

KADIR HAS UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES



BORDERS AS BLACK HOLE
CONTEMPORARY MIGRATORY FILMS IN TURKEY


GRADUATE THESIS

AZRA AYATA

October, 2016

BORDERS AS BLACKHOLE
CONTEMPORARY MIGRATORY FILMS IN TURKEY

AZRA AYATA



Submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in
CINEMA AND TELEVISION

KADİR HAS UNIVERSITY

October, 2016

KADİR HAS UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

BORDERS AS BLACKHOLE
CONTEMPORARY MIGRATORY FILMS IN TURKEY

AZRA AYATA

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. Gülümser Deniz Bayrakdar (Advisor)

Kadir Has University

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Melis Behlil

Kadir Has University

Prof. Dr. Gülseren Yücel

Nişantaşı Üniversitesi

APPROVAL DATE: 04/10 /2016

“I, Azra Ayata, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.”



AZRA AYATA & SIGNATURE

ABSTRACT

BORDERS AS BLACKHOLE

CONTEMPORARY MIGRATORY FILMS IN TURKEY

Azra Ayata

Master of Cinema and Television

Advisor: Prof. Dr. Glmser Deniz Bayrakdar

October, 2016

European Union integration process foresees harmonization of nation-state's migration and asylum systems. In this sense, border controls are strengthened and non-European countries are included in these border regimes. As a candidate country, Turkey's migration and asylum system shows changes. As a result of these policies, new transition spaces, structures and definitions are generated. In accordance with changing socio-political environments; cinema reflects these changes. In this thesis, primarily focusing on *Kumun Tadı* (Melisa nel, 2013) and *Rıza* (Tayfun Pirselimoglu, 2007), I will examine how these films question produced structures and definitions of migration. In this sense, they offer "critical sites" to those newly established spaces.

Keywords: Smuggling, representation of illegal migration in Turkish Cinema

ÖZET

KARA DELİĞE DÖNÜŞEN SINIRLAR TÜRK SİNEMASINDA ÇAĞDAŞ GÖÇ FİLMLERİ

Azra Ayata

Programın Adı: Sinema ve Televizyon

Danışman: Gülümser Deniz Bayrakdar

Ekim, 2016

Avrupa Birliği'nin entegrasyon sürecinde birçok politika alanında olduğu gibi ulus devletlerdeki göç ve sığınma sistemlerinde uyumlaştırılmaya gidilmiştir. Bu anlamda sınır kontrolleri arttırılmış, birliğe üye olmayan devletler bu sistemlere dahil edilmiştir. Avrupa Birliği'ne aday ülke konumunda olan Türkiye de sistemini Avrupalılaştırmıştır. Diğer yandan bu politikalar yeni geçiş mekanlarının, yapıların ve yeni tanımların üretilmesine neden olmuştur. Bu gelişimler sinemaya da yansımıştır. Bu bağlamda, Türkiye'nin bir geçiş ülkesi olması üzerinden, “illegal göç” ve “transit göç” konusunu ele alan *Kumun Tadı* ve *Rıza* filmleri incelenmiştir. Bu filmler, yeni geçiş mekanlarının oluşturulmasına karşı eleştirel bir tavır sergilemişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Göçmen kaçakçılığı, Türk Sineması'nda illegal göç temsili

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor Prof. Dr. Deniz Bayrakdar for guiding me through this process and thesis committee members Doc. Dr. Melis Behlil and Prof. Dr. Gülseren Güçhan for discussion and feedback.



Table of Contents

Abstract

Özet

Acknowledgements

1	Introduction	1
2	Europeanization of Asylum and Migration Politics	4
2.1	Bordering Europe.....	4
2.2	Critical Approaches to Transit Migration.....	5
3	Migrant and Diasporic Cinema	8
3.1	Migratory and Diasporic Aesthetic.....	10
3.2	Space and Mobility.....	14
3.3	Migration and Turkish Cinema.....	17
4	<i>Kumun Tadı and Rıza</i>	18
4.1	<i>Kumun Tadı</i>	18
4.1.1.	Space and Time.....	21
4.1.2.	Boat and Sea.....	33
4.2	<i>Rıza</i>	34
4.2.1.	Space and Time.....	34
4.2.2.	Trucks, Hotels Pubs.....	38
5	Conclusion	40
	References	42

1. INTRODUCTION

Practices of migration, mobility and border control regime have reconfigured since 1990s. Schengen Agreement is also the turning point for creation of new spaces or migration figures such as “transit migration” and “transit country.” There has been a growing interest in concept of “transit migration” around the world, although it is not a new phenomenon. In line with this trend, number of studies focusing on “transit migration” has been increasing also in Turkey on top of already existing considerable amount of literature about emigration. The main reason of this uptrend is the geographical position of Turkey. That is to say, Turkey is geographically located in the junction of the countries where people want to leave or escape from their “home country” (the Middle East, Central and South Asia) and move to “host countries” (European countries) due to various reasons. Nevertheless, “transit migration” is not an automatic and neutral outcome of geography. Furthermore, “transit migration” is usually associated with “illegality.”

From the very beginning the harmonization of member states’ asylum and migration policies focus on the main headings such as more stringent measures for crossing the land and sea borders. In accordance with this purpose, Turkey approaches the issue alike. These strict controls at borders and lengthy procedures for migration have led to an increase in “illegal immigration.” Therefore, part of the immigration literature discusses the issue in terms of borders’ security, controlling the migrant “inflow” and their integration. Furthermore, there is significant amount of studies dealing with the judicial aspects of the immigration while national and international institutions conduct surveys, publishing statistics about demographic features of immigration. To end with, non-governmental organizations are primary actors in

creating policy discourse such as definition of “illegalization of transit immigration”. However, the first and foremost significant aspect of migration is humanitarian side. In this sense, films are important tools in order to question security-based tendencies.

In this thesis, my aim is to bring to the fore how films approach the reflection of “transit migration” on the basis of “illegality.” With an interdisciplinary method, primarily focusing on political science and international relations, this thesis scrutinizes the newly produced films dealing with “transit migration” in Turkey. In other words, studies of migrant and diasporic cinema in Europe, international relations, mobility studies will constitute the theoretical framework of this thesis. Accordingly, *Kumun Tadi* (Melisa Önel, 2013) and *Rıza* (Tayfun Pirselimoglu, 2003) will be analyzed since these are the only examples focusing on “transit migration.” In this sense, these films are counter-geographic problematizing dichotomies such as host/home, inclusion/exclusion, and us/them.

The first chapter examines harmonization of asylum and migration policies at European Union level. This system leads to paradoxical (re)production of the borders. That is to say, borders of Europe has expanded on the other hand strengthen measures of keeping “alien” outside of the territory is encouraged. In order to achieve this aim, various tools are used making this border regime possible e.g. the construction of concepts such as “transit countries” and “transit migration.” Thus, narratives of these tools will be analyzed. Indeed, all tools come to the same thing: “illegal migration.” In conclusion, this chapter attempts to define how ever-evolving borders of European Union affects the faith of migrants and non- EU geographies; especially in Turkey.

Representation of identities in the cinema has also magnified thus, the second chapter underscores literature overview of migration and diasporic film studies. Since

migration is associated with mobility and geography, this chapter evaluates mobility studies dealing with space. In this sense, Hamid Naficy's "accented cinema" and Laura Marks' "intercultural cinema" are significant concepts, which mention films creating counter-discourse and counter-geographies to policies highlighted in chapter one. Furthermore, Michel Foucault's concept of "heterotopia" and Marc Augé's "non-places" are also helpful for analyzing selected films.

The third chapter intends to make analysis of *Kumun Tadı /Seaburners* (Melisa Önel, 2013), and *Rıza* (Tayfun Pirselimöğü, 2007) to examine role of cinema in reflecting migration politics, particularly about the creation of "transit migration" policy discourse and recently established structure of borders. These are the recent examples dealing with "transit migration" emphasizing "illegality" in Turkish cinema. Thus, it is important to make an analysis of these two films in terms of thematic and formal to find out how they question the established structure of migration.

Final chapter assesses Turkish cinema and its perspective on "transit migration", arising as a result of harmonization process of migration and asylum system in Europe. "Transit country" and "transit migration" are categories, employed to define and comprehend the borders of "dystopian imaginary homeland". Thematic and aesthetic preferences yield breakdown of home/host, inclusion/exclusion and us/them binaries by creating "critical-sites" in the film.

2. EUROPEANIZATION OF MIGRATION AND ASYLUM POLITICS

Border control regime, mobility and practices of migration have been changing since 1990s. Schengen Agreement and Dublin Conventions are the primary factors of this shift that foresee the elimination of internal borders while encouraging the stringent measure at external borders. As a result of these policies borders of Europe change, multiplied and went beyond the EU. Besides these agreements, European Union uses various tools in order to externalize its border regime. Next section assesses brief overview of this border regime. What's more transit migration will be defined since it is constructed by this border regime.

2.1. Bordering Europe

Ahmet İçduygu argues there is exchange between countries, which are in need of labor and have surplus of labor. When there is labor shortage, the status of migration-legal, illegal, transit- is irrelevant. Therefore, their mobility based on economic interests is intensified by securitization of borders. (İçduygu and Yüksek 2010: 450-454) As it is seen, mobility and border narratives depend on selectivity, economy and security. Tools of border regime can be summarized in three categories even though their ever-evolving feature is accepted as an obstacle to illustrate these categories in a strict way.

The first tool is the construction of the concepts and migration categories such as “transit country,” “safe country of origin,” “country of first asylum,” “safe third country,” “transit migration,” “illegal migration,” “irregular migration.” Secondly, EU signs readmission agreements with non-EU countries that foresee return of people to these countries. Final tool is the establishment of border control regime such as *European Data Archive Convention (EURODAC)*, *Schengen Information System (SIS)*, *European Agency for the Management of Operational Cooperation at the External*

Borders of the Member States of the European Union (FRONTEX) with inclusion of non-European countries to these regimes.

As a result of these policies there is a system of “a border within a border” (Olga Lafazani 2013) or “network of networks” which constructs the categories of legal/illegal, citizen/denizen. (Jansen, Celikates and Bloois 2015) In the next section, the concept of “transit country” will be examined since, selected films for analysis for the third chapter deals with one of the border management regime’s tool: the concept of “transit migration” and its relationship with “illegality”

2.1. Critical Approaches to Transit Migration

Ahmet İçduygu in his article “*Transit Migration in Turkey: Trends, Patterns and Issues*” argue that the term “transit migration” is used for the phenomenon where migrants come to a country of destination with the intention of going and staying in another country. The unique position of these migrants derive from their own intention-based so-called “temporary” character in the country of transit together with largely “irregularity” or “illegality” (İçduygu 2005)

In his article, “*Transit Migration: A Blurred and Politicized Concept*” Franck Düvell argues that the concept of “transit migration” is constructed by European Union in order to externalize its migration policy and integrate non-EU countries into a comprehensive migration control policy. Moreover, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations play a key role in the construction of policy discourse. Thus, the concept of transit migration was constituted and popularized. (Düvell 2010: 415)

The concept of “transit migration” seems to enter into policy discourse during the early 1990s. Firstly, UN/EC used the term “transit country. (Düvell 2010; Papadopoulou-Kourkoula 2008) UN/EC define transit migration as “migration to a

country with intention of seeking the possibility there to emigrate to another country as the country of final destination" by means that are partially, if not fully, illegal." (1993:7)

International Organization for Migration (IOM) is another significant actor paving the way for entrance of 'transit migration' in policy discourse via its series of papers. Furthermore, Duvell argues, "Over the time, transit migration became a discursive code for illegal migration. This frame includes asylum seekers who are perceived ineligible and who are supposed to make their claim in the first safe country instead of moving on." (Duvel 2010: 416- 417) Yet, In his article "*Transit and Suspension: Migration Management or the Metamorphosis of Asylum Seekers into Illegal Immigrants*" Christina Oelgemöller confers that right from the start, in discourse of western governments' representatives illegality took place rather than about refugee and asylum seekers by referring *Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees* (IGC). Their discussions give priority to management and control instead of protection. (Oelgemöller 2011: 409-410)

Indeed, the tools of border management regime are built upon mutual benefit of countries involved in this regime. Conditionality is among the tools of EU to reach reciprocal benefit. In case the conditions are fulfilled, performance of the target government is rewarded, where vice versa result in e.g. withdrawal of funding. Capitalization of EU's dominant position is sustained against external parties, possessing the tendency to be partially/fully integrated with EU. In addition to financial aid; technical support, membership prospect, conclusion of a collaboration project exhibit further examples of rewards, all of which are applicable for the theme transit migration. (Sampson, Gifford and Taylor 2016) In other words, transit migration does not only

hinge on politics e.g. EU's asylum and migration policies, but also linked with the economy. (Hess 2012)

As a result of this rewards, Oelgemöller argues "protection in the region of origin leads to the assumption that there are countries labeled 'safe third countries' and on these grounds to the inference that people who move on from a place where they had found protection must necessarily be illegal. All Western European countries considered each other as 'safe third countries'; however, this idea was extended to Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Such policy provided the basis for the idea that people could find a place of protection near to their putative home." (Oelgemöller 2011: 416)

Nowadays, no consensus on the definition of transit migration has been attained. Transit migration mainly refers to "on hold" (Brekke and Brochmann 2014) lives of asylum seekers in the "waiting room." "Involuntary mobility" (Carling 2002) is also included, which leads to a state of in-between-ness. Yet, state of in-between-ness is unable to differentiate the concept of "transit" and distinction between temporariness to permanency (Hess 2012: 435) (Sampson, Gifford and Taylor 2016: 1137-1138)

Moreover, transit migration plays a major role to provide and sustain geopolitical order. In-between-ness state of asylum seekers does not arise as a stand alone existence, but turns out to be a preferred positioning of governments to regulate refugee access and draw the frame of border regime. (Samson, Grifford and Taylor 2016) Hightower concludes, "limbo does not simply exist, but instead, is a tool used by governments to restrict refugee access to the border of EU and systems of protection." (Hightower 2015: 335) Overall, as Christina Oelgemöller argues that the concept of "transit country" has a vital political function still situated in an "us/them" binary. (Oelgemöller 2010: 408)

In the next chapter, how European migration and asylum politics find its place in film studies will set forth. Specifically, I will try to examine the relationship between the notion of “transit migration” and space.

3. MIGRANT AND DIASPORIC CINEMA

Sandra Ponzanesi claims that migratory characters and forms of representation changed and accelerated patterns of migration have magnified their significance since 1980s thanks to digital technology. This also leads to the shift in migrants and postcolonial subjects’ position brings them “periphery” to “center.” (Ponzanesi 2012) In line with this changes, many film scholars come to conclusion that there exist a shift away from the earlier stereotypical representations of victimhood to a new cinematic language comprising of different cultural encounters and multiple border crossings. (Bayraktar 2016: 7) For instance, in her article “*Beyond Paternalism: Turkish German Traffic in Cinema,*” Deniz Göktürk debates that until well into 1980s, stories of minority films in Germany represent Turkish women were victims suppressed by their patriarchal fathers, brothers and husbands and excluded from public spaces or imprisoned in closed spaces. *Vierzig Quadrameter Deutschland* (Tevfik Başer, 1986) and *Abschied vom Falschen Paradies* (Tevfik Başer, 1988) are the examples of this kind of stories. In a similar vein, she refers the film *Yasemin* (Hark Bohm, 1988) is also made by an understanding that German society is considered as civilized while the Turkish patriarchy is bound traditional beliefs. She argues that since they are funded by same source, both films of Turkish filmmakers in Germany and German filmmakers are ideologically close and freedom for Turkish women from patriarchy, dependence or prostitution is popular fantasy creates empathy with victims of violent “other culture.”

What's more, it primarily serves the purpose of self-confirmation. Thus, these films finally confirm the superiority of German culture. (Göktürk 2002: 250-251)

Departing from victim narratives, there exist different films where Turkish-German encounters are humorously staged. *Polizei* (Şerif Gören, 1988) and *Berlin in Berlin* (Sinan Çetin, 1993) are examples of this kind of cinema. *Berlin in Berlin* traverses the old understanding of ethnographic and voyeuristic gaze. In the film, Turkish family “explores” the German who killed their son accidentally. The claustrophobic situation of captivity is reconfigured ironically by the camera lingers on him in close up. Moreover, in her account, films directed by Fatih Akin have different style because of liberating women from the prison of a subnational paternalism. For instance, *Im Juli* (Fatih Akin, 2000) projects fantasies of travel, transgresses the boundaries of realist representation and performs national identities with self-conscious identity. (Göktürk 2002: 252-255)

In conclusion, migration and diasporic studies dealing with cinema will be overviewed in this chapter. Hamid Naficy's concept of “accented cinema” and Laura Marks' “intercultural cinema,” which includes broad range of films creating counter-discourse and counter-geographies will be defined. Furthermore, Michel Foucault's concept of “heterotopia” and Marc Augé's “non-places” take significant part of this chapter since migration and exile associated with geography and space.

3.1. Migratory and Diasporic Aesthetics

Some scholars deal with the notion of transnational cinema by focusing on exilic, diasporic and postcolonial cinema and its hybrid characteristic that challenge the dominant host culture, its narrative and aesthetic formations.

To begin with, Laura Marks claims that intercultural cinema paves the way for resistance to dominant host culture. In order to achieve this aim she proposes “haptic visuality.” Haptic qualities can be found in many works. They are not just belonging to one’s film who experience of migration, exile, diaspora and displacement on the other hand; intercultural films take advantage of these haptic qualities combination of visual, olfactory and haptic perception. (2000: 176)

According to Laura Marks, cinema possesses the power to evoke sense of touch by appealing to haptic visuality. In order to achieve this, eyes function like organs of touch. In addition, she makes separation between haptic visuality and optic visuality. In haptic visuality things are seen from enough distance therefore their separate and distinct form is perceived in a deep space. That is to say, haptic visuality deals with the surface of object instead of pulling into illusionistic depth. Moreover, it privileges the material presence of the image and evoke other senses such as touch and kinesthetic. Similarly, cinema has haptic qualities. (2000: 162) She explains that cinema achieve haptic character by changing focus, graininess or using under-over expose intentionally. Some medium-specific techniques such as optical printing, solarization, and electronic manipulability can be usually haptic as well. Hence, viewer is discouraged to distinguish objects and encouraged to relationship with the screen as a whole. Moreover, she exemplifies *Blow-up* (Michelangelo Antonioni, 1966) and asserted that some haptic images may raise ontological questions. (Laura Marks 2000: 170-176)

Intercultural cinema also benefits from these haptic qualities. By way of illustration, films use haptic images to head off viewer's expectations relating to exotic visual spectacle. Sometimes, haptic images gives impression of seeing for the first time by gradually clarifying what is in the image instead of putting the image already knowing what it is. Moreover, she uses the term "haptic sound" to describe a moment consisting of too many sounds and viewer cannot decide which sounds are most significant to attend to. Therefore, using of haptic sound leads to difficulty to separate aural boundaries between body and world. (Marks 2000: 182-183)

Moreover, Hamid Naficy used "Independent Transnational Cinema" in his article "*Phobic Spaces and Liminal Panics: Independent Transnational Film Genre*" as a genre in opposition to "geographic, national, cultural, cinematic and meta-cinematic" boundaries. He particularly pays attention to exile as a genre in his article. This genre consists of two aspects. The first aspect is transnational filmmakers as interstitial authors. Secondly, claustrophobic spaces are the most important iconographies of this genre. Transnational films belong a genre that self-narrativization with special thematic and stylistic conventions. Furthermore, they are product of particular transnational location of its filmmaker in time, place and culture. Exile and transnationality are considered as processual, discursive and ambivalent. In addition, there is a shifting relationship between homeland and host society that are continuously challenged. As a result, they are de-territorialized and located in interstitial space with hybrid excess. Beside this hybrid outcome, transnational cinema is positioned on the margins of the mainstream film industry. (Nacify, 2005: 120-25)

He advances his idea "independent transnational cinema" in his book "*An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking.*" According to him, the term

“accented cinema” comprises exilic, diasporic and post-colonial cinema. Furthermore, origin of filmmakers has an effect upon both thematic and aesthetic aspects of films.

“Accented” films are interstitial in terms of production modes, their presence in the interstices of social formations, spaces, de-territorialized conditions of its makers and generic conventions. In addition, narratives of these films are epistolarity consisting of letter reading, telephonic epistle that creates and exchanges meaning. Exile and epistolarity necessitate one another, for distance and absence drive them both. The use of different types of epistolary in films creates an illusion of presence emphasizing text’s interstices. What’s more, epistolarity is regarded as counterhegemonic since it has multi-vocal, multi-authorial, free indirect courses and challenges the classical use of omniscient narrator and narrative system in films. (Naficy 2001)

Even though there are exceptions, many accented films questions belonging and identity and opposed to hostile conditions through emphasizing the notion of travel, travelling aesthetics and travelling identity. Territoriality and geography is significant theme in these films because accented films are de-territorialized. Their pre-occupation with place is expressed in their open and close-space time representations. (Naficy 2001)

Consequently, he encounters the term “tactile optics”, which reflects the nonlinear and extraordinary coexistence of multiple times, foci, narratives and spaces. Film characters, exilic filmmakers and relevant audience via memory, desires, nostalgic aspirations and multiple losses extract this montage effect. Furthermore, audiovisual communication from different locations boosts tactility. Similar happenings at a film, in this case multiple locations, are viewed with an awareness by displaced people. Elements, by way of illustration, gestures, mimics, images, characters, sounds and

locations trigger “sense memories” (Marks 1994:258) with a possible expansion towards smell, touch and recalls exilic spectators’ private and individual emotions associated with the things/people left behind (Nacify 2001: 29)

In her book “*Hayalet Ev: Yeni Türk Sinemasında Aidiyet Kimlik ve Bellek*,” Asuman Suner argues that Nacify sees Yılmaz Güney’s films as examples of “accented cinema” because of his exile experience. However, Suner criticizes Nacify’s narrow concept of displacement that he only takes into account movements from Third World towards the west. (Suner 2006: 263) This kind of evaluation of displacement leads to ignore exile and migration experience of both between and within non-western countries. Moreover, this approach glorifies migration, exile and diaspora experience and is based on preliminary acceptance that this experience has brought self-critical consciousness about belonging automatically. Thirdly, making experience of exile into fixed status leads to discrimination between different historical and social conditions experienced in exile and hampers to be able to grasp these experiences in their context. Finally, this approach is also problematic because of claiming local at the same time global. Ultimately such a claim gives priority to cultural production in the West to have a statement and right to criticize aesthetic and political aspects of belonging in the universal (the production of third world origin, albeit done by artists) plane while it can only make evaluations about these issues within their specific context. (Suner 2006: 285)

3.2. Space and Mobility

In his book, *“Non- Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity,”* Marc Augé defines non-places in contrast with anthropological place. Anthropological place contains organic society stemming from space and time on the basis of shared meanings and notions of personhood. According to him, non-places are the production of supermodernity indicating that they are not anthropological places. That is, if a place cannot be described as “relational, historical or concerned with identity will be a non-place.” Their characteristics can be defined as: “listed, classified, promoted to the status of ‘places of memory’ and assigned to a circumscribed and specific position.” To him, hotels, holiday clubs, refugee camps, means of transports, supermarkets are the examples of such non-places. Furthermore, Non-places are transit and waiting points consisting of both luxurious and inhuman conditions. They are surrendered by solitary individuality, temporal and ephemeral. This places only creates ‘neither singular identity nor relations; only solitude, and similitude’ (Augé 1995: 77-78)

Sandra Ponzanesi argue that Marc Augé builds his concept of non-places on Michel Foucault’s notion of heterotopia and highlight their transformative character “where the “host” who is usually in a position of domination and control, becomes dependent on the “guests” (Ponzanesi 2012: 678) He argued that these alternative venues becoming a place of semi-belonging. Michel Foucault introduced the term heterotopia in a lecture for architects in 1967, referring various institutions and places that distort “visible” continuity and normality of everyday space. Foucault called these places as “heterotopias”- different or another place. Indeed, heterotopia is a medicine term indicating that one particular tissue develops at another place. This dislocation does not refer a disease. (Lax 1998: 114) (Johnson 2016: 3)

In his article “*Of Other Spaces (Des Espaces Autres)*” Michel Foucault argues that we live inside a set of relations that delineates emplacements, which are irreducible to one another and absolutely not superimposable on one another. Yet, one might observe the set of relation in order to find definition of a given emplacement, for instance, to describe the whole set of relations that defines the emplacement of passage such as trains and streets or the emplacement of temporary relaxation such as cafes, cinemas and beaches. (Foucault 2008: 16) However, Foucault is interested in two main types of sites having a remarkable feature like being in relationship with all other sites. Moreover, these sites also suspend, neutralize or invert the set of relations, which they represent, reflect or designate. These spaces linked with all the others still contradict all the other emplacements that are distinguished into two main types. (Foucault 2008: 17)

The first type is utopias. These are emplacements with no real places. Utopias are also in direct relation or inverted analogy with the real space of society. In other words, they represent society in a perfected form or have reverse situation with society. In essence, utopias are not real spaces. The second type is heterotopia. These are real places existing in every civilization and culture. Heterotopias are something like counter-emplacements that are formed in the very founding of society. Moreover, they are kind of realized utopias where all other emplacements within the culture represented, contested and inverted. Even though, it can be possible to indicate their real location, places of this kind are outside of all places since as opposed to utopia, these places are different from the sites that they reflect and mention. (Foucault 2008: 17)

Foucault argues between utopias and these quite other sites there exists mixed, joint experience, which function as mirror. The mirror is after all a utopia because it's a placeless place. He asserts that one see himself/ herself over there where he/she in

unreal, virtual space. It's utopic feature is that it enables someone to see oneself there where he/she absent. Nevertheless, it has also heterotopic characteristics since one can realize that his/her absence where he/she is (Foucault 2008: 17).

There exist no universal form of heterotopias. In other words, every civilization and culture constructs heterotopias in varied forms. Nevertheless, he classifies two main categories of heterotopias. First category is the crisis heterotopias consisting of privileged, sacred or forbidden places in relation to society that reserved for individuals who live in a state of crisis. Military service or boarding school can be given as an example, since young men's virility were supposed to take place elsewhere than at home, it should take out of sight. The second category is the heterotopias of deviation here people show deviant behaviour in accordance with required norm of the society such as prisons. (Foucault 2008: 18)

Furthermore function of heterotopias shows changes in a period of time. Foucault gives cemetery as an example of this principle since he argued that until the end of the century the cemetery was located at the heart of the center. Yet, in the beginning of 19th century has the right to own their little box which located "the other" outside the center where each family posses its dark resting place. What's more heterotopias have the capacity of gathering distinct sites and spaces, which seems incompatible to exist together. For instance, theatre welcomes various places that foreign to one another on its rectangle shape of the stage. Additionally, heterotopias accumulate time such as museums whereas, the other ones linked to time in its most fleeting, transitory aspect. In other words, these heterotopias show temporal character such as fairgrounds. Finally, heterotopias require opening and closing systems that both isolate them and make them

penetrable. Put it differently, this kind of heterotopic site is not freely accessible like public spaces. (2008: 20-21)

3.3. Migration and Turkish Cinema

Until recent years, film studies in Turkey focus on representation of internal migration and exile. For instance, in her book “*Toplumsal Değişme ve Türk Sineması,*” Gülseren Yücel examines migration from rural to urban, their financial and cultural hardships in İstanbul, their family structure and changes in the migrant films thematically. (Yücel 1992: 97-150) Since, politics of mobility from urban to rural is significant within Turkey in those years.

From 1980s, practices of migration show changes. Reasons of this shift can be summarized as: Iranian Revolution, wars between Iran and Iraq (İçduygu 2000) and finally Syrian civil war. As a result of this evolution “transit migration” have become popularized in the policy discourse. Therefore, my contribution is to examine that how newly produced films handle with “illegalization of transit migration.” In this sense, next chapter comprise the formal and thematic analysis of *Kumun Tadı* and *Rıza*. These films benefit from aesthetic choices that “accented” or “intercultural cinema” uses.

4. KUMUN TADI AND RIZA

4.1. Kumun Tadı/ Seaburners

As indicated in the first chapter, European Union asylum and migration law leads to construction of the “transit migration” and “transit zones.” In a similar vein, *Kumun Tadı* also creates a “transitional space” via sound and image corresponding to “dystopian imaginary homeland” where different cultures encounter. In this sense, the construction of the story around “impossible love” between Hamit and Denise correlative with the building of “transit zones” for refugees who is assumed to pass and reach “Fortress Europe.”

Film title in Turkish via sand [kum] and the taste [tat], which are directly related with death. Moreover, film’s English title, *Seaburners*, has a remarkable meaning. At her interview with Engin Ertan, Melisa Önel, expresses that African refugees are called *Seaburners* in African literature, since they migrate through the sea and burn their identity during their journey in Mediterranean.¹ “It’s an awareness of a life without name, without legitimacy, a life of enclosure in physical, genealogical and cultural spaces perceived as uninhabitable. It also entails the search for a horizon drawing on an imaginary of the elsewhere and of exile.”² (Pandolfo 2007: 333)

Space, time, editing and camera movements and also relationship of each component within itself coupled with interaction of two or more components enable uncertainty about “reality” of the scenes. “Blurred” characters, darkened shots, reflections from vaporous mirrors are employed to heighten this uncertainty. Film encourages the spectator to rethink about myth of this newly established spaces as

¹ <http://www.radikal.com.tr/kultur/melisa-onel-bir-duygunun-pesinden-gittim-1186303/>
11.09.2016

² quoted by Alessandra Di Maio

examined in the first chapter and this uncertainty leads to downfall of such dichotomies as inclusion/exclusion, host/home and us/them. Finally, film also offers re-signification process for newly established zones and goes beyond the realistic conventions.

Diegetically speaking, the story of the film can be summarized as follow: The main character Hamit (Timuçin Esen) is a charcoal dealer and engaged in smuggling as the antihero. Hamit (meaning the sublime one to whom we owe our being, the high presence) works for Ali (the name of cousin of prophet Muhammed and also meaning sublime/high/supreme) who is also a charcoal dealer. Mehmet (derived from the name of prophet Muhammed) helps the two in their dealings. Mehmet is stuck into the power struggle between Hamit and Ali. Being subordinate to Ali, Hamit feels pessimistic about building a future in the unknown, desolate village. He falls in love with Denise (pronunciation of Denise resembles Deniz [sea] in Turkish) who is temporarily located in Turkey to conduct a research project on plants. Their love erodes gradually in correlation with the failing escape attempt of a new refugee group, which is obliged to live in the village for a certain period of time. After all, Hamit has to make decision that ends with his catastrophe.

As indicated in the second chapter Hamid Naficy has explored the elements that characterize exilic and diasporic cinema, which he describes as “accented,” that origin of the filmmaker impacts on not only thematic but also stylistic aspects of film. Accented cinema might be characterized by questions of belonging and identity, by language use, modes of production, narrative style, and the addition of haptic elements Moreover, Laura Marks’ “intercultural cinema” also embodies her theory from the exile and diaspora experiences of directors. On the contrary, director Melisa Önel lacks in individual experience in those fields. However, some stylistic and thematic affiliation

with these studies can be traced in *Kumun Tadi*. When mode of production is taken into account, the cast and crew include people from different countries such as Croatia, Bulgaria and Germany.

As indicated in the second chapter, heterotopias are fragments, gaps and discontinuities. “Heterotopias are “black holes” of the social imaginary where ordinary space-time is stretched, manipulated, or fractured.” (Elana Gomel 2014: 21) Film also uses this as a narration strategy. For instance, repetition of *tracking shots*, mirrors and doors not only serves “imaginary” characteristics of the film but also highlights how space and time is constructed. This strategy resembles the Laura Mark’s “haptic visuality” and Hamid Naficy’s “tactile optics,” which leads to the juxtaposition of multiple spaces, times, voices, narratives in the film. Moreover it is also about the spectatorship since certain images, sounds, and characters evoke “senses of memories.”

In this sense, the spectator has an active role in the construction of the story. In conclusion, this study examines the film by portraying each shot in order to find the core elements of how the film focuses on “illegalization of transit migration”

Besides thematic and aesthetic affiliations with Hamid Naficy’s “accented cinema,” Michel Foucault’s notion of heterotopia and Marc Augé’s non-places and psychoanalysis will be scrutinized in order to illustrate how film approaches “illegalization of transit migration”.

4.1.1 Space and Time

In the beginning of the film, there is a black *frame* accompanied by uncanny and multifaceted sound track. As these sounds continue, viewer faces rough sea. Then, there are three cuts respectively: (a) infertile hill nearby the sea, (b) arid scrub lacking in *depth of field* where the *frame* is partially *blurred*, (c) *high angle shot* over the scrub where part of the sea is included in the *frame*. The black screen follows these three cuts, where the soundtrack is still heard; yet the notion of sound evolves as if one is drowning under the sea. Soundtrack continues while *gaze* of the camera is pacing seawater and beach in a *steadicam shot*, a dead body is recognized on the seaside. Retroactively speaking, this body belongs to Hamit. Suddenly, the black screen is seen. After the black frame, Hamit escapes from something with a torch for a while. Title of the film *Kumun Tadi* superimposes onto the escape scene.

The *fade in* is accompanied by music (Erdal Helvacioğlu) *fade out* is assembled by the car voyage and the credits flow on the dark side of the frame. After the credits, there exists *tracking shot* from right to the left of the frame, ending with black screen. When the screen opens again, Hamit walks on a street. The sound of a train arises from the *off-screen space*. Then, we see Hamit under the bridge while he is looking up to the train passing. The camera *tilts* down as someone approaches Hamit and acknowledges that the job is off. However, in part of the dialogue it is not possible to see the mouth of the other man and Hamit. Indeed, throughout the film, “impression of reality” is sustained or disappointed by this way creating confusion for the spectator.

Afterwards, they depart from the subway. Hamit is framed in a *close-up shot* and sits in an unknown place. He smokes and drinks beer. Spectators hear news reporting

that the antique smugglers dug a 28-meter tunnel to enter tumulus in Sivas and a nationwide investigation has been initiated to catch them.

Then, camera cuts to inside of a car. Hamit drives on a muddy road. Two shots follow afterwards: First we see fogs surrounding coals and then two men sifting the coals. Later, the camera is positioned in the cottage where spectators view from the window that Hamit is coming. We hear that the door opens and closes although we did not see this scene. Then, there exists a bug on the window, which is visible once again towards the end of the film. The camera cuts to Hamit in a *close-up shot*. He cleans his body for a while and calls Denise. They agree to meet at night.

Afterwards, the spectator sees Denise walking on a street where people look at someone trying to lift a statue. Simultaneously, we hear that smugglers have been arrested continue to the check the “border.” Nevertheless, the sources of the sound are not shown. In the next shot, Denise drives her car. Her face is *blurred* during this shot. Subsequent shot illustrates Denise heading towards the reeds. There is *tracking shot* from right to the left. Suddenly, Denise hears an uncanny sound, as she is moving in the reeds. She investigates the environment carefully. She continues walking as if she found out the reason, while camera follows her. She exits the reeds and stands for a while. Suddenly, sound of gunshot is heard. Again, we are unable to see the source of this sound. Eventually, Denise is framed in a green house. She wanders around and examines the plants in the muddy sand. The camera cuts to outside of the green house. Denise closes the tarp; hence we are unable to witness anything. The remarkable difference between two subsequent shots is the color of Denise’s sweater. At first shot, she wears green sweater yet, we see her in a white sweater as she is closing the tarp. Therefore, we assume that time changed.

Mountain, encountered as the upcoming shot, is one of the sublime objects of the film. There exists sound of rough sea arising from the *off-screen space*. Afterwards, almost entire frame becomes dark. Someone walks with a torch. Following shot illustrates Denise approaching the camera with a torch thus we assume that the person in the previous shot was Denise. She stands in front of the window. Hamit is cooking and drinking rakı inside the shed. He returns to the window and realizes Denise. He approaches the window. Then, they are framed in a *medium shot* and make love. We see them in the bed lying down back to back. Soon after, Denise turns and looks at Hamit. In the next shot, Denise walks on the seaside. The color of her jacket is brown. Then, she is framed in the car and the spectator sees Mehmet driving his motorbike. Soon after, Denise recognizes somebody riding a motorbike through vaporous window on the wing mirror. On the whole, the spectator unable to claim both images fully overlaps. In other words, there exists impossible point of view that highlights the *off-screen space*.

Following shot demonstrates Hamit sleeping in his bed. A telephone rings yet we are unable to see the source of this sound. He wakes up and falls asleep again without responding the phone. Later, camera is positioned outside the window. Reflection of outside and Hamit's body superimposes, as Hamit stands by the window. Our perception of space is distorted since; this cottage is not same with the other one where Hamit and Mehmet stay. Moreover, throughout the film, Hamit prefers to stay at the hut nearby the sea. This shot however confuses us since this cottage is different from the other one where Hamit and Mehmet reside. Moreover, the spectator gets the information that this cottage is located at an unknown place far from the sea.

The next sequence begins with the Denise working on plants. She looks up a plant encyclopedia. In the other shot, she reveals some seeds from a pot and examines them.

After that, Hamit is framed in an extreme *close up* while he is washing his hands. The camera *tilts* up that we see Hamit's face in the reflection of the mirror saying, "Tell Ali I'm out tonight." Then, Mehmet is framed in a *close up*. He is listening to music. Suddenly, he shudders and takes out the earphones. We hear Hamit's voice: "Let him know I'll be staying at the hut again." Mehmet replies "Ali will be pissed of at me." Then camera cuts to Hamit's reflection and we hear Mehmet's voice: "He wanted you to leave the keys". Hamit responds, "If he got he balls, he can tell me himself". Later, Mehmet is framed in a *close-up shot*. He seems confused. Again, he wears his earphones and looks at the right side of the frame where Hamit is assumed to stand. Hamit expresses "Ali's little bitch!" Then, Hamit wears his jacket, opens the door and says, "Don't forget to let Ali know." In the next shot, Mehmet is framed in a *close-up shot* looking out of the window. The camera cuts to the window that we see Hamit leaving the shed in fogs.

The new sequence begins with the meeting of Hamit and Denise. They sit on the bank, smoke and kiss. At the following shots, Denise lies in the bed and we see them together with Hamit in a *close-up shot* without *depth of field*. We cannot identify the place. There exist only faces in the shot. She insists that she saw Mehmet in the morning. Hamit replies "he stays with the fishermen on the seaside." Later, they stand in the kitchen. Hamit prepares dinner. Suddenly the phone ring is heard. Hamit exits the hut and answers the phone. Therefore, we cannot exactly hear what he is talking about. Next, he enters the hut and sits on the chair. Denise asks what happened yet he does not reply her. She gets angry and leaves the frame. Afterwards, we see that Denise is sitting on the bed and staring at the right side of the frame, where Hamit is supposed to stand.

Another important sequence is that two people are walking with the torch in the dark. Again, almost all part of the frame is dark. We hear Denise mentioning rumours about human smugglers within neighborhood. Hamit replies, “they are antique smugglers.” Later, we see the road in tracking shot for a while. Next, Hamit is framed in a *close-up shot* while he is driving the car. He looks sleepy.

The frame is almost completely in black. Sound of the pickup is audible from *the off-screen space*. We are unable to see the pickup clearly. Hamit parks the car. In the next shot, camera follows Hamit while he is heading towards the hut. Mehmet sits with his friend in front of the shed. As soon as they recognized Hamit, they stand up. We cannot see clearly both Mehmet and his friend since the tree shadows him. Their conversation is respectively:

Hamit: Didn't you tell Ali that I was out tonight?

Mehmet: I told him. He needs the truck

Hamit: Fucking truck! So what if he needs it!

Mehmet: There's a load to be picked up from the port. He said you knew.

Then, Mehmet makes a gesture to a man who is sitting in front of the fire. He stands up and takes keys from Hamit. He exists from the frame. Mehmet wants Hamit to stay with him. They walk and sit around the table. Hamit asks “Anything to eat? Bring out some food. Come on, go get something to eat.” Then we see Mehmet moving out of the frame. The camera cuts to Hamit's close-up. He smokes his cigarette and looks left. This time, Mehmet is framed in a medium close-up and looks right where the spectator estimates they pursue the conversation face to face. Hamit expresses from *off-screen space*, “Have take puff.” Mehmet stretches out his arm, takes and smokes the cigarette. We assume that Hamit gives the cigarette even though we cannot see his hand in the

frame. Hamit continues to speak as “This place is falling apart. Soon charcoal furnaces will go down. Later, we see Hamit in a medium *close-up shot* telling, “Ali will leave!” He takes and smokes the cigarette while he is looking forward. Mehmet asks, “Why did you come back?” in an *off-screen space*. Hamit turns right and mentions, “I felt simply like doing so” In the next shot, Mehmet explains “The ones that go... How do they stay? They say if you get married with someone there you can stay.” Later, Hamit is framed in a *close-up shot*. He laughs at Mehmet’s reasoning. He looks right asking “What? Will you leave as well?” After we see Mehmet’s face, Hamit continues talking “Should I tell Ali that you’ll take the boat and make a run for it?” Mehmet replies him “There is nothing to do.” Next, Hamit mentions, “You think it’s easy? I would have stayed if it were easy.” This sequence illustrates Mehmet’s departure from the frame yet, we have never been shown if and/or when he comes and sits around the table. In other words, we have never seen both Hamit and Mehmet again in the same frame, after Mehmet left in the beginning of this dialogue where Hamit asks him for some food. We are mediated by gestures of them as if this conversation comes into existence. However, spectator is unable to assure the existence of such a conversation with regard to consecutive *shots*.

Afterwards, the moon and clouds are illustrated at night. There exists an uncanny soundtrack. We see poor and naked tree branches in the darkness in five different shots. Next, Hamit appears as if escaping from something or someone with his torch. Music and sound of thunder rise and fall, then we see black frame.

In the next shot we see the reflection of leaves and naked braches in the water. Later, we see Denise’s face in a *blurred, close-up shot*. The camera shows the reeds and feet are included in the frame. She wears her gloves and tries to cut plants in the water. There exists *tracking shot*, which again moves from right to left in the frame. We hear

the sound of motor. In the next shot Denise is framed in the motorboat. This time we can see her face clearly. The difference between these shots is the color of the Denise's jacket. In the previous shots where her face is *blurred* her jacket was in grey nevertheless, in this shot it is brown where the spectator clearly see her face.

The other sequence begins at Denise's workplace. She tries to fill the pot with plants. Rooster crow is heard. This shot is combined with the other shot in which we see green grass. The spectator sees smoke from chimneys. Now, rooster crow is heard in a more clear way. Hamit is lying down on his bed. A knock on the window is audible. Hamit turns his head to the left side of the frame. The camera cuts to a scene in which Mehmet is sleeping on the sofa and we see a silhouette outside of the window as someone is passing by. However, this scene has never been enlightened in the film. Who is the person passes by the window? Was it daydream of Hamit?

In the subsequent shot, Hamit is framed in *medium shot*. He wears his jacket in front of the hut's door. He expresses, "I'm leaving" Mehmet tries to wake up. Hamit's voice is heard without involvement of the frame. He tells, "If there is a problem we'll meet at the stable. Did you hear me?" Yes, I did. Mehmet replies, "Say something kid!" Mehmet continues to sleep in his bed. Then, the camera cuts to car. Hamit's reflection is seen from the rear view mirror of the car. Next, Hamit waits and smokes on a street. Suddenly he walks towards an establishment. Denise passes by the establishment and comes to Hamit. As soon as she recognizes Hamit, she changes her way however, Hamit forces her to stop and speaks with her. They agree to meet at night.

In other sequence, Denise works at her workplace; a woman comes and gives her a letter. Later, Denise is framed in a *close up shot* while she is driving her car. We see the *tracking shot* from left to right side of the frame at night. Hamit walks on a crowded

street. He meets the same person, who was the stranger under the bridge at the beginning of the film. As they are walking, the man gives money to Hamit and informs him there are seven people and a child. Again we cannot see their mouth. The conversation is added as soundtrack. The *tracking shot* from left to the right repeats. The frame is in black almost completely; there exists a girl sleeping close to her mother. After dark road is seen behind the car's window, Hamit is framed in a *close up shot*. He seems drunk and/or sleepy. In the next two shots, we see refugees and harbor.

Mehmet walks in one of the boats. He phones somebody but he cannot dial. Then the camera cuts to Hamit, who is still behind the wheel. After that, an unclear gendarmerie/police car is seen on dark road. Immediately, Hamit turns to the stony area and a siren is heard. Hamit looks back. Nevertheless, the spectator cannot be sure whether polis car drives away. Hamit makes a gesture that something went wrong with his telephone. Next shot illustrates Mehmet sleeping on the boat; the sound of wireless is heard. He wakes up and listens for a while. Ali orders him to call Hamit. He mentions he calls Hamit but cannot reach him.

In the next sequence, Hamit drives car on a stony road. He stops and gets out of the truck. The screen is almost in black. The spectator is unable to differentiate anything. We hear voices of the people and their footsteps while they are leaving the truck. Part of the place is illuminated by torch. This place is estimated to be a barn. Later, Hamit smokes cigarettes outside of the barn. We see him in a *medium shot* for a while. In the next shot, Denise is driving her car. There exists slow motion where she passes by gendarmerie. Next, Denise approaches the hut with her torch but she cannot find Hamit. The camera cuts to the bug in the barn and then we see the child sleeping near her mother.

The other sequence starts as Mehmet drives his motorbike. Then, Hamit sleeps in the car. As soon as the sound of motor rises, Mehmet enters into the frame. Hamit wakes up and exits the car. He yells at Mehmet since they had agreed to meet at the barn in case of a problem. Mehmet says, "I called you but your phone was off."

In the forthcoming sequence, the camera is positioned in the car for a while. Car stops. The window is covered with vapor. Hamit exits the car. He walks on the muddy and foggy road. We hear a man's voice welcoming him. After that Hamit approaches Ali. They walk together for a while. Their conversation is as follows:

Ali: You screwed, fuck it all up.

Hamit: What should I have done? Driven right to the gendarmerie checkpoint?

Ali: You know they're looking for antic smugglers.

Hamit: That's bullshit. What if they checked the trunk?

Ali: Has gendarmerie ever stopped you to check the trunk?

Hamit: I don't know.

Hamit: Why didn't you warn me?

Ali: I called you but your phone was off. The boat left.

Hamit: So what? It will come back, wont it?

Ali: So they'll stay at the stable for two days. And you'll stay with them! Then who will take the charcoal to İstanbul? I will cut this from your commission.

Hamit: I'm going to get food for them. Anything else?

In the next sequence, Hamit sits in front of a house, in which the woman called Emine says that she prepares packages. He wants her to charge his mobile phone. Then, woman migrant is framed in a *close up shot*. She looks pensive. The camera tilts down. She asks her child whether she is hungry. She takes cracker from her bag and throws the

last pieces of crackers. There exists another woman sleeping. After we hear the sound of a car, Hamit walks towards the barn. He realizes that Mehmet is sitting outside the barn. He tells him to take the bags from the car. He calls someone but nobody answers.

The other significant sequence is that Denise sits in an unknown place. It resembles a bar however; there is nobody in there except her and her colleague. Then Hamit joins them. They talk for a while. Hamit feels shocked since Denise says, “they are calling her back.” We do not hear answer of Denise. Moreover, we never informed that where she should return. There is question, “who are they?” Afterwards, Hamit walks towards the sea. Next, we see him drinking by sea.

The escape scene at the beginning and middle of the film is repeated with a difference later. This time, Hamit is escaping from something on the beach instead of forest. In the next sequence, Mehmet lights a fire. While refugees are eating food, Mehmet lies in the darkness. Afterwards, Mehmet collects bushes in front of the barn. The woman asks that when they will leave. Mehmet yells her and says “I don’t know.”

After Denise had a bath, she stands in front of her bed. She looks as if she hears a voice. Then, the camera cuts to the door. Hamit asks Denise to open the door. However, the spectator does not know if she affirms.

In the other shot, Mehmet takes cows out of the barn in a *subjective shot* and the half of the frame is almost in dark. Then, we see child refugee from her profile trying to look outside of the bars. Therefore, viewer assumes that the previous scene is shown from the *point of view shot* of the child. After she asks her mother for permission, she opens the bar and leaves the *frame*. Then, she is positioned in front of the camera from her back. While she is walking slowly, she looks back inside of the barn, whereas the spectator is restricted to witness her view. She seems fearful. After, she opens the outer

door, exits the barn and also nearly the frame. Yet, camera is still positioned in the barn. Soon, camera cuts to a scene where an iron pipe divides frame into two. Some of the cows are visible behind this pipe. This scene is sutured to another one that the girl is framed in a *medium close-up shot* in her profile. Therefore we assume that we saw the previous scene from the eye of the girl. She leaves the frame. All sounds which we assume the *diegetic sound* is merged with *non-diegetic sound* in order to give the impression of being ‘exterior’, ‘other’ and ‘being captured’. Suddenly the voice of Mehmet is heard from *off-screen space*. He states, “what are you doing in here” After we see him without involvement of the girl in the frame.

Then, Mehmet calls Hamit and wants him to come since he cannot stop the child wandering around the barn. In the next sequence, viewer sees the woman refugee in *medium close up* while she is sitting with her daughter in the barn. The girl asks “What are we to do here, all day long?” and mother replies, “Sleep a little.” The camera cuts to child’s back in an *extreme close up*, whereas all photographs in the frame are *blurred*. After that, Mehmet says, “Be quiet! A car is here.” although no relevant sound is audible. He exits the barn and speaks with Ali. Ali ordered him to throw their belongings. Mehmet takes their belongings and throws them into fire. Then, Mehmet stoops over the fire.

In the next sequence, telephone rings and Hamit says “I am coming, no problem” Hamit’s voice is accompanied by four consecutive shots (a) water boiler, (b) bug on the window that is seen in the beginning of the film with a little difference, (c) underskirts at the iron bar (d) outside of the window where fogs are sprawling. Finally, Hamit sits on the bed looking around.

After, camera cuts to the inside of the car on the muddy road. The spectator sees Ali's car. Ali leaves his car and approaches Hamit. Ali yells him for not throwing belongings of refugees and being late. Then, Mehmet sits in front of the barn. Woman exits the barn. In the next shot, she smooths her pants. The spectator cannot see what she is hiding. Indeed, it is not possible whether she hides something (money?) or not since it is not indicated in the frame. As she turns back, she spots Mehmet standing behind her. Mehmet says, "Give me all the money." Woman replies, "When boat arrives, I will give you the money." Mehmet threatens her "You cannot go anywhere" Woman does not reply him and leaves the frame.

In upcoming shot, refugees get on the truck in darkness. Hamit collects belongings of the refugees and throws it to the marsh. There exists three shots respectively that all people in these frames are sleeping a) a man b) a woman and her daughter c) another man.

In the next shot, Mehmet is framed in a *close up*. Then Hamit drives the car, where the camera is positioned. Ali stops the engine and Hamit, as well. He exits the car and approaches Ali's car. Hamit expresses "Why did we stop?" Ali does not reply him and gets out of the car. He gets close to the truck and Hamit follows him. Then we hear Ali's voice however it is impossible for the spectator to comprehend what Ali is talking about. The woman says, "Did we arrive?" We see reflection of woman on the mirror as she is begging Hamit "I have money". Simultaneously, Ali leaves the frame. However, Ali's voice is heard but cannot be understood by the spectator. Then Hamit gets on the car. It's impossible to

4.1.2 Boat and Sea

Ponzanesi argues heterotopias are neither here nor there that are simultaneously physical and mental. As a “space of illusion” the boat is important motif in the film. In a scene, Mehmet closes the door of a cabin at the boat, where refugees are assumed to stay. Then he tells Hamit they are ready to depart. Hamit asks, “Did you inform on the woman?” Mehmet remains silent and finalizes the preparations. Hamit runs towards the boat and forces him to leave the boat. Afterwards, Hamit turns on the engine. Next shot demonstrates people lying probably in the cabin of the boat. The heterotopic characteristics of the boat stems from the “illusion” since we did not see the scene that refugees get on the boat. We have never informed whom are the people lying in that “place” after Hamit turns on the engine.

There exists repetition that the film ends where it begins with difference. There exists four shots. (a) rough sea (b) shrubberies (c) infertile hill nearby the sea (d) high angle shot over the scrub where part of the sea is included in the frame (e) *tracking shot* on the sea side where two bodies are seen. This leads to vicious cycle of the time in a loop creating “black hole.” Deniz Bayrakdar in her unpublished article “*Denizde Zaman*,” pointed out that the sea in the film functions “as a ‘black hole’ indicating the brutality of the time and the sea’s characteristic being physically a non-space.” In this sense, sea is a heterotopia since, this repetition of beginning in the ending with difference reveal gaps, discontinuities in time.

4.2. RIZA

Rıza is a truck driver. He strives for finding money in order to make his truck be repaired. He does not reside at a permanent location, since he transports goods from one city to another. That is to say, he lives like a “voyager.” He tries every way to find money; even he wants help from Meryem, whom he leaves after living together for a period of time in the past. Consequently, Rıza commits a crime in order not to lose his truck.

4.2.1. Space and Time

Film opens in a room. City lights and neon lights are illustrated in a shadowy form behind the window with a transparent and shabby curtain. At the same time, the sound of city accompanies with these images. Then, camera cuts to the door. Rıza opens the door; he is framed in a *close up*. He looks around for a while then the other “guests” of the hotel is showed from his *point of view*, one of them says “Couldn’t you sleep again? Count sheeps!” Rıza does not respond him and shuts the door. Subsequently, Rıza becomes visible from his profile, standing in front of the window. Camera *cuts* to another building in a *high angle shot* from long distance. The scene is almost in dark. Distinguishing the silhouette of city from the other building is impossible. A man stands in front of the window of his room while he is smoking his cigarette. This scene ends with *fade out*, footsteps accompanying with *credits* are audible. This sequence is repeated throughout the film with differences.

In the beginning of the film, Rıza and one of his friends are framed by the window, while he is asking for money from his friend, who refuses to help him. After that, camera *cuts* to Rıza in *high angle shot* while he is exiting hangar. Then, he is framed in *low angle shot* of his *three-quarter rear*. In the following scene there is *sound bridge*

combining two scenes. His *voice-over* is heard while he is walking near trucks and camera is placed in his back. The scene is linked to telephone cabinet in which he asks for money from someone else via *sound bridge*. In this sense, relationship between time and space is distorted, hence the spectator has to reconstitute time and space. Suddenly the telephone is canceled in this scene. After that we see Rıza's efforts to find money in different shots in a fragmented narrative. In the following shot, Rıza is on the way to visit one of his friends. He learns that his friend died. Later, he goes to Meryem's workplace yet hesitates to enter and leaves the street. At night, he visits Burhan, who lives in a truck. Rıza also stays with him. Same night he dies and Rıza has to overnight at a hotel.

The next sequence starts with Rıza's entrance to Meryem's workplace. She dismisses Rıza. After that, Rıza approaches to Ganyan Bayii. The camera cuts to Meryem's workplace. She leaves and steps into the bus. Afterwards, she visits her sister who is working at a textile company. Rıza meets the immigrants, when the spectator sees him back at the hotel. Afterwards, his conversation with the man wearing Brazil kit (MWBK) is demonstrated. We are acknowledged about the stories of hotel residents, as introduced respectively:

Rıza: The old man upstairs, is always watching TV, you know?

MWBK: You mean uncle Muhittin? Yes, he is.

Rıza: When you watch TV, you forget everything.

MWBK: He is waiting for his son to come and pick him up, you know?

Rıza: So, he'll wait for.

MWBK: What are you waiting for?

Rıza: Nothing

MWBK: There are so many drivers come and go, you know?

Rıza: I have been in this hotel more than anybody else.

MWBK: Brother, is your truck big?

Then Musa, a resident with the tape, shows up, picks up a glass of tee and exits the frame.

MWBK: You are cheerful again, aren't you, brother Musa? What? The ship didn't return yet? (Again turning to Rıza) He is a nice guy. He got the tape and goggles in gambling from a Russian. He travels the seas like this. He's going to take me on his ship, you know. I swear. He travels the seven seas. He's going to take me. Do you think we will enter European Union?

Rıza: What?

MWBK: If we will, there would be jobs.

Rıza: There won't be a shit.

Someone comes from a room calling Rıza inside. This conversation implies that "illegal migrants" come from Afghanistan. Gulam and his son's wife are willing to reach Italy. At another shot, Rıza exits the frame after he has waited close to a truck with full of hammers. Afterwards, he goes to Meryem's workplace, attacks Meryem. Then, Rıza expresses his need for money, however Meryem dismisses him again. In the following shots, the spectator sees Rıza wandering around. As he enters a public toilet, he spots watchman's money. At the second time, he makes an attempt to usurp the watchman's money with the hammer but had to run way, after the watchman took out his gun.

At another sequence, Rıza roams in a park, where he spotted Gulam at the buffet across the road. They walk together for a while, and then Rıza kills Gulam as he hit his head with the hammer and takes his money. He checks in another hotel afterwards. The

picture at his new room looks very much like the picture at his old room. At the next shot, he apologizes from Meryem. Later on the spectator sees Rıza at the old hotel trying to convince Gulam's bride to travel back to Afghanistan, whereas she insists on following her husband assuming he arrived Italy. Next shot repeats Rıza's apology from Meryem. Soon, he agrees with smugglers to take Gulam's bride to Italy. The spectator sees Rıza at Meryem's home, however he does not overnight there and heads to the hotel. Next shot demonstrates Rıza explaining the man wearing Brazil kit that his truck has been repaired and he will check out next morning. At the end of the film, the spectator sees the same man at the beginning of film again. Afterwards, we see a man exiting the hotel and hear his footsteps. He fades out like in the generic.

4.2.2 Trucks, Hotels, Pubs

In the film, spaces are too similar as if they are replica of the other and they are repeated throughout the film. Nevertheless, they are also different from each other. Similar to *Kumun Tadi*, *mise-en-scène* of the film includes both exterior and interior locations. The spectator is aware that the story takes place in Istanbul, whereas exact location is not introduced. Suburbs in a concrete jungle located nearby industrial zones imply a dystopic city.

As indicated in the second chapter, heterotopias or non-places enable to combine several sites and spaces that seem incompatible to come together. Trucks have same function in the film. Truck is an important vehicle that problematizes interior and exterior opposition. Container part is used for accommodation since Rıza has no other place. In other words, distinction between inside and outside becomes unclear, like the difference between motion and stillness. It's the place of immobility and confinement on the other hand it's the place of freedom due to its ability to move. In the film, it's function traverses in a metaphorical way. Moreover, it has the capacity to harbor notion of "life" and "death."

Hotels are the most remarkable *motifs* in the film. The names of the hotels are not indicated intentionally. In these hotels, all "habitants" are at the "waiting room" to move towards various destinations; so-called mooring end. By way of illustration, Rıza is waiting his truck to be repaired, where "illegal migrants" are hoping to cross the border and reach Italy. Muhittin is anticipating his son. Also Musa is residing there till his next journey starts. Aquarium refers to their confinement in the hotel. Equally important, hotel is not only the place for claustrophobia and confinement, but also mobility.

“Continuous change/flow of people” at Rıza’s room highlights this existence. After all, Rıza helps the “illegal migrant” to go to Italy.

In addition, objects at these hotels resemble each other. For instance, after the death of Burhan who permits Rıza to stay in his truck, Rıza has to move to hotel. At his new room, he takes a look around and realizes a landscape picture on the wall. Similar landscape picture is also hanged at the next hotel, which he settled after “the murder.”

Analogically, restaurants refer to transitional spaces. In the film there are three restaurant scenes. In the beginning of the film, Rıza tries to find money to make his truck be repaired. He is illustrated in the telephone cabinet while he is asking for money from someone. After that, he is framed in the restaurant in which he eats food. While he is eating food, a lottery ticket seller appears on the screen. Rıza buys one scratch ticket, which refers to hope. In this sense, restaurant turns into a place where hope and change are possible. At the pub scene, music and origin of human voices are not exhibited. We only view a place, as the stage of Rıza’s failing attempts to find money. Second bar scene follows after Rıza “attacked” Meryem. Televisions at hotels and pubs have relation with time and underlines the meaning suspension of time.

Phone booth is another place where people can reach other places or can communicate with each other. However, there are two significant scenes illustrating, this feature of phone booth is subverted. The first scene is in the very beginning of the film indicating that Rıza asks money to make his truck be repaired. In this scene, he is chatting with someone. At the final scene, the woman refugee tries to call her husband, assumed to be in Italy, however she is unable to dial.

5. CONCLUSION

Nicholas De Genova uses the term “border spectacle” defined as a spectacle of law enforcement at “the” borders making migrant’s “illegality” visible. In other words, border policing and immigration law set a scene of “exclusion” rendering the migrants “illegality” visible. (De Genova 2013) *Kumun Tadı* also produces “border spectacle,” which traverses the spectacle of law enforcement at “the” borders. In other words, the film offers an inverted analogy of this border spectacle. Heterotopic characteristics of film helps to achieve this inverted analogy of “border spectacle.”

Second chapter dissects the existing literature dealing with migrant and diasporic cinema on top of all tropes of space and mobility, since it’s important to locate how newly produced films handle “transit migration” in Turkey is related with existing literature. Hamid Nacify and Laura Marks argue that exilic, diasporic and post-colonial cinema challenges the dominant host culture thanks to its aesthetic formations. Scholars’ works in film studies such as Hamid Nacify’s “accented cinema” or Laura Marks’ “intercultural cinema” embody their theories from the exile and diaspora experiences of directors. On the contrary, director Melisa Önel and Tayfun Pirselimoglu lacks in individual experience in those fields. For instance, Nacify says that accented films use exterior spaces as utopian, timeless and boundless. Nevertheless, *Kumun Tadı* portray dystopian places in terms of exterior and interior places. Furthermore, film prevents nostalgia to home, which is left behind contrary to most “accented films.” Yet, modes of production, use of language (multilingualism), liminal spaces, counter-hegemonic and counter-geographic attitudes are in line with “accented cinema” or “intercultural cinema” conventions.

Finally, this thesis examines how recently produced films in Turkey approach “transit migration” created by the harmonization process of migration and asylum system in the Europe. These films reconstruct such categories with its use of elements of cinematic representation. They create “dystopian imaginary homeland” to question these newly produced “transit zones.” Films offer a “critical-sites” or “alternative geography” that creates an ambiguity in terms of home/host, inclusion/exclusion and us/them via its aesthetic and thematic choices.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bayraktar, G. D. 2016. "Denizde Zaman", Türkiye Sinema Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler Konferansı XVI, İstanbul 5-7 Mayıs 2016
- Bayraktar, N. 2016. *Mobility and Migration in Film and Moving Image Art: Cinema Beyond Europe*, New York: Routledge
- Berghahn, D. and Sternberg C. 2010. Locating Migrant and Diasporic Cinema in *European Cinema in Motion: Migrant and Diasporic Film in Contemporary Europe* ed. Berghahn D. and Sternberg C., London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Brekke, J., and Grete B. 2014. "Stuck in Transit: Secondary Migration of Asylum Seekers in Europe, National Differences, and the Dublin Regulation." *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 28(2): 145-162
- Bialasiewicz L. "Off-shoring and Out-sourcing the Borders of Europe", *Geopolitics*, 17(4): 843-866
- Carling, J. 2002. "Migration in the Age of Involuntary Immobility: Theoretical Reflections and Cape Verdean Experiences." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 28 (1): 5-42
- Di Maio, A. 2013. The Mediterranean or Where Africa Does (Not) Meet Italy: Andrea Serge's A Sud Di Lampedusa in *The Cinemas of Italian Migration: European and Transatlantic Narratives*, ed. Schrader, S. and Winkler, D. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: New Castle
- Dehaene, M. and De Cauter L. 2008. *Heterotopia and the city: public space in a post-civil society*, New York: Routledge

- De Genova, N. 2013. "Spectacles of migrant 'illegality': the scene of exclusion, the obscene of inclusion", *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(7): 1180- 1198
- Düvell, F. 2012. "Transit Migration: "A Blurred and Politicized Concept," *Population, Space and Place* 18: 415–427
- Elsaesser, T. 2005. *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*, Amsterdam University Press: Amsterdam
- Ertan, E. 2014. "Bir Duygunun Peşinden Gittim" radikal.com.tr, Date Accessed: Spetember 2016, <http://www.radikal.com.tr/kultur/melisa-onel-bir-duygunun-pesinden-gittim-1186303/>
- Ezra E. and Rowden T. 2006. *Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*, Routledge: London
- Foucault, M. 2008, "*Of Other Spaces*" in *Heterotopia and the city: public space in a post-civil society*, ed. Dehaene, M. and De Cauter L., New York: Routledge
- Gomel, E. 2014. *Narrative Space and Time: Representing the Impossible Topologies in Literature*, New York: Routledge
- Göktürk, D. 2002. *Beyond Patternalism: Turkish German Traffic in Cinema in The German Cinema Book*, ed. Bergfelder, T., Carter E. and Göktürk D., London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hess, S. 2012. "De-Naturalising Transit Migration. Theory and Methods of an Ethnographic Regime Analysis." *Population, Space and Place* 18 (4): 428–440.
- Hightower, B. 2015. "Refugees, Limbo and the Australian Media." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 28 (2): 335–358
- Higson, A. 2006 *The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema in Transnational Cinema: The Film Reader*, ed. Ezra E. and Rowden T., London: Routledge

- İçduygu, A. 1995. *Transit Migration in Turkey*, Budapest: International Organisation for Migration
- _____ 2000. The Politics of International Migratory Regimes: Transit Migration Flows in Turkey, *International Social Science Journal*, 52(3): 357
- _____ 2007. The Politics of Irregular Migratory Flows In The Mediterranean Basin: Economy, Mobility and Illegality, *Mediterranean Politics*, 12(2): 141-161
- İçduygu, A. and Yükseser, D. Rethinking Transit Migration in Turkey: Reality and Representation in the Creation of a Migratory Phenomenon, *Population, Place and Space*, 18: 441-456
- Jansen Y., Celikates R. and De Bloois J. 2015 *The Irregularization of Migration In Contemporary Europe: Detention, Deportation, Drowning*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield
- Johnson, P. 2016. "Brief History of the Concept of Heterotopia" (revised) Heterotopian Studies, Date accessed: September 2016 <http://www.heterotopiastudies.com>
- Lax, F. 1998. "Heterotopia from a Biological and Medical Point of View" in *Other Spaces. The Affair of the Heterotopia, Dokumente zur Architektur 10*, ed. R. Ritter and B. Knaller-Vlay, Graz, Austria: Haus der Architektur, 114-123.
- Marks, L. 2000. *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment and the Senses*, Duke University Press: London
- Naficy, H. 2001 *An Accented Cinema: Exilic and Diasporic Filmmaking*, Princeton University Press: New Jersey
- Oelgemöller, C. 2011. "'Transit' and 'Suspension': Migration Management or the Metamorphosis of Asylum-Seekers into 'Illegal' Immigrants," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(3): 407-424

- Papadopoulou-Kourkoula, A. 2008. *Transit Migration: The Missing Link Between Emigration and Settlement*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ponzanesi, S. 2012. "The Non-places of Migrant Cinema in Europe", *Third Text* 28(6): 675-690
- Sampson R. C., Gifford S. M. and Taylor S. 2016. "The myth of transit: the making of a life by asylum seekers and refugees in Indonesia," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(7): 1135-1152
- Yücel, G. 1992. *Toplumsal Değişme ve Türk Sineması*, Ankara: İmge



FILMOGRAPHY

Journey of Hope (Xavier Koller, 1990)

Caché (Michael Haneke, 2005)

Rıza (Tayfun Pirselimoglu, 2007)

Kumun Tadı (Melisa Önel, 2013)

Berlin in Berlin (Sinan Çetin 1993)

40m² Deutschland (Tevfik Başer, 1986)

Im Juli (Fatih Akın, 2000)

Polizei (Şerif Gören, 1988)

Yasemin (Hark Bohm, 1988)

Sunset Boulevard (Billy Wilder, 1950)

Blow-up (Michelangelo Antonioni, 1966)

