

**WHAT DOES A DOCUMENTARY CHANGE?  
REMEMBRANCE AND THE SEARCH FOR TRUTH IN *AYRILIĞIN YURDU*  
*HÜZÜN (SORROW: HOMELAND OF SEPARATENESS)* AND *YENİ BİR*  
*YURT EDİNMEK (ADOPTING A NEW HOMELAND)***

**Assoc. Prof. Senem DURUEL ERKİLİÇ**

**Assist. Prof. Hakan ERKİLİÇ**

Mersin University Faculty of Communication

Department of Radio, TV and Cinema

Mersin

**ABSTRACT**

This study focuses on the concepts of remembrance, memory, trauma and mourning through Enis Rıza's documentaries *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* (*Sorrow: Homeland of Separateness*, 2001) and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* (*Adopting a New Homeland*, 2006) which were based on the 1923 population exchange, and in doing so it discusses the role of documentaries in the construction of collective memory. These films, which demonstrate a good usage of oral history method in documentary cinema, portray a reality beyond the limited framework of official history with their narrative structures and witnesses. In other words, documentaries provide a confrontation with the truth through the remembrance of the people of population exchange by deconstructing the official history. Documentary helps the living memory in the construction process of the common history and at the same time it is a form that is borrowed from it. Within this scope, documentary expands the place of collective memory in the archives of today and the future. In these two films Enis Rıza questions the population exchange and at the same time problematizes documentary. The production process and screenings become a layer within the narrative. The documentaries act as a catalyst for the elimination of prejudices. The mode in *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* is analyzed in accordance with the classification of Bill Nichols. As a result, this paper tries to find an answer to the question, "what does a documentary film change?"

**Key Words:** Documentary, history, memory, oral history, population exchange

**Bir Belgesel Neyi Değiştirir? *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* ve *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*'te Hatırlama ve Gerçeği Arayış**

**ÖZET**

Bu çalışma, 1923 nüfus mübadelesi üzerine Enis Rıza'nın yönettiği *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* (2001) ile *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* (2006) adlı belgesellerden yola çıkarak hatırlama, bellek, travma ve yas kavramlarına odaklanmakta, belgesellerin toplumsal belleğin inşasındaki rolünü tartışmaktadır. Sözlü tarih yönteminin belgesel sinemada kullanımına iyi birer örnek oluşturan bu filmler, anlatı yapılarıyla, tanıklıkların resmi tarihin sınırlı çerçevesinin ötesinde bir gerçekliği aktardıklarını ortaya koymaktadırlar. Bir diğer deyişle belgeseller, mübadele insanların hatırlamaları üzerinden, resmi tarihi yapıbozuma uğratarak gerçek ile yüzleşilmesini sağlamaktadır. Belgesel, ortak tarihin inşaa

sürecinde, yaşayan hafızaya yardımcı olurken aynı zamanda ondan ödünç aldığı bir formdur. Bu açıdan belgesel, kollektif belleğin hem günümüz hem de geleceğin arşivindeki yerini genişletir. Enis Rıza, filmlerinde mübadeleyi sorgularken bir yandan da belgeseli sorunsallaştırmaktadır. Yapım süreci ve gösterimler katmanlı olarak anlatıya dâhil olmaktadır. Geçmişe ilişkin önyargıların sorgulanmasında belgeseller katalizör olmaktadır. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* ile *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*'teki tarz Bill Nichols'ın sınıflandırmasına dayanarak çözümlenmiş ve böylece bir belgesel film neyi değiştirebilir sorusuna yanıt aranmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Belgesel, tarih, bellek, sözlü tarih, mübadele

## Introduction

Carlo Ginsburg (2000) indicates that a randomly chosen life can very well unite the world and its concepts, and he cites Proust:

People foolishly imagine that the broad generalities of social phenomena afford an excellent opportunity to penetrate further into the human soul; they ought, on the contrary, to realize that it is by plumbing the depths of a single personality that they might have a chance of understanding those phenomena. (p. 39)

This citation from Proust does not only manifest the importance of micro history studies, but it also points out the role of a humane writing of history in its search for truth, which can be seen in the documentaries that this paper studies. Narrative forms/cultural representations like novel or cinema can open a door to the deeper evaluations of experiences in history; they make us closer to history by providing a humane understanding of it.

After September 11, along with globalization, the contribution of documentary cinema to social change has been increasingly questioned (Duruel Erkıılıç, 2008). In this context, the discussion that centers on the question, “can documentary cinema really change the world?” focuses on the connection, on the relationship between documentary and the audience. The convincing trait of documentary, which has been usually emphasized, is based on the argument that documentary, by nature, tells the truth. Grierson argues that people can be educated by documentary. However, documentary has also been used as a vehicle for propaganda during World War II (Barnouw, 1993). The political climate of the 60s and the developing technology of cinema have improved free cinema, direct cinema and *cinéma vérité*. Direct cinema mainly emphasizes stories based on multiple characters (Rabiger, 2004, p. 28). In *cinéma vérité* the film producer/director plays

an important role in revealing the truth via the interaction of event and person (Barnouw, 1993; Nichols, 2010). In this context, the effect of documentary cinema on social change has changed considerably after *cinéma vérité*. In the 70s, after documentaries have become widespread in television, many documentaries have been made about nature, history and animals. In these years the guerilla production method has also started to develop. Video activism, which has been playing an important role in social change, has followed the guerilla production method. Today although documentary has developed various ways different from Grierson's description and style, it nevertheless tries to be a narrative which is useful, educational and serving society (De Jong, 2008, p. 143) just like his principles. Today documentary molds public opinion and address many social issues like human smuggling, ethnic and gender identity, military readiness, women's rights, movements against globalism or environmental issues.

Nichols (2010) indicates that documentary is a political voice in describing social issues and classifies its tendencies in social issues as follows:

1) the construction of national identity in terms of a melting-pot homogeneity up through the 1950s and early 1960s, (2) the challenges to this construct associated with political confrontation (worker militancy, antiwar protest, civil rights protests) in the 1960s and 1970s, (3) the emergence of an identity politics that gave voice to suppressed minorities in the early 1970s and 1980s, and finally, (4) the acknowledgment of hazards of categories and identities themselves in a time of catastrophic events, trauma, exile and diaspora in the 1990s and since. (p. 242)

*Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* (Rıza, 2001) and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* (Rıza, 2006) address the 1923 population exchange in a humanistic manner, and the narrative, the style of these documentaries and the question they ask, "what does a documentary change?" make them remarkable. In the context of tendencies that Nichols (2010) has specified, these productions take place in the fourth category and they allow the audience to face the concepts like identity, belonging, exile and trauma. Both documentaries manifest the audio-visual platform of the tendency towards remembrance and facing the past, which has been showing its effect in Turkey and in the world after 1990. These two documentaries confront the audience with the truth

by their narratives. In this context, these two documentaries that complement each other make it possible to go beyond the writing of official history, and they provide an inside view of the past with different perspectives by focusing on human lives hidden behind diplomacy, politics, dates and numbers. They deconstruct history. They go beyond the ascribed patterns of the construction of the past. In these documentaries, people who are strangers and hostile to each other share a common pain that also transcends them. Above all, they open a field where the past can be faced, and they contribute to a lasting, real peace that can be possible by way of knowing each other, by knowing yourself and by establishing a deeper relationship. As a result, they help to eliminate mutual prejudices.

This study develops a practice of thought by using the concepts like memory/remembrance, belonging, cultural trauma, oral history and documentary that are related to each other, and in doing so it deals with the contribution of documentary to social change within the limitations of documentary. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* are selected because they illustrate that documentary can be an important actor in viewing the historical/social issues.

For the method a literature review has been made on documentary, migration and population exchange, the selected films are analyzed according to their narrative structures and evaluated in accordance with the mode classification of Nichols (2010). The theoretical picture that this paper has drawn for the concepts like migration, population exchange, mourning and trauma is based on the interviews of the documentaries. In the film analysis, we discuss narrative structure and style like the composition, the editing, and the filmmaker's presence in the films with his own image/voice or the transformation of the documentary audience in order to become, in Nichols' words, a social actor. Moreover, key elements in the documentary structure like the place of oral history, or the presentation of the signs of nature and everyday life as the codes of migration and trauma are also analyzed. Therefore, this study examines the role of documentary in the construction of the past, which is based on narratives.

## **Kayaköy and Nea-Makri in the Shadow of Population Exchange**

*Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* are two documentaries that complement each other. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* focuses on the painful separation that the population exchange has created. There is a text in the beginning of the film:

Due to the ‘population exchange’ between Turkey and Greece, beginning in 1922 approximately two million people had to leave their homes. Greeks who lived in Fethiye (Makri) and Kayaköy (Levissi) before the population exchange, named their new homes in Greece as Nea Makri/Nea Levissi. Kayaköy was abandoned to loneliness.

According to various sources (Pekin, 2005; Yıldırım, 2006; Hirschon, 2005), the migration wave started during Balkan Wars, gained speed in 1922, and became a compulsory population exchange with the signing of an additional protocol on 30 January 1923 after the Treaty of Lausanne. The first provision which the Turkish government and the Greek government agreed said: “As from the 1<sup>st</sup> May, 1923, there shall take place a compulsory exchange of Turkish nationals of the Greek Orthodox religion established in Turkish territory, and of Greek nationals of the Muslim religion established in Greek territory” (Anlaşma, 2012, para.1). The second provision of the protocol indicated that it would not include the Greek inhabitants of Istanbul and the Muslim inhabitants of Western Thrace. The 7<sup>th</sup> provision stated that the emigrants would lose the nationality of the country which they were leaving, and they would acquire the nationality of the country of their destination, upon their arrival in the territory of the latter country. In this respect, 1.200.000 Orthodox had emigrated to Greece from Turkey and around 500.000 Muslims had emigrated to Turkey from Greece (Arı, 2005, s. 388).

After the introduction text that summarizes the population exchange at a micro level, *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* narrates Kayaköy with its empty houses and streets through the lives of people that do not live there anymore. It gives voice to the rituals that belong to every space in Kayaköy as if life was going on there. This revival of the people playing backgammon in coffee houses or girls walking in the streets, which is done only in the film’s soundtrack, expresses the daily life’s natural rhythm. It reveals the memory of the space. Furthermore, *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün*

proceeds with interviews conducted via the oral history method focusing on the effect of a political decision and practice that changed people's lives. The witnesses in the film express the daily realities outside the official history. They illustrate the effect and power of the documentary as an alternative history writer. The Greeks, who had been sent away from their homes in Fethiye and Kayaköy, were not wanted in Greece either. They called them, "You are Turks," and they did not let them get off from the ships in which they were forced to sail on under unhealthy conditions. In the documentary this memory is narrated by an old lady who speaks Greek. This opens many doors simultaneously in our minds about the population exchange. The film brings forward that the lives of people are the greatest narrator when they express the results that belong to political decisions. And along with many matters, it also brings forward that the union of religion and language does not form the concept of homeland/native country. The film ends with a couple of touristic sentences about Kayaköy, uttered by three kids playing in the abandoned homes and streets of Kayaköy. For these children, Kayaköy is a mysterious playground. For the people of Nea Levissi, however, it is their "home". *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* displays the deep chasm between the historical knowledge that children have memorized (while forgetting some of the lines with all their adorable looks) and the lives that once lived there. It reminds that, apart from the memorized version, history encompasses the lives of others and ourselves.

*Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* (2006) has emerged from the willingness of second and third generation emigrants to talk about their past after the screenings of the first documentary in Kayaköy-Livissi (2003) and Nea Makri (2005). This documentary begins with a question: "What can a documentary change?" The answer is provided via voice over:

The encounter that began during the filming of *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* was like a little experiment about facing pains, joys, memories and history. The beginning of the reevaluation of everything... The journey of the search for the souls of forgotten stories and abandoned homes... An effort to overcome prejudices...

*Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* depicts the migration of Anatolian Greeks living in Kayaköy-Livissi and Fethiye-Makri to Greece and the challenging process that they

have gone through by building a new home for themselves in Nea Makri. After watching this film, the people of New Fethiye, meaning New Makri, have started to question their prejudices towards Turkey and their neighbors in Turkey, and they have felt the need to retell their stories. (In this respect, the second documentary of Enis Rıza reiterates the first documentary's effect on people). Most of them connect their struggle for building their new homeland and the resistance against Nazi occupation with being an Anatolian. The eyes of the first generation once again reflect their longing and curiosity towards their old homeland Anatolia, and the second and third generations try to find an answer to the question, "who's the enemy?" The film brings to light what the official history ignores. Both *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzüin* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* focus on the effect of population exchange on people, rather than giving attention to its historical development. They both call out to the culture of common life and to a common soul.

### **Population Exchange, Trauma and Mourning**

The 1923 population exchange was also a compulsory identity change. Arı (2005) underlines that even when it is only considered in numerical terms, there has not been such a serious phenomenon like the population exchange in world history, and he indicates that this exchange can be described as a social trauma (p. 338). According to Iğsız (2006), a lot of people in Greece experienced "a cultural trauma". Mavrogordatos (1983) describes it in the following way: "Even when they shared the same religion and the same language, it did not make it possible for the emigrants to mix with the 'inhabitants'" (as cited in Iğsız, 2006, p. 161). Cultural trauma is a phenomenon in the collective consciousness which is loaded with negative emotions like anger, revenge and blame, and it cannot be disregarded or thought as if it did not happen. Smelser (2004) defines cultural trauma as a memory accepted and publicly given credence by a relevant membership group and evoking an event or situation which is regarded as threatening a society's existence or violating one or more of its fundamental cultural presuppositions (as cited in Çelebi, 2002, p. 345). Due to the fact that the same historical event or situation has been depicted with incompatible

concepts for the Turkish War of Independence or the Asia Minor Catastrophe, a wall (obstacle) has been formed against the facing of this common pain. However, after the 1980s when the tendencies towards facing the past increased, population exchange has been brought to Turkey's agenda. Milas (2007) refers to "the discovery of the population exchange" after the 1980s and he states that in relation to the population exchange, studies have been increased, exhibitions and conferences have been held, and many emigrants have visited their homes in their old homeland (p. 334). There have also been novels that deal directly with the population exchange<sup>1</sup>.

In 2001, Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı (The Foundation of Lausanne Treaty Emigrants) was founded. In its objectives this foundation says that the emigrants who have emigrated from Turkey to Greece organized various activities in order to preserve their culture, art and folklore. They were organized in associations and they opened art centers, research institutes and museums; yet the organization of the emigrants who have emigrated from Greece to Turkey has not been widespread. First, second and third generation emigrants have come together not only for the preservation of the cultural heritage, but also for maintaining the air of friendship which has been established after the 17 August 1999 İzmit earthquake and the 7 September 1999 Athens earthquake.

In Greece the relationship of the emigrants with their past have long been established. Centre for Asia Minor Studies, which was founded by Melpo Logotheti-Merlier in 1930, has an important place in the preservation of the emigrant identity. The centre has preserved the history and the collective consciousness of the population exchange by archiving the materials of oral history and by organizing the archive of photographs and music. Although these organizations are not the remedy of the trauma caused by the population exchange, they lift the "remembrance" to the level of consciousness and in a sense reduce the destructive effect of the trauma (Sancar, 2007, pp. 150-151). According to Sancar, like the individuals, communities also react in different ways to traumatic events. These reactions can be brought

---

<sup>1</sup>In his article, "Population Exchange in Turkish Literature" Herkül Milas analyzes many novels, particularly Feride Çiçekoğlu's book, "The Other Side of the Water". This book has been filmed by Tomris Giritlioğlu in 1990.



together in two tendencies that are opposite to each other: 1) To deny the awful events and avoid talking about them or 2) To accept these events, openly speak about them and try to face them.

The migration from Anatolia, the efforts of finding a new homeland and hostile receptions create trauma for the emigrants. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* are one of the important tools for depicting these traumatic events and for facing them. According to Volkan (1998):

Humans cannot accept change without mourning what has been lost.  
Mourning  
is an involuntary response that occurs at the time of the loss of a loved one or loved possession or when a loss appears to be imminent, as with a dying parent. We also mourn the loss of persons and things that we hate, since, like love, hate connects us deeply to one another. Human nature gives us a painful but ultimately effective way to let go of our previous attachments, to adjust internally to the absence of lost people or things and to get on with our lives. (p. 36)

After watching *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* in which there was an interview that she had made, Vera Tzoumelea talks about getting over the trauma as a third generation emigrant: “Maybe we need time (...) When I saw this affectionate production in the place that we have assumed as an enemy space, I don’t know, something happened...”. Volkan (1998) says that when we finish the work of mourning, we feel a new surge of energy and an adaptive liberation that may be expressed in undertaking new projects or developing new friendships (p. 36). Both *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* feature “goers” and “leavers” that can talk openly about what has happened and about their prejudices. It shows that the mourning process is over and that the time has come to approach the subject with a transformative energy. When Ayşe Arıcan mentions the Greek friends that she loves, she says sincerely, “we were getting along with the infidel (gâvur) girls” and she uses the word “gâvur”<sup>2</sup> by reversing its negative meaning and implication with a natural

---

<sup>2</sup>The word gâvur means a person who is not Muslim or who is an unbeliever; yet it is also used for depicting the persons who are not Turks in an insolent and contemptuous manner. Insolent expressions like “Turkish sperm (Türk dölü)” and “baptized with yogurt (yoğurtla vaftiz edilmiş)” are also used for the emigrants in the other shore (as cited in Papailias from Mavrogordatos, 2006: 269). Even these definitions can tell much about the dimension of the trauma.

feeling, without otherizing. Thus, she goes beyond politics, diplomacy and the common usage in language.

Second and third generation emigrants are curious about the past of their families. Their history is built upon the past of their families. Being an emigrant turns into a collective identity and trauma, passed down through generations.

Transgenerational transmission is when an older person unconsciously externalizes his traumatized self onto a developing child's personality. A child then becomes a reservoir for the unwanted, troublesome parts of an older generation. Because the elders have influence on a child, the child absorbs their wishes and expectations and is driven to act on them. It becomes the child's task to mourn, to reverse the humiliation and feelings of helplessness pertaining to the trauma of his forebears. (Volkan, 1998: 43)

In *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*, Ira Silamianou from Kayaköy, a second generation emigrant, talks about transgenerational transmission related to Kayaköy (Makri) and the curiosity of the new generations about Kayaköy:

After I was fifteen years old, I asked about the origin of the name, Nea-Makri (New Makri). Was there a Paleo Makri (Old Makri)? In this way I learned that only Makri had existed, not Paleo Makri, and I realized that everything had begun there.

Other second and third generation emigrants from Makri also speak about the conversations of their parents about Makri and they believe that one day they will return there.

It is possible to read the learned hostility between the Turks and the Greeks through second and third generation emigrants. “Neither Turks nor Greeks have successfully mourned past losses or resolved previous traumas, nor have they modified their negative images of the other group” (Volkan, 1998, p. 135). It can be claimed that cultural representations, documentaries could play an important role in this matter. They would at least question the prejudices. As we have seen at the beginning of *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*, the people of Makri who have watched *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* were surprised to learn that this documentary was directed by a Turk because they were taught that Turks were enemies. Especially the humane

and sensitive structure of the film makes it possible to think about prejudices. When Despina Damianou says, “it was a warm, humane film and I liked its humane side very much”, she describes her feelings about the film. And Vera Tzoumelea states that she has understood, “at that moment that a history has been going on”. The narration of Ira Silamianou goes on through the images in Greece where people were watching the film: “Although I heard about that Turks were against Greeks, the fact that this film was made by a Turk – which sounds a bad word after what we had been taught – is tear inducing”. The voice of Vera Tzoumelea is matched with her recorded images when she has visited Kayaköy:

I realized that my history, the history of Kayaköy and the history of that place is an ongoing history. Until this day, I thought that Turks were our enemies. That we were good and they were bad... I have never rethought about it.

Mihalis Delisavas depicts his feelings about the first documentary and says that the pain is mutual:

At that moment I have not only felt lots of things due to the magic of the image, but I have also realized that art makes you think about the things that never cross your mind. The migration wasn't only ours or our ancestors', it was also the migration of other people.

The success of these two documentaries is hidden in these words. These films present the mutual pain and the mutual population exchange that belong to the Turks and the Greeks as a universal problem.

When the past is mentioned, the concepts of friend and enemy are frequently depicted. There are differences between first generation emigrants and second and third generation emigrants about their view of the Turks through these concepts. Apollon Psaroudakis says, “Greeks and Turks were living in harmony, it means that Greeks also had no reason to leave there”. Kiriakos Tskiyannis also adds, “During the Asia Minor Catastrophe nothing has happened to the people of Makri and Livissi. They all escaped with the help of Turks by using boats”. In a sense the documentary becomes the driving force to decipher the mutual prejudices. Towards the end of *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*, Vera Tzoumelea talks about it in an opposing manner:

What can you do for not letting them bomb the center of marketplace?  
We have seen people in Iraq that carries tomatoes, the tanks didn't stop. And they run over the American woman who was trying to stop the tanks. They run over. Who's the enemy?

At that moment the camera pans backward and after the pan, we see the film crew and the director, Enis Rıza. Tzoumelea continues her speech: "I don't agree with the American. I agree with Enis. Because we have common goals". Then in the room, the image of a relative who is surprised by these words appears. In a sense, behind the camera scenes are also included in the film. All the friends and those who are seen as enemies are in the same room. They are after the past. Tzoumelea concludes her words:

Because our goals are to lead a simple life, to be able to play backgammon. To be able to drink ouzo and raki together. To be able to drink tea and coffee. To be able to watch the sunrise and the sunset. We should go swimming in the clean seas between the two countries and we should go across these seas healthfully.

Is it possible to go across these seas with a sound mind by getting rid of politics, diplomacy and historical hostilities? The documentaries offer a definite answer: Yes.

### **Remembrance, Oral History and Documentary**

Sancar (2007), points out a tendency of remembrance and memory that gradually increased after the second half of the 1980s, and states that today's culture of remembrance differs radically from the ways of previous states of remembrance. According to the author, "in early days, the 'glorious' pages of the past were wanted to be remembered, but now the splits of the past also constitute the subject of remembrance" (p. 62). The 1923 Population Exchange is one of these splits. Both *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* are concrete examples to the remembrance of these splits.

When we consider many documentaries<sup>3</sup> and studies like these documentaries, we can ask questions like “why do we remember now?” or “why do we remember so much more in the last 10 years?” Assman (2001) connects this tendency of “memory and remembrance” to three reasons. The first reason is that “we live in an age in which the storage of non-memory (artificial memory) is possible due to new electronic media. The second reason is the proliferation of the attitude that recognizes today’s culture as the past’s ‘successor culture’ and defines it as ‘a thing that completes its life’ by connecting the past culture to the effort of understanding as memory and remembrance” (Assman, 2001, pp. 16-17). As for the third and the most important reason, Assman (2001) points out that a generation, the eyewitnesses to the catastrophes and crimes against humanity that the written history has recorded, is now saying goodbye to life. According to French historian Pierre Nora (2006), “one of the reasons for the ‘Rise of Memory’ is the democratization of history. What Nora means with the ‘democratization of history’ is that it is the strong independence and liberation struggle of the nations, communities, ethnic groups and even individuals. Accordingly, all the forms of the memories of minority groups that one can think of are becoming widespread very quickly. For the minority groups, taking their past back is an integral part of the identity” (as cited in Sancar, 2007, p. 65).

Enis Rıza’s both documentaries reflect especially the anxiety of the “memory” that might fade away with the generation who would soon say goodbye to life. Oral history studies and the documentaries which were made with the method of oral history have gained wide currency, and this is related to the generation that would soon leave us as Assman has mentioned. Enis Rıza states that the oral history method in documentary gives an important opportunity for the society in order to review itself and to catch the starting point of its examination: “The area, which oral history and documentary cinema come together as two different disciplines, is

---

<sup>3</sup>The Kayaköy documentaries: Mihriban Tanık "Zamanın Durduğu Yer: Kayaköy" ("Kayaköy: Where Time Stopped", 1995); Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün: Kayaköy, 2001; Mithat Bereket "Kayaköy and Krifçe – Two Immigrant Towns"; Engin Ayça "Penceremde Sardunyalar" ("Geraniums at My Windows", 2002).

collective consciousness/memory” (Rıza, 2007, p. 72). According to Channan (2007), documentary helps the living memory in the construction process of the common history and at the same time it is a form that is borrowed from it (p. 269). Within this scope, documentary expands the place of collective memory in the archives of today and the future. Öztürkmen (2001) depicts that it was the beginning of the 1990s that “oral history has become a current issue for social scientists, documentary producers and investigative reporters” (p. 115). In reality, “oral history is not a new branch of history but a new technique – a means of bringing into play new sources to be evaluated alongside written sources and material remains” (Tosh, 1997: 212). However, by allowing different readings of history and by creating an area for alternative history writing, oral history has drawn attention (Counce, 2001, p. 68). It is evaluated not as a way of reaching the information which is not found on the written sources, but also as “the way to reach the information beyond the rulership of written sources” (Öztürkmen, 2001, p. 115). According to Thompson (1999), “oral history is a history built around people. It thrusts life into history itself and it widens its scope. It allows heroes not just from the leaders, but from the unknown majority of the people” (p. 18).

Besides allowing a different history writing due to their study of oral history, another significance of the interviews in *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* is their role of lending an ear to the individuals/communities who would not otherwise come together and find the opportunity/patience to listen to each other. In this respect, interviews made with the method of oral history do not only bring history closer, but they also bring individuals/communities closer to each other. Connerton (1989) uses Habwachs’ argument and talks about remembrance:

It is through their membership of a social group – particularly kinship, religious and class affiliations – that individuals are able to acquire, localize and recall their memories. For the kind of association that makes possible retention in the memory is not so much one of resemblance or contiguity as rather a community of interests and thoughts. It is not because thoughts are similar that we can evoke them; it is rather because the same group is interested in those memories. (p. 37)

According to Connerton (1989), what binds our memories together is the fact that they form part of a whole ensemble of thoughts common to a group, to the groups with which we are in a relationship. In this respect, it can be claimed that documentary enables encounter and contact, and it forms a different perspective, thought ensemble and memories by the transmission of memories related to the past in the filming process and by the synergy created at the shootings. Therefore, the filming process of documentary will not be erased from the memories due to the partnership that it has created in the interest and in the thought. According to Enis Rıza (2007), “documentary cinema, like oral history, takes the person as a starting point and has an approach which accepts that a life only represents itself” (p. 75). In this respect, documentary cinema has a simple, real and inclusive dimension.

### **Mixed Mode Documentary**

The ability to depict its subject’s truth in its own aesthetics is an important thing for documentary. Documentary cinema creates awareness by its narrative modes in addition to its subject. According to Nichols (2001), there are six documentary modes: Expository, Poetic, Observational, Participatory, Performative and Reflective<sup>4</sup>. Saunders (2010) says that there are some transitive aspects in

---

<sup>4</sup>The features of these modes can be summed up as: **Expository**: voice of God; what we identify with the documentary; it emphasizes verbal commentary and argumentative logic; most associated with television news programming; often using a narrator; addresses viewer directly; using titles or voices; editing generally establishes/maintains rhetorical continuity more than spatial/temporal. **Poetic**: subjective; artistic expression; opens up possibility of alternative forms of knowledge to straightforward transfer of knowledge; moves away from the objective reality of a given situation or people to grasp an inner truth that can be grasped by poetical manipulation. **Observational**: window on the world; best exemplified by the cinema vérité or direct cinema; non-intervention of filmmaker; editing doesn't construct time frame or rhythm but enhances impression of lived or real time; uses indirect address; speech overheard; synchronous sound; relatively long takes; attempts to capture objective reality with filmmaker as a neutral observer; sounds and images recorded at moment of observational filming in contrast to voice-over of expository mode; filmmaker stays behind the camera. **Participatory**: interactive; unlike the observatory mode; the participatory mode welcomes direct engagement between filmmaker and subject(s); the filmmaker becomes part of the events being recorded and the filmmakers impact on the events being recorded is acknowledged; allows filmmaker to account for past events via witnesses and experts whom viewer can also see; archival footage becomes appended to these commentaries to avoid hazards of reenactment and monolithic claims of voice of god commentary. **Performative**: filmmaker as participant; emphasizes the subjective nature of the documentarian as well as acknowledging the subjective reading of the audience; tries to

Nichol's classification (p. 26). Thus, mixed modes are formed. Enis Rıza's films also do not only show the aspects of one mode. They include the aspects of different modes. However, *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* have differences and similarities in the context of their narrative and production modes. Their similarities can be seen in their atmosphere and partially in their narrative mode. Both of them use voice over and this voice over is the voice of the director. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* mostly features observatory and expository modes. On the other hand, *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* has a hybrid structure that consists of expository, participatory and even poetic modes.

The painful separation stories in *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* are sometimes narrated by the voices of emigrants, their children or their old neighbors, and they are also sometimes narrated by the director Enis Rıza's voice. In *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* the director, whose voice is heard as voice over, is not seen; witnesses and memories are told in an observatory manner. In *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* the director is in the film with his physical entity. In this respect, in *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* witnesses and memories are told in a reflexive manner; on the other hand, there is a participatory perspective, an eye that unites, interprets all the narrations. This eye is the film's director. A scene at the beginning of *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* shows this very clearly. In an extreme long shot Kayaköy is filmed. In front of the frame Enis Rıza and his camera are shown. Off-screen, the sentence, "maybe we have caught the emotions related to our reconstruction of life" is heard from the voice of the director. The director sometimes becomes a part of the narrative (with the movements of the camera or editing), and sometimes he interprets as an outside eye. In this respect, the voice over that continues throughout the film sometimes connects the parts with the interpretation of the director, and sometimes it is the voice of God that tells the truth. In documentary the voice over is described as the

---

demonstrate how understanding such personal knowledge can help us understand more general processes of society; notions of objectivity are replaced by evocation and affect. **Reflective:** recognizes the constructive nature of documentary; conveying to people that it is not necessarily truth-a truth not the truth, the artifice of the documentary is exposed - the audience is made aware of the editing, sound recording. (Nichols, 2010, pp. 172-210).



voice of God (Nichols, 2010, pp. 59-60). The voice over, which has been seen as one of the main features of documentary until the 1960s, is an aspect in expository documentary according to Bill Nichols' (2010) classification. The audience unconditionally accepts the things that the voice over says. The voice over develops a discourse that tells the audience how they ought to understand by describing the truth in the image It guides the audience. By using his own as voice as voice over, - which almost resemble a self-talk- Enis Rıza breaks the classic usage of voice over in documentary. In both documentaries, the voice overs are not didactic or authoritarian like in the conventional usage. On the contrary, they exemplify a poetic discourse that shares the pain of the emigrants with a humane interpretation. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün*, which proceeds with voice over and oral history interviews, differs from expository documentary due to the tone of the voice over. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* is in Nichols' (2010: 180) words, "I speak about them to you", and *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* turns into "I speak with them for us (me and you)". The interaction of director Enis Rıza with the people of Kayaköy gives "a distinctive window onto a particular portion of our world" for us and for the grandchildren of those who migrated from Kayaköy.

*Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* shows the characteristics of *cinéma vérité* as well. On the other hand, it would not be right to directly evaluate this film as an example of *cinéma vérité* because in this film, the film crew does not guide like in *cinéma vérité*. However, it functions as a "catalyst" (Barnouw, 1993, pp. 253-262) in presenting the truth about population exchange. The people of Nea Makri who have watched *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* face their history in a different way. This confrontation produces a new film called *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*. The audience in *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* also witnesses the relationship between the filmmaker and the subject, that is to say that the audience witnesses the relationship between the persons of the subject (the people of Nea-Makri) and the film crew (VTR crew) that film the subject. In *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*, the director, like the owl in the church, places its wise perspective on the narrative. The film crew, director, camera and monitor inside the film; they are all seen in the frame whether they are in the scenes after the film screening in Kayaköy, in Centre for Asia Minor Studies, in the scenes after the film

screening or in the spaces in which interviews are made. Thus, the production crew and the production process become the part of the film's truth. It's like as if they were saying, "this crew presents the film's truth; if we were not here as a crew, you would not have faced this history and pain; if we had not done this film, you would not have witnessed these". The camera, monitor and the images that are related to the process of the shooting and the screening depict that the truth on the screen is narrated as a film through documentary cinema and that the truth is spread out by documentary. In the films the images of camera or film projector do not top the truth; cinema is not blessed by camera or the projector. The relationship of cinema with the truth and cinema's powerful interpretation of the truth are underlined. However, in *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* the image of the director Enis Rıza's thoughtful gaze to Kayaköy and the fact that the voice over is the director's own voice show very clearly that the dominant perspective belongs to the director and that the narrated truth about the population exchange is the director's interpretation. In *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* during the screening of the first film in both shores, the light of the projector illuminates the dark room and the screen. The audience, the emigrants watch what is related to them on screen. Documentary film makes people think about the population exchange with its reference to the truth. While the audience is facing their past, the light of the projector illuminates history. With history illuminated by cinema, the second and third generation emigrants of *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* from Kayaköy are challenged to think again about the population exchange days of their parents and the two shores of the Aegean Sea. In a fiction film the audience experience catharsis at the end of the film. "Without suspecting the truth of what they see, the audience of documentary film adds these images to their experience and knowledge of life as if they had witnessed them personally" (Güngör, 1997, p. 118). Thus, the audience in documentary film can overcome their prejudices and start to think about the problem by facing the truth.

The animal figures (turtle, owl, sparrow nest, eagle, birds flying together) and the plants (pomegranate, newly sprouted tree branches, dried flowers and leaves) shown in both documentaries, make a reference to humans' ongoing "communion" with nature. This is the story of an archaic share. The view of the owl represents

wisdom. Like the turtle, it is an outside eye. It is the eye of the nature. In *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* the witnessing and the outside eye are underlined with a turtle image that looks from the top. This turtle, which has witnessed all the process in Kayaköy that turned into a ghost town after its inhabitants have left it in 1922, consists of lots of metaphors: The witnessing to old age and to all the process, being nature's and indirectly the God's eye, and carrying your home on your back. The turtle is a creature that transcends time. It is a big outside eye. The documentary is even a bigger eye that films its image. The birds flying together in various scenes depict migration; the pomegranate, which represents abundance; the birth that filmed in Kayaköy and Nea-Makri depicts becoming together again and multiplication. The documentary, which discusses the issues of home/homeland/belonging, carries these concepts to a new level by virtually showing these living creatures that share this space. Like the question, "who's the enemy?" asked at the second documentary, it brings to mind the question, "can a space have an owner?", and with the emotion of possession that also embraces all nature, it leaves us alone at the two shores of the Aegean Sea with the lives shattered by the borders.

### **Images, Objects and the Traces of Lullabies**

In *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* the connection made with the past is established through a few properties, letters and lullabies that remained from the past. In Assman's (2001) classification of memory, objects also have their own memories:

Ever since man has known himself, from daily and private tools like bed, chair, food and washing sets, clothes and implements to houses, villages, streets, vehicles and ships; the imagery like expediency, ease and beauty are surrounded with the things that he has found.. Therefore, the objects that surround him in a sense are his reflections, they remind him his past, his ancestors. The world of the things in which he lives, has a chronology that reminds him different pasts while he is living the present time. (p. 25)

Vera Tzoumelea, one of the grandchildren of the emigrants that had gone to Nea Makri, has a connection to the past through a cube with a date of 1878 written on it and two bird nests hiding inside; the cube was brought by her parents from

Anatolia. Since the bird nest directly connotes the concepts of home/homeland, it is very remarkable as an object that kept from the past. In a similar way, the chest that Ayşe Arıca's friend Maria gave her when she left Kayaköy, is Ayşe Arıca's only object and memory related to the mutual times that once lived; it is the carrier of the past. Ayşe Arıcan, who talks about the painful stories of her friends Irine, Maria, Fulson and Bidine that left their possessions by saying, "if we return they're ours, if we don't they're yours", has always kept the chest and tried to protect it even from the possible nicks.

Both documentaries give a place to lullabies, the warmest carriers of oral history and the past. As the most familiar and warmest auditory/imaginary carriers of the past related to childhood, lullabies represent, remind mother, home, homeland. Lullabies have no homeland. With their mutual melodies and lyrics, lullabies point out the common aspect of the time and the space that lived and shared. The lyrics of the lullaby that Vera Tzoumelea sings as a third generation emigrant, are also precious because they transmit the forms of life of the past: "Sleep, I ordered your dowry from Istanbul, and your odorous oil and jewelries from Venice. Sleep with sugar, wake up with honey, spend the night with the rose water that angels drink. Sleep with sugar, wake up with honey".

First generation emigrant Despina Christapoukou sings in laughter the lyrics of the song that is still sung and loved in Turkey: "Are you angry with me, my love... my brunette my beautiful, my sweet talker, oh God I'm burning, I love very much"<sup>5</sup>. Apart from a few possessions that the emigrants had taken when they left Anatolia, songs are what remain from memories and from the shared time in the geography of Anatolia.

### **Conclusion**

In his book, *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence* Burke (2001) depicts that most good films deal with the recent past and act as a bridge between micro and macro level. Documentary opens the door for a view outside

---

<sup>5</sup>The same song is interpreted as Hariklia in Greece.

official history. It provides the questioning of the official history by use of the oral history method in narration. With their emotions and thoughts, it brings to screen the people who live and create history that transcend diplomacy, politics, borders or statistics. It removes the shadow of the power over the people and the communities.

It can be claimed that the documentaries in this study, in Burke's words, act as a bridge between micro and macro level. *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün*, which depicts Kayaköy, has drawn widespread attention in Samos International Film Festival. The grandchildren of the emigrants who left Kayaköy -the people of Nea Makri- have felt the need to tell their stories after watching the film (*Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün*). These stories form the starting point of the second documentary. In a way, *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek* becomes the documentary of the people who watched *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün*.

Based on the fact that the audience who watched *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün* has become the main actor of *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*, this study mainly focuses on a historical/social reality that can be examined in different dimensions. It examines not only the subjectivity of director Enis Rıza who uses his own voice and image in the film, but also his becoming a part of the film with his director identity. Thus, the paper depicts that in the film, second and third generation emigrants and the director Enis Rıza have the ability to represent themselves through the help of mixed mode narrative structure. In this context, we have seen that these documentaries have deepened the questioning which is related to the concepts of population exchange, migration and trauma. With the method of oral history, they overhaul the view of the past. These documentaries create an opportunity for the grandchildren of the emigrants to speak their minds, and they let us think about phenomenon like migration, identity, friendship, enemy that go beyond the reality of Kayaköy.

Amin Maalouf's wish at the end of his book, "*In the Name of Identity: Violence and the Need to Belong*" reflects the expectations of the human beings from the future and depicts the hope that our view towards the concepts like identity, migration (population exchange) or friend/enemy will change dramatically. Maalouf (2001) reminds that when an author reaches the last page of a book, his fondest wish

is usually that his work should still be read 100 or 200 years hence and he continues his words, saying:

For this book, neither a literary work nor a diversion, I make a different wish. May my grandson, growing up and finding it one day by chance on the family bookshelves, look through the pages, read a passage or two, then put it back in the dusty corner where he found it, shrugging his shoulders and marveling that in his grandfather's day such things still needed to be said. (p. 164)

We believe that Maalouf's wish could only be possible with the change of attitude and view within a wider framework that these kinds of documentaries have also contributed.

Cultural "representations not only give shape to psychological dispositions, they also play an important role in determining how social reality will be constructed, that is, what figures and boundaries will prevail in the shaping of social life and social institutions" (Ryan & Kellner, 1990, p. 13). Director Enis Rıza's effort to understand the emigrants, his empathy with them, his questioning of the difficulty to find a new homeland, his humane view to the problem, his ability to present the population exchange as a universal event by not displaying it only as a Greek-Turkish problem, make it possible not only for the emigrant audience, but also for the other people that watched the film to question and to rethink about the exchange.

This analysis shows that the documentary also answers the question, "what does a documentary change?" by changing prejudices. Thanks to similar documentary productions, the learned hostility between societies can be questioned; societies can start to ask the questions that they have never asked. The documentaries' point of view display that the sadness of separation from home, the difficulty to find a new homeland are not only the problems of the people that live through these, but also are the common problems of all human beings. This writing of history with documentary, points out the role of history writing with a humane attitude in the search for truth. The power of cinema may not be enough to change the world. However, cinema (fiction or documentary) has an important power and function in order to understand the world, to make it meaningful. In this respect, it is

especially necessary to increase the channels of documentary screenings and make sure that more people watch these productions.

## References

- Arı, K. (2005). Bir tarih araştırması konusu olarak mübadele. In M. Pekin (ed.), *Yeniden kurulan yaşamlar* (pp. 387-400). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Anlaşma. (2012). Retrieved on January 25, 2012 from <http://www.lozanmubadilleri.org.tr/anlaşma>.
- Assman, J. (2001). *Kültürel bellek* (A. Tekin, Çev.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
- Barnouw, E. (1993). *Documentary a history of non-fiction film*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, P. (2001). *Eyewitnessing: The uses of images as historical evidence*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Counce, S. (2001). *Sözlü tarih ve yerel tarihçi*, (B. B. Can ve A. Yalçınkaya, Trans.). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Channan, M. (2007). *The politics of documentary*. London: BFI.
- Connerton, P. (1989). *How societies remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Çelebi, N. (2001-2002). Kültürel travma üzerine. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 91, 344-348.
- De Jong, W. (2008) Developing and producing feature documentary: the case of Deep Water. In Austin, T. ve De Yong, W. (Eds.), *Rethinking documentary* (pp. 133-135). London: Open University Press.
- Duruel Erkılıç, S. (2008). Küreselleşmenin yarattığı gerilime sinemanın yanıtı: belgesel sinema. In İter, T. et al. (Eds.), *Communication in peace/conflict in communication* (pp. 225-232). Eastern Mediterranean University Press.
- Ginsburg, C. (2000). Küreselleşmeye yerel bir yaklaşım. In A. Kızılyaprak (Ed.), *Tarih yazımında yeni yaklaşımlar* (G. Evrim, Trans.) (pp. 17-39). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Güngör, Ş. (1997). Belgesel sinemanın işlevi. In *Belgesel sinema üzerine, belgesel sinemacılar birliği birinci ulusal konferans bildirileri* (pp. 180-183). İstanbul: Belgesel Sinemacılar Birliği Yayınları.

- Hirschon, R. (Ed.) (2005). *Ege'yi geerken* (M. Pekin ve E. Altınay, Trans.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Hirschon, R. (2000). *Mübadele çocukları* (S. Çağlayan, Çev.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Iğsız, A. (2006). Memleket, yurt ve coğrafi kardeşlik: Arşivci kültür politikaları. In E. Özyürek (Ed.), *Türkiye'nin toplumsal hafızası*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Maalouf, A. (2001). *In the name of identity: Violence and the need to belong* (B. Bray, Trans.). New York: Arcade Publishing.
- Milas, H. (2005). Türk edebiyatında nüfus mübadelesi metinlerin arkasındaki fısıltı. In R. Hirschon (Ed.), *Ege'yi geerken* (pp. 329-346). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Milas, H. (Ed.) (2001). *Küçük Asya Araştırma Merkezi göç* (D. Demiröz, Çev.). İstanbul: İletişim.
- Nichols, B. (1991). *Representing reality*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Nichols B. (2010). *Introduction to documentary* (2nd ed.). Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Öztürkmen, A. (2002). Yeni bir disiplin olarak sözlü tarih. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 91, 115-121.
- Papailias, P. (2006). Mülteci belleği veya bir Yunan kurumu üzerine notlar. In E. Özyürek (Ed.), *Türkiye'nin toplumsal hafızası*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Pekin, M. (Ed.) (n.d.). *Yeniden kurulan yaşamlar*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Rabiger, M. (2004). *Directing documentary*. Boston: Focal Press.
- Rıza, E. (2007). Sözlü tarih ve belgesel sinema. In E. Seyhan (Ed.), *Belgesel Sinema* (pp. 72-79). N.p.: n.p.
- Ryan, M., & Kellner, D. (1990). *Camera politica: The politics and ideology of contemporary hollywood film*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sakızlı, S. (Producer), & Rıza, E (Director). (2001). *Ayrılığın Yurdu Hüzün*. Türkiye: VTR.
- Sakızlı, S. (Producer), & Rıza, E (Director). (2006). *Yeni Bir Yurt Edinmek*. Türkiye: VTR.
- Sancar, M. (2007). *Geçmişle hesaplaşma*. İstanbul: İletişim.



- Saunders, D. (2010). *Documentary*. London: Routledge.
- Şakarer, E. (2010). Ayrılığın yurdu hüznü & Yeni bir yurt edinmek. *Sinefil*, 5, 34-35.
- Thompson, P.(1999). *Geçmişin sesi* (Ş. Layıkel, Çev.). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Tosh, J. (1997). *Tarihin peşinde* (Ö. Arıkan, Çev.). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı.
- Volkan, V. (1998). *Bloodlines: From ethnic pride to ethnic terrorism*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Yıldırım, O. (2006). *Diplomasi ve güç*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.