

SHOOTING AND CRYING: REPRESENTATIONS OF
MASCULINITY IN ISRAELI CINEMA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MELTEM DURUL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

JANUARY 2020

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe SAKTANBER
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa ŞEN
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgür YAREN (Ankara Uni., ILEF) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa ŞEN (METU, SOC) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgür AVCI (METU, ADM) _____



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Meltem Durul

Signature :

ABSTRACT

SHOOTING AND CRYING: REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY IN ISRAELI CINEMA

Durul, Meltem

M.Sc., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Şen

January 2020, 96 pages

In this study, masculinity representations presented in “shooting and crying” films of the 2000s Israeli cinema were analyzed by using critical discourse analysis method and the concepts presented by critical masculinity studies. In the films included in the mentioned genre, the manner in which the masculinity crisis is constructed, how it is produced and which mechanisms are used to get out of the crisis situation has been investigated within the framework of social power relations. In this thesis, based on the assumption that there is a fracture in the representation of masculinity in war films produced in the 2000s Israeli cinema, it is aimed to examine the effect of this fracture on the representation of the masculinity crisis and the means by which the crisis is presented. In this context, *Beaufort*, *Waltz with Bashir* and *Lebanon* films were dealt with and the male characters in these films were analyzed on the basis of the concepts of masculinity crisis, militarism and trauma.

Keywords: Israeli Cinema, shooting and crying, masculinity crisis, militarism, trauma.

ÖZ

SHOOTING AND CRYING: İSRAİL SİNEMASINDA ERKEKLİK TEMSİLLERİ

Durul, Meltem


Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Mustafa Şen

Ocak 2020, 96 sayfa

Bu çalışmada, 2000'ler İsrail sinemasında yıllarda ortaya çıkan “shooting and crying” türüne ait filmlerde sunulan erkeklik temsilleri, kritik söylem analizi yöntemi kullanılarak ve eleştirel erkeklik çalışmalarının sunduğu kavramlardan yararlanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Belirtilen türe dahil olan filmlerde, erkeklik krizinin ne şekilde kurgulandığı, nasıl üretildiği ve kriz durumundan kurtulmak amacıyla hangi mekanizmalardan yararlandığı toplumsal iktidar ilişkileri çerçevesinde araştırılmıştır. Çalışmada, 2000'ler İsrail sinemasında üretilen savaş filmlerinde, erkekliğin temsiliyetinde bir kırılma olduğu kabulünden hareketle, bu kırılmanın erkeklik krizi temsiliyeti üzerindeki etkisini ve krizin hangi araçlar aracılığıyla sunulduğunu incelemek amaçlanmıştır. Bu çerçevede, *Beaufort*, *Waltz with Bashir* ve *Lebanon* filmleri ele alınmış ve bu filmlerdeki erkek karakterler, erkeklik krizi, militarizm ve travma kavramları temelinde çözümlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İsrail sineması, “shooting and crying”, erkeklik krizi, militarizm, travma.



To that black curly-haired child who is no longer alive

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It was a really long journey, but finally it ended. In the process of preparing this thesis, even though I have come across several obstacles, it was fortunate to reach the end with the support of my family and the precious people in my life.

First, I would like to express my highest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa ŞEN and my jury members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Özgür YAREN and Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgür AVCI for their guidance and constructive support.

I would like to thank my dear friends Safiye ÜÇKARDEŞ for her eye-opening views and Orçin AKGÖNÜL, Dr. Ece BULUT and Hazal TURASAN for their valued efforts in access to academic resources. It would be a pity if I ignore the spiritual support of my cat, dear Matmazel, while sleeping and purring during long hours of writing this thesis. I'm also deeply grateful to my beloved life partner Bora DURUL for his immense patience and unlimited support. I really appreciate him for encouraging me even tirelessly to complete this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	13
2.1. A Critical Approach to Masculinity Studies.....	14
2.1.1. Development of Masculinity Studies	14
2.1.2. Debates and Main Concepts	16
2.2. Masculinity Crisis and Militarism	21
2.2.1. Masculinity Crisis	21
2.2.2. Militarism and Masculinity	25
3. MILITARISM AND TRAUMA IN ISRAELI SOCIETY	28
3.1. The Arab - Israeli Conflict and Militarization of Israeli Society	29
3.2. Memory and Trauma in Israeli Society	38
4. DISCOURSES OF MASCULINITY CRISIS IN THE 2000s ISRAELI CINEMA	42
4.1. Development of Israeli Cinema	43
4.2. Masculinity Representations in Israeli Cinema	46
4.2.1. “Shooting and Crying” Films	49
4.3. Analyzing “Shooting and Crying” Narratives: <i>Beaufort</i> , <i>Waltz with Bashir</i> and <i>Lebanon</i>	51
4.3.1. Trying to Survive: <i>Beaufort</i>	52
4.3.2. Traumatic Experiences of War: <i>Waltz with Bashir</i>	57
4.3.3. Through the Sight of a Tank: <i>Lebanon</i>	63

5. CONCLUSION	70
REFERENCES.....	76
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: FILM TAGS	84
APPENDIX B: TRKE ZET / TURKISH SUMMARY	86
APPENDIX C: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU	96



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DOP	The Draft Declaration of Principles
IDF	Israel Defense Forces
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
SCR	Security Council Resolution
UN	United Nations
UNEF	United Nations Emergency Forces
US	the United States
USA	the United States of America

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This thesis focuses on the reflections of masculinity crisis observed in combat soldiers who served in the First Lebanon War in 1982 which are represented in the films produced in 2000s Israeli cinema. This study is based on the assumption that militarist discourse is presented as a part of the national ideology in films produced in the early stages of Israeli cinema, and that there are some fractions in this discourse in the 2000s. In the films produced in the 2000s, called “shooting and crying” genre, the narrative is formed around the First Lebanon War and male characters are presented in an anxiety, stress and uncertainty. In this direction, it is argued that the soldiers are in a masculinity crisis based on the feelings of anxiety, stress and uncertainty presented in these films produced in the 2000s. In this frame, three films that are included in the 2000s “shooting and crying” genre in Israeli cinema will be examined in the context of masculinity crisis discourse.

2000s Israeli cinema is considered a new era due to its social, cultural and political themes. During this period, many social, ethnic and religious issues were included, collective narrative and political messages were replaced by personal stories, and a more questioning and critical approach was reflected in cinema works. Another group of genres that took shape during this period, called “shooting and crying”¹, focuses on the internal contradictions of Israeli soldiers in war films. These narratives, which are fictional or based on real events, deal with the representations of male soldiers in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF). In this direction, the main purpose of the study is to examine the male characters represented in these films produced in Israeli cinema in

¹ It means “people are aware of the problematic issues of war, yet still take part in it” (Wonnenberg, 2013: 212). In the following sections of the study, detailed information about the development and characteristics of “shooting and crying” genre is going to be presented.

the context of masculinity crisis. Taken into account that masculinity is a gender category shaped within social, cultural and political dimensions, the impact of political and social processes through which the films go through on the representations of masculinity must be taken into account. Therefore, films produced within the scope of “shooting and crying” genre provide the appropriate narratives and features to search the discourses on masculinity crisis.

Research Questions – One of the questions to search for answers in this study is how the discourse of masculinity crisis in the representation of male characters is established and how it shows up through the narrative of the film. In this context, how the crisis-producing structures are shaped will be explored. Another question to look for in the study is that whether the discourse on this crisis is used to reproduce and legitimize masculinity, and whether the structure that produces masculinity crisis also provides an opportunity for getting rid of it. Moreover, the roles of concepts such as militarism and trauma in producing masculinity crisis will be examined.

Why Israeli Cinema – Israel is a melting pot that incorporates many different cultures, languages, traditions and various political trends (Shohat, 2010: 1). Israel has always been on the global political agenda and has been one of the influential countries in the Middle East since its foundation in 1948. Relations between Israel and Turkey dates back to the Ottoman Empire era, that is very far from the official establishment of two states. At the end of the 15th century, after King Ferdinand and Queen Isabelle of Spain decided to exile all Jews living in Spain, many of the Jews dispersed into various parts of the Ottoman Empire (Rumelia²; Western and Northern Anatolia; Mediterranean coastal regions - Egypt, Jerusalem, Damascus) and continued to live in these regions for many years (Birnbaum, 1994: 18). However, when the Ottoman Empire began to weaken and lose its lands in Rumelia, the Jews, most of whom lived in Rumelia, found themselves under the rule of other states. For this reason, Jewish population began to decline during this period in Turkey. When the Republic of Turkey formally

² *Rumelia* defines the former Ottoman possessions in the Balkans (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1998).

established in 1923, *aliyah*³ was not much popular among Jews in Turkey. Until the establishment of the State of Israel, there were few migrations occasionally. But, after the official establishment of the Israeli state, almost 40% of the Jewish population in Turkey emigrated to Israel. Jews who immigrated to Israel from Turkey, had no trouble adapting to the new Israeli society. In addition, a majority have maintained the culture and preserved their ties with Turkey (Toktaş, 2006: 507-513). In Turkey, there are still about 15,000 Jewish citizens resident.⁴ After Israel declared its establishment as official in 1948, Turkey has been one of the first countries to recognize the newly established state (28 March, 1949).

Despite these historical ties and relations with Israel mentioned above, academic studies with regard to Israel remains very limited in Turkey. Prepared or ongoing studies in Turkey is often related to issues such as security, terrorism, immigration and the Israeli-Palestinian question⁵. The limitation of the studying frame to these areas may be related to the Palestinian issue and the uncompromising policy that Israel pursues in this regard. However, it is necessary to turn to other fields than politics in order to better understand and establish more effective communication of a country and its people whose historical ties and trade relations still continue. Acting on all these mentioned motives, in this study - focusing on Israeli cinema, which has come to the forefront in world cinema in terms of both the number of films it produced and its diversity - it is aimed to contribute also a sociological contribution to the Israeli studies in Turkey. Considering this aspect, Israeli society, which is defined as a “military society”, offers a wide content for researches especially on militarism and masculinity studies. Evaluated as a homosocial field for men, militarism permeates to all areas of Israeli society both individually and in institutional terms. The fact that

³ *Aliyah* (“going up”), “in Judaism, the honour accorded to a worshiper of being called up to read an assigned passage from the Torah (first five books of the Bible). But in modern times, aliyah has also been used to designate the ‘going up’ to Israel of immigrants from other lands, just as in former times it meant going up to the Holy Land” (Encyclopedia Britannica, 1998).

⁴ Jewish Virtual Library (May 2019).

⁵ Regarding the studies on Israel, “Journal of Israeli and Judaic Studies” was launched in 2017 under the name of “Israiliyat”. In the issues published hitherto, articles on religion, politics, economics, history and international relations are included. For detailed information and to access to studies please see the link: <http://israiliyat.com/en/>

military service is mandatory for both young men and women has facilitated this penetration and caused the normalization of militarism for the Israeli society. Therefore, there is also the possibility to look at reflections of militarism in cinema in relation to masculinity studies. This position of militarism for society, individuals and institutions, enables us to investigate how it is handled in cinema. In cinematic studies conducted in Turkey there is still a huge lack because there is not much studies prepared in this area. This study will make possible to fill this gap albeit partially and will allow the Israeli society to be seen from different perspectives in Turkey.

Research Method

There are different methods for analyzing films that developed for the purpose of the analysis. These methods should be chosen in accordance with the nature of the elements to be focused on the films. In films, to examine a concept, subject, sound or image in the context of discourse, an appropriate method that allows discourse analysis should be chosen. Critical discourse analysis is one of the most widely used methods in film analysis. For this reason, it was considered appropriate to use Critical discourse analysis method in the analysis of the films to be examined in this study.

In everyday life, any text, speech or indication that is involved necessarily includes a purpose / an intent. Thus, it can be said that meaning is a product of the communication and that symbols or words convey a particular discourse; therefore, any spoken word creates a process of discourse. In order to reveal the purpose to be expressed in this process, the discourse needs to be analyzed (Zor, 2017: 878). Discourse is an abstract term commonly used to refer to various topics in many disciplines. Jaworski and Coupland propose three main categories for the definition of discourse: “1) anything beyond the sentence, 2) language use and, 3) a broader range of social practice that includes non-linguistic and non-specific instances of language” (cited in Tannen et al., 2001: 1). For Hall:

“Discourses are ways of referring to or constructing knowledge about a particular topic of practice: a cluster (or formation) of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about, forms of knowledge and conduct associated with a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society” (2013: 4-5).

Discourse analysis is used to express a range of approaches to analyze the written and verbal expression of language beyond the grammatical parts of language, such as words and sentences. Therefore, discourse analysis focuses on how language is used in a social context. In the discourse analysis method, which is mentioned with the tradition of structuralism, language refers to text or speech and context refers to social conditions in which text or speech occurs (Salkind, 2010: 367-368).

Michel Foucault, who is considered as the thinker who carries the discourse analysis method forward, brings a sociopolitical approach to discourse analysis. According to him, discourse refers to a historically conditional social system that produces knowledge and meaning. More specifically, discourse is a way of organizing information that structures the formation of social relations through collective understanding of discursive logic and acceptance of discourse as social reality. According to him, the logic produced by a discourse is related to the broader epistemology of the historical period in which it emerged structurally. Discourses, however, are produced by the effects of power in a social order. Therefore, in order to legitimize the truth, power establishes rules defining the criteria in the discourse system and these rules precede discourse. Thus, discourse enables both the determination of meaning and the concealment of political intentions; a discourse can mask itself historically, universally and scientifically (Foucault, 1972)⁶.

The discussions on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), based on the critique of power emphasized by Foucault, take the subject further. Norman Fairclough, one of the prominent scholars in CDA studies, claims that discourse is shaped and limited by social structure and culture (Salkind, 2010: 369). Fairclough, together with Wodak, deals with CDA in relation to a few basic elements. The first element points to social principles; CDA not only focuses on language and its use, but also takes into account the linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures. The second element sets out the relations of power. In respect to this, the linguistic and discursive

⁶ Foucault's and Lacan's definitions of "discourse" coincide with this aspect; however, the parts they focus on are separated. While Lacan interprets discourse from a psychoanalytic perspective, Foucault takes discourse from the structural point of view of institutions and power (Adams, 2017).

nature of the social relations of power in contemporary societies should also be considered. For Fairclough and Wodak, these power relations are built along with discourse. The third element is that discourse constitutes society and culture. In this regard, emphasis is placed on the formation of discourse by society and culture as well as being shaped by them. The other two elements are the ideological and historical aspects of speech. This association indicates that discourse is not neutral and cannot be produced and understood without a certain historical context. Another element relates to the aspect of the CDA that links the characteristics of the text with social and cultural processes and structures. In addition, the CDA aims to go beyond the analysis of the text to an interpretive and descriptive stage. As the last element, it refers to the discourse being a social action and intends to uncover power relations with CDA (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). In sum, in Fairclough's view, discourse, in general terms, deals with language in its own social context and focuses on the relationship of language with power. Besides, he regarded language as a part of society within a dialectical relationship between society and language (Fairclough, 2001: 1-3).

Teun van Dijk evaluates the concept of discourse through media texts and deals with it in relation to the concept of power. For Van Dijk, Critical Discourse analysis described as "... analytical research that primarily studies the way social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context". Discourse offers a critical perspective and can be found in many areas such as "discourse studies, such as discourse grammar, conversation analysis, discourse pragmatics, rhetoric, stylistics, narrative analysis, argumentation analysis, multimodal discourse analysis and social semiotics, sociolinguistics, and or the psychology" (Van Dijk, 2015: 466). In Van Dijk's view, basically, the CDA focuses on social issues and political issues. Instead of defining the structures of discourse, it tries to explain them in terms of social structure. It focuses on the ways in which discourse structures establish, validate, legitimize, reproduce or challenge relationships of power abuse (sovereignty) in society (2015: 467).

As Fairclough, Van Dijk relates the microstructure of language and the macrostructure of society. However, Van Dijk takes a socio-cognitive approach when establishing this

relationship. The socio-cognitive approach focuses on a tripartite structure that includes discourse, society and cognition within the framework of ideology. He mentions that CDA serves as a bridge between micro elements (agency, interactional) and macro elements (structural, institutional, organizational). While discourse, language use, conversation and verbal interaction are considered to belong to the micro level of social order, concepts such as power, inequality and dominance between social groups are seen as belonging to the macro level. Van Dijk states that in social terms, it is possible to identify the gap between the macro-micro levels and to achieve a holistic critical analysis with the help of this. Van Dijk also focuses on the analysis of ideological structures and social relations in power within discourse. He proposes two kinds of categories of power in relation to this analysis. The first, “coercive power”, which is based on force and can be exemplified as military power or the power of a violent man. Secondly, he suggests “persuasive power”; this type of power is based on knowledge, information and authority. The power used by parents, educationists or journalists can be included in this category. Moreover, he proposes four principles to describe ideologies that he named as “ideological square” that each edge symbolizes a different constant. First edge emphasizes positive things about “us”; second edge is for negative things about “them”; third edge de-emphasized negative things about “us” and the last edge de-emphasize positive things about “them”. This ideological frame described by Van Dijk refers to the polarization of in-groups versus out-groups (2015: 468-474).

For Van Dijk, discourse is a communicative event involving conversation, written text, and any kind of semiotic media. Personal or social cognition includes memory or mental structures, representations and processes in discourse and interaction such as beliefs, evaluations, and emotions. Society includes both microstructures and social and political structures such as group relations, institutions and the political system of this interaction and processes. Subsequently, for him, “the combined cognitive and social dimensions of the triangle as defining the relevant (local and global) context of discourse” (2001: 97-98).

Based on the aforementioned views, in the study, which focuses on the discourses of the masculinity crisis in Israeli cinema in the 2000s, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) method, which enables the analysis of individual and social discourses produced in historical processes within the framework of ideology and power relations, will be used at the macro and micro level to analyze the films. In this respect, Teun van Dijk's approach that allow the analysis of the discourses produced through written text, conversation and semiotics will be utilized, together with the crisis situation in the representation of masculinity and the categories such as militarism and trauma put in place to deal with the crisis. In the framework of macro and micro level analysis presented by Van Dijk, the discourse on the ideology and representation of groups and institutions will be analyzed under macro level; and discourse on the representation of individuals, personal ideas and interpersonal interaction will be analyzed under micro level.

Background

Since the 1960s, masculinity studies, being positioned together with feminist studies and feeding on feminism and queer theory, focuses on the questioning and transformation of masculinity roles from a critical perspective (Günay-Erkol et al., 2018: 3). Gender studies have progressed for a long time by fixing men to a dominant position in early periods. However, theoreticians such as R. W. Connell, Michael Kimmel, Jeff Hearn and Tim Carrigan stated that masculinity studies should be removed from fixed positions and should be considered within and as a whole with gender studies. With the second wave feminist movement, masculinity studies started to produce their own concepts in itself. Some theorists emphasized the social structure in the formation of certain masculinities, while some theorists argued that masculinities were built in certain discourses (Connell, 2017; Hearn, 1998, Kimmel, 1987). Among the theories put forward in relation to different and multiple masculinity identities in specific discourses, Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity, which refers to power relations between men, provided different expansions in terms of masculinity studies. She argued that gender relations are not only related to the position of domination between men and women, but that the relationships of dominance

among men should be included in this framework. With the expansion of the debate on hegemonic masculinity, views on the sustainability and problems of hegemonic masculinity have been proposed. In this respect, the role of money making, which constitutes one of the main pillars of masculinity in the traditional sense, establishes the hegemony of the man and ensures the continuity of the patriarchal system has been endangered by the fact that women also take an active role in business life. Due to the climate of insecurity and uncertainty as a result of the change, traditional masculine roles have faced a crisis. Thus, it is argued that hegemonic masculinity is deprived of the means to maintain its hegemony with various transformations of the society in the modernization process (Onur and Koyuncu, 2004: 36). Theorists who advocated another approach to the crisis of masculinity argue that the crisis is not valid for all masculinities and that the situation of entering into crisis is related to certain forms of masculinity in certain periods (Edwards, 2006; Connell, 2002; MacInnes, 1998).

Within the masculinity studies, the crisis faced by hegemonic masculinity in the process of modernization manifests itself also in the cinema studies. Strong, heroic, guarding, perfect men have been replaced by men who are depressed, fragile, unsuccessful, lacking authority and unable to realize themselves. In parallel to this, in Israel, conflicts of identity are experienced especially in the matters of war, militarism and trauma with the spread of postmodernist approach and practices all over the world (Yüksel, 2013: 73). In Israel, which is regarded as a militarist society, gender studies and particularly masculinity studies have been discussed in the cinematic field in addition to theoretical approaches and social projections. In the essay "*Spectacles of Pain: War, Masculinity and the Masochistic Fantasy in Amos Gitai's Kippur*", Raz Yosef provides an evaluation of masculinity and masochism in Israeli war films. Various rituals and representations of masculinity, together with the concept of war, are considered within the framework of the concept of pain (2005). In his book "*The Politics of Loss and Trauma in Contemporary Israeli Cinema*", Yosef examines the relationship between trauma, nationalism and cinema, collective memory, crime and guilt, and the impact of post-trauma on Israel's past and present in a comprehensive and critical way. The repetitive and unifying effect of trauma in the political, cultural

and social life is discussed in detail. There is also a strong emphasis on the “postmemory” concept proposed by Marianne Hirsch, which affects the memory of the second and third generations born after a traumatic event (2011). In *“Deeper than Oblivion”*, edited by Raz Yosef and Boaz Hagin, leading scholars’ articles in Israeli film studies are collected. In that collection, scholars, by dealing with past and recent examples of films in Israeli cinema, examine discourses of militarism and war under the general concepts of trauma and memory (2013). Ella Shohat’s famous book *“Israeli Cinema: East/West and the Politics of Representation”* (1989, re-edited in 2010) deals with the reflections of changing political events and perceptions in Israeli cinema. In his book, Shohat discusses the Israeli cinema from an East – West and Third World – First World perspective. In a historical context, on the basis of the relationship between filmmaking and the ideological construction of Zionism, various elements have been extensively evaluated (2010). Miri Talmon and Yaron Peleg focus on Israeli identities presented in cinematic works in their books *“Israeli Cinema: Identities in Motion”* dealing with relatively new concepts in Israeli cinema. In the book consisting of compilation articles of the new generation writers, national elements that were represented in the early periods; change and representation of Israeli soldiers during and after the war; Mizrahi cinema and representations of immigrants; works on the axis of holocaust and trauma; concepts such as masculinity, queer and sexuality are analyzed through films and contribute to the understanding of contemporary Israeli cinema (2011).

Apart from these, which deal with Israeli cinema from a holistic and historical perspective within the framework of various concepts, there are studies especially on the genre called “shooting and crying” that puts the Israeli soldier in its center. Felice Naomi Wonnenberg, in her study *“Sissy and the Muscle-Jew Go to the Movies”*, explains the representation of Jewish men in the world and Israeli cinema from the beginning of Israeli cinema to the present. In addition, she discusses the characteristics of the “shooting and crying” type, the way that male characters are represented in this type, and how films included in this genre are perceived by European and Israeli audiences. Wonnenberg asserts that in “shooting and crying” films, male characters

are described in fragility, sensitivity and uncertainty as in pre-Zionist narratives, and she analyzes this through various films (2013). In the article *“Looking for an Invisible Enemy in Israeli Film”*, Francesca de Lucia examines the representation of the enemy in the films that took place around the first Lebanese War and questions the concepts of trauma, guilt, stress and crisis of heterosexual masculinity in three films of the “shooting and crying” genre (2018). Yuval Benziman, in *“‘Mom, I’m Home’: Israeli Lebanon-War Films as Inadvertent Preservers of the National Narrative”*, examines the national narrative in the works produced in the last three decades in Israeli cinema, especially based on the Lebanese war, and analyzes the formation of the soldiers represented in the films (2013). In these studies, “shooting and crying” is attributed some specific features in terms of thematic, character representation and historic features. The authors conducted analyses that male characters were represented in traumatic, fragile, stress and anxiety situations - in a more holistic sense as “in crisis”. In this context, based on the controversies put forward about “shooting and crying” genre, it is aimed to examine the films included in this genre in the 2000s Israeli cinema through the presence of discourses of masculinity crisis. In addition to investigate the representations of masculinity crisis in films, in which situations the masculinity crisis arises and how the characters try to cope with this crisis will be analyzed. This thesis differs in terms of evaluating the films in question within the perspective of masculine-oriented gender studies using critical discourse analysis. This study is going to make a new contribution to the literature of both Israeli cinema and masculinity studies in terms of examining the relationship between the concepts of militarism and trauma in the context of masculinity crisis.

This study is established in three chapters. In the first part, the emergence and development of masculinity studies will be evaluated. Based on the assumption that masculinity is not a natural and fixed gender position, but it is a gender practice that is built and reproduced in the historical and spatial process, the concepts of masculinity crisis and militarism will be discussed. First chapter will provide a theoretical and conceptual background to provide a general framework for the study and to link historical, political and social processes in the analysis of masculinity representations

in selected films from Israeli cinema. In the second chapter, it is aimed to evaluate the concepts of militarism and trauma in the context of historical processes in Israeli society. In this regard, the reasons having an impact on militarization of the society will be examined. Besides, what the concept of trauma and memory corresponds to in Israeli society will be analyzed. In the last chapter, within the scope of the views presented in the first two chapters, male characters in *Waltz with Bashir*, *Lebanon* and *Beaufort*, selected from the 2000s Israeli cinema and containing narratives of masculinity crisis in relation to war, militarism and trauma, will be examined by using critical discourse analysis method.



CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In this part of the study, it will be explained that masculinity is not a natural, hegemonic and fixed position, but a gender category that can be constructed, changed and reproduced within the context of gender relations and historical process. For this purpose, at first, the emergence and development of critical masculinity studies will be researched. The history of masculinity studies that developed in parallel with gender studies will be briefly mentioned. This section is deemed necessary in order to understand the origins of the basic concepts of masculinity studies to be covered in this thesis. Then, the views of the theorists who adopt the approach that masculinity is a constructed and changing gender practice will be presented. The concepts of hegemonic masculinity, performative construction of masculinity and masculinity crisis derived from this approach will be introduced. In the second part, the focus will be on the more specific concepts of masculinity studies. Based on the information given in the previous section, masculinity crisis and the relationship between militarism and masculinity will be examined. The fact that masculinity is one of the fragmented, contradictory categories of gender that constantly rebuilds itself, adapts to changing conditions and tries to provide integrity, and the uncertainties about it are more on the agenda today and open to different interpretations (Yüksel, 2013: 92). With the consideration that it will help to explain these contradictions and provide different interpretations of uncertainties, the concept of masculinity crisis is included in the conceptual framework adopted by the study. In this frame, different approaches put forward in order to examine the crisis-producing structure of masculinity, which is supposed to have emerged within the framework of changing social relations system and temporal conditions, will be discussed. Then, militarism, one of the most prominent homosocial institutions among men, will be analyzed in relation to masculinity; views on how masculinity is built and maintained within the militarist

system will be presented. With the first chapter of the study, it is aimed is to provide the theoretical and conceptual background to be used to examine the representations of masculinity produced in shooting and crying films in 2000s Israeli cinema.

2.1. A Critical Approach to Masculinity Studies

2.1.1. Development of Masculinity Studies

From a historical perspective, the critical studies on masculinity are built on the gains of the feminist movement that brought women's rights to the agenda in the 1960s. These researches and critics on masculinity has started in 1970s in Europe and America parallel to studies of second wave feminist movement. In this period, together with the increase in women's emancipation and feminist research, the concept of masculinity has been taken up and the foundations of masculinity studies have been laid (Connell, 1993: 597). Feminism, which centered on the problems of oppression of women and the view of women as second class, reshaped the studies on gender which were previously carried out from a male perspective. Since the second wave of feminist movement, some men have started to support feminism with emphasis on women's experiences by questioning their own position in the context of gender inequality. In this respect, the confrontation of men with their own masculinities and social positions by reacting to the problems of women's oppression and subordination has led to the emergence of masculinity studies in relation to gender studies (Bozok, 2009: 269-270). In addition, gay and queer movement also has challenged normally and universally accepted manhood fiction and paved the way for questioning men and masculinity (Easthope, 1990: 2).

Under the influence of women's efforts to make themselves accepted as political subjects, the emerging and progressing masculinity studies in the historical development of feminism have been enriched and elaborated by taking different approaches of first, second and third wave feminism. The theoretical debates brought

about by first and second wave feminism – with the view that oppression of women is socially reinforced – have led to the studies on masculinity in parallel to gender studies. However, despite the acceptance of masculinity as a socially defined gender role, discussions continued with the view of the nature of man and the effects of biological sex. In particular, in the American society under the negative influences of the Vietnam War, men who refused to go to military service and to murder played an important role in deepening the gender debate in the second wave. With the war that ended in 1975, liberation movements and diversity of theoretical debates gained in the masculinity studies literature have increased.

Despite the progress of masculinity studies in this manner, masculinity has been assigned fixed roles on the axis of gender roles and explained with reference to certain types of behavior. With the emergence of the third wave feminist movement in the 1980s, the idea of female-male opposition/dichotomy began to lose its popularity. Debates on the inaccuracy of handling masculinity on the basis of purely biological sex have accelerated and the main arguments of the first and second wave, which suggest that there is a single model of masculinity that does not change, were targeted. The idea that there is not a single and unchangeable concept of masculinity and that it is necessary to talk about masculinities that change according to various conditions has started to strengthen (Günay-Erkol, 2018: 7-8).

Today, the main point of discussion in masculinity studies are based on the assumption that masculinity is formation of a series of socio-cultural and historical interactions (Türk, 2007: 2). Critical masculinity studies, which have been nurtured by feminist and queer theories since 1970s and focused on the transformation and questioning of fixed roles attributed to masculinity, enable the examination of masculine identities and practices in all spheres of life from cinema to politics. The fact that certain roles imposed on men from an early age and expected to be fulfilled by the society put men into difficult situations. Therefore, as a result of the situation they have fallen into for the sake of fulfilling these roles imposed on them, they sometimes have difficulty in communicating and assisting. It has been an issue of discussion in masculinity studies especially recently that they experience various crisis and try to find ways out. In the

following chapters, together with the basic approaches in the field of masculinity studies, the concepts that are supposed to put men into crisis situation specifically in militarism and trauma, will be discussed.

2.1.2. Debates and Main Concepts

After the opinion that masculinity cannot be reduced to the whole set of immutable concepts and behaviors became widespread, it has started to be evaluated within the framework of gender relations like femininity, and new concepts and approaches have been added to the field of masculinity studies. As Connell stated, a critical perspective must be taken within the context of gender relations and the sociological and historical orientations of these relations should be examined in order to make sense of masculinity studies (Connell, 2005: 44). Masculinity studies, similar to and complementary to the field of Women studies, has emerged as an area that centralizes the problem of the formation of gender differences (Sancar, 2016: 26). Accordingly, a field of masculinity studies has developed in which masculinities are evaluated not only in relation to femininity but also within their own boundaries and produce their own concepts. Within the scope of “critical” masculinity studies which emerged under the influence of second wave feminist movement and offer a more questioning discussion area, it can be said that many contributions have been made to the literature both theoretically and conceptually. In this section, approaches which are considered as a turning point in the literature of masculinity studies and which will contribute to the theoretical and conceptual framework of this thesis will be mentioned.

In order to understand the relationship between men and masculinities to power, Nancy Chodorow focuses on how a man enters into a relationship from the moment he is born. She states that as soon as the child is born, the first person he/she develops a relationship with is the female parent. Based on this assumption, the first person who tends to look after children is the mother; the child is born dependent on the mother and defines himself/herself through her. Chodorow argues that this relationship causes

a contradictory situation for boys. Nancy Chodorow, by interpreting Freud's object relations theory differently, suggests the thesis that gender-based personality traits are developed in the family. Based on the assumption that the relationship between the boy and the father is not as close as the relationship between the daughter and the mother, for the boy, the concrete masculinity identity that he takes as a role model is more remote. Therefore, the boy stays away from a permanent role model and tries to shape his own identity by taking specific categories of masculinity in society (Chodorow, 1975). Gilmore, on the basis of Chodorow's approach, argues that the first commitment between the boy and the mother poses a major problem for patriarchy. The boy, trying to break the strong relationship with his mother, endeavors to establish the socially accepted masculinity identity in various ways. But, for the boy, the absence of a role model to set it this relationship establishes a closer inner bond with the mother, revealing the ideal of being narcissistic and capable of doing anything (Gilmore, 1990).

Judith Butler, one of the prominent living postmodern theorists, like other theoreticians who adopt a pro-feminist approach, criticizes modern feminists who develop theories within the boundaries of traditional binary categories. Butler conceptualizes gendered subjectivity as a fluent identity and states that the individual is never only a "man" or a "woman. For her, gender is constructed performatively around a series of repetitive acts. On this basis, she states that "expressions" and "statements" are not the results of our social gender, but rather the constituents of it (Butler, 2018: 77). Gendered subjectivity is not a "fixed" or "essential" concept; it is an ongoing series of actions consisting of repetitions and rituals. Therefore, the reason for Butler's uses the term of "performativity" instead of "performance" is the continuous manner of gender practices. Gender is "an expectation that ends up producing the very phenomenon that it anticipates". As Butler describes, the fluid nature of gender allows the phenomenon of masculinity to be handled within variable or fluid identities (2018: 45). Butler, considers "sex" like gender and that gender norms also shape biological gender. Although she does not deny some biological differences, she explains the discursive and theoretical conditions in which certain biological differences become the prominent features of gender. Besides, she uses the term of "heterosexual matrix"

where “proper men” and “proper women” are defined as heterosexual. For Butler, the relationship between biological sex, gender definition and heterosexuality are not naturally formed, and that this association is an illusion stemming from cultural systems. She indicates that the inner essence of gender is produced by sustained action and the gendered stylization of the body (Butler, 2018). Butler’s concept of drag performance, by making visible the imitation and performance-based structure of heterosexuality, removes it from naturalness and originality. This performance has the possibility of removing gender norms from naturalness and idealizing them. It creates a gap with the ability to overturn in relation to re-alluding and contextualization with this binary structure (Butler, 2018: 84-86).

According to Connell, although every society has a culturally constituted gender perception, there is no consensus on masculinity, and the concept of masculinity differs socially and temporally (Connell, 2005: 67). For men or women, in spite of generally accepted norms and how these are exhibited are determined on the basis of social relations, gender is the product of social practice (Connell, 2005: 71-72). Her another claim is that even though there is more than one masculinity, men do not form a homogeneous group. The idea that there is not a single and anti-feminine representation of masculinity and that it is a plural concept began to spread with the 1980s. Based on this multiple use of masculinity, Connell argues that men have a power relationship between themselves, and indicates that the real problem is that men are forced to act according to the dominant norms of masculinity (Connell, 2005: 83). As Sancar indicates, as well as understanding how women experience oppression, it is also important to understand how men build and maintain their positions of power (2016: 15). This relation between masculinity and power, which is one of the fundamental questions of masculinity studies, has led to the development the concept of “hegemonic masculinity” which still continues to affect the discussions today (Türk, 2007: 3). This concept, starting from Gramsci’s arguments on hegemony, points to a kind of ideological domination that is established by persuading rather than subjugation through the establishment of an intellectual and cultural hegemony on individuals in society (Önen, 2016). The concept was first introduced in 1982 in the

field studies that Connell also participated in and it was developed with her own works. Together with Connell, researchers such as Jeff Hearn (2005), Tim Carrigan (2002), James Messerschmidt (2005) and Michael Kimmel (2005) have also contributed to the development of the concept.

The concept of “hegemonic masculinity”, in Connell’s words, constitutes the basis of inter-male relations that determine the form of hegemonic masculinity in society as a whole. However, it is not limited to men’s relations with each other or with women; it is also constructed in relation to various forms of masculinity pushed to the secondary position (Connell, 2017: 267). To give an example, many men in society display some negative behaviors towards women, not necessarily but because they think they should be treated as such, but as a result of certain ideological assumptions. Another group of men who object to such behavior do not object to it physically, nor do they struggle directly against it because of the same hegemony. Although this concept does not ensure a perfect system, it is important because it provides a relatively more comprehensive and consistent approach among other definitions of masculinity (Önen, 2016). Connell uses this concept to describe the construction of gender practices that underpin the legitimacy of the patriarchal order in which men are the dominant and women are subject to (Connell, 2005: 77). Hegemonic masculinity also makes it possible to question the forms of masculinity that are reduced to secondary position by society as well as the domination of women (Kandiyoti, 2015: 201). While “external hegemony” refers to the domination of men over women, “internal hegemony” refers to the hegemony of a group of men over another group of men. With hegemonic masculinity, not only difficult and violent situations are meant; the concept, at the same time, emphasizes the means of consent and persuasion that operate through institutions and culture in the constitution of the domination relations established by men over women and other men. It emphasizes how the form of masculinity, which is considered to be ideal within the society, spreads to the whole society through various institutions, not individually. In addition, it is thought that this concept can help determine the reasons underlying the violence against domestic violence, homosexuals or individuals who are not defined as hegemonic men in society, and to analyze the logic of

institutions built on violence (Türk, 2015: 87). The concept, in general, emphasizes the masculinity images/norms of men holding power. Accordingly, hegemonic masculinity refers to a particular set of images that may differ historically and spatially: having a good education, having a high-income job, having a good body, being heterosexual and being a family man (Türk, 2007: 3-4). Serpil Sancar defines the general map in which hegemonic masculinity traces can be sought: “masculinity represented by young, urban, white, heterosexual, full-time job owner, reasonably religious, having active physical performance to be successful in at least one of the sports branches” (transl. by the author, 2016: 30).

Masculinity is generally considered equivalent to being strong, successful, capable, reliable and having control. Culturally developed definitions of masculinity allow some men to maintain domination over other men and all men over all women. Hegemonic masculinity is associated to man in power, man with power, and man of power and it has a greater share of patriarchal power (Kimmel, transl. Bozok, 2011: 46). For Connell, there are several basic mechanisms by functioning of hegemonic masculinity that ensure this greater share. First of these mechanisms is gender-based division of labor which causes inequality in education, positions, statues and wages by creating women’s jobs and men’s jobs separately (Connell, 2017: 151). It is thought that men have more control over division of labor compared to women. This situation, by restricting women doing household and family-related works, causes in lower paid or unpaid work. Secondly, power relations based on differences such as class, ethnicity, regional development level, and social relationship patterns regarding to gender differences are intertwined, causing the gender system to be maintained within a network of power relations (Sancar, 2016: 31). The third mechanism that Connell calls “cathexis” is related to the existence of social structures and relationships in sexuality. Using the term “sexual social relations”, Connell emphasizes the relationships organized around the emotional attachment of one person to another. Noting that none of these three structures can be independent of the other, Connell states that these three come together and form and sustain the structure that women subjugate and men subject to (Connell, 2017: 170-177).

2.2. Masculinity Crisis and Militarism

2.2.1. Masculinity Crisis

In the field of gender studies in recent years, it is emphasized that changes in the social sphere also affect the dominant gender order (Levant & Richmond, 2007: 140-141). Based on this emphasis, one of the most recent debates on masculinity studies is the assumption that masculinity is in a crisis. By addressing masculinity crisis from different theoretical perspectives, researchers have proposed different approaches to what the masculinity crisis is, what the determinants of the crisis are, and whether or not the masculinity crisis exists. The power position of masculinity that must be constantly proved and privileges that must not be lost, transform masculinity into a constant source of tension (Bourdieu, 2014). Masculine domination relations based on the gender differences regime may undergo a transformation based on time and space with the change of social relations system. Migration, flexible production system, new market capitalism, new capital logic, new familial relations or any other change that would affect the usual order are effective in this transformation. Therefore, with the change in the values and styles of sovereign masculinity, the concept called “masculinity crisis” emerges (Oktan, 2008: 153). In other words, it is a problem that arises from the interruption of the usual masculine norms and behavior for various reasons (Gilbert, 2005: 16).

Theorists and researchers supporting the assumption, mention that especially hegemonic masculinity is in a crisis because it lacks the means to maintain its hegemony as before. As reasons for this assumption they indicate the environment which feminist and queer movements finding an increasingly comfortable space for action and the insecure and unknown environment faced by economic, social and technological changes arising from the impact of globalization. In the global world where the norms of sexual difference begin to be invalidated, women can be as much involved in working life as men and gender equality efforts supported by liberal policies bear its fruit; therefore, it is claimed that being a man in the new order and

maintaining the privileges brought by manhood have no value (MacInnes, 1998: 46-47). Based on MacInnes' claim that women are also taking an active part in business life, this change have shaken the monopoly in the role of "earning money", which constitutes the hegemony of masculinity, maintains the patriarchal system and gives the man its power (Onur and Koyuncu, 2004: 36). Another impact that dragging into crisis of traditionally established masculinity is the shift at the social sphere in the last thirty years. In this period called "postmodern", sexual, ethnic or religious identities tended to break away from the narrative of modernity and form their own group identity. The glorification of the world image of diversity brought about by this trend has also affected the gender field. This has caused men who adopt traditional identities in biological and social terms to fear their own gender (Oktan, 2008: 156).

There are masculine doctrines, narratives and models that differ from each other, compete and contradict each other within each social structure. Thus, as in all other discriminator hierarchical categories of society, masculinities form plural, diverse and dissimilar categories. However, at least one of the models in these categories is perceived and conveyed by other male subjects as the most accurate, most reasonable, most logical, most normal and healthy. Other men are also trying to reach the values of this representation, which seems to be one and only. This model of masculinity, which is accepted, supported and blessed, is, or must be compatible with the reality that always suggests superiority to women. However, because of the aforementioned reasons, the hegemonic masculinity to move away from this purpose or framework causes the masculinity crisis to emerge. The new masculinity, built by the influence of different actors and causes after this crisis, can also become hegemonic and be compatible with the gender regimes that require men to be superior to women (Özbay, 2012: 186). In a sense, in Robert Bly's expression with traditional example, the loss of modern masculinity because of the fact that traditional role of the father is forgotten can cause men to face an identity crisis with the change of the usual order (Bly, 2004: 92). Collier mentions that the crisis is an open-ended and diversifiable notion. However, focusing more on the roles of men in the family, he speaks of the challenge of the traditional bread-winning father figure. According to him, in modern Western

cultures, differences can easily come together and influence each other and establish gender categories, and also laws have been made to provide convenience to this. However, he makes the assessment that the same laws facilitate the divorce procedures and that the “family man” figure who needs defense enters into a crisis (Collier, 1996).

Another group of theorists argue that the concept of the masculine crisis is an open-ended concept that applies to certain areas and cannot be generalized. John Beynon acknowledges that there is a crisis of masculinity, but draws attention to the lack of discourse on the crisis of masculinity. He emphasizes that the crisis of masculinity can change over time and cannot be experienced by all men in the same way. Beynon’s assumption that there is no singular masculinity have importance at this point; he refers to the necessity to mention of the reasons that affect different masculinities in different ways, in real and discursive levels. Beynon also stresses another view on the creation of the crisis within masculinity itself:

“Crisis is... a condition of masculinity itself. Masculine gender identity is never stable; its terms are continually being re-defined and re-negotiated, the gender performance continually being re-staged. Certain themes and tropes inevitably re-appear with regularity, but each era experience itself in different ways.” (Mangan, 1997: 4 cited in Beynon, 2002: 90-96).

According to Connell, the crisis of masculinity is the change in the situation in which men are accustomed; however, he does not call this situation as a crisis. He emphasizes that changes in the gender order may occur in a given period under the influence of psychological mechanisms, and may include the crisis in gender relations. He claims that men can find a solution to this problematic situation with the help of various institutions and tools in the new order (Connell, 2002: 97). Connell, rather than crisis, speaks of the transformation or degradation of masculinity, where certain practices are embodied in the system of gender order. She argues that even if the existence of a crisis is mentioned, it cannot be discussed independently of the gender order, that this crisis does not mean the destruction of masculinity, and that men can repair itself by making use of this crisis (1995: 84). Habermas uses the concept of “crisis tendencies” to explain the differentiation that masculinity experiences due to generational differences related to gender rules and changes in social structure. Capitalism is

located at the heart of this concept and covers social crises in social systems, structural inequalities and tensions that occur spontaneously in the system (Connell, 1993). Connell, while adapting Habermas' concept of crisis tendencies, emphasizes the difference between the crisis tendency in the gender order and the crisis of masculinity. While gender order is a social system in itself, masculinity is a concept that is a part of this system. However, masculinity can reflect the effects of the crisis tendencies observed in the gender order. That is to say, power, with the mechanisms such as gender-based division of labor and cathexis, speaks of the possibility of political, economic and cultural changes occurring outside the gender order, creating a crisis in the gender order (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005: 852-853).

Tim Edwards offers a historically and theoretically integrated approach to the issue. Edwards evaluates the masculinity crisis through structures that he categorized as "without" and "within". "Without", that he defines as external, is a crisis stemming from men's concerns about the social structures such as family, education and business life which they are in. At this point, the loss of power and privilege of men within these institutions is a source of concern. "within", that is described as internal crisis, corresponds to the perceptions of men in their individual lives and various emotions such as powerlessness, meaninglessness, uncertainty and alienation, while he explains the external crisis within the scope of the negative effects that occur in their social positions. He considers these external and internal crisis categories in relation to the seven key areas: "work, education, the family, sexuality, health, crime and representation" (Edwards, 2006: 6-7). Edwards, like Connell, believes that a comprehensive and generalized manhood crisis cannot be mentioned. However, he states that masculinity is a crisis in itself rather than being in a crisis, similar to Connell's finding, that it has a tendency and potential to enter into crisis at any time (2006: 14).

Within the scope of this study, in line with these basic debates on the crisis of masculinity, that masculinity crisis cannot exist in all societies and in all masculinities at the same time and in the same way, and an approach that takes into account the social structures in which men are involved and their performance is adopted. Based

on the assumption that different men may experience the masculinity crisis differently and that not all men tend to enter into a crisis, it is aimed to evaluate the causes and consequences of the crisis and what the crisis may be associated with.

2.2.2. Militarism and Masculinity

It is known through feminist discussions that gender identities are concepts constructed according to the needs of time and space through social institutions and political mechanisms (Selek, 2018: 130). Despite renewal and change in economy, policy and technology in global scale and despite of all the gains of the feminist movement and gender studies, the roles established in various levels or institutions of society remain constant. In this process of renewal and change, there are homosocial coexistence mechanisms in which this constancy is visible, and in which the relationship of violence and masculinity is evident. When the gender field is considered as an analytical category, the field of war and security emerges as a male field (Enloe, 2014).

Feminist studies suggesting that in order to fully understand the reasons of militarism and war, the issue should be handled with a gender dimension, by analyzing the interaction of militarism, nationalism and masculinity, make it possible to question how various concepts such as honor and courage circulate around gender references and the role of normative masculinity in the naturalization of war (Selek, 2018: 132). Military institutions are leading mechanisms where masculine representation is the most powerful in administrative terms, given the close relationship between militarism, war and masculinity (Enloe, 2000; Sasson-Levy, 2003). They provide the ideal environment in which not only masculinity but also hypermasculinity can be performed. As Peterson stressed:

“Militaries, of course, are quintessential sites of hypermasculinity. Success in war is presumed to demand a constellation of qualities long considered the exclusive province of men: superior physical strength, incomparable male bonding, heroic risk taking, extremes of violence, and readiness to sacrifice one’s life for the cause. Historically, military service afforded decisive proof of manhood and constituted a claim to citizenship” (2010: 23).

Before moving on to the relationship between masculinity and militarism, it may be a good start to address the definition of the concept of militarism. Militarism can be defined as the exaltation of military-specific values and the dissemination and acceptance of the idea that care about military structure (Akgül, 2011: 19). In the historical process, militarism has also changed with various political and social transformations; however, it is known that there is not much decrease in its impact on society. The process of militarism is not intertwined only with war and military practices; it is also a system that keeps alive the fear of the society with the perception and belief of a permanently damaging enemy and maintains its existence by internalizing this threat (Doğaner, 2018: 25-26). In its simplest definition, militarism, which means the use of military values and practices in the way of organizing social life, has a multidimensional and broad meaning that cannot be studied only through military and war (Altınay, 2007: 352). It is necessary to examine the concept of militarism in terms of gender by removing it from this limited definition. In countries where military service is compulsory, it can be said that militarism has a continuing impact on individuals and social relations. Militarism is located at the intersection of political, social, economic and cultural processes, and communication between them is mostly maintained through dominant gender fictions (Mosse, 1998: 16-19). The patriarchal structure of militarism is still valid and it is seen as normal; this partly explains the fact that the means of organized violence such as contemporary armies and the knowledge of using them are in the hands of men. The patriarchal militarist order naturalizes nationalism and sexist roles that are influential in everyday practice and cultural values. From time to time, militarism - which goes beyond the aim of defense and shows violence as a solution for society and individual - makes masculine values unquestionable (Akgül, 2011). As Joane Nagel points out that nationalism and masculinity are constructed in harmony with each other and that concepts such as honor, patriotism, duty, courage and cowardice are used in relation to both nationality and masculinity, there is an internal connection between nationalism and militarism and the microculture of masculinity in everyday life. It is stated that the masculinity codes created in this connection are related to hegemonic masculinity which causes other masculinities to be graded in the frame of these codes (Nagel, 2005: 401).

Mosse indicates that, modern masculinity is formed within the bourgeois society and around the concept of the citizen, which establishes the constituent element of the nation-states, and this is based on the combatant men (Mosse, 1998: 53). Therefore, according to the norms of nationalism and hegemonic masculinity, it is necessary to be ready for war at any time. Demonstrating an opposite attitude means rejecting war and thus masculinity. The militarization of male citizens around the myth of the warrior male also makes it possible to legitimize political violence and to obtain the necessary public support (Horne, 2004). Militarism also includes belief and consciousness that will enable them to act jointly to achieve the aim of becoming a state. States are fed by militarism in order to maintain their existence and give a strong image both internationally and before their people (Nagel, 2011: 74).

Military service that provides mutual reinforcement of nationalism, militarism and masculinity is also one of the important practices in which male homosociality is produced. The military service, which reinforces male loyalty by keeping women outside and enables the production of male homosociality, also causes men to develop a privileged relationship with the nation-state (Yüksel, 2013: 53-54). Throughout their common life in a homosocial hierarchical community, men receive a common model of education and acquire various knowledge and habits (Selek, 2014: 59). This obligatory practice serves to socialize men in accordance with the hegemonic masculinity norms. The transformation of militarism into a kind of masculinity proof through military service at every point where the security and defense demand of militarism are dominant, the transformation of the security task into a kind of masculinity proof through military service makes it possible to teach hegemonic masculinity values to young men easily. Hegemonic men are presented in the form of heroes as a result of practices implemented in line with demands such as security and defense. However, men also may experience trauma, insensitivity or heroism when they faced with situations such as dying and killing. On one hand they feel fear of dying and killing, on the other hand they think that when they die they will be glorified in a sacred way (Selek, 2014: 175).

CHAPTER 3

MILITARISM AND TRAUMA IN ISRAELI SOCIETY

Politics is more or less involved in all criticisms made on both Israeli society and consequently Israeli cinema. There are several reasons for this: First, the establishment of the state of Israel was the result of a political ideology like Zionism, unlike an organization that developed after a certain historical process. Therefore, the personal or historical memories of filmmakers may inevitably reflect this ideology. Secondly, the political existence of the State of Israel is the result of a problematic use of force. In other words, the national independence of the state or of the Jews is essentially built on another national independence (Shohat, 2010: 5-6). For these reasons, the emergence of the mentioned problems with the establishment of the state has had an impact on other future problems. Among the problems that have arisen, there are two main issues that are thought to have a significant impact on Israeli society: the Arab-Israeli conflict and militarism. In addition to these two problems, collective historical memory is also known to have a traumatic impact on Israeli society.

In this part of the study, firstly, the Arab-Israeli conflict and the major transformational points that has influenced the militarization of the society will be dealt with chronologically in order to understand the political and social structures that are assumed to affect Israeli society. Afterwards, the relationship between trauma and political, historical and social events which are thought to have an impact on collective and individual memory in Israeli society will be examined. By this means, this chapter will provide the necessary background for the social and political process which the films go through.

3.1. The Arab - Israeli Conflict and Militarization of Israeli Society

A number of events that have occurred since the official establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 to the present day correspond to important social and political transformation points. In the Middle East in general, and in the Israeli – Palestine region in particular, the main problem that is tried to be prevented and managed is political and military conflict. Factors such as war, violence and foreign interventions were among the most important issues preventing the end of the conflict in the region.

In Israel, as in many other issues, militarism is generally associated with security and the Israeli-Arab conflict (Kimmerling, 1993: 196). In parallel with this issue, there are many opinions about the widespread acceptance and settlement of militarism in society. A group of researchers positively approach the impact of militarism on society and define the army as a popular army. They believe that the military is not as effective as thought on the Israeli government and society, that it plays a role when security is needed, and that the citizens who have served in military service are reassigned only when necessary, so that the state and society cannot be attributed a militaristic status. Another widely accepted view characterizes Israeli society as a militarized society. At the source of this militarization, they see the Israeli state to externalize the conflict to an interstate arena instead of solving the Palestinian issue. The internal reason for the conflict is claimed to be a “security problem” (1993: 198). In this part of the study, this militarization process and its reasons will be examined on the second view that alleged acceptance of Israeli society as having a militant character. Since the establishment of the State of Israel, the security policies and militarist attitudes of the leaders who came to the administration will be explained chronologically and the events that take place in the same historical periods and which constitute important milestones will be examined in terms of their effects on society.

The first leaders of the State of Israel have achieved many objectives of the pioneers involved in the construction process, such as regional integrity, population balance, economic prosperity, and international recognition. However, the lack of Arab-Israeli peace, and more specifically the Palestinian-Israeli peace in the region from the very

beginning, has been the major obstacle to stabilizing the political and international balances in the region. Israeli leaders are divided into two main groups according to their approaches to this problem. The first group includes those who advocated to end the Arab-Israeli conflict with the language of violence that puts militarism at the center. They tried to shape the state institutions and the society within the doctrine of militarism during their term of office. The leaders of the second minority group adopted a more moderate approach to diplomacy both to solve the Palestinian-Israeli problem and to create a fair state and society in the international arena (Isacoff, 2018: 41-42).

The first crisis between Palestine and Israel and Israel's security concerns began in 1947 when the UN decided to divide Palestinian region into two separate parts. The Arab states (Egypt, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Yemen and Syria) objected to the UN decision, but they did not have any enforcement power at the General Assembly. After that the Israeli forces occupied several cities in Palestine, the Arab states rushed their armies to the relevant locations. Although they were numerically superior to the Israeli army, they lost the war due to lack of military coordination, and Israel occupied more territory as set out in UN Plan (Smith, 2005: 221). Immediately after the end of the British mandate and the withdrawal of troops from the region, Israel declared its independence on May 14, 1948. The defeat of the Arab states caused both the weakening of their image in the international arena and the beginning of the Arab - Israeli crisis that still continues today (Rogan, 2005: 36-37). The Arab states have boycotted Israel. Between 1948 and 1956, border tensions between Israel and its neighbors (Egypt, Jordan, Syria) caused clashes (Smith, 2005: 221).

David Ben-Gurion, who was elected as the first Prime Minister (1948-54) with the official establishment of Israel, then served as Minister of Defense and Prime Minister (1955-63), followed a militarist and aggressive path from the very beginning. Ben-Gurion has remained attached to this attitude not only for the foreign policy of Israel but also in the construction of the Israeli society (Isacoff, 2018: 45). The second Prime Minister Moshe Sharett who served between 1954 and 1955 and his supporters argued that, unlike Ben-Gurion, diplomacy and negotiation would work as a solution to

foreign policy and security problems. Sharett believed in the importance of international acceptance and diplomacy for long-term security concerns and building a fairer Israeli society (Morris, 1999: 280). In line with this policy, the military budget of the period 1954-55 was decreased. Sharett's moderate policy began to lose support in the eyes of elite groups and the public, and was harshly criticized by Ben-Gurion, who was appointed as Minister of Defense in 1955.

Conflicts over the Jordanian border until 1955 turned to Egypt after that date. Nasser reached an agreement with Great Britain to complete the withdrawal of British forces from the 200 square-meter area of the Suez Canal by 1956. However, Ben-Gurion wanted the British forces to remain in the region, believing that Israel would secure and prevent Egyptian forces from moving to the Sinai region. Thereupon, Ben-Gurion returned as Minister of Defense; although he seemed officially under Sharett's control, he was essentially independent. In February 1955, Israel launched an attack on Gaza. Many Egyptians and Palestinians lost their lives as a result of the attack. In November 1955, Ben-Gurion won Sharett's wing and Ben-Gurion returned as the Prime Minister again. At the height of the Israeli-Egyptian crisis, the Suez Crisis erupted when Israel attacked Egypt in an alliance with Britain and France. Although the war that began in October 1956 resulted in the defeat of Egypt, Britain and France were politically defeated. Britain's and France's co-operation with Israel boosted Nasser's reputation as a defender for the Arabs. After the war, the peace between Israel and Egypt lasted for ten years. United Nations Emergency Forces (UNEF) was deployed here to form a buffer zone in Sinai. This was the last war in the Middle East involving imperial powers. However, the USA, Soviet Union and European countries continued to provide weapons to Arab countries (Smith, 2005: 222-223).

Between 1963 and 1974, Levi Eshkol (1963-1969) and Golda Meir served as Prime Ministers, respectively. During this period, two critical wars took place for Israel: The Six Day War (1967) and the Yom Kippur War (1973). As a result of the growing tension between the Arab states and Israel - mainly between Egypt and Israel - in 1967 Israel attacked Egypt and its allies Jordan and Syria. After Israel prevailed, it went beyond the cease-fire zones declared in 1948, invading the Gaza Strip, the Golan

Heights, the Sinai Peninsula and the West Bank. With these occupations, the settlement movement started to progress. Thousands of Palestinians living on the West Bank and in Gaza Strip came under Israeli rule (Smith, 2005: 225; De Lucia, 2018: 294). Israel announced that it would withdraw from all the areas it occupied, provided that peace agreements were signed. However, the Arab states that came together in Khartoum, demanded the withdrawal of Israel from occupied territories without negotiations. For the Palestinians, the acceptance of Israel's demand by the Arab states and the recognition of Israel meant that the Palestinians became refugees. PLO and other Palestinian groups, under the leadership of Yasser Arafat, tried to resist international pressure. However, the Security Council Resolution 242 (SCR 242) was adopted by the United Nations. With the Resolution, Israel withdrew from some of the regions it had occupied and it is condemned that having a region by war. The Palestinians were not considered as a people with political presence and became at refugee position (Smith, 2005: 226).

Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, after getting negative response from Prime Minister Golda Meir and the US President Richard Nixon to his proposal about Israel's returning to pre-1967 borders, ordered war preparations for the liberation of the Sinai Peninsula. Syria, which lost the Golan Heights in 1967, joined Egypt in hopes of reclaiming the region. Egypt and the Syrian forces attacked Israel in October 1973. Although Israel was caught unprepared for attack on both fronts, it achieved a military victory. After the war, an agreement was signed between the Israeli and Egyptian authorities to establish a buffer zone on the Suez Canal to be controlled by the UN (Bregman, 2003: 139-156). Although Israel emerged victorious from these wars, the wars had a significant impact on the country. They caused an increased perception of vulnerability and insecurity in Israeli society, and the Labor party began to lose its dominance (Gilbert, 2014).

In 1977, administration passed from Yitzhak Rabin of Labor to Menachem Begin of national-liberal lined Likud, and Israel continued to use the language of violence in its political and military attitude. The doctrine of "territorial security" was proposed by the Likud party for Israeli state policy in this new era. Likewise, Benjamin Netanyahu

pioneered the ideology of territorial security throughout the 1990s and developed a political discourse that identifies land and security. Within the framework of this doctrine, during the Likud party governments, Israel regarded the Palestinians as regional threats rather than political partners. Besides, the idea that controls Palestinian territory is essential for Israel's security began to prevail (Isacoff, 2018: 53-55).

As of 1978, the balance that had deteriorated after the six-day war between Egypt and Israel was continuing in this way. Anwar Sadat's visit to Jerusalem, where he proposed to withdrawal all the Israeli settlements and air forces in Sinai and find a solution to the Palestinian problem, failed. Thereupon, US President Carter, attempted to bring together Anwar Sadat and Menachem Begin. When both sides agreed, Sadat and Begin met at the summit in Camp David, Maryland in September 1978. As a result of the negotiations that continued until March 1979, two different agreements were signed. The first was "A Framework for Peace in the Middle East" and the second was "A Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt". One of the peace focuses was on the withdrawal of Israel in three stages in the occupied territories in West Bank and in Gaza. The second, more specifically, was about Israel's withdrawal from the Sinai region and its passing freely through the Suez Canal, thereby normalizing Israeli-Egyptian relations. Despite the objections from the Knesset and the threats of some ministers such as Moshe Dayan to withdraw from the cabinet, Begin continued to keep his word according to the agreements signed at Camp David (Bregman, 2003: 183-189).

In the meantime, the ceasefire between Israel and the PLO had been going on for a while. However, plans for the region had started to be made because Israel - especially Ariel Sharon - was uncomfortable with the presence of PLO in Lebanon and the presence of Syrian air forces. Preparations have begun to eliminate PLO and neutralize Syrian forces. Already there was a mutual support relationship with Bashir Gemayel, who was seen as the rising leader of Lebanon and who controlled the Maronite Christians and their Phalangist forces. When the Israeli ambassador was shot and wounded in Palestine in June 1982, the Israeli cabinet convened and decided to destroy the PLO targets. After the Israeli air strike, the PLO opened fire on settlements in the

Galilee area. Upon this, the Begin Cabinet enacted the Resolution 676 for military invasion of Lebanon. The invasion was going on in two fronts. On the Syrian side, the attack on the Syrian air force and armored troops resulted in success in a short time for Israel and a ceasefire was declared. But the Beirut side was more complicated; Israel opened fire on the PLO in Beirut. The Lebanese administration, which was disturbed by this situation, has pressured PLO leader Yasser Arafat to withdraw. Also, with the involvement of the United States in directing the situation, the 15,000 PLO guerrilla withdrew from Beirut and dispersed into different Arab countries. Maronite leader Bashir Gemayel was elected president of Lebanon, but was assassinated immediately thereafter. Thereupon, with the permission and control of Israel, the Maronite militant Phalangists entered the Sabra and Shatila camps which were in the Israeli-occupied Beirut and killed hundreds of Palestinians and Shiite Lebanese in order to take revenge. The Israeli people were already reacting to the operations turning into a war. After the massacres, nearly 400,000 Israelis gathered in Tel Aviv on September 25 to protest this unfortunate event and they demanded that those responsible for the massacres be investigated. Upon this public pressure, Begin government had to give consent to the investigation (Smith, 2005: 231-232; Bregman, 2003: 196-201). Israel's invasion of Lebanon in 1982 completely changed the perception of Israeli public opinion that Israel did not actually want to fight but was forced into war until that time (Ben-Porat, 2008). The Kahan commission report led to the resignation of Defense Minister Ariel Sharon who was the planner and executor of the war and the Prime Minister Menachem Begin. The occupation of Lebanon had a major and lasting impact on Israeli society; it was a critical event in terms of changing the perception of Israeli society about the government and military (Benziman, 2013: 115).

During the 1980s, Israeli settlement movement underwent a large-scale expansion of the West Bank with the financial support of Likud party. This expansion was due to the fact that the Soviet Union allowed Russian Jews to emigrate to Israel, and the attempt to settle a large population coming to Israel was effective. With the beginning settlement movement in the region, the rebellions among Palestinians had already started. However, the Israeli military vehicle involved in a traffic accident that killed

four Palestinians in Gaza, and the Israeli soldiers opened fire on Palestinians protesting the event sparked the start of a comprehensive civil rebellion. This resistance, called *Intifada*, soon became an organized and planned civil movement. The PLO, albeit indirectly, announced that it represents the Palestinians in the region. In the first stage, there was a relatively non-violent movement. However, when Israel reacted strongly to these actions and it was realized that civil disobedience had no effect on Israel, the Palestinians also started armed actions. Hamas, Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamic jihad organizations were also prominent in terms of administration and coordination in these actions. In 1992, with the election of Yitzhak Rabin as Prime Minister, peace efforts accelerated. Rabin and foreign minister Shimon Peres took positive steps towards reconciliation, because they thought Islamic violence was dangerous to Israel's security. After that time the process going to the Oslo Accords began (Bregman, 2003: 215; Smith, 2010: 232).

As a result of the US pioneering on the resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict through diplomatic means, all parties except the PLO were invited to Madrid. Palestine was represented by a delegate selected from Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza regions. In 1992, when the Israeli government moved from Likud to Labor - Yitzhak Rabin as President - Israel's stern attitude began to change in favor of the Arabs. Israel's political engagement with PLO for the first time paved the way for the Oslo Accords. The Draft Declaration of Principles (DOP) was signed on 13 September 1993 by the main signatories Rabin and Arafat (Shlaim, 2005: 243-245). After the signing of the Oslo Accords, peace agreements were signed between Israel and the Arab states and the articles of the Oslo Accords began to be implemented gradually. In May 1994, the Palestinian self-rule began in the Gaza Strip, Jericho and West Bank. Upon these developments, right-wing supporters demonstrated with the support of Benjamin Netanyahu and Ariel Sharon. Prime Minister Rabin was assassinated and killed by a right-wing Israeli. Shimon Peres took over as new Prime Minister. Peres, who had similar political views to Ben-Gurion for most of his career, took a more moderate stance when he was elected Prime Minister.

Israeli forces, who settled in the region during the Lebanon war in 1982, withdrew from some parts of Southern Lebanon; however, for security reasons, the IDF was still present in this area. The fact that the IDF had still been in the security zone was a matter of debate among the Israeli society. The occasional killing of IDF soldiers in Southern Lebanon had given the impression that the security in this region was not ensured. Thereupon, public campaigns had been carried out, which were pressing for the IDF to leave Lebanon. In 2000, then Prime Minister Ehud Barak responded to the “bring the kids” campaign and IDF withdrew completely from Lebanon (Benziman, 2013: 115). In the same year, in September Ariel Sharon visited the Mount Temple. This visit, which took place at a very sensitive time for the Palestinians, caused discomfort among the Palestinians. A few days after Sharon’s visit, the murder of a 12-year-old Palestinian child led to the start of *the Second Intifada* – also known as *Al-Aqsa Intifada*. With the beginning of the intifada, both sides resorted to violence. Neither Israeli leaders nor Yasser Arafat took a step to withdraw (Shlaim, 2005: 257-258). During the second intifada, several suicide bombings were carried out by the Palestinians. Operation Defensive Shield, committed by the Israeli military in 2002 to prevent suicide attacks, has been considered the largest military operation in the West Bank since 1967. The United States, the European Union, Russia and the United Nations proposed the creation of a roadmap to solve the Israeli-Palestinian problem. Ariel Sharon received government approval to withdraw from Gaza, and in 2005 the settlers were removed from the area. In 2006, Hezbollah kidnapped two Israeli soldiers on the Israeli-Lebanese border, and the Second Lebanon War began. This war led to the re-emergence of the traditional Israeli narrative of security and militarism before the First Lebanon War. Hezbollah’s actions were seen by the majority of Israel’s people as a proof that Israel’s neighbors were not approaching peace and that Israel had no choice but to resort to violence. There was no negative perception both of the media and the public about the legitimacy of war (Benziman, 2013: 116). The second intifada, which continued intensively between 2000 and 2004, and the uncertainty of the attacks, created a perception that there could be an attack in Israeli society at any time (Morag, 2008: 121-124).

In 2008, the ceasefire between Hamas and Israel was interrupted. There were rocket attacks from Gaza to Israeli border towns. As a result, Israel, with the support of Egypt, organized a blockade, carried out attacks on the Gaza Strip and many Palestinians lost their lives. When Egypt's mediated six-month ceasefire came to an end, Hamas continued to fire rockets and Israel continued the embargo. Citing the rocket attacks, Israel launched Operation Cast Lead in the Gaza Strip, which was found to be legitimate by about 92% of the Israeli society (cited in Başer, 2009: 85) After 22 days of operation, Israel accepted a cease-fire and began withdrawing from the Gaza Strip. In 2018, the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel by the US, which caused demonstrations on Gaza border in 2018 had resulted in many Palestinian casualties, which have added another dimension to Arab-Israeli conflict (BBC News, 9 April 2019).

Ben-Eliezer attributes the Arab-Israeli conflict to a large extent to the institutional militarization of Israeli society and culture. Military policies advocated as solutions from the beginning have gradually turned into a state doctrine and have been influential in shaping contemporary Israeli society (Ben-Eliezer, 1998: x). Israel's security policy decisions - such as counter-retaliations or practices as in the Sinai Campaign - are institutional and ideologically preferred rather than strategic or rational. The selection of military practices as a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict was supported by the promotion of militarism practices throughout the society. The support and encouragement of pro-militarism policies made the Ashkenazi groups, which already had a dominant role in the administration, more effective and dominant in the military hierarchy than the other weaker groups of the society. As the number and severity of military operations increased, more prestige was given to military by Ashkenazi political administrators (Levy, 1997: 85-93).

There is a strong counter-relationship between war and the state and community building. Wars provide a sense of mobilization among citizens, while at the same time, they ensure the adoption of aggressive ideologies of states. When war preparations and actual wars cease to be exceptions, they become instruments that serve to ensure governance and sovereignty. Hence, the normalization of war leads to the

militarization of the state apparatus (Heydemann, 2000). Israel is the essence of a war society where all aspects of life are, to some extent, conditioned by the security policy dilemma. The dominance of war in Israel developed in parallel with the state building process. The military was given a special role in the transformation of both Israeli citizens and Israeli society and in the development of the state. Over the years, the prolonged Arab-Israeli conflict has been effectively positioned as a general power structure that affects the state and its security apparatus, all other aspects of life in Israel, whether political, economic, cultural or social (Jacoby, 2018: 84).

3.2. Memory and Trauma in Israeli Society

Space and place have been extremely important issues for the Israelis to determine both their history and their identity. After a diaspora of about 2000 years, away from the current Israeli territory, including the current state of Israel, the perception of space and place has materialized by gaining a physical reality with the official establishment of the State of Israel. However, in the subsequent process, in the region where the state of Israel was founded, there was again a disturbance in terms of place due to the method of declaring its legitimacy and the reasons arising from the dynamics of the region itself (Zanger, 2012: xvi).

During the Second World War, the murder of about six million European Jews, the Holocaust, continued to have an impact on Israeli society, culture and politics after the establishment of the Israeli state. In the declaration of foundation of the State of Israel, there is an emphasis on this catastrophe:

“The catastrophe which recently befell the Jewish people—the massacre of millions of Jews in Europe—was another clear demonstration of the urgency of solving the problem of its homelessness by re-establishing in Eretz-Israel the Jewish State, which would open the gates of the homeland wide to every Jew and confer upon the Jewish people the status of a fully privileged member of the community of nations.”⁷

⁷ *Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel* (14 May 1948). Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

However, although the founding declaration referred to the catastrophe that was exposed to the Jews in Europe, the Holocaust influence in society and administration was not yet dominant in the early years of the establishment of the state of Israel. At that time, the survivors of the genocide did not talk much about this bitter experience. In addition, those who immigrated to Israel or were born there before World War II were looking at the survivors of the Genocide with some kind of scorn because for them, they preferred to live as refugees and could not resist the Nazis (Bora, 2018). There was an ideological goal to move away from the image of European Jews described as weak, repressed and frightened. In order to get rid of this image, the Holocaust and the experiences of those who lived through this process were not emphasized until the early 1960s (Zerubavel, 1994: 18).

The sensitivity to the suffering of the Holocaust victims was mostly found place in the public sphere. The trial of Adolph Eichmann, a responsible officer of the Holocaust in an Israeli court in Jerusalem in February 1961, marked the beginning of a process of identification for the tragedy of victims and survivors. The trial of Eichmann played an important role in making this crime of humanity cost the world public. However, the victims / survivors wanted to question why the international Zionist movement did not make enough effort to save them. They doubted whether the Zionist movement and Israel were really interested in the fate of European Jews (Bora, 2018). For the first time, the Israeli people began to understand and feel the bitter experiences of those who survived the Holocaust. Later, the suffering of the Holocaust victims became a moral obligation at the national level. The first Prime Minister, David-Ben Gurion, saw the Holocaust as a means to achieve solidarity and citizenship at the national level through the Eichmann case, and to function as a national catharsis. Moreover, he considered that the case would constitute a national identity for Ashkenazi, Mizrahi and other immigrants. This emphasis on victims of the Holocaust later became a means to legitimize military operations and defend Israel's right to "security". In this direction, "the Holocaust stood very clearly as a sign of the fragility of Jewish existence and a metaphor for Jewish fear" (Ochs, 2006: 358-359). As a collective

memory, the Holocaust continued to maintain its strength and priority in the consciousness of the Israeli people.

Extreme traumatic events such as Holocaust have a repetitive and unifying effect in the political, cultural and social life. Marianne Hirsch proposes the concept of postmemory for this kind of extreme traumatic events. According to her, postmemory,

“...defines the familial inheritance and transmission of cultural trauma. The children of victims, survivors, witnesses, or perpetrators have different experiences of postmemory, even though they share the familial ties that facilitate intergenerational identification. ... Postmemory characterizes the experience of those who grow up dominated by narratives that preceded their birth, whose own belated stories are displaced by the stories of the previous generation, shaped by traumatic events that can be neither understood nor re-created” (2001: 9-12).

She describes postmemory as a powerful form of memory; because the connection to its source is not through direct recall, but through silent and invisible methods of representation, prediction and creation. Subsequent generations identify with the victims or witnesses of cultural or collective traumas and witness in a retrospective way in Hirsch's words (“retrospective witnessing”) to the past trauma, allowing it to be passed on to future generations.

Except for the transfer of traumatic events to the next generations of the survivors or the shaping of the collective memory, individual memory is also mentioned in Israeli society. In particular, after the controversial First Lebanon War, collective memory began to evolve into individual memory. In the 2000s, especially with the rise of the Second Intifada between 2002 and 2004, Israeli society experienced chronic trauma. A series of terrorist attacks by suicide bombers was the source of this trauma. It is estimated that three monthly explosions occurred between October 2000 and November 2004. In this period, the approach that “anything can happen at any moment” has emerged in society (Morag, 2008: 121-124). Moreover, the trauma of the first Lebanese war, which has never been dealt with, was revived by the start of the Second Lebanon War in 2006, which has re-influenced Israeli society. There was an unacceptable trauma that people did not want to get into. During this period, many social campaigns (e.g. “not let the boys go in”) were conducted to prevent men from

being sent to war (Wonnenberg, 2013: 216-217). Therefore, the future impact of the First Lebanon War, the effects of suicide attacks increased during the Intifada period and the widespread concern in the society caused the trauma to become chronic.

In addition to this, within the framework of the concepts of trauma and social memory, it is also worth mentioning the Palestinian people who partially live with the Israeli people. Just as the Holocaust has an impact on the social memory for the Israelis, the day of Nakba⁸ has a similar meaning for the Palestinian people. The creation of an inclusive and unifying conception of nationalism is closely related to the discourse produced on the “other” side. In this narrative, which is based on contrasts, the enemy figure is placed on the other pole and this figure is structured to affirm the “self” (Pappé and Hilal, 2010: 159-161). Thus, throughout the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a homogeneous and self-righteous narrative that tries to silence the Palestinian figure, which is described as “other”, is being sought. Both sides identify themselves as victimized by the other and reject the tragedy of the other. For the Palestinians, accepting the Holocaust means accepting the moral structure that laid the groundwork for the establishment of the State of Israel. For Israelis, accepting the suffering of the Palestinians is associated with accepting their contribution to this pain (2010: 319). In addition to this common rejection, the first Lebanon War is also considered an unfortunate and unnecessary war that left deep traces on the national memory of both Israelis and Palestinians. This controversial war that lasted from 1982 to 1985 (complete withdrawal of IDF from the region was completed in 2000), led to the emergence of a serious hidden trauma in Israeli society and revival of this repressed trauma in Israeli society during the first and second intifada. For the Palestinians, it is tragic because of the extremely painful events such as the Sabra and Shatila massacres. Collective traumas that have emerged as a result of common historical events for both communities emerge as memory in the future and lead to the formation of a solidarity that is exclusive to the other side.

⁸ Nakba day: “Nakba” is the arabic word for “disaster” or “catastrophe”. Nakba day defines the occasion remembers the 700,000 Palestinians forced to flee as a result of the 1948 Arab-Israeli War and seek refuge in some Arab countries often without citizenship (Sommerlad, 16 May 2019).

CHAPTER 4

DISCOURSES OF MASCULINITY CRISIS IN THE 2000s ISRAELI CINEMA

In this part of the study, the films *Beaufort* (2007), *Waltz with Bashir* (2008) and *Lebanon* (2009), selected from the 2000s Israeli cinema and included in the “*shooting and crying*” genre, will be analyzed in relation to the concept of masculinity crisis. This concept is put forward within the framework of multidimensional approaches to masculinities in the context of changing and transforming gender relations. Therefore, considering the context of changing and transforming masculinity representations in the films, it would be appropriate to examine the discourses on masculinity crisis.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the films, firstly, an overview of the development of Israeli cinema starting from the pre-Zionist period (1930s - 40s) up to the present will be given. In this development process, the ideologies, national norms or political and social factors that affect the cinematic narratives will be explained. By this means, the place and characteristics of the 2000s Israeli cinema will be understood in this development process. Secondly, in the course of the development of Israeli cinema, what masculinity representations are influenced and how they are fictionalized will be focused on. This section on the development of Israeli cinema and how the representations of masculinity are constructed in this process seems to be necessary for understanding the historical context of the films to be examined. Afterwards, in the scope of masculinity representations in Israeli cinema, the features of shooting and crying films shaped in the 2000s, containing narratives of masculinity and militarism will be discussed in detail. By this means, it is intended to be understood the conceptual framework and cinematic features in the three films selected from the genre of “shooting and crying”, which are the focus of the analysis.

4.1. Development of Israeli Cinema

Over the last three decades, Israeli cinema has undergone a dramatic change in cinematic and academic terms. In the academic field, interest in Israeli cinema has increased and the studies carried out in this field have gained conceptual diversity (Harris, 2015: 221). In addition to this, the number of productions that question the past and the future of the country is increasing. In Israeli cinema, which is accepted as one of the promising cinemas, narratives based on Arab-Israeli conflict, ethnic, religious and cultural contradictions and multiple identities have the opportunity to be depicted in different ways in this new era.

Israeli cinema, or “Hebrew cinema” as Miri Talmon and Yaron Pereg put it, served to create a new national culture just before the Israeli State was established officially (Talmon and Peleg, 2011: x). The post-1948 Israeli cinema was essentially the successor of the pre-state Pioneer Cinema, which put forward themes such as Kibbutz and the heroism of Halutz that were the figures of Zionism. As Shohat describes,

“...the majority of the realist Zionist films, similar to the realist-socialist films, determined an idealization process, whether through a central heroic figure or whether through interpretative, sentimentally dramatic music. Similar to Soviet films, early Israeli films reflect a constant subordination of representation to ideological and edifying demands.” (Shohat, 1991: 30).

In the films shot during this period, the representation of rebirth of a nation within the framework of the new ideology offered by Zionism constituted the basic leitmotif. The first productions, mostly shot in documentary form, describe a person or a group trying to make a land productive (Harris, 2015: 221). The unifying, powerful and masculine character of Hebrew labor was often emphasized. In these films, it was common to portray such a distinct homogeneous and collective Israeli culture that even the Diaspora Jews were not included in the whole; the memories of those who survived the massacre or their efforts to integrate into the newly established society were beyond this discourse. The state-funded propagandistic cinema regarded the Holocaust as the national symbol of destruction and salvation, and built its narrative on it to create a single collective identity. Therefore, personal narratives did not take place on the basis of this officially established discourse. The individual (male) is depicted only to

symbolize the collective. In the films of this period, women were identified with land and portrayed as a figure to be protected by the male pioneer (Harris, 2015: 223). With the theme of Holocaust and salvation finding more space in cinema, the personal traumas of those who survived the path from the Holocaust to salvation disappeared, combined with the integrity of national and monolithic discourse (Gertz, 2005: 67-70). In addition to this themes, western-style mythic collision stories were reflected on the screen, with a particularly masculine style. The Palestinian “Orientals”, seen as the opposite side of the conflict, were presented as feminine, passive, weak and victimized (Talmon and Peleg, 2011: xi). In the films of the 1940s and 1950s, there were still representations of the creation and consolidation of an Israeli identity.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the identification between the Labor Party and the Zionist side became ideological. But, after the Eichmann case revived the Holocaust memory which has an impact on national identity and the results of the 1967 war, it caused the Labor Party to be put under the scope. As a result of these political and social changes, nationalist elements were presented in a hybrid narrative in war films, melodramas and comedies. In these narratives, pioneering warriors, individuals and groups of social importance were at the forefront. In most of these films, the borders of national identity have been preserved, the male world has been kept in the foreground, and the experiences of immigrants or different ethnic groups have been out of story (Gertz, 2004 cited in Cohen, n.d.).

In the 60s and 70s, in line with the demands of the audience, works of types called “Bourekas” were started to be produced. Generic comedies, melodramas, narratives those include folk tales of Middle Eastern and Eastern European Jews, conflicts between classes and ethnic groups with happy ending were the themes mentioned under this type. Actually, these films were an alternative to Zionist hegemony, revealing cultural contradictions. Parallel to these narratives, films produced called as “New sensibility” which adopted the characteristics of French New Wave, Italian Neorealism and American New Hollywood Cinema (Ne’eman, 1995: 25-30). In these genres, there was a narrative in which national myths and metaphors were criticized and related to depictions in the pre-Zionist period (Harris, 2015: 224).

At the end of the 1970s, the fact that the socialist Labor party, which had been in power for a long time, was replaced by the Likud Party (on a national-liberal line) showed that there were various social changes in Israeli society. This change was also reflected in the cinema, and in the 1980s, with a radical transformation, the soldier became the antithesis of morality and heroism, rather than serving as an agent of violence (Talmon and Peleg, 2011: 60). During this period, under the influence of political cinema, were no longer subject to comedy and ridicule, but were treated as victims of state neglect, racism and national politics. On the other hand, themes related to diaspora Jews, holocaust survivors and Arabian Palestinians were not included to the narratives. The 1980s were also the beginning of queer cinema in Israel and by the end of the 2000s, the queer subject was the mainstream in Israeli cinema. Queer films offered an opportunity to discuss the crisis of Israeli masculinity and militarism (Yosef, 2011).

In the 1990s, Israeli cinema became vulnerable to external influences. In parallel with postmodernism, artistic, cultural and political productions have been described in a different way than previously described. Global trends also began to find places in Israeli cinema. Feminist films, the depiction of the religious community, and the first films portraying Russian and Georgian immigrants and foreign workers all reflected the growth of political consciousness in Israeli cinema. The Israeli cinema turned away from the pure Arab-Jewish division and turned to a cinema that provided narratives about the situation of all kinds of individuals rather than the nation. Since the 2000s, discordance, trauma, memory, oppression, and the second generation's experience of these concepts have found discourse in some major films⁹ (Yosef, 2011).

⁹ After the 2000s, among the films that contain discourses regarding these concepts, "shooting and crying" genres have come into prominence. Detailed information about this film type is provided in section 4.2.1.

4.2. Masculinity Representations in Israeli Cinema

The Jewish male was represented periodically by different dominant characters in both Israeli cinema and Israeli-European co-productions. The formation of these representations in cinema was established within the framework of historical, social and political events. Raz Yosef lists the issues affected by these representations as follows:

“These issues are analyzed along the axes of cardinal historical and socio-political discourses of the Israeli society that have informed the representation of Israeli manhood: namely, the Zionist project, the military culture, the interethnic tension between Mizrahim (Sephardi/Oriental Jews) and Ashkenazim (Eastern European Jews) in Israel, the Jewish/Israeli-Arab/Palestinian conflict, and the emergence of Israeli lesbian and gay consciousness.” (2004: 1).

Before going to the early stage of masculinity representations in Israeli cinema, it is needed to be looked at Zionism, which has decisive norms in terms of politics, ideology and gender. In the political process created by Zionism in order to liberate the Jews, there is also the removal of the Jewish men from the pattern that is perceived in Europe. Instead of a Jewish man described as ugly, passive and effeminate, an athletic, strong and good-looking male profile was adopted. This male model set an example for the militarized masculine *sabra*¹⁰. Therefore, the early films and documentaries formed within the framework of Zionist norms were seen as an effective tool for presenting this new model of masculinity representation (Yosef, 2004: 2). While in the pre-Zionist period, the Jewish figure represented in European films, in particular, was presented in relation to features such as femininity, tenderness, weakness and fragility, “muscular-Jew” was represented within the framework of the new Zionist masculinity (Wonnenberg, 2013: 209). The Zionist movement used films for two main purposes: propagating Zionist ideology and providing financial and political support. Just before and after the establishment of the state of Israel (1930s - 1950s), Ashkenazi man was brought to the fore in the Zionist propaganda films. Ashkenazi man’s mission to make unproductive lands fertile and spread civilization

¹⁰ Sabra is used to define the native-born Jews in Israel (Palestinian region) (Yosef, 2004: 41).

there are emphasized in the films of this period (Shohat, 2010). In the Zionist films, the “white” Ashkenazi male was presented as a pioneer and presented himself as superior to the “black” diaspora Jew and the Mizrahi Jew of Middle Eastern origin. In Israeli cinema, Representing Mizrahi and Palestinian men as brutal, primitive and violent reproduces the sexual nature of oriental masculinity and some Zionist ideological constructions and psychic determinations about the other. Given the representations described, it is seen that the Ashkenazi man was never represented as a racial and ethnic character (Yosef, 2004: 7-8). However, racial development of Ashkenazi male is presented in relation to hygiene and “whiteness”. The Jewish male body was beautified by the fantasy of Zionism with various visual and metaphoric narratives (2004: 47).

In Israeli society, dying on the battlefield played an important role in the Israeli film genre, where heroism and nationalism prevailed. In these films, there is the emergence of a new generation who are in favor of bringing militarist solutions to national problems. The image of masculinity in this film genre, which was dominant in the 1950s and 1960s, was introduced as a fighter man. instead of being presented as a hardworking athletic and pioneer as previously. In the films about the war of independence, which played a role in the establishment of the State of Israel, the films were depicted as reflecting the slogan “all the country a front and all the people an army”. Moreover, the male figure who sacrificed himself for the Israeli nation by dying on the battlefield was often presented. In these films, there are masochistic elements in presenting the bodies of male soldiers as hard, powerful and perfect war machines. Male soldier tries to stay solid and strong, trying to show that he is not afraid of pain and death. Rituals such as suffering and death are frequently featured in heroic-nationalistic films (Yosef, 2004: 48-52).

By the 1970s, productions criticizing the Israeli military male began to emerge. It was assessed that the representation of the Israeli soldier in a humiliated representation also caused anxiety about the loss of the power and authority of masculinity. The male characters are represented as in between the self-sacrifice and personal satisfaction that the army expects from them. As Raz Yosef argues, male soldier’s concerns about

this sacrifice expected from him indicate to the crisis of masculinity in some films produced since the mid-seventies (2004: 59-60).

Zionist discourse has also been decisive on the body and sexuality of the Mizrahi male characters represented in Israeli cinema. This discourse has implications for the differentiation and homogenization of the Mizrahi male body. Accordingly, the Mizrahi male was portrayed as primitive and sexually brutal. In addition to this representations, there are also productions in which the Mizrahi man's body is presented as elegant, energetic and exotic in order to meet an exotic Oriental fantasy. In the 1970s and 80s, the rise of social and political consciousness for Mizrahi led to the emergence of a new Mizrahi macho image (Yosef, 2004: 87-97). The economic, political and social changes that emerged during this period have led to a generally critical discourse in Israeli cinema. As the Israeli-Palestinian conflict began to deepen, films on interracial relations began to increase. These relationships were not only represented in the heterosexual sense, both Israeli and Palestinian male characters were presented in a homosexual relationship or in male friendship, and there were films involving miscegenation (2004: 118-125). In the 1980s and 1990s, films in which Ashkenazi man was presented with gay identity are quite numerous. Unlike Zionist ideology's project of presenting the male body as heterosexual, powerful and active, it continued to be presented in feminine, passive and queer relationships in this period. But in these films, as if supporting colonial fantasy, the Mizrahi male body continued to be characterized as "the Eastern sexual stud, and the delicate exotic Oriental boy" (2004: 141-143).

By the 2000s, it was seen that the film categories, which were mentioned by different names in terms of male representation, started to form in Israeli cinema. Especially in the films related to militarism, the film genre called "shooting and crying" in which men are presented in a state of traumatic, uncertainty and crisis will be discussed in detail in the next section. In addition, in the recent period of Israeli cinema, there is also another relatively new genre called "New Violence" films. In the contemporary state of Israel, which is characterized by ongoing conflicts with Palestinians, constant tension between religion and democracy and ever-increasing economic inequality,

these films are built on the concern that violence can never be completely eliminated and are seen in more than ten Israeli films made between 2010 and 2015. Influenced by the Israeli New Sensitivity movement and post-national New Extremism in European cinema, young Israeli producers are turning these tensions into provocative, compelling and open-ended narratives. Focusing on concepts such as rape, incest or torture, these films are regarded as different from the interpretive attitudes and political messages of shooting and crying films. A study on the subject can be look at in Neta Alexander's article "*A Body in Every Cellar The 'New Violence' Movement in Israeli Cinema*" (2016).

4.2.1. "Shooting and Crying" Films

In 2000s Israeli cinema, films that question the relations between war, militarism and masculinity and narrating the conflicting inner worlds of characters and their circles, and containing discourses on the concept of masculinity have been produced. This new representation of masculinity, which has been on the agenda for the last three decades, is performed in genres called "shooting and crying"¹¹. In the Israeli context, this film genre offers an important space for critique of society and institutions. In this film genre, which took its place in Israeli cinema literature, there is a tendency in which Israeli man is placed in the center of the military defeat as "Israeli soldier". By this metaphor, it is meant that people are aware of the problem but are still involved in. The Israeli soldier(s) represented in this genre, suffers psychologically as they have combatted or experienced war environment¹². As Wonnenberg describes, "The men

¹¹ The phrase called in Hebrew as "yorim ve bochim". "Shooting and crying" The tradition is traced back to S. Yizhar's powerful novella Khirbet Khizeh (also spelled: Hirbet Hizah or Hirbet Hizah), originally published in 1949. The novella tells the story of several young Israeli soldiers who are ordered to "clear" some Palestinian villages right after the end of the 1948 war. The text is a moving depiction of post-war atrocities, of colonial violence, of performative militarized masculinity, and of the inner turmoil of the narrator, who himself is a young soldier (Wonnenberg, 2013).

¹² *Paratroopers* (1977) and *Yom Kippur* (2000) can be given as initial examples in Israeli cinema where "shooting and crying" genre and military masculinity are questioned (Yosef, 2004: 57).

portrayed in these films are morally shell-shocked antiheroes, traumatized and confused”. As they regret their actions, they expect compassion and solidarity from army colleagues. In a militarized society where there are many other people with silenced and repressed feelings like themselves, they avoid voicing their inner problems aloud. Through these films, in a sense, a return to the representation of emotional masculinity in traditional society before Zionism was made (Wonnenberg, 2013: 212-213).

The First Lebanese War, which began in 1982, continued until the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon in 1985. However, despite all these years, its impact on social memory continues. The Lebanese War was regarded as the first “illegitimate” occupation according to the Israeli society, because it is described as the first aggressive and unnecessary war initiated by Israel. Gilbert states that “It was the first war in Israel’s history for which there was no national consensus. Many Israelis regarded it as a war of aggression” (2014: 503–504). Israel and IDF has lost credit both in the international arena and before the Israeli community. In addition, the Lebanese occupation paved the way for the Sabra and Shatila massacres. In September 1982, the Christian militant group, known as the Phalangists, massacred about 3500 Palestinians living in the camps. The role of Israel Defense Forces in the massacres is still a matter of public debate; however, it is recognized that the IDF has an effect and control, albeit indirectly. In the eyes of Israeli society, the belief that the IDF refrains from harming civilians, even at the expense of losing soldiers, has lost its validity (Keynan, 2014: 67).

The narratives of the Lebanese War are directly included in these films which are also included in the “shooting and crying” genre. As Francesca de Lucia points out, “These stories, whether fictional or fact-based, problematize both typical portrayals of the IDF and the broader role of the Israeli army.” (De Lucia, 2018: 293-296). “Shooting and crying” can also be interpreted in part as a humiliating metaphor as a critical but not having a serious sanction on IDF. Also, the cinematic representation around this war is presented through a depiction of an unknown and incomprehensible enemy. In the films, although there is a faint enemy figure that is thought to represent organizations

like PLO or Hezbollah, there is no discourse that directly refers to the enemy, points to it or gives information about the reason for its existence. Rather than who and why on the other side, the focus is on the representation of emotional moods of IDF soldiers. In the films, the questioning and emotional situation of Israeli soldiers is reminiscent of the Jewish men represented in pre-Zionist films. In these films, historical facts are sometimes used as fragments; however, they are separated from historical integrity and treated as disconnected from previous events or reasons.

4.3. Analyzing “Shooting and Crying” Narratives: *Beaufort*, *Waltz with Bashir* and *Lebanon*

In the 2000s Israeli cinema, films were produced presenting fragile, stressful, anxious internal conflicts of male soldiers that emerged during or after the war, questioning the relationship between militarism and masculinity representing interpretations in the context of the crisis of masculinity. As explained in detail in the previous section, the most common thing about these films, called “shooting and crying”, is that they present male characters in a crisis. In this part, through the analysis of *Beaufort*, *Waltz with Bashir* and *Lebanon*, in what situations the masculinity crisis arises and how it is tried to get rid of will be questioned. In addition, the presentation of the concepts of trauma and memory will be discussed in the context of war, militarism and masculinity crisis. The films will be examined within the framework of macro and micro elements introduced by Teun van Dijk within the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis. While collective memory, militarism as an institution and representative of the enemy in films will be evaluated in the scope of the macro elements, masculinity crisis, hegemonic masculinity codes, presentation of interpersonal relationships, trauma and individual memory issues will be discussed under the micro elements.

4.3.1. Trying to Survive: *Beaufort*

Beaufort was set in 2000, when IDF withdrew from the Israeli Security Zone in southern Lebanon. The film depicts the daily routine of a group of IDF soldiers guarding a border outpost in an isolated region during the last months of IDF's withdrawal from Lebanon. The First Lebanon War, which began in 1982 and was one of the most controversial wars in Israeli history, ended in 1985 three years later. However, the complete withdrawal of Israeli soldiers from the security zone for security reasons took place in eighteen years later, in 2000.

The opening of the film gives information about the history of Beaufort castle. It is said that Beaufort, a 12th-century crusader castle, had been captured by the centuries and the flag of Israel was hoisted on the first day of the Lebanon War in 1982. Eighteen years after this date, under the pressure of the Israeli public, the Israeli army decided to leave this region. In the film, Beaufort castle, also known as the border outpost, is frequently bombed by Hezbollah and the soldiers try to survive during these attacks. The film is not interested in the historicity of the Lebanon War and occupation; it focuses on soldiers' personal experiences, anxiety and stress disorders, and traumatic experiences. The departure of soldiers from Beaufort castle is also portrayed as a traumatic event. Before and during the withdrawal process, there is an intense emphasis on trauma, anxiety, fear and stress about the soldiers.

Since the road leading to the outpost is paved with mines, the only connection between the soldiers and the outside world is helicopters. Although the outpost is surrounded by a vast landscape, the Hezbollah forces nearby keep the outpost in harassment fire for a certain period and the soldiers are trapped in this castle on the top of the mountain. After a while, a bomb disposal expert (Ziv) is sent to clear the mines on the way. The arrival of Ziv means more food and better facilities for the soldiers. This mountain, which constitutes the film's set, can be said to represent the mood of the soldiers as it is distant, deserted, dangerous and lacking physical means. The fact that there is no other living being than soldiers – there is an enemy, but it is absolutely invisible throughout the film – creates a feeling of disconnection from time and space, which

makes this area far from reality. Although the exterior of the outpost is built with stone walls, the interior consists of rooms covered with solid metal plates. The narrow passages and rooms evoke a prison feeling, not a castle. Therefore, even the wideness of the landscape of the outpost environment, it can be said that this situation is effective in the feeling of being trapped and helplessness for the soldiers who have to live in this prison-type outpost. Another interpretation of space representation in the film can be made by referring to Foucault's term "heterotopia". As Yosef explains "In contrast to a utopia, which is a site that has no real place, while the conditions for it to become so are clear, a heterotopia—which literally means 'other place'—is a real place, a site that subsists in time and space, a place that exists and yet does not exist" (cited in Yosef, 2013: 129). This description provides a different perspective on the representation of space in the film. The outpost is physically present and its location is known; however, the soldiers think that both they and this station are ignored and forgotten. The fact that a physically existing thing is forgotten or taken no notice can also be regarded as being ignored at the same time.

One of the most important discourses of the film about the masculinity crisis is related to militarism. The soldiers living in the outpost become hysterical and traumatized for fear of being attacked at any moment, making them victimized in an extent. Prior to the decision to withdraw, there is a belief that the soldiers had been abandoned by both the army, the state and the people of Israel. Most of the soldiers think that nobody, especially the army, cares about them and that they have been abandoned in a deserted place. These soldiers, who grew up with heroic and mythical stories, no longer have any responsibility for their national duties and goals with the feeling that nobody cares about them. Raz Yosef's remark on the positions of the soldiers at this station is noteworthy, "They feel like victims of a national and political conflict, with nothing they can do but wait for the politicians to determine their fate while the enemy kills them almost daily" (2013: 127).

When Ziv arrives at Beaufort, he asks the soldiers, "*Do your parents know you're here?*". It is understood from the answers given to this question that the soldiers also felt abandoned by their families. Moreover, the failure of the "patriarchal" military

authority to ensure the security of soldiers at the outpost emphasizes that the soldiers were also abandoned by the “papa” state. The weakness of a patriarchal figure and his inability to protect his children leads the soldiers to anxiety and weakens the hegemonic features of masculinity. IDF officials come to the police station as the soldiers who are on guard are the target of successive bombs. They start talking to soldiers about what can be done. Liraz, the commander of the outpost, asks the IDF officials why the IDF has done nothing about the situation and he criticizes their positions. In this scene, Liraz emphasizes the Four Mothers Movement¹³, saying that no action has been taken because of them. In Liraz's view, keeping the soldiers from fighting makes them feminine and passive. Regarding this attitude of Liraz, Yosef claims that:

“From Liraz’s perspective, preventing the soldiers from fighting places them in a passive and “feminine” position that is seen as unheroic, humiliating, and castrating, a position that is represented as threatening to male heterosexual dominance and autonomy. The soldiers’ masculinity is not only endangered by the enemy, but also by women: The Four Mothers movement—or, as Liraz calls them, the four “old ladies” [...] The trauma of abandonment, which creates and signifies the rupture between the soldiers’ personal experience and national history, is represented, therefore, as a crisis of heterosexual masculinity.” (2013: 131-132).

Liraz takes on the role of foster father to rescue the Israeli male from this heterosexual crisis and tries to persuade IDF authorities to save his soldiers. Liraz is the only one among the soldiers who did not question his presence on the mountain. He attaches great importance to his duty here and speaks of the heroism of the previous soldiers by adopting a traditional warrior attitude. Ziv, whose father and uncle died fighting in the castle of Beaufort, in a conversation with Liraz says, “*They could come up here without a battle and without casualties*”. Ziv meaning that instead of fighting in

¹³ Four Mothers Movement: A protest movement that demands that Israel withdraw from the territories occupied in Southern Lebanon. Israel invaded South Lebanon on June 6, 1982 to solve security problems at the northern border. While it was planned as a limited operation, it resulted in a problematic occupation. More than 1,200 Israeli soldiers were killed in the region and many soldiers and civilians were killed on the other side of the border. On February 5, 1997, 73 soldiers were killed in the collision of two military helicopters, and the Four Mothers Movement was formed after this tragic event. The protest was initiated by four women, all of whom were combat soldier mothers (Zahara Antebi, Miri Sela, Ronit Nahmias, Rachel Ben Dor); however, many later joined the movement, including men. In fact, the term 'Four Mothers' has a symbolic meaning in the Jewish tradition because it represents the four Bible mothers (Sara, Lea, Rebecca and Rachel) (Lemish and Barzel, 2010: 147-148).

Beaufort, it can also be visited for touristic purposes. But Liraz responds by defending the soldiers who fought and died here, "*You could say that about every battle. The fact is that the troops fought here like men!*". Liraz sees himself as the representative of these soldiers.

Liraz orders Ziv to destroy the bomb placed on the road to the police station, and also, he tells Ziv that he wants to be volunteer as a guard. Ziv refuses to accept it, and as he tries to clear the bomb, the bomb explodes and Ziv loses his life. This event has a traumatic effect for Liraz, but he tries to get rid of the effect and seize the image of a vigorous commander again. However, Liraz's trauma repeats when one of the soldiers, Zitlawy, dies of a rocket during a sentry-duty. Later, when another soldier, Oshri, was wounded and asked for help, Liraz is again in shock and cannot act for help. Like a father who cannot protect his children, Liraz cannot protect his soldiers. "Liraz is incapable of coping with the trauma of abandoning his 'son' " (Yosef, 2013: 137). Liraz's recurring trauma and his inability to play the role of father can be regarded as one of the main causes of his heterosexual masculinity crisis.

Among the soldiers in the outpost, Koris is the only soldier who can openly oppose Liraz's patriarchal attitude. Koris is a very sensitive person who can say what he thinks and feels clearly. After the death of the bomb disposal expert Ziv, by stating "*the man just died for no reason. I still haven't understood what he died for... Why are we here? To make them think we didn't run away?*", he questions his aims at the outpost. A traumatic crisis narrative is presented through Koris, who was deeply affected by the deaths of the soldiers. Like other soldiers except Liraz, Koris does not understand what they are there for, what purpose they serve and when they will get out of there. Despite being under attack, they cannot physically see the enemy. They are in a total uncertainty and obscurity. The sensitivity of this situation causes Koris to enter into crisis and to present a disobeyed attitude. Liraz uses national myths and memories to save his soldiers from this crisis. By reproducing the past, he tries to keep them out of this situation and keep the national memory alive. However, there is a personal trauma for soldiers rather than a collective trauma.

The power relations in the film can be read on Van Dijk's approach to presenting ideological discourses of power-holding groups such as the state or the military (Van Dijk, 2000: 6-7). The castle of Beaufort was captured by Israeli forces during the First Lebanon War. On a sign hanging on the wall of the outpost is written "*to protect the northern border of the State of Israel*". Soldiers are expected to protect this deserted and uninhabited area against an enemy they do not see. At this point, inferences can be made about power and ideology. Firstly, Israel has occupied this region as a result of its "land for security" policy, and the security issue that is effective in the militarist attitude of the state is presented as the reason for the presence of the soldiers at the outpost. The fact that the outpost is located in such a desolate and useless area may be related to the IDF's desire to prove its hegemonic power and sanction. In the film, the chain of command that forms the basis of the military institution and the interpersonal hierarchy can be observed within the concepts of both "coercive power" and "persuasive power". The IDF continues to impose sanctions despite the loss of its soldiers, and this attitude can be identified with Van Dijk's concept of "coercive power" (Van Dijk, 2015: 469). The IDF continued to occupy the region for years, despite the fact that it would achieve nothing. However, when the number of soldiers killed at the Beaufort castle reached a remarkable level and the IDF encountered a social reaction, it gave up its sanction power. On the contrary, the commander Liraz's harsh but persuasive attitude corresponds to "persuasive power". Liraz is the only one among the soldiers who wants to stay at the outpost and fight. He knows that other soldiers are not as enthusiastic and energetic as he is. Although he does not have a warm-blooded attitude, Liraz encourages them with a seductive approach to ensure that they can endure until they leave the outpost. Thus, in this hierarchical order in which he is at the top, he uses persuasive force instead of using coercive force to keep the process running.

At the end of the film, when it is time to rescue the soldiers and destroy the outpost, all soldiers except Liraz are pleased that this archival structure will be destroyed. Soldiers think it would be better to destroy this place, which is home to bad events and memories. For Liraz, however, this is a symbol of memories and heroism; therefore,

he is upset that the outpost will be destroyed. The army decides to demolish the station and at this point the control of the army over the archive, namely memory, can be mentioned. The ability to erase, silence, or manipulate all the memory stored in the archive reveals the “coercive power” of the state, the military, or the hegemonic authority. At this stage, Liraz acts as the protector of the archive. Since he considers the police station as a representation of national patriarchal power, heroism and sacrifice, he is reluctant to destroy this archive (Yosef, 2013: 134-135). Finally, when the Beaufort castle is blown up with all the memories and myths, the soldiers embrace each other with joy; the only person who does not share this joy is Liraz. He approaches the ruins of the outpost, kneels down and starts to cry by shouting. The destruction of this archive is equivalent to the traumatic destruction of collective memory for Liraz. The loss of importance of national memory, and the fact that personal memory and experiences come to the forefront can be read in the context of the film’s discourse on memory.

4.3.2. Traumatic Experiences of War: *Waltz with Bashir*

Waltz with Bashir is technically edited in animation documentary style. The narrative of the film is based on a structure different from the generic characteristics of the familiar war films. Themes such as victory, defeat or friendship which are the dominant codes of war films are not included (Easthope, 1990). Although the use of animation technique in making the film gives a sense of distancing from reality, the film contains discourses on real events and memory (De Lucia, 2018: 298). At the end of the film, which uses the rotoscoping technique¹⁴ in general, real images are also included.

Waltz with Bashir is a film that is open to different analyses and interpretations because of its theme that is a very sensitive in both Israel’s and Palestine’s history

¹⁴ Rotoscoping: The technique of transferring the movements in the real film to the animated film by copying them one by one (IndieWire, 2019).

related to a particularly painful event for Palestinians (Başer, 82: 2009). The film mainly focuses on the true story of director and protagonist Ari Folman, who participated in the First Lebanese War in 1982. In this narrative, although the main character is Ari, the lens is also focused on the internal conflicts of the soldiers whom Ari was with during the war. There is a discourse about how soldiers try to solve the relationship between the hallucinations they see in the present and their experiences of war in the past, questioning their contradictions and trying to get rid of the uncertainties. Basically, the complex policy of certain representations and ethics is presented with reference to the “traumatic experience of war” (Kraemer, 2008: 57).

One night, Ari sits at the bar with his friend Boaz. Boaz, tells Ari about a repetitive dream. As two friends advance their conversation, they find out that this nightmare has a relation with the 1982 Lebanon War. As Boaz tells him about the war, Ari realizes that he doesn't remember much about that period of his life and starts thinking about it. In the film, we watch Ari trying to solve his psychological dilemma by visiting his friends who were with him during the Lebanon War. A few days after talking to Boaz, Ari visits Ori, Carmi, Ronny and Shmuel, whom he thinks were in battle with him. From time to time, with the help of his friends, he tries to reveal the mystery underlying his mind. In the film, emphasis is placed on post-traumatic syndromes in IDF focusing on the individual experiences of combat soldiers who experience military environment. As a result of his meetings with friends, Ari slowly approaches the massacres of Sabra and Shatila, whose victims are Palestinians. This time, he tries to figure out his relation with these massacres. He tries to find out whether he was there or what effect he had. Eventually he finds himself at the very center of the massacres: It was Ari who fired the firecrackers so that Christian militant Phalangists could carry out the massacres at night.

Within the narrative of the film, it is possible to make inferences about war and anti-war issues, in addition to the discourse that enables us to make inferences about the inner worlds of the characters. The Lebanon war is a war that its purpose and legitimacy has been widely questioned in Israeli public opinion. This war has demolished the perception of the society that Israel is a state which enters into the war

only when it considered necessary for its security. Therefore, questioning the legitimacy of a past war through this film is not considered a bold and anti-war initiative. Already during the narrative of the film, there is little emphasis on the unnecessary and illegitimacy of war; the main issue is in particular what Ari's role in the Sabra and Shatila massacres. However, at this point, it is seen that there is no political questioning about Israel's role in the massacres. During Ari's meetings with his friend Carmi in the Netherlands, Carmi says "*I don't understand why people were so surprised that the Phalangists carried out the massacre. I knew all along how ruthless they were*". It can be inferred that the offense was directly thrown into the Phalangists. the lack of a direct mention that the IDF is already aware of the massacres makes it clear that the main problem of the film is not about Israel, but about the main character's personal concerns (Başer, 2009: 83). However, Carmi gives a hint about the ideology of the Israeli government when he talks about how popular Bashir Gemayel is for Lebanon: "*Their idol was about to become a king. We were the ones to crown him*". It can be read as a veiled confession that emphasizes how closely Israel has a relationship with Bashir Gemayel and the Phalangists under his command, or rather how effective Israel is on the road to his coronation.

In *Waltz with Bashir*, the First Lebanon War is presented as a special memory of a group of soldiers. The film focuses on the memories and efforts of remembering of soldiers who experienced it, rather than focusing on the details of the war (Yosef, 2010: 311). The narratives of both individual and collective memory are described in relation to the concept of trauma throughout the film. The desire to improve trauma is as strong as the effects of trauma. Therefore, it can be quite challenging to heal the trauma by exposing it again. In the film, trauma is repeated in both obvious and non-obvious ways (Levine, 1997: 173). It is necessary to examine in detail whether this reenactment is really intended to heal the trauma or to recover the crisis of trauma and to provide comfort. In relation to those two kinds of trauma are being handled, the first is the trauma of the soldiers' experiences in the Lebanese war, and the second is the trauma allegedly taken over by their families as the survivors of Holocaust.

Cathy Caruth describes trauma as an “unclaimed experience”. According to her “trauma is a response, sometimes delay, to an overwhelming event or events which takes the form of repeated, intrusive hallucinations, dreams, thoughts or behaviors stemming from the event.” (1995: 4). In the first type of trauma that can be evaluated at the micro level and included in Caruth’s definition, emphasis is given to unrecognizable traumatic events through the experience of the subject. These traumatic events, which have been thrown out of social memory, come into being through dreams and hallucinations in the individual memories of both Ari and other soldiers. The first narrative of these experiences is observed in Boaz’s recurring dream. Boaz dreams of a group of aggressive dogs running wild. After the dogs run for a long time, they stand in front of a building and look at Boaz who is watching them from the window. Boaz associates this nightmare with an unfortunate memory of the Lebanon war. During the war, realizing that Boaz was unable to kill people, his commander ordered him to shoot the dogs in the operation area. Thus, dogs would not be able to warn people in the area to be aware of the danger. Boaz's killing of 26 dogs is subconscious and can be regarded as a traumatic memory that emerges in a different spatial and temporal context. After their conversation with Boaz, unlike Boaz, Ari realizes that he does not remember anything about the war and goes on a quest. The fact that he does not remember anything about war is already a problematic situation. Either he has not really had a strong memory in his mind about war, or he has a serious problem and his memory plays games to him. However, his efforts to remember and find out what it is, hints that Ari senses a problem from the very beginning. The intuition that led him to this seeking, is transformed into a crisis which is reinforced by the increase of obscurity, uncertainty and suspicion. Raya Morag explains the ethical crisis of the main character Ari with the concept of “perpetrator trauma”. Morag does not mean psychopaths here; she refers to soldiers acting in the sense that they are doing their duty on behalf of certain institutions. The main obstacle to the crisis for Ari is the “inability to remember” the event that caused the perpetrator trauma sensation. Janet Walker describes this situation as “disremembering”. Disremembering does not mean not remembering; it is related to the inability to remember events that are socially unacceptable or incomprehensible (Walker, 2005:

17). Ari strives to remember the traumatic events he cannot remember and find his origins. In this process, some memories come to life in pieces from time to time. However, on the other hand, this inability to remember and the fact that events remain somewhere in an unknown way protects the protagonist from these dangerous memories. In Walker's words, disremembering functions as a survival strategy.

Secondly, the inherited trauma through the metaphors of the Holocaust and the Warsaw Ghetto, which has an indelible place in the memory of Israeli society and is a part of Jewish identity, can be read as a discourse that may enable Israeli society to identify with the suffering of Palestinians. In a scene, photojournalist Ron Ben-Yishai compares the images of women and children crying out of the camp to those in the Warsaw Ghetto. This analogy, which makes no sense, merely obscures and confuses the role of enemies and allies and victims. In addition, no information is given about how Ari's relationship was with his family, how much he knows about his family's unfortunate experiences, and whether or not he was exposed to these experiences. It is unclear how much Ari has internalized and influenced his family's memories of the Holocaust. Therefore, the fact that such information is given about the family in the film does not serve any purpose for Ari's part (Kraemer, 2015: 63-64).

Another discourse about the film can be analyzed through the representation of the "enemy" figure. The lack of a distinct enemy representation and the othering of the enemy, which one of the prominent features of shooting and crying films, is used in *Waltz with Bashir*. Palestinian Arabs, alluded as other in the film, are represented by long shots or indirect figures, making them almost invisible. Their voices, appearances, what they say or do are presented vaguely and indirectly. For example, the memory that constitutes the starting point of Boaz's nightmare can be considered in this sense. Boaz is moving in a village with the military team. At this time, no one of the inhabitants of the village is shown - only IDF soldiers as human beings. Instead of the inhabitants, dogs emerge which will warn them in the event of danger. The real enemy - this is understood from the narrative of the scene - is the inhabitants, however they are represented through dogs. In another scene, the enemy is visible as a child. Again, there is no precise description of the enemy; because the figure of a fighter

child remains abstract and incomplete (De Lucia, 2018: 300-301). Another remarkable narrative of the film is directed at the accidental actions of the soldiers, emphasizing the youth and inexperience of them. IDF soldiers in their 20s are portrayed with an obscurity, unconsciousness and trauma throughout the film. They do not know for what purpose and to whom fought against. Therefore, they sometimes get into panic and cause irreversible harm to innocent people. Ari's friend, Carmi, recalls his experience in a tank during the Lebanon war and draws attention to the beauty of the Lebanese countryside. While this scene is depicted, the song "*Levanon, boker tov*" ("Lebanon, good morning") plays in the background. The lyrics of the song make Lebanon almost human. But what really draws attention in the words is different: "*every day I have bombed Sidon / every day I have bombed Beirut / I got out alive but I could have died ... / we bombed people we didn't know/ we probably killed some of them by mistake*". The song mentions the killing of civilians silently and insignificantly, but the main emphasis is made on the survival of the Israeli soldiers. The accidental killing of civilians is described as a possible and rather ordinary act. Moreover, as De Lucia indicates in a point shot way, "the mention of killing people 'by mistake' foreshadows the devastating 'mistake' of Sabra and Shatila" (2018: 300).

The other discourse is about whether the film's director and main character, Ari Folman, is trying to get rid of his sense of conscientious responsibility with this film or proving that he has taken this responsibility openly. In a scene just the beginning of the film, Boaz asks Ari "*Can't films be therapeutic?*" and this question allows us to analyze it. Answering this question gives the impression that throughout the film, Ari will try to provide a way out of the trauma and the psychology of guilt (Kraemer, 2008: 59). Folman, perhaps, makes the audience of the film to question Folman's responsibility and guilt of helping the massacre by keeping silent and taking no action. Regardless of the film's "target" audience's attitude, the focus should be on how Folman tries to get rid of his conscientious responsibility, or to try to eliminate uncertainty. Throughout the film, he does not only include his own experiences, but also the individual experiences of the soldiers even if partly he was with during the war. Focusing on the memories of each of his friends, which may be considered

interesting, he occasionally pushes and fades his troubles into the background. In a sense, he puts some of the burden of his conscientious responsibility on his fellow soldiers and expects compassion and solidarity because of this regret and uncertainty (Wonnenberg, 2013). Moreover, it is not only military friends who seek support; a post-war trauma expert, a photojournalist, and a psychologist, with the advice and views of calming Ari enters the frame.

The final part of the film focuses on the uncovering of Ari's memories of the Sabra and Shatila massacres. While continuing to seek out what really happened during the war and what role he was playing, Ari discloses that his parents are Auschwitz survivors in a scene with his friend Ori. Ori tells him, *"The massacre cares you. Your interest in the massacre developed long before you saw it in the army. Your interest in the massacre stems from previous massacre"* and continues, *"... so the memory of the massacre has been with you for decades. You lived through the massacre and those camps"*. For Raya Morag, *"it is a 'time trap' engendered by 'prememory'. Haunted by the ghosts of wars past, and that horrific event, the Holocaust, subject to a seemingly endless series of chronic traumas, time takes on a new quality for Israeli"* (cited in Nichols, 2014: 84). Ori relates the horrors of the incident that Ari lived to the treatment his family saw as the victims of Auschwitz. Ori also helps Ari to save him from the post-traumatic crisis he is going through. To get out of this, he tells Ari to learn more details and to find out where he really was and what he was doing. For this, to help him remember, he learns what his friends who were with him have experienced (Viljoen, 2014: 41-42).

4.3.3. Through the Sight of a Tank: *Lebanon*

Lebanon depicts the experiences of four soldiers deployed in a tank on the first day of the First Lebanese War in 1982. The film focuses on attempts to rescue a group of Israeli soldiers trapped in a tank in a Lebanese village surrounded by Syrian commando forces. This tank is assigned with a support unit to investigate an enemy

town that was previously bombed by the Israeli Air Forces. Four soldiers in their 20s, who have never killed people and have never been in a war environment, are waiting for a very difficult 24 hours in a tank: Assi, the commander in charge of the other three; ammunition officer Hertzal, who is a close friend of Assi; the driver of the tank is Yigal and the fire missioner Shmulik.

The film has a fiction that is directly related to the role of IDF and militarism. Therefore, there is a direct account of warfare. Since the entire film passes through the tank, the limited connection to the world outside is established through the periscope of the tank. Soldiers, who don't even know where they are geographically, move on the orders of Gamil, the commander of the support team outside the tank. During this movement, the periscope serves as both an eye to the outside world and a narrator (De Lucia, 2018: 302). Through the periscope of the tank, the distress and anxiety of the soldiers who observe the horrors of the war outside are depicted.

In general, the film provides a narrative of the anxiety and distress of the soldiers who experienced the war environment for the first time. These inexperienced young soldiers, who have never harmed any human beings in their lives, are imprisoned in a tank. They are ordered to eliminate every potential danger they face until they get out of the Lebanese village that had previously been destroyed by the IDF. However, the only wish of the soldiers is to get out of this area as soon as possible and go home. During their obedience to this task, they experience emotional contradictions within themselves as well as conflicts with their colleagues. In this context, the film revolves around the crisis of hegemonic masculinity through the representation of soldiers who become hysterical and traumatized by war. Especially, the images related to phallus are under attack. No physical image is shown; but, the firing system of the tank and its control evoke the phallic power. The need for urination at a time when the soldier Shmulik had to shoot, turns into the main function of this organ. Shmulik's difficulty in firing live targets and delaying firing with various pretexts interrupts and puts into crisis the strong, determined and courageous attitude expected from him as in the phallic image. Therefore, there is a discourse regarding interruption in the phallic image level and in terms of hegemonic male representation and not being able to meet

the expectations (Wonnenberg, 2013: 222). Shmulik's hesitation and fear of destroying the enemy represented as other and unknown by confronting with the pressure from the commanders Gamil and Assi on their expectations from Shmulik, puts him into a crisis – in a lousy and claustrophobic tank resembling the crisis environment of the Middle East. Shmulik, as the person responsible for the firing of the tank, is pre-traumatized by the imminent incidents. The concern that there may be a danger at any moment, the fact that the enemy is not exactly who he is and where he is, leads him into a crisis of pre-trauma. When faced with the other, the pre-trauma turns into trauma, in other words the moment of trauma takes place. With this transformation, the crisis of the body becomes visible (Morag, 2008: 5-6).

It is indicated in the beginning scenes that the commander Assi and the soldier Hertzel are friends in civil life. However, the fact that they have to work together in the same tank and that they are hierarchically different ranks will jeopardize their friendship. Assi's appointment as the commander of the tank gave him military superiority over the others; they must obey all his orders. In one of the first sequences, Gamil goes into tank and tells the commander what to do in order. Before starting the first mission, they have an hour to sleep. Assi assigns Hertzel to keep watch while everyone is asleep. However, Hertzel reacts by saying *"Why me?"* and Assi replies as *"because I want so, I'm the commander"*. Hertzel does not call Assi as "sir" and reproach him as saying *"You will soon make yourself call the Commander"*. Hertzel proceeds to argue and begins giving orders to Assi. He says he is very tired and someone else can keep watch. However, Assi gets very angry and says that he is responsible for everyone there and that he will decide. Throughout the narrative, it can be said that the hierarchical superiority between them has turned into a crisis for Assi. Because, the only person who does not obey Assi's orders is Hertzel, and therefore Assi gets a scolding from other commander Gamil due to the problems caused by Hertzel's disobedience. This disobedience, which was not a problem for Assi at first, turns into a major crisis for Assi. After a while, Hertzel starts to decide as a commander even for critical decisions without caring about Assi, brings destructive results for Assi who cannot establish its hegemony.

There is also a narrative about how soldiers try to get out of the crisis or get used to the crisis situation, except in situations that cause crisis. That is to say, Shmulik, for example, has difficulty firing at first, hitting live targets, whether enemy or not, and starts to act more easily and quickly towards the end of the film. When he realizes that the “self” and the subjects/objects belonging to “self” begin to be harmed – for instance, the death of one of the soldiers in the support force outside the tank – he becomes able to control the crisis situation. For Assi, the commander of the tank, the situation is completely different. He suffers a crisis mainly because he cannot maintain his hegemony and control his power. Both this deficiency and the fact that he was in stress and anxiety like the other soldiers in the tank cause Assi to be shocked towards the end of the film. He cannot think logically and cannot perceive what is spoken and asked about him. This unconsciousness that Assi is experiencing due to the crisis and trauma he is experiencing turns into a situation that saves him from the crisis and responsibility. Yigal, who is a quiet and well-adjusted person, wants to return home and meet his elderly parents. When one of the first scenes speaks of the Phalangists, Yigal asks “*What is Phalangist?*”, revealing how far he is from the terminology of war. In spite of his calm, he finally cannot bear it and begins complaining and crying about how uncomfortable he is. However, Yigal’s escape from this crisis caused by unknown and uncertainty is only possible with his death.

The tank, which functions as the setting of the film, triggers the crisis in soldiers with its spatial characteristics. From the very beginning of the film, four soldiers have been trying to stay together, meet their needs and fulfill orders given in a small, dark, hot, dirty, humid, viscously narrow space. As the film progresses, the inside of the tank becomes even worse. Besides, it makes very uncomfortable and loud noise when the tank starts, stops or moves. The telescope, which provides their only connection with the outside world, also reminds them of their desperation by a very limited perspective of view. Since the soldiers stay in the tank throughout the film, they do not know where they are geographically or in which direction they should proceed. Therefore, they cannot comprehend the context of their situation in military terms. The soldiers wish

to complete their mission from the very beginning and get rid of this tank as soon as possible.

In *Lebanon*, there is no clear narrative of exactly who or what the enemy is. There are no large war machines or huge armies on the opposite side. From time to time people who come across the tank are seen as potential threats and destroyed. Filled with hesitation and close-ups, this destruction can also be interpreted as the extinction of life they are used to for the soldiers in the tank; because every order expected from them affects their perceptions of conscience. The Lebanese who come across the tank are presented as both victims and potential threats. At the very beginning of the film, the man driving the pick-up across the tank calls out “Hello!” (“Salam!”) as he approaches. After Shmulik hesitantly fires into the truck, the dust gets into the soil and the chickens in the truck’s crate are scattered around. After the dust has dispersed, the old man continues to shout “Hello!!”, with one arm shredded and in pain. In the meantime, the commander Gamil outside the tank, without hesitation shoots the man in the head. In a later sequence, both Gamil and the other soldiers are hesitant to take action in a scene where armed men take hostage of a Christian family and use them as shields. They do not do anything for a long time, worrying about hurting the family. After the armed men shoot the father and daughter, the soldiers fire the structure that they are in. In both scenes, people are represented as innocent; but in one, an innocent and old man is killed without hesitation in cold blood, while in the other a compassionate attitude is shown. These two contradictory attitudes can be read as a contrast in which both pro-war and anti-war attitudes are put forward in the film. Furthermore, in this sequence, it is also possible to make inferences about the subject of empathy. As Slavoj Žižek quoted in his book *“Against the Double Blackmail”*, in 2003, the IDF wanted to demolish a house of suspected terrorists. They were even so kind that they helped the family to take their furniture and belongings out before they destroyed the house. Žižek points to “the falsity of such a gesture of empathy” and adds “the message of such humanization is to emphasize the gap between the complex reality of the person and the role he has to play against his true nature” (2016: 47). The empathy shown by the soldiers in the former scene, but denied in the previous scene,

precisely points to this gap. The side that is defined as “other”, “enemy” or “suspected” lacks the possibilities to use power and dominance and it is the side to be damaged in any case. At this point, as Van Dijk emphasized, the superiority of one group over another in terms of power comes into question (2000: 35). Therefore, while there is such a large difference in the use of power between the two sides, it does not seem beneficial and realistic to show a “selective” empathy.

Teun van Dijk proposes the concept of “ideological square” to explain the discourse formed within the framework of power-oriented ideological relations. He builds the edges of this concept on the subjects of “us” and “them” – that is, “self” and “other” (or the “enemy”). In this context, discourse should provide positive statements about “us”, and negative statements about the “other”. Or it must undermine and neutralize negative statements about “us” and positive statements about the “other” (2015: 474). The “self” and the “other” narrative in the Lebanon film is quite readable from these assessments by Van Dijk. Throughout the film, the “other” was alienated and presented as a potential threat. From time to time, negative actions of “self” were tried to be neutralized by showing empathy towards the “other”. Otherwise, a generally negative attitude towards the “other” is evident throughout the film. However, the mention of the IDF soldier killed as “*angel*” and when the helicopter comes to take the body of the soldier, the announcement of the radio as “*Angel is ascending*” is an example of the positive meaning of the self-loaded on the discourse. Death and gender metaphors are often used in military terminology. The metaphors of “*angel*” and “*Angel is ascending*” are used in IDF’s discourse to address issues related to death (Cohn, 1987).

The urinating action is highlighted and repeated many times throughout the film. Soldiers, who should not leave the tank, fulfill these needs by using a tin ammunition box. Hence, emphasis is placed on a clear account of the basic humanitarian actions and needs that preceded the war. In the last scenes, the soldiers assist the Syrian warrior peeing – who had been seized as they were moving through the village and was tied up in the tank for almost the entire operation – is the scene where the priority of this need is most effectively presented. In this scene, the enemy is contacted for the first time, even though they do not understand each other, and there is a strong emphasis

on the human needs of what is defined as the “other”. Since the Syrian warrior's hands and feet are tied, Shmulik helps him to urinate. In the context of the power relationship, power and control are Shmulik. In this scene, it is the subject to touch the enemy's privacy and help him fulfill his most basic human need. In this last part of the film, Wonenberg describes this favor that is done for the “other” as a stage that brings *redemption* to the “self”, (2013: 223).



CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

In this study, “shooting and crying” films produced in 2000s Israeli cinema, it is determined that masculinity is presented in a crisis by considering masculinity representations and the reasons for this crisis, how the crisis was performed and how it was tried to get out of the crisis were questioned. In this direction, in the first part of the study, it is emphasized that masculinity is not a fixed and dominant gender position but it is rather a gender category that can be changed and reproduced being influenced by social and historical events. For this purpose, in the first part, the development of masculinity studies within the scope of gender studies and the opinions of the theoreticians adopting the approach that masculinity is a reproducible and changing gender practice are explained in order to understand the theories and concepts that shape this study. In the “shooting and crying films” of 2000s Israeli cinema, it was seen that there are a significant fracture, anxiety and stress in the representations of masculinity formed around the narrative of war, and this situation is represented by the narrative of masculinity crisis. Accordingly, under the title of masculinity crisis, it is stated that masculinity can enter into a crisis because of its internal conditions and under the influence of various external conditions. In this context, while the internal crisis of masculinity refers to the contradictions, uncertainties and weaknesses resulting from the fixation of masculinity as a hegemonic dominance position, the external crisis emphasizes the anxiety, insecurity and uncertainty caused by social transformations on men (Edwards, 2006). In this study, the discourses on the masculinity crisis in Israeli cinema in the 2000s were explained through the male characters represented around the narratives of militarism and war. Therefore, militarism, one of the most basic homosocial communities for men, examined in terms of its impact on the representations of masculinity.

In the second chapter, the concepts of militarism and trauma which are effective factors in Israeli cinema as well as in Israeli society are elaborated. Firstly, considering the assumption that the films are influenced by the context in which they pass, the critical events affecting the militarization of Israeli society and the attitudes of the leaders of the state administration in these processes were chronologically examined. These investigations have demonstrated that the majority of Israeli leaders have pursued hawkish policies and tried to shape society and institutions in this direction since the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948 to the present day. Subsequently, the events that are supposed to affect both collective and individual memory in Israeli society were explained in relation to the trauma element. Thus, within the framework of militarism and trauma, the concepts that constitute the main parameters of the crisis have been revealed. In the third chapter, *Beaufort*, *Waltz with Bashir* and *Lebanon* films, which are included in the shooting and crying genre by using the theoretical and conceptual framework presented in the first two chapters were analyzed in the context of building the masculinity crisis.

For community members who share similar experiences and social events, it is possible to talk about the sharing of common ideologies, emotions and beliefs. Critical events in Israeli society, such as the Lebanese war, or more tragically the Holocaust, increase communication and solidarity among members of society (Benziman, 2013: 112-113). The events which are distinctive and impressive in the society have the opportunity to be represented in the fictional texts. In this context, the films discussed in this thesis differ from each other in terms of story, cinematic genre, cinematic tools and their position in the national narrative of Israel. However, in spite of this differentiation, it is the First Lebanon War that is the magnet of narrative for all three films. These films are part of an effort to go beyond trauma and guilt caused by the Lebanon War (Nichols, 2014: 84). In these films, the representation of emotionally depressed male soldiers refers to the Jewish man of the Diaspora, and contradicts the image of the powerful Jew represented in Israeli cinema, which has been constructed in line with Zionist ideology from the beginning. Therefore, the interruption of the strong and heroic image that the Israeli audience expects from the male soldiers

serving in the IDF appears to be the crisis of masculinity in the characters represented in the new era (Wonnenberg, 2013: 215).

In the 2000s, films in which the crisis of masculinity had the opportunity to be represented in Israeli cinema are defined as “shooting and crying” films. In these works, the basic aspects of the crisis and their discourse are presented through various representations. The first is the narrative of male characters' inability to meet the hegemonic masculinity norms. The male subject, who has a traumatic experience, goes into a crisis with the effect of the feelings of uncertainty and obscurity. At this stage, the image of powerful and hegemonic masculinity is interrupted or completely eliminated. The crisis of masculinity is demonstrated by the inability of the male subject to perform the widely accepted hegemonic masculinity performance. In *Beaufort*, for example, Liraz's inability to fulfill the norms required by the war environment, to protect the soldiers he commanded and to maintain the discourse of national heroism within his patriarchal perspective is considered as the crisis of heterosexual man. In addition, in *Lebanon*, the failure of tank commander Assi to provide command relations and to establish his hegemony from the beginning causes frustration, and this leads to the beginning of the crisis. This situation, which was not a problem for Assi at first, turned into a psychologically destructive crisis for him when Hertzeli took control and assumed the role of commander. In both representations, the interruption of the practices of hegemonic masculinity, such as nationalism, fighting and directing, undermines the naturalized relationship between masculinity and militarism.

The second narrative of the crisis is made visible on the basis of males being fragile, stressful and presenting in an anxiety. The narrative of this kind of crisis representation constitutes the common point in all three films. In *Beaufort*, even Liraz, presented as a traditional patriarchal man, suffers from anxiety and fear as a result of the inability to protect his soldiers and to fulfill the normative requirements of military service. The obscurity with temporal and spatial uncertainty of the soldiers dragged them to anxiety and stress. All the other soldiers, other than Liraz, at the outpost were presented in these feelings from the very beginning because they did not understand both

geographical and purposive context. This narrative is more evident in the characters in *Lebanon*. From the very beginning, the tank's claustrophobic space and harsh appearance created a sense of concern and pessimism in the spatial sense. The negative experiences of soldiers in trying to implement what was expected of them in war conditions in this limited space, caused the soldiers to act with chaotic feelings. Hesitation to shoot live targets and fear of death brought about soldiers to enter a traumatic situation. This trauma, which continued almost throughout the film, fed constantly with anxiety, stress and fear. Therefore, the crisis situation was continuously being experienced by the four soldiers.

The third discourse around the presentation of male characters as victims is expounded by questioning the normative soldier identity. The trauma experienced by the male soldier during the war, abandonment by the state and society, and the suffering of the fragile male serve the narrative of victimization. Violence perpetrated by men, particularly in the military field, can be attributed to a variety of causes such as psychological reasons, and thus perpetrators of violence may be victimized. Thus, it can be ensured that the perpetrator act of violence around the victim position are legitimate; that is, the elements of responsibility and subjectivity are rendered insignificant. Consequently, a male figure emerges who is not responsible for the violence he performed, has to bear a heavy burden and is psychologically destroyed (Selek, 2018: 135). Acting unintentionally, under pressure or due to victimization does not remove the responsibility. Therefore, in *Waltz with Bashir*, for Ari, Boaz, Carmi or other soldiers - although they try to impose responsibility on others indirectly - this does not relieve them of their personal responsibility when considered in themselves. Ari, in recognition of this responsibility, was presented in crisis throughout the film, resorting to a number of ways to mitigate this effect, even bringing forward events that affect the collective memory. However, neither the methods he resorted to nor his confrontation with the incident did not allow an inference to be made that Ari survived the crisis.

In the First Lebanon War, there was not an enemy at the governmental level against the Israel Defense Forces. IDF fought against non-governmental formations.

Therefore, the IDF was able to move more easily in the context of the capability area. In parallel to this, also the war environments presented in the films are located at completely different places - their only common point is that they are within the borders of Lebanon. The male soldier represented in this war environment has lost its widely accepted characteristics. The image of strong and warrior masculinity has disappeared, creating a more fragile and emotional male image. In a sense, this new image functions in favor of defending the actions of the IDF ("self"). Therefore, the presentation of male characters in films in a crisis has turned into an opportunity to affirm "self" and negates or grays the "other". On behalf of the humanization of "self", there is a clear emphasis on the possibility to make mistakes under various conditions. This ideological humanization attempt is particularly evident in the presentation of the IDF and its soldiers. Instead of presenting both the IDF and the soldiers as excellent war machines with superhuman qualities, this humanization attempt is reinforced by presenting them as subjects with imperfections, mistakes or psychological difficulties. On the basis of the proverb "*to err is human to forgive divine*", war and enemy are made vague and thus, Israeli soldiers are brought to the forefront as a damaged and victimized subject (Žižek, 2016: 47).

In consequence, understanding how the performances of the masculinity crisis that came to the fore in Israeli cinema in 2000s were produced through masculinity within the framework of gender relations, has a significant potential in providing discourses on the transformation and change of these relations. The films included in this study contain the traumatic events experienced by the male soldiers around the First Lebanon War and the discourses of the resulting masculinity crisis in various ways. Psychological problem/trauma and military breakdown are common features of the characters represented in the films. In addition, instead of narratives to the collective and social, a narrative of body and bodily feelings is presented through the subject. Through individual performances, the causes, functioning and consequences of the masculinity crisis have been examined, and as a result it was seen that the mythical heroic norms depicted in the early stages of Israeli cinema have radically lost their validity in the new era. As a result of the analyses carried out, by using critical

masculinity and cinema studies together, it has been provided to reveal the excluded masculinity practices such as the masculinity crisis in the context of hegemonic masculinity and performances related to the reproduction of masculinity through various social and historical influences.



REFERENCES

- Adams, R. (2017). *Michel Foucault: Discourse*. Retrieved from <http://criticallegalthinking.com/2017/11/17/michel-foucault-discourse/#fn-22957-1>
- Akgül, Ç. (2011). *Militarizmin Cinsiyetçi Suretleri: Devlet, Ordu ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Alexander, N. (2016). A Body in Every Cellar The 'New Violence' Movement in Israeli Cinema. *Jewish Film & New Media: An International Journal*, Volume 4, Number 1, pp. 4-24.
- Aliyah. (2019). *Encyclopedia Britannica Online Database*, retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/aliyah>.
- Altınay, A. G. (2007). "Militarizm", *Kavram Sözlüğü I: Söylem ve Gerçek*, (ed. Fikret Başkaya). Ankara, Özgür Üniversite Kitaplığı, pp. 351-366.
- Başer, Z. (2009). *Ulusal ile Kişisel Arasında: Beşir'le Vals'in Sorumluluk Paradoksu*. Altıyazı Dergisi, Mart 2019, 82-85.
- Ben-Eliezer, U. (1998). *The Making of Israeli Militarism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ben-Porat, G. (2008). Israeli Society: Diversity, Tensions, and Governance. In G. Ben-Porat, Y. Levi, S. Mizrahi, A. Naor, and E. Tzfadia (Eds.), *Israel since 1980* (pp. 9-43). Cambridge University Press.
- Benziman, Y. (2013). "Mom, I'm Home": Israeli Lebanon-War Films as Inadvertent Preservers of the National Narrative. *Israel Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Special Section-Roundtable on the Status of Israeli Women Today (Fall 2013), pp. 112-132.
- Beynon, J. (2002). *Masculinities and Culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Birnbaum, E. (1994). Jews in the Ottoman Empire: Some Recent Historiography. *Middle East Studies Association Bulletin*. Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 18-21.
- Bly, R. (2004). *Iron John: A Book About Men*. Cambridge, Da Capo Press.
- Bora, T. (1 August, 2018). İsrail. *Biririm*. Retrieved from <https://www.biririmdergisi.com/haftalik/9030/israil#.XgnMKUczZPZ>

- Bourdieu, P. (2014). *Eril Tahakküm*, (transl. Bediz Yılmaz). İstanbul, Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Bozok, M. (2009). *Feminizmin Erkekler Cephesindeki Yankısı: Erkekler ve Erkeklik Üzerine Eleştirel İncelemeler*. Cogito, Issue 58, 269-84.
- Bozok, M. (2011). *Soru ve Cevaplarla Erkeklikler*. Sosyal Kalkınma ve Cinsiyet Eşitliği Politikaları Merkezi Derneği. İstanbul, Altan Basım.
- Bregman, A. (2003). *A History of Israel*. Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Butler, J. (2018). *Cinsiyet Belası: Feminizm ve Kimliğin Altüst Edilmesi*. İstanbul, Metis.
- Caruth, C. (1995). Introduction. In Trauma: Cathy Caruth (ed.), *Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1975). *Family Structure and Feminine Personality: The Reproduction of Mothering*. Brandeis University.
- Cohen, G. (n.d.). *Defining Moments in Israeli Cinema*. Retrieved from <http://hbjk.sbg.ac.at/kapitel/filme-in-israel/#top>
- Cohn, C. (1987). Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals. *Signs*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 687-718. The University of Chicago Press.
- Collier, R. (1996). "Coming Together?": Post-Heterosexuality, Masculine Crisis and the New Men's Movement. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 4(1), pp. 3-48.
- Connell, R.W. (1993). *The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History*. Theory and Society, Issue 22, 597-623.
- Connell, R. W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2002). On Hegemonic Masculinity and Violence: Response to Jefferson and Hall. *Theoretical Criminology*, 6 (1): 89- 99.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd edition). California: University of California Press.
- Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). *Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept*. Gender & Society. 19(6): 829- 859.
- Connell, R.W. (2017). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve İktidar*, (Cem Soydemir, transl.). İstanbul, Ayrıntı Yayınları.

- De Lucia, F. (2018). Looking for an Invisible Enemy in Israeli Film. In I. C. Gil and C. Nesci (Eds.), *The Enemy in Contemporary Film* (pp. 293-309). Berlin/Boston, Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Doğaner, S. K. (2018). *2000 Sonrası Türkiye Sinemasında Militarizmin İnşası ve Erkeklik Temsilleri*. Ankara University Graduate School of Sociak Sciences Radio, Television and Cinema Department, Master's Dissertation.
- Easthope, A. (1990). *What a Man's Gotta Do: The Masculine Myth in popular Culture*. Boston, Unwin Hyman.
- Edwards, T. (2006). *Cultures of Masculinity*. London ve New York: Routledge.
- Enloe, C. (2000). *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Enloe, C. (2014). *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies 2* (A Multidisciplinary Introduction) (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. New York, Pantheon Books.
- Gertz, N. (2005). The Early Israeli Cinema as Silencer of Memory. *Shofar*, Vol. 24, No. 1, Special Issue: Israeli Cinema (Fall 2005), pp. 67-80. Purdue University Press
- Gilbert, J. (2005). *Men in the Middle: Searching for Masculinity in the 1950s*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gilbert, M. (2014). *Israel: A History*. Rosetta Books.
- Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity*. Yale University Press.
- Günay-Erkol, Ç. (2018). *İllet, Zillet, Erkeklik: Eleştirel Erkeklik Çalışmaları ve Türkiye'deki Seyri*. Toplum ve Bilim, Issue. 145, pp. 6-32. İstanbul, İletişim.
- Günay-Erkol, Ç., Atılğan, E. Ü., Akyıldız, O. (eds) (2018). *Eril Tahakküm, Erkek Edebiyatı, Hegemonya*. Toplum ve Bilim, Issue. 145. İstanbul, İletişim.
- Hagin, B., Yosef, R. (eds.) (2013). *Deeper than Oblivion*. Bloomsbury Academic.

- Hall, S. (2013). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publication.
- Harris, R. (2015). Through the Lens of Israeli Cinema: A Review. *Jewish Film & Medis: An International Journal*, Vol. 3 (2), pp. 220-231. Wayne State University Press.
- Hearn, J. (1998). *The Violences of Men: How Men Talk about and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women*. London: Sage.
- Heydemann, S. (2000). *War, Institutions, and Social Change in the Middle East*. University of California Press.
- Hirsch, M. (2001). Surviving Images: Holocaust Photographs and the Work of Postmemory. *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, Vol. 14(1), pp. 5-37. Yale University and The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Horne, J. (2004). Masculinity in Politics and War in the Age of Nationstates and World Wars, 1850–1950. In S. Dudink, K. Hagemann and J. Tosh (Eds), *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gender in Modern History* (pp. 22–40). Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.
- How the World of 'Undone' Came to Life Through Rotoscope. (13 September 2019). *IndieWire*, retrieved from <https://www.indiewire.com/2019/09/undone-came-to-life-through-rotoscope-1202172916/>
- Isacoff, J. B. (2018). Between Militarism and Moderation in Israel: Constructing Security in Historical Perspective. In T. A. Jacoby and B. E. Sasley (Eds.), *Redefining Security in the Middle East* (pp. 41-61). Manchester University Press.
- Israel profile – Timeline. (9 April, 2019). *BBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-29123668>.
- Jacoby, T. A. (2018). Gender relations and national security in Israel. In T. A. Jacoby and B. E. Sasley (Eds.), *Redefining Security in the Middle East* (pp. 83-104). Manchester University Press.
- Kandiyoti, D. (2015). *Cariyeler, Bacılar, Yurttaşlar: Kimlikler ve Toplumsal Dönüşümler*. İstanbul, Metis Yayınları.
- Keynan, I. (2014). *Psychological War Trauma and Society: Like a Hidden Wound*. London, Routledge.
- Kimmel, M. (1987). "Rethinking "Masculinity": New Directions in Research, in M. Kimmel (ed.), *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity* (pp. 9–24). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J., Connell, R., W. (2005). *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Kimmerling, B. (1993). Patterns of Militarism in Israel. *European Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 196-223. Cambridge University Press
- Kraemer, J. A. (2008). Trauma and Representation in the Animated Documentary. *Journal of Film and Video*, Vol. 67, No. 3-4 (Fall/Winter 2015), pp. 57-68. University of Illinois Press.
- Lemish, D., Barzel, I. (2000). "Four Mothers" The Womb in the Public Sphere. *European Journal of Communication*, 15(2), pp. 147-169. Sage Publications.
- Levant, R. F., Richmond, K. (2007). A review of research on masculinity ideologies using the Male Role Norms Inventory. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 15(2), pp. 130-146.
- Levine, P. A. (1997). *Waking the Tiger, Healing Trauma*. Berkley, North Atlantic.
- Levy, Y. (1997). *Trial and Error*. Albany, State University of New York Press.
- MacInnes, John (1998). *The End of Masculinity: The Confusion of Sexual Genesis and Sexual Difference in Modern Society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Morag, R. (2008). Chronic Trauma, the Sound of Terror, and Current Israeli Cinema. *Journal of Cinema and Media*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (SPRING 2008), pp.121-133. Wayne State University Press
- Morag, R. (2008). The Living Body and the Corpse—Israeli Documentary Cinema and the Intifadah. *Journal of Film and Video*, Vol. 60, No. 3/4 (FALL/WINTER 2008), pp. 3-24. University of Illinois Press
- Morris, B. (1999). *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist–Arab Conflict, 1881–1999*. New York: Knopf.
- Mosse, G. L. (1998). *The Image of Manhood, The Creation of Modern Masculinity*, New York: Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Nagel, J. (2005). Nations. In M. S. Kimmel, J. Hearn and R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* (pp. 397-414). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Nagel, J. (2011). *Erkeklik ve Milliyetçilik: Ulusun İnşasında Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Cinsellik*. In Ayşe Gül Altınay (ed), *Vatan Millet Kadınlar* (pp. 65-101). İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.
- Ne'eman, J. The Moderns: The 'New Sensitivity' in Israeli Cinema, In N. Gertz (ed.), *Fictive Looks-On Israeli Cinema* (pp. 29–30).

- Nichols, B. (2014). Waltzing with Bashir: Perpetrator Trauma and Cinema. *Studies in Documentary Film*, 8 (1), 81-85, DOI: 10.1080/17503280.2014.900954.
- Ochs, J. (2006). The Politics of Victimhood and its Internal Exegetes: Terror Victims in Israel. *History and Anthropology*, 17:4, pp. 355-368, DOI:10.1080/02757200600914102
- Oktan, A. (2008). Türk Sinemasında Hegemonik Erkeklikten Erkeklik Krizine: Yazı-Tura ve Erkeklik Bunalımının Sınırları. *Selçuk İletişim*, Vol. 5, Issue. 2, 152-166.
- Onur, H., Koyuncu, B. (2004). Hegemonik Erkekliğin Görünmeyen Yüzü: Sosyalizasyon Sürecinde Erkeklik Oluşumları ve Krizleri Üzerine Düşünceler. *Toplum ve Bilim*, Issue:101, 31-50.
- Önen, C. (2016, June 13). *Sinema ve Erkeklik*. Retrieved from <http://www.azizmsanat.org/2016/06/13/sinema-ve-erkeklik-can-onen/>
- Özbay, C. (2012). Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Erkeklik. *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, Vol. 2012-13, Issue 63, ISSN: 1303-7242, 185-205.
- Pappé, I., Hilal, J. (2010). Across the Wall: Narratives of Israeli-Palestinian History. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Peterson, V. S. (2010). Gendered Identities, Ideologies, and Practices in the Context of War and Militarism. In L. Sjöberg, S. Via (Eds.), *Gender, War and Militarism* (pp. 17-30). California, ABC-CLIO, LLC.
- Rogan, E. L. (2005). The Emergence of the Middle East into the Modern State System. In L. Fawcett (ed.), *International Relations of the Middle East* (pp. 17-41). Oxford University Press.
- Rumelia. (1998). *Encyclopedia Britannica Online Database*, retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/place/Rumelia>.
- Salkind, N. J. (2010). Discourse Analysis. *Encyclopedia of Research Design* (pp. 367-370). California, Sage Publications.
- Sancar, S. (2016). *Erkeklik: İmkânsız İktidar (Ailede, Piyasada ve Sokakta Erkekler)*. İstanbul, Metis Yayınları.
- Sasson-Levy, O. (2003). Military, Masculinity, and Citizenship: Tensions and Contradictions in the Experience of Blue-Collar Soldiers. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 10:3, pp.319-345, DOI: 10.1080/10702890390228892
- Selek, P. (2014). *Sürüne Sürüne Erkek Olmak*. İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

- Selek, P. (2018). Şiddetin Öznesini Kurmak ya da Erkek Yapmak. In Günay-Erkol, Ç., Atılğan, E. Ü., Akyıldız, O. (eds), *Eril Tahakküm, Erkek Edebiyatı, Hegemonya* (pp. 130-138). Toplum ve Bilim, Issue. 145. İstanbul, İletişim.
- Shlaim, A. (2005). The Rise and Fall of the Oslo Peace Process. In L. Fawcett (ed.), *International Relations of the Middle East* (pp. 241-263). Oxford University Press.
- Shohat, E. (2010). *Israeli Cinema: East/West and the Politics of Representation*, (1989, re-edited in 2010). London, I.B.Tauris & Co Ltd.
- Smith, C. (2005). The Arab – Israeli Conflict. In L. Fawcett (ed.), *International Relations of the Middle East* (pp. 217-241). Oxford University Press.
- Sommerlad, J. (16 May 2019). Nakba Day: What is the annual ‘Day of Catastrophe’ observed by Palestinians? *Independent*, Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/nakba-day-catastrophe-palestinians-israel-benjamin-netanyahu-gaza-west-bank-hamas-a8346156.html>
- Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., Schiffrin, D. (eds) (2015). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Second Edition). United Kingdom, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- The Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel. (29 September 2002). *Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://mfa.gov.il/mfa/aboutisrael/israelat50/pages/the%20declaration%20of%20the%20establishment%20of%20the%20state.aspx>.
- Toktaş, Ş. (2006). Turkey's Jews and their Immigration to Israel. *Middle Eastern Studies*. 42(3):505-519. DOI: 10.1080/00263200500521479
- Türk, B. H. (2007). *Eril tahakkümü yeniden düşünmek: Erkeklik çalışmaları için bir imkân olarak Pierre Bourdieu*. Toplum ve Bilim, Issue. 112.
- Türk, H. B. (2015). *Şiddete Meyyalım Vallahi Dertten: Hegemonik Erkeklik ve Şiddet. Şiddetin Cinsiyetli Yüzleri* (ed. Betül Yazar). İstanbul, Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 95–120). London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, H. E., Schiffrin, D. (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Second Edition) (pp. 466-486). United Kingdom, Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Viljoen, J. M. (2014). Waltz with Bashir: Between Representation and Experience. *Critical Arts*, 28:1, 40-50, DOI: 10.1080/0256046.2014.883695.

- Vital Statistics: Jewish Population of the World. (May 2019). *Jewish Virtual Library*, retrieved from <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jewish-population-of-the-world>.
- Walker, J. (2005). *Trauma Cinema: Documenting Incest and the Holocaust*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Wonnenberg, F. N. (2013). Sissy and the Muscle-Jew Go to the Movies. In C. S. Dorchain and F. N. Wonnenberg (Eds.), *Contemporary Jewish Reality in Germany and Its Reflection in Film* (pp. 205-231). Göttingen, Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG.
- Yosef, R. (2004). *Beyond Flesh: Queer Masculinities and Nationalism in Israeli Cinema*. New Jersey, Rutgers University Press.
- Yosef, R. (2005). Spectacles of Pain: War, Masculinity and the Masochistic Fantasy in Amos Gitai's Kippur. *Shofar*, Vol. 24, No. 1, Special Issue: Israeli Cinema (Fall 2005), pp. 49-66.
- Yosef, R. (2011). *The Politics of Loss and Trauma in Contemporary Israeli Cinema (1st edition)*. Routledge Publications.
- Yosef, R. (2013). Traces of War: Memory, Trauma, and the Archive in Joseph Cedar's Beaufort. In R. Yosef, B. Hagin (Eds.), *Deeper than Oblivion* (pp. 117-146). Bloomsbury Academic & Professional.
- Yüksel, E. (2013). *2000'ler Türkiye Sinemasında Erkeklik Krizi ve Erkek Kimliğinin İnşası*. Ankara University Graduate School of Sociak Sciences Radio, Television and Cinema Department, Doctoral Dissertation.
- Zanger, A. (2012). *Place, Memory and Myth in Contemporary Israeli Cinema*. UK, Vallentine Mitchell.
- Zerubavel, Y. (1994). *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Zor, L. (2017). Van Dijk'in Eleştirel Söylem Analizinin Sinema Filmlerine Uygulanması ve Kazakistan Sineması'ndan Örnek Bir Film Çözümlemesi: Stalin'e Hediye. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*. Vol. 61. Pp. 877-899. ISSN:1694-528X.
- Žižek, S. (2016). *Against the Double Blackmail: Refugees, Terror and Other Troubles with the Neighbours*. UK, Penguin Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: FILM TAGS

BEAUFORT (2007)

Directed by: Joseph Cedar

Written by: Joseph Cedar, Ron Leshem (novel)

Producer: Moshe Edery

Director of Cinematography: Ofer Inov

Stars: Oshri Cohen, Itay Tiran, Eli Eltonyo, Ohad Knoller, Itay Turgeman

Duration: 2 hours 11 minutes

Languages: Hebrew

Genres: Action - Drama - War

WALTZ WITH BASHIR (2008)

Directed by: Ari Folman

Written by: Ari Folman

Producer: Ari Folman

Director of Cinematography: Yoni Goodman

Stars: Ari Folman, Ori Sivan, Ron Ben-Yishai, Ronny Dayag, Shmuel Frenkel, Zahava Solomon, Dror Harazi

Duration: 1 hours 30 minutes

Languages: Hebrew, Arabic, German, English

Genres: Documentary - Animation - Biography

LEBANON (2009)

Directed by: Samuel Maoz

Written by: Samuel Maoz

Producer: Uri Sabag, Einat Bikel

Director of Cinematography: Giora Bejach

Stars: Oshri Cohen, Itay Tiran, Michael Moshonov, Yoav Donat, Zohar Strauss

Duration: 1 hours 33 minutes

Languages: Hebrew, Arabic, French, English

Genres: Drama - War

APPENDIX B: TRKE ZET / TURKISH SUMMARY

2000’ler İsrail sineması, sosyal, kltrel ve politik temaları sebebiyle, yeni bir dnem olarak deęerlendirilir. Bu dnemde retilen pek ok filmde, sosyal, etnik ve dini temalara yer verilmiř, topluma iliřkin anlatım ve siyasi mesajların yerini kiřisel hikayeler almıř ve sinema alıřmalarına daha sorgulayıcı ve eleřtirel bir bakıř yansıtılmıřtır. Sz konusu dnem ierisinde, savař temalı filmlerde İsraili askerlerin yařadıęı isel atıřmalara odaklanan “*shooting and crying*” olarak adlandırılan slup ortaya çıkmıřtır. Bu film trnde yer verilen kurgusal ya da gerek olaylardan esinlenilerek retilen anlatılar, zellikle İsrail Savunma Kuvvetlerinde (IDF) grev yapan erkek askerlerin temsillerini odaęına yerleřtirir. Bu doęrultuda, bu tez alıřmasının amacı, İsrail sinemasında retilen “*shooting and crying*” trne dahil olan filmlerde temsil edilen erkek karakterleri “*erkeklik krizi*” (masculinity crisis) kavramı baęlamında incelemektir. Erkeklięin (*masculinity*) sosyal, kltrel ve politik boyutlarda řekillendirilmiř bir cinsiyet kategorisi olduęu kabulnden hareketle, filmlerin iinden getięi siyasi ve sosyal srelerin erkeklik temsili zerindeki etkisi de dikkate alınarak, “*shooting and crying*” filmlerinin erkeklik krizinin incelenmesi baęlamında uygun anlatıları ve zellikleri barındırdıęı sylenebilir. Bu amala, “*shooting and crying*” trne dahil edilen *Beaufort*, *Waltz with Bashir* ve *Lebanon* filmleri, erkeklik krizi sylemi erevesinde, savař, militarizm ve travma kavramlarıyla iliřkili olarak zmlenmiřtir.

2000’ler İsrail sinemasında retilen “*shooting and crying*” filmlerinde savař anlatısı etrafında řekillenen erkeklik temsillerinde nemli bir kırılma, kaygı ve stres olduęu ve bu durumun erkeklik krizinin anlatısı ile temsil edildięi grlmřtr. Bu sebeple, alıřmada, yanıt aranmak zere iki temel arařtırma problemi belirlenmiřtir. Bunlardan ilki, erkek karakterlerdeki erkeklik krizi syleminin filmin anlatımı ierisinde nasıl kurulduęu ve nasıl ortaya çıktıęı zerinedir. Bu baęlamda, kriz reten yapılar ele alınmaktadır. Bir dięer soru ise, erkeklik krizine iliřkin sylemin erkeklięi yeniden retmek ve meřrulařtırmak iin kullanılıp kullanılmadıęı ve krizi reten yapının krizden kurtulmak iin bir fırsat saęlayıp saęlamadıęı ile ilgilidir. Ayrıca militarizm

ve travma gibi kavramların erkeklik krizinin üretilmesinde ve iyileştirilmesindeki rolleri incelenmiştir. Bu amaçla ilk olarak, cinsiyet çalışmaları kapsamında erkeklik çalışmalarının gelişimi ve erkekliğin yeniden üretilebilen ve değişkenlik gösteren bir toplumsal cinsiyet pratiği olduğu yaklaşımını benimseyen kuramcılarının görüşleri ve çalışmayı şekillendiren kavramlar açıklanmıştır. Bu doğrultuda, hegemonik erkeklik, erkeklik krizi ile erkeklik ve militarizmin ilişkisine yer verilmiştir. Erkeklik krizini açıklayabilmek için, erkekliğin uygulanış biçimlerine ve iktidar ile ilişkisine vurgu yapan kuram ve kavramlara değinmek gerekir. Her toplumun kültürel olarak oluşturulmuş bir cinsiyet algısı olsa bile, erkeklik konusunda bir konsensüs yoktur ve erkeklik pratikleri toplumsal, zamansal ve mekânsal olarak farklılık gösterir. Kuramcılar, bu farklılığı erkeklik ile çeşitli kavramları ilişkilendirerek açıklamışlardır. Nancy Chodorow, bu ilişkiyi anlamak adına, erkeklerle iktidar arasında bir bağ kurmuş ve bir erkeğin doğduğu andan itibaren nasıl bir ilişkiye girdiğine odaklanmıştır. Chodorow, Freud'un "nesne ilişkileri" (*object relations*) teorisini yorumlayarak, çocuğun doğduğu anda ilk olarak anne ile ilişki kurduğunu ve bu ilişkinin çocuğun davranışlarının şekillenmesinde etkili olduğunu vurgular.

Önde gelen post modern kuramcılardan biri olan Judith Butler, geleneksel ikili kategorilerin sınırları içinde teoriler geliştiren modern feministleri eleştirir. Butler cinsiyetli özneliği (*gendered subjectivity*) akıcı bir kimlik olarak kavramsallaştırır. Butler'a göre, cinsiyetçi öznellik sabit ya da temel bir kavram değildir; tekrarlardan ve ritüellerden oluşan süregiden bir dizi eylemdir. Bunu açıklamak amacıyla "performatiflik" (performativity) terimini kullanır. Bir diğer kuramcı Raewyn Connell ise, erkekler ve kadınlar için genel kabul görmüş normların nasıl sergilendiğinin sosyal ilişkiler temelinde belirlenmesine rağmen, toplumsal cinsiyetin sosyal pratiklerin bir ürünü olduğunu dile getirir. Buradan yola çıkarak, toplumsal cinsiyet kategorilerinin, toplumsal normlardan, zamansal ve tarihsel farklılıklardan etkilenecek değişebileceğine ve yeniden üretilebileceğine değinir. Connell'in bir diğer iddiası, birden fazla erkeklik olmasına rağmen, erkeklerin homojen bir grup oluşturmadığı ile ilgilidir. Erkekliğin tek ve kadınlık karşıtı (*anti-feminine*) bir temsilinin olmadığı ve çoğul bir kavram olduğu fikri 1980'lerle yayılmaya başladı. Erkekliğin bu çoklu

kullanımına dayanarak, Connell erkeklerin kendi aralarında bir güç ilişkisi olduğunu savunur ve asıl sorunun, erkeklerin baskın erkeklik normlarına göre hareket etmeye zorlanmaları olduğu ifade eder. Erkeklik çalışmalarının temel sorunlarından biri olan erkeklik ve güç arasındaki bu ilişki, bugün hala tartışmaları etkilemeye devam eden “hegemonik erkeklik” kavramının ortaya çıkmasını sağlamıştır. Connell ile birlikte Jeff Hearn, Tim Carrigan, James Messerschmidt ve Michael Kimmel gibi araştırmacılar da kavramın geliştirilmesine katkıda bulunmuşlardır. Connell’in deyimiyle “hegemonik erkeklik” kavramı, bir bütün olarak toplumdaki hegemonik erkekliğin biçimini belirleyen erkekler-arası ilişkilerin temelini oluşturur. Bununla birlikte, yalnızca erkeklerin birbirleriyle veya kadınlarla ilişkileri ile sınırlı değildir; ikincil pozisyona itilen çeşitli erkeklik biçimleriyle ilişkili olarak inşa edilmiştir. Dolayısıyla, hegemonik erkeklik, kadınlar üzerinde kurulan hakimiyetin aynı sıra, toplum tarafından ikincil konuma indirgenmiş erkeklik biçimlerini sorgulamayı da mümkün kılar. Hegemonik erkeklik tartışmasının genişlemesi ile, hegemonik erkekliğin sürdürülebilirliği ve sorunları üzerine görüşler öne sürülmüştür. Bu bağlamda, erkeğin hegemonyasını kuran ve ataerkil sistemin sürekliliğini sağlayan geleneksel anlamda erkekliğin temel direklerinden birini oluşturan para kazanma rolü, kadınların da iş yaşamında aktif olmasından dolayı tehlike girmiştir. Değişikliğin bir sonucu olarak oluşan güvensizlik ve belirsizlik ortamı nedeniyle, geleneksel eril roller bir krizle karşı karşıya kalmıştır. Dolayısıyla, hegemonik erkekliğin, modernleşme sürecinde toplumun çeşitli dönüşümleri ile hegemonyasını sürdürme araçlarından yoksun kaldığı ileri sürülmüştür. Krizle ilgili öne sürülen başka bir yaklaşıma göre, krizin tüm erkeklikler için geçerli olmadığı ve krize girme durumunun belirli dönemlerde belirli erkeklik biçimleriyle ilişkili olduğu öne sürülür. Erkeklik krizi başlığı altında erkekliğin hem içsel koşullar hem de çeşitli dış koşulların etkisi altında bir krize girebileceği belirtilmektedir. Bu bağlamda, erkeklik içsel krizi (*internal crisis*), erkekliğin hegemonik bir hakimiyet konumu olarak sabitlenmesinden kaynaklanan çelişkiler, belirsizlikler ve zayıflıklara işaret ederken, dış kriz (*external crisis*) erkeklerde toplumsal dönüşümlerin neden olduğu kaygı, güvensizlik ve belirsizliği vurgular. Erkeklik çalışmalarında, modernleşme sürecinde hegemonik erkekliğin karşılaştığı kriz, sinema çalışmalarında da kendini göstermektedir. Güçlü,

kahraman, koruyucu, mükemmel erkeklerin yerini endişeli, kırılgan, başarısız, otoriteden yoksun ve kendini gerçekleştiremeyen erkekler

Bu çalışmada, 2000'li yıllarda İsrail sinemasında erkeklik krizine ilişkin söylemler, militarizm ve savaş anlatıları etrafında temsil edilen erkek karakterlerle açıklanmıştır. Bu nedenle, erkekler için en temel homososyal topluluklardan biri olan militarizm, erkekliğin temsilleri üzerindeki etkisi açısından incelenmiştir. Milliyetçiliğin, militarizmin ve erkekliğin karşılıklı güçlendirilmesini sağlayan askerlik hizmeti, erkek homososyalliğinin üretildiği önemli uygulamalardan biridir. Ekonomide, politikada ve teknolojiye küresel ölçekte yenilenmeye ve değişime ve feminist hareketin ve toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmalarının tüm kazanımlarına rağmen, toplumun çeşitli düzeylerinde veya kurumlarında kurulan roller sabit kalmaktadır. Söz konusu yenilenme ve değişim sürecinde, bu sabitliğin görünür olduğu ve şiddet ile erkeklik ilişkisinin belirgin olduğu homososyal birliktelik mekanizmaları vardır. Cinsiyet alanı analitik bir kategori olarak değerlendirildiğinde, savaş ve güvenlik alanı erkek alanı olarak ortaya çıkmaktadır. Horne'a göre, milliyetçilik ve hegemonik erkeklik normlarına göre, her zaman savaşa hazır olmak gerekir. Karşıt bir tutum sergilemek hem savaşı reddetmek hem de erkekliğin ifade edilmesini reddetmek demektir. Savaşçı erkek mitinin etrafında erkek vatandaşların militerleşmesi, politik şiddeti meşrulaştırmayı ve gerekli kamu desteğini almayı da mümkün kılar.

Çalışmanın ikinci bölümünde, ilk olarak, Arap-İsrail çatışması ve toplumun militerleşmesini etkileyen ana dönüşüm noktaları, İsrail toplumunu etkilediği varsayılan siyasi ve sosyal yapıları anlamak için kronolojik olarak ele alınmıştır. Daha sonra travma ile İsrail toplumunda kolektif ve bireysel bellek üzerinde etkisi olduğu düşünülen siyasi, tarihi ve sosyal olaylar arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir. Bu sayede, filmlerin içinden geçtiği sosyal ve politik altyapının kavranması amaçlanmıştır. Siyaset hem İsrail toplumu hem de toplumla ilişkili olarak İsrail sineması üzerine yapılan tüm eleştirilerde mutlaka yer almaktadır. Bunun birkaç nedeni vardır: Birincisi, İsrail devletinin kurulması, belirli bir tarihsel süreçten sonra gelişen bir örgütten farklı olarak Siyonizm gibi politik bir ideolojinin sonucudur. Bu nedenle, film yapımcılarının kişisel ya da tarihsel hafızaları kaçınılmaz olarak bu ideolojiyi

yansıtabilir. İkincisi, İsrail Devleti'nin siyasi varlığı sorunlu bir güç kullanımının sonucudur. Başka bir deyişle, devletin veya Yahudilerin ulusal bağımsızlığı esasen başka bir ulusal bağımsızlığın üzerine inşa edildi. Bu nedenlerle, devletin kurulması ile ilgili sorunların ortaya çıkması, ileri tarihlerde ortaya çıkmış olan diğer sorunlar üzerinde etkili oldu. Ortaya çıkan sorunlar arasında, İsrail toplumu üzerinde önemli bir etkiye sahip olduğu düşünülen iki ana konu vardır: Arap-İsrail çatışması ve militarizm. Bu iki soruna ek olarak, kolektif tarihsel hafızanın da İsrail toplumu üzerinde travmatik bir etkisi olduğu bilinmektedir. Bu açıklamalar ışığında, Arap-İsrail çatışması ve toplumun militerleşmesinde etkili olan kritik dönüşüm noktaları, İsrail toplumuna tesir ettiği varsayılan siyasi ve sosyal yapıları anlamak için kronolojik olarak incelenmiştir. Bu çerçevede, İkinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında yaşayan Holokost, İsrail toplumunun hem dününü hem de bugününü etkileyen ve devlet politikasında oldukça belirleyici bir trajedi olarak öne çıkar. Bu olayın etkisiyle Filistin bölgesine gerçekleşen göçler ve 1948'de İsrail devletinin resmi olarak kurulmasından sonra, İsrail yönetiminde “güvenlik” endişesi baş gösterdi.

1947'de Birleşmiş Milletler'in Filistin bölgesini iki ayrı bölüme ayırmaya karar vermesiyle başlayan ilk kriz, farklı siyasi olaylar ve savaşlarla tekrar ederek bu güne kadar devam etti. Bununla birlikte, Arap-İsrail barışının olmaması ve daha spesifik olarak Filistin-İsrail barışının en başından beri sorunlu olması, bölgedeki siyasi ve uluslararası dengeleri sağlamanın önündeki en büyük engel oldu. Bu süreçte, Arap Devletleri ile İsrail arasında meydana gelen 1948 Savaşı, 1956 Süveyş Krizi, Altı Gün Savaşı (1967), yerleşimcilik hareketinin (*settlement movement*) başlaması, Yom Kippur Savaşı (1973), Camp David görüşmeleri (1978), Birinci Lübnan Savaşı (1982) ve bu savaşta gerçekleştirilen Sabra ve Şatila Katliamları, Birinci İntifada (1987-1993), Oslo Görüşmeleri, İkinci İntifada (2000-2004), Gazze Şeridine saldırı düzenlenmesi gibi zaman zaman krizi artırıp bazen de yavaşlatan kritik dönüm noktaları meydana geldi. Bu süreç içerisinde görev yapan İsrail Devleti'nin liderleri, bu soruna yaklaşımlarına göre iki ana gruba ayrılırlar. Birinci grupta, Arap-İsrail çatışmasını merkeze militarizmi alan şiddet diliyle sona erdirmeyi savunanlar yer alır. Bu grupta yer alanlar, görev süreleri boyunca devlet kurumlarını ve toplumu

militarizm doktrini içinde şekillendirmeye çalıştılar. Azınlığı oluşturan ikinci gruptaki liderler ise, hem Filistin-İsrail sorununu çözmek hem de uluslararası arenada adil bir devlet ve toplum yaratmak için daha ılımlı diplomatik bir yaklaşım benimsediler. İsrail, yaşamın tüm yönlerinin bir ölçüde güvenlik politikası ikilemi tarafından koşullandırıldığı bir savaş toplumunun özüdür. İsrail'de savaşın hakimiyeti, devlet inşası sürecine paralel olarak gelişti. Orduya İsrail vatandaşlarının dönüşümünde ve devletin gelişmesinde özel bir rol verildi. Yıllar boyunca, uzun süren Arap-İsrail çatışması, politik ve ekonomik, kültürel veya sosyal anlamda, İsrail'i yaşamın diğer tüm yönlerini, devleti ve güvenlik aygıtını etkileyen genel bir güç yapısı olarak etkili bir şekilde konumlandırıldı.

İkinci Dünya Savaşı sırasında, yaklaşık altı milyon Avrupalı Yahudi öldürülmesi, Holokost, İsrail devletinin kurulmasından sonra da İsrail toplumu, kültürü ve politikası üzerinde etkili olmaya devam etti. Ancak, İsrail devletinin kuruluşunun ilk yıllarında toplum ve yönetimdeki Holokost etkisi henüz baskın değildi. O zaman, soykırımdan kurtulanlar bu acı deneyim hakkında çok fazla konuşmadılar. Soykırım ve bu trajediyi yaşayanların deneyimleri 1960'ların başına kadar vurgulanmadı. Şubat 1961'de Kudüs'teki bir İsrail mahkemesinde Holokost'un sorumlu bir subayı olan Adolph Eichmann'ın yargılanması, kurbanların ve hayatta kalanların trajedisinin benimsenmesi sürecinin başlangıcı oldu. İsrail halkı ilk kez Holokost'tan kurtulanların acı deneyimlerini anlamaya ve hissetmeye başladı. Holokost kurbanlarına yapılan bu vurgu daha sonra askeri operasyonları meşrulaştırmanın ve İsrail'in “güvenlik” hakkını savunmanın bir aracı olarak kullanıldı. Bu doğrultuda Holokost, Yahudi varlığının kırılganlığının ve Yahudi korkusu için bir metaforun işareti olarak görülmeye başlandı. Kolektif bir anı (*collective memory*) olarak Holokost, İsrail halkının bilincindeki gücünü ve önceliğini korumaya devam etti. Holokost gibi ekstrem travmatik olayların politik, kültürel ve sosyal hayatta tekrarlayıcı ve birleştirici bir etkisi vardır. Marianne Hirsch bu tür ekstrem travmatik olaylar için “postmemory” kavramını önerir. Hirsch, *postmemory* kavramını güçlü bir hafıza biçimi olarak tanımlar; çünkü kaynağına olan bağlantısı doğrudan hatırlama yoluyla değil, sessiz ve görünmez bir biçimde temsil, tahmin ve yaratma yöntemleriyle kurulur. Sonraki

kuşaklar, kültürel veya kolektif travmaların kurbanları veya tanıklarıyla özdeşleşir ve geçmiş travmaya gelecek nesillere aktarılmasına izin vererek geriye dönük bir şekilde (*retrospective witnessing*) tanık olurlar.

Travmatik olayların gelecek nesillere aktarılması veya kolektif hafızanın şekillenmesi dışında, İsrail toplumunda bireysel hafızadan da bahsedilir. Özellikle, tartışmalı Birinci Lübnan Savaşı'ndan sonra, kolektif hafızanın bireysel hafızaya dönüşmeye başladığı ifade edilir. Raya Morag'a göre, 2000'li yıllarda, özellikle 2002 ve 2004 yılları arasında İkinci İntifadanın yükselişiyle birlikte İsrail toplumu kronik travmayı tecrübe etti. Bu travmanın kaynağını intihar bombacıları tarafından düzenlenen bir dizi terör saldırısı oluşturdu. Bu dönemde İsrail toplumunda “her an her şey olabilir” yaklaşımı ortaya çıktı. Ayrıca, hiç ele alınmamış olan Birinci Lübnan Savaşı sonrasında ortaya çıkan travma, İsrail toplumunu 2006 yılında İkinci Lübnan Savaşı'nın başlamasıyla yeniden canlandı. İnsanların içine çekilmek istemedikleri bir travma durumu söz konusuydu. Bu dönemde erkeklerin savaşa gönderilmesini önlemek için birçok sosyal kampanya gerçekleştirildi.

Buna ek olarak, travma ve sosyal bellek kavramları çerçevesinde, kısmen İsrail halkıyla yaşayan Filistin halkının durumundan da bahsetmek gerekir. Holokost'un İsraillilerin sosyal belleği üzerinde etkisi olduğu gibi, Nakba günü de Filistin halkı için benzer bir anlama sahiptir. Her iki taraf da kendilerini diğeri tarafından mağdur edilmiş olarak tanımlar ve diğeri için trajedisini reddeder. Filistinliler için Holokost'u kabul etmek, İsrail Devleti'nin kurulmasına zemin hazırlayan ahlaki yapıyı kabul etmek anlamına gelir. İsrailliler için de Filistinlilerin acılarını kabul etmek, bu acıda olan paylarını kabul etmekle ilişkilidir. Bu ortak reddedişe ek olarak, ilk Lübnan Savaşı da hem İsraillilerin hem de Filistinlilerin ulusal hafızasında derin izler bırakan talihsiz ve gereksiz bir savaş olarak kabul edilir. 1982'den 1985'e kadar süren bu tartışmalı savaş (IDF'nin bölgeden tamamen çekilmesi 2000 yılında tamamlandı), İsrail toplumunda ciddi bir gizli travmanın ortaya çıkmasına ve İsrail toplumunda birinci ve ikinci intifadada bu baskılanmış travmanın yeniden canlanmasına yol açtı. Filistinliler için, Sabra ve Shatila katliamları gibi son derece acı verici olaylar nedeniyle trajiktir. Her

iki toplum için ortak tarihsel olayların bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkan kolektif travmalar, karşı tarafı dışlayıcı bir dayanışmanın oluşmasına neden olur.

Üçüncü ve son bölümde, 2000’ler İsrail sinemasında üretilen “shooting and crying” türü filmlerden seçilen *Beaufort*, *Waltz with Bashir* ve *Lebanon* filmlerinin çözümlenmesi yapılmıştır. Bu filmlerde, erkekliğe ilişkin krizin yönleri ve söylemleri çeşitli temsiller yoluyla sunulur. Birincisi, erkek karakterlerin hegemonik erkeklik normlarını karşılayamamalarına ilişkin anlatıdır. Travmatik bir deneyimi olan erkek özne, belirsizlik ve bilinmezlik duygularının verdiği etkiyle bir krize girer. Bu aşamada, güçlü ve hegemonik erkeklik imajı kesintiye uğrar veya tamamen ortadan kalkar. Erkeklik krizi, erkek öznenin yaygın olarak kabul edilen hegemonik erkeklik performansını gerçekleştirememesi ile gösterilmiştir. Örneğin *Beaufort* filminde Liraz’ın savaş ortamının gerektirdiği normları yerine getirememesi, emri altındaki askerleri koruyamaması ve ataerkil bakış açısıyla ulusal kahramanlık söylemini sürdürememesi heteroseksüel erkeğin krizi olarak kabul edilir. Buna ek olarak, *Lebanon* filminde tank komutanı Assi’nin altındaki askerlerle emir komuta ilişkisini sağlayamaması ve hegemonyasını en baştan kuramaması hayal kırıklığı yaratır ve bu da krizin başlamasına neden olur. Assi için ilk başta sorun olmayan bu durum, Hertzel kontrolü ele geçirip komutan rolünü üstlendiğinde onun için psikolojik olarak yıkıcı bir krize dönüşür. Her iki temsilde de milliyetçilik, savaşma ve yönetme gibi hegemonik erkeklik uygulamalarının kesintiye uğraması, erkeklik ve militarizm arasındaki doğallaştırılmış ilişkiyi zayıflatmıştır.

Krizin ikinci anlatısı, erkeklerin kırılgan, stresli ve endişe içinde sunulmaları temelinde görünür kılınmıştır. Bu tür kriz anlatısı her üç film için de ortak bir nokta oluşturmaktadır. *Beaufort* filminde, geleneksel ataerkil bir erkek olarak sunulan Liraz bile, askerlerini koruyamaması ve askerlik hizmetinin normatif gereksinimlerini yerine getirememesi nedeniyle endişe ve korkudan muzdariptir. Askerlerin içinde bulunduğu belirsizlik duygusu ve zamansal ve mekânsal olarak bilinmezlik hissi, onları kaygı ve strese sürükler. Liraz hariç, karakoldaki diğer tüm askerler bu duygusal yoğunluk içerisinde sunulurlar, zira en başından beri hem coğrafi hem de amaçsal bağlamı anlayamazlar. Bu anlatı *Lebanon* filmindeki karakterlerde daha belirgindir. En

başından beri, tankın klostrofobik ortamı ve sert görünümü, mekânsal anlamda bir endişe ve karamsarlık yaratır. Askerlerin bu sınırlı alanda savaş koşullarında kendilerinden bekleneni yerine getirmeye çalışırken yaşadıkları olumsuz deneyimler, askerlerin kaotik duygularla hareket etmesine neden olur. Canlı hedefleri vurmaktan ve ölüm korkusundan uzaklaşmaya çalışmak, askerlerin travmatik bir duruma girmesine sebep olur. Neredeyse bütün film boyunca devam eden bu travma, sürekli endişe, stres ve korku ile beslenir. Bu nedenle, kriz durumu dört asker tarafından sürekli olarak tecrübe edilmiştir.

Erkek karakterlerin kurban olarak sunulmasıyla ilgili üçüncü söylem, normatif asker kimliğinin sorgulanmasıyla açılanmaktadır. Savaş sırasında erkek askerin yaşadığı travma, devlet ve toplum tarafından terk edilmeleri hissi ve kırılgan erkeğin çektiği acı, kurbanlaştırma (*victimizaiton*) anlatısına hizmet eder. Özellikle askeri alanda erkekler tarafından uygulanan şiddet, psikolojik nedenler gibi çeşitli nedenlere bağlanabilir ve bu nedenle şiddeti uygulayanlar da kurbanlaştırılabilir. Böylece, failin mağdur pozisyonu çevresinde uyguladığı şiddet eyleminin meşru olması sağlanabilir; yani sorumluluk ve öznellik unsurları önemini yitirir. Nihayetinde, uyguladığı şiddetten sorumlu olmayan, ağır bir yük taşımak zorunda olan ve psikolojik olarak yıkılmış bir erkek figürü ortaya çıkar. Ancak, istemeden, baskı altında veya mağduriyet nedeniyle hareket etmek, sorumluluğu ortadan kaldırmaz. Bu nedenle, *Waltz with Bashir* filminde, Ari, Boaz, Carmi veya diğer askerler için – dolaylı olarak başkalarına sorumluluk yüklemeye çalışsalar da – kurban pozisyonunda sunulmaları onları kişisel sorumluluklarından kurtarmaz. Bu sorumluluğu kabul eden Ari, film boyunca kriz içerisinde temsil edildi ve bu etkiyi hafifletmek için çeşitli yollara başvurdu; hatta Holokost gibi kolektif belleği etkileyen olayları bile gündeme getirdi. Fakat ne başvurduğu yöntemler ne de hatırlamaya çalıştığı olayla en sonunda karşı karşıya gelmesi, Ari'nin krizden kurtulduğuna ilişkin çıkarım yapılmasına izin vermez.

1982 yılında başlayan Birinci Lübnan Savaşında, İsrail Savunma Kuvvetlerinin karşısında hükümetler düzeyinde bir düşman yoktu. Bu savaşta, IDF hükümet dışı oluşumlara karşı savaştı. Bu nedenle IDF, kabiliyet alanı bağlamında daha kolay hareket edebildi. Buna paralel olarak, filmlerde sunulan savaş ortamları tamamen

farklı yerlerde bulunuyor – tek ortak noktaları ise Lübnan sınırları içinde olmaları. Bu özgür savaş ortamında temsil edilen erkek asker, genel kabul gören özelliklerini kaybetmiştir. Güçlü ve savaşçı erkeklik imajı kaybolarak, yerini daha kırılgan ve duygusal bir erkekliğe bırakmıştır. Bir bakıma, bu yeni imaj IDF'nin eylemlerini “kendi” (*self*) adına savunmak lehine işlev görmüştür. Filmlerde, bir kriz içerisinde sunulan erkek karakterlerin mağdur konumları, “self”i onaylama ve “öteki”ni (*other*) olumsuzlama fırsatı vermiştir. *Self*’in insancıllaştırılması (*humanization*) adına, çeşitli koşullar altında hata yapabilme olasılığına açıkça vurgu yapılmaktadır. Bu ideolojik insanlaştırma girişimi, IDF ve askerlerinin sunumunda özellikle belirgindir. IDF’yi ve askerleri, insanüstü niteliklere sahip mükemmel savaş makineleri olarak sunmak yerine, onları kusurları, hataları olan veya psikolojik zorluklar yaşayan özneler halinde sunarak bu insancıllaştırma girişimini pekiştirmiştir. “Herkes hata yapar” (“*to err is human to forgive divine*”) deyişinden yola çıkarak, savaş ve düşman belirsiz hale getirilmiş ve böylece İsrail askerleri hatalı ve mağdur özneler olarak ön plana çıkarılmışlardır.

Sonuç olarak, 2000’li yıllarda İsrail sinemasında öne çıkan erkeklik krizine ilişkin performansların cinsiyet ilişkileri çerçevesinde erkeklik yoluyla nasıl üretildiğini anlamak, bu ilişkilerin dönüşümü ve değişimi üzerine söylemler üretmek açısından oldukça önemlidir. Bu çalışmaya dahil edilen filmler, Birinci Lübnan Savaşı etrafında, erkek askerlerin yaşadığı travmatik olayları ve ortaya çıkan erkeklik krizi söylemlerini çeşitli şekillerde kapsamaktadır. Psikolojik sorun / travma ve askeri çöküntü (*military breakdown*) filmlerde temsil edilen karakterlerin ortak özellikleridir. Buna ek olarak, kolektif ve sosyal anlatılar yerine, öznenin bedeni ve bedensel duyguları üzerinden bir anlatı sunulmaktadır. Bireysel performanslar aracılığıyla, erkeklik krizinin nedenleri, işleyişi ve sonuçları incelenmiş ve bunun sonucunda İsrail sinemasının ilk aşamalarında tasvir edilen mitik kahramanlık normlarının yeni dönemde geçerliliğini tamamen kaybettiği görülmüştür. Eleştirel erkeklik ve sinema çalışmalarını birlikte kullanılarak yapılan analizler sonucunda, hegemonik erkeklik bağlamında erkeklik krizi ve erkekliğin çeşitli toplumsal ve tarihsel etkiler yoluyla yeniden üretilmesi ile ilgili performanslar gibi dışlanan erkeklik pratiklerinin ortaya konulması sağlanmıştır.

APPENDIX C: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences

☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences

☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics

☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics

☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences

☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Durul
Adı / Name : Meltem
Bölümü / Department : Sosyoloji

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English) :

SHOOTING AND CRYING: REPRESENTATIONS OF MASCULINITY IN ISRAELI CINEMA

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master

☒

Doktora / PhD

☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide.
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. *
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. *

☒☐☐

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir.
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date