current everyday life includes various cultural rites, which of meaning is actually totally mystical to us as modern people in our modern societies. (Huhtinen 2002, 33.) Nevertheless, as the way knowledge, culture and man is perceived and acted out varies throughout time, customary rituals and habits quickly become superficial and insignificant phrases used according to the use value and not to the original function. As I see it, this is the way the so called typical or recognizable space specific architectonic expressions have, too, evolved.

Similarly, if people are not commonly aware of the effect environment has on them in terms of action, values, emotions and cognitive functions, their behavior is quite easily shaped. Power and its expression in architecture is not dangerous as such, but it becomes indeed questionable, if either the one using or being affected by the power, is not aware of the relationship. This leads to a situation, where it becomes impossible for people to structure the power-
relation and therefore analyze or become aware of its affects on themselves or others in individual, group or societal levels. This is why, I feel this topic needs to be brought more actively to public discussion and back to the state of everyone’s art and everyone’s issue.

If people in general would have more opportunities to interact with architecture, architects and planners, it would make it easier to give feedback, which in turn would make the job of an architect or a planner easier to deliver more desired and practical environments and spaces. Since, as I see it, currently the typical situation is following: an architect designs a project that is then executed and exhibited mainly in the professional publications. Then it is commented by other architects and the whole of community, which affects the original architect’s practice in the future, ergo the following projects are developed further based on these only professional views. This, in my mind, is ”architecture for architects”.

Social media, for instance, provides numerous possibilities to make architecture visible, interesting and meaningful from various view points. This could ideally lead to mutual interest in the field, mutual understanding of the field as a shared necessity and passion, and mutual respect of each others views as professionals of their side.

**In terms of an architect**

The role of an individual architect as an author of one’s visual interpretation feels self-evident in the field. However, at the same time we are fostering an understanding of a contextually appropriate expression based on traditions and institutionalized expectations—but ultimately, often justified with budget or practicality. This exactly highlights my notion of an architect as a professional strongly and widely socialized by the values, practices, traditions and expectations of the society, and the restrictions of state governed legislation and economically determined budgets.

Through this lens, or with this burden, is the only way an architect can actually realize his or her personal interpretations and creative force. However, by this
the architect simultaneously maintains and channels this socially negotiated reality only in his or her superficially personal or unique way. To understand the power this has, it should be widely acknowledged that institutional power can only operate on the basis of other, already existing power-relations. For instance, the state, or the military, is a superstructural in relation to a whole series of power networks that invest the body, the family, knowledge, technology, architecture and so on. (Foucault 1980, 122.) This is why, I feel we should be more aware of these issues, and they should be made an integral part of architectural practice and education.

In addition, in the prevailing society, the visible forms of discipline and socializing procedures are becoming invisible. This is why it is increasingly important to recognize the ‘hidden’ and built-in ways of persuasion and socialization. As the power and discipline becomes more and more invisible and multipolar, it is more important than ever to become aware of the ways we affect each other and are affected too. Since, ultimately by manipulating space, it becomes possible to manipulate people and the possibilities of their relationships.

Something that should, too, be taken significantly more consistently and profoundly into consideration is the fact how the functions and practices that closely relate and essentially define buildings, are creating experiences which inevitably shape the behavior and emotions of the users. Only the psychological effects of various colors, materials, distances and shapes are indisputable and visible also as physiological responses. This is not a problem per se, but if it is not actively acknowledged, it might become an issue. This is why, I propose more conscious contemplation and broad knowledge among planners concerning the effects of their visual expression in terms of social, psychological and physiological micro and macro levels. Where the competence then comes from? Basic information from architectural schools, in my mind, the more advanced knowledge provided by employers or self-imposed.

To conclude, as I see it, it comes down to societal participation and transdisciplinary networks of architects. Through more active participation, it would be possible to create all in all better and healthier societal structures and ope
The “architecture for architects” -phenomenon.
rational environments. It starts with academic discussion, courage to question and make changes, challenge traditions while at the same time recognizing their strengths. In my mind, everyone should be ready to question their state and professional competence, but also be aware of its strengths and use them where it is most beneficial for the entire community. It also starts with architectural education, societal values and attitudes, individual values and attitudes, openminded collaboration between fields and professions, empathy, and genuine will for knowledge, progress and understanding—and not just to sustain and justify the status quo and one’s own state. The genuine will to grow as an individual, as a professional, as a field and as a society and refusal of settling for the existing, easy solution, offers the keys to lead the way and make a difference with brave moves.

**In terms of Finnish Defense Forces**

The effect of these rapid changes in society concerning the relationship between the military and the public are realized in the gap between the military and the citizens. The alienation from military of generations grown up in the prevailing environment is evident in their knowledge concerning the Finnish Defense Forces as an institution, as a part of the Finnish society and the overall safety environment. (Hooper 1982, 209.) As a reflection of this, the knowledge over the buildings of the Defense Forces has declined among the younger generations.

In a questionnaire I conducted in 2018, there was a staggering difference between participants especially in the age-groups of 20–35 and 60–75 in the recognition of the building stock of Finnish military. The older group could name the buildings in pictures (such as some barracks or bureaus of the Defense Forces) and actively describe some of them without seeing them. The younger group could not name the buildings, neither describe or locate them by their name. However, the younger group intuitively linked the buildings to military and state use, even without knowing them. This is a strong evidence concerning the uniformity and recognizable style military architecture has. In other words, it still represents military without the younger citizens even recognizing it.
The visible forms of discipline and socializing procedures are becoming invisible. It seems that disciplinary measures have given way to individual emancipation and self-determination—indeed, independently from authorities. The absence of visible forms of discipline can easily give the impression that there is no discipline at all. This easily leads to the situation where the existence of strong institutions, as military forces, is simply forgotten and neglected or underrated. However, information is more and more tied to the electric control exerted on people. Through electronic systems, every person is tied to global control and it is almost impossible for an individual to know who actually controls their learning, behavior and their adaptation to society. (Huhtinen 2002, 7.)

The Finnish Defense Forces use the social media platforms widely and seemingly efficiently to promote their agenda of national safety. However, architecture does not seem to be a part of it anymore. In my mind it would be still easily implemented as a supporting part of the public image and social media imaginary, for instance.

**In terms of architecture**

Referring to the above, I feel that military architecture can be, and should be, analyzed more broadly than just as physical buildings with functions, or simply as bordering structures limiting social communities. And as I see it, the same goes with every branch of architecture. Since, only through studying the all-encompassing traditions and practices that define the built environment—in the exemplary case of military architecture: garrisons, barracks and military architecture as a whole—it is possible to see the network that covers the whole society; it expands itself from institutions, such as economics, law, politics, education, media and police forces to more subtle social codes including volunteering, technological development and social media. It affects the whole society through juridical, economical, academical and social discourses and fundamentally underlines the significance of everyday environments into human behavior. Therefore, it is the omnipresence and enduring nature of architecture and their potential to influence, that makes it very important to understand how communication works in the case of built environment.
Also understanding the typical features and historical, functional and economical connections of a certain field of construction—let it be military architecture or church architecture—it becomes possible to contemplate the role of garrisons, state bureaus or churches from the building conservation or infill construction point of view more specifically. This would allow the buildings and built environments to retain their historical value and narrative while serving the adequate purpose and needs of modern society and military. To conclude, by taking over the neglected areas inside architecture, we would not have to settle for only replacing ventilation systems or waterproofings, but buildings and the spatial entities formed by them could be maintained and repaired comprehensively considering the prevailing structures, past realities and future requirements.

**In terms of society**

A society is loosely defined as a group of individuals, who share the same geographical area, typically subjected to the same political authority and dominant cultural expectations and are involved in continuous social interaction—though, rarely directly (e.g., Briggs 2000 & Lenski 1974). Notably, societies are not just communities, but communities with settled, organized and controlled site of influence (Effland 1998). The relation between people and space or architecture and culture is complex, but let the structure be more or less permanent, extensive or administrated, a man is inevitably a social product and society a human product. Therefore, neither is pre-existing entity but similarly necessarily and intimately connected; the one constitutes the other. (Berger & Luckmann 1966, 79.)

Often we hear the question, ”How do the societal values reflect in architecture?”. However, I feel, that it might be relevant in this context to ask ”How could architecture not reflect the values of the society?”. Since, if and as architecture is growing inside a society, how could it genuinely create, enforce or spread anything other than that very same society.

From my point of view, the societal participation of today’s architects is shy,
prudent and lacking, and outright roots the profession inside itself and not to the society it truly arises from. Among other things, the amount of opinion pieces written by architects in Helsingin Sanomat, books dealing with societal role of architecture—from an architect’s point of view—and papers on architecture theory have declined radically in the past 50 years. This lack of interactive and public conversation only deepens the gap between architects and users; architecture and everyday life; and makes it even harder to build a mutual respect and open discussion over built environment and its significance.
In the following I will summarize the findings and interpretations concerning the visibility of architecture and the power-relation it conveys in relation to physical and psychological meanings.”Well, what is the point”—might someone ask—”What if you can somehow address the obsolescence or some restrictions of a certain theory, paradigm, power-status or viewpoint? What then?” First of all, for purely academic reasons, I see the lack of theoretical research and discussion especially inside the Finnish architectural community a major risk to the whole of Finnish society: the almost nonexistent societal participation of the field leads to ever widening gap between the users and planners; between the reality and the drawing table. This creates environments that are either reinforcing the traditional and unquestionable policies, traditions, demarcations, power statuses and divisions or creating them. Therefore, it would be important to raise discussion and find ways of increasing the consciousness over this issue and solutions to use the power as a planner to promote sustainable and equality in society.

It is naturally difficult for us to recognize when significant changes occur in society, or to realize how quickly we adapt to new conditions—except in retrospect. This is why, it would be important from time to time to look back and compare the past circumstances, practices, environments and overall emotions to the prevailing ones; to be able to pin point the possible issues and successes. This is why I have stretched the examination interval over 100 years; to give more perspective and to be able to see some transformations, their reasons and consequences. However, even longer timespan would be fruitful in terms of seeing the big patterns.

As mentioned in the beginning, central for this work is fundamentally open-minded stance, where everything is interpreted in relation and in interaction with each other, and not just as separate and independent singularities limited to specific fields. Therefore, one of the main goals for the study was to outline a genuinely transdisciplinary approach to architecture, the role of an architect and their relation and responsibility towards an individual and the society as a whole, in order to asses the entity of society, built environment and institu-
tionalized power.

Here I shall summarize the results of my study and ultimately to answer the question I posed in the very beginning of my thesis: How? How does architecture convey power and shape us in everyday practices without us even noticing? How has the visibility of architecture affected its possibilities to mediate power in society and how prominent is this in the building stock of Finnish Defense Forces?

As noted, information networks and technology have diminished the role of a specified leader and made supervision increasingly subtle and indistinguishable. This has further enabled an overall decentralization of power, which in turn implies that it is also easier to hide or forget. In addition, the less values, ideals and power statuses are emphasized, the harder it becomes to understand where decisions concerning an individual or a group of individuals are originally based on. (Huhtinen 2002, 30, 35.) Power has therefore vanished from active discussion especially in terms of indirect actions and representations and the Defence Forces lost both their visibility in the Finnish society. Why and which one is the reason and which the result?

I would suggest that this difference is mainly due to the diversified media imaginary and overall visibility of Finnish Defense Forces inside the society. As the safety environment in Finland has changed, the visibility and status of Defense Forces has declined. Especially after the Cold War, the role of Finnish Defense Forces has become clearly more ordinary and commonplace, though still well appreciated. (Mansikka 2018.) The visibility in media has subsequently declined in terms of architecture, but been substituted with other themes. I cannot say that architecture is not as powerful representation as it used to be, but based on the study, I can say that its significance and meaning inside society has declined since the emancipation. This is mainly due to the addressed societal and social transformations. However, the change in transportation, media or ways of living do not provably or clearly affect the symbolic role of buildings, which would imply that they are still a part of any institutions public image and create legitimacy to their actions and state.
In the core of the used method of Michel Foucault’s, is considering great social and political human events in the larger context of long enduring material and economic structures. According to Foucault, history does not move along a linear path of human action. But, the human is conditioned by the material world. Hence, causality in history is not from human event to human event, but at the conjuncture of material, economic, and social forces. History does not, therefore, run through time, but the time of events is in the time of duration. (Lemert & Gillan, 11.) Therefore, time is ultimately spatialized.

For long architecture was built simply to be seen (palaces) or to observe the external space (fortresses). When it developed into more specialized form a problem arises as it permits an internal, articulated and detailed control—in more general terms, architecture that would operate to transform individuals; to act on those it shelters; to carry the effects of power right to them; to alter them. (Foucault 1977, 172.) The concurrent transformation of the characteristics of power from the 17th century to the 19th century highlight also the current responsibility of an individual to act and develop oneself on the terms of normalizing power.

Documents are visible, readable or hearable practices regulated by specific relations at a specific time, regulated by forces of society. (Ibid, 40.) Therefore architecture too should be considered as a practice of power—regulated by the prevailing social relations and knowledge—and not simply as an expression of an individual architect. However, the architectonic tradition has not changed significantly since the 17th century in terms of perception and symbolic role of buildings. Especially institutional buildings have always been representations and still are. Is there a need for change, I cannot say, but it is worth noting that all fields of society do not change uniformly.

This is in the core of the findings here: the function and expression of architectural spaces has superficially stayed the same, but the motive has changed. Buildings as representations still mediate the same practices, but the society in terms of practices has transformed. Are we aware of this? Are we capable of reading the spaces as traditions with enduring histories but with modern exe-
cutions? Can we see the palace as something else than representation of a power that no longer exists? Do we implicitly and unconsciously still juxtapose the Parliament building with king castle, due to the immutable architectonic tradition even though the societal reality has changed drastically? What is the burden or legacy of architecture in terms of power? Does it keep up the outdated interpretations of power in peoples unconscious? Or work simply as symbols of institutions that execute their power elsewhere?

Power- vise, societal regulation is both an imposition of forces prohibiting certain practices and a dispositive of forces included in practices. In simple terms, society does not just rule out certain practices. It works because actors accept and maintain, in their actions, what is known to be acceptable action. Hence, power excludes what is not said; and it selects what is said. Similarly, knowledge is that which is excluded; and it is that which is said. Power-knowledge is not an abstraction, it is practices. And as practices it is only intelligible by means of the concrete historical conditions that rule and regulate, exclude and include what is done or said. Practices are visible, rules are not. Rules are not the action of society on actors, but the conditions within which action takes place. Power, thereby, is not rule imposition, but practices. (Lemert & Gillan 1982, 39.) And these practices are something that one should always be able to challenge or resist, since they are not abstract. Therefore it should not be a problem that the way power is imposed has changed, but what if we have become ignorant or blind to it? How to resist then?

All of the above led me contemplating the actual visual, spatial and psychological manifestation of power in the prevailing built environment—and ultimately in the prevailing societal and social reality. Since, architecture and built environment are a fundamental part of the social and functional world, I feel they should be considered more carefully in terms of their role as a creator, conveyor, transformer and restrictive structure inside society. And ideally taken as a part of planning practices and education. But how could this happen? It should not be impossible, since after all architecture arises from, affects and is in numerous ways in interplay with the society.
For sure, indoctrinating teaching or bare liking for architecture is not enough. It is impossible to establish any method or construct any pleasant or functional space without understanding its principles. This is why more effort needs to be put into transdisciplinary collaboration and education. In order to resist or embrace, we need to understand. And as long as it is not understood that power is not localized in the state apparatus, and nothing in society will be changed if the mechanisms of power that function outside, below and alongside the state apparatuses, on a much more minute and everyday level, are not also changed. But as soon as this is acknowledged and implemented into architectural practice, we as planners have provably great amount of power in our hands to affect the society through spatial designing and representative values.

Fundamentally power is everywhere and no-one is capable of avoiding it not as a user nor as a subject. Simply, where to draw the door is a deliberate act of power. And not drawing it anywhere is probably even more drastic act of power. Hence, power is unavoidable. This is why we need to acknowledge it and not to be afraid of it. We cannot hide behind big designer eyeglasses and act like it is not there. Power is not negative per se. The belief that there is a fundamental and set gulf between those who exercise power and those who undergo it is helplessly outdated. It is all about how consciously and in what manner it is being used. It is about giving the other side the possibility resist and be aware. This is how power works as its best: as a mutually acknowledged relationship where goals are collective and open for discussion.
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