

Historiography of
World War II
in Contemporary
American Cinema

Historiography of World War II in Contemporary American Cinema

By

Deniz Gürgen Atalay

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Historiography of World War II in Contemporary American Cinema

By Deniz Gürgen Atalay

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Deniz Gürgen Atalay

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-1121-9

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-1121-7

To Osman.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Introduction	1
Chapter One.....	7
Historiography as a Construct that Houses Historical Facts	
Chapter Two	31
Historiographical Function of Blockbuster Historical Film	
Chapter Three.....	55
The Shift in the Discourses of Bush and Obama and Their Reflections in Blockbuster World War II Films of These Periods	
Conclusion.....	89
Bibliography.....	99

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing this study was as challenging as it is rewarding. It wouldn't be accomplished without the support of my family and my dear friends Berna Göl, Burak Tamer and Osman Atalay.

My professors Kaya Özkaracalar, Selim Eyüboğlu, Savaş Arslan, Nilay Ulusoy, Burçe Çelik, Defne Karosmanoğlu, Christine Hanke and Zeynep Tül Akbal Süalp were there to guide me through the way.

My colleague Yeliz Günel's support was compassionate and influential.

I want to thank the editors of the manuscript Maria Alba Brunetti and Graham Clarke for their detailed and precious work. I thank the staff at Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Publisher Anthony Wright for his great efforts, Helen Edwards from prepress team, Victoria Carruthers from author liaison, and designer Sophie Edminson for making the publication possible and shape the manuscript into this book.

My students were the ones who gave me the opportunity to revisit and crosscheck my arguments during our debates. Our lectures not only made me transform my abstract theoretical fragments of thought into communicable forms but also guided me to unpack fresh perspectives in my theoretical tendencies.

Thank You.

INTRODUCTION

Historical films have always fascinated me with the invitation they send for a trip to the past. They offer a kind of witnessing of the historical event they narrate through the sensational experience of the past. Being almost able to sense the past through the visual excitement that arises on layers of lace and all the other elements that are not commonly in use in the present are a significant part of my fascination. As a constant viewer of historical films, from time-to-time I noticed myself interpreting historical events through the references based on my visual and sensual memories of the films.

Focusing on this peculiar observation, I discovered that an important portion of my historical consciousness was housing the sensual cognition of the historical films I had watched. Considering my own experience as an elementary cinephile on historical films, I started to develop the idea that historical films were somehow performing as a tool of historiography. If this is the case, how is the audio-visual and diegetic film medium practicing historiography? What are the parallel, and also different, aspects of the filmic and written practices of historiography? What is the distinguishing role of the notion of filmic experience in the historiographical performance of a historical film? And of course, to start with, what is historiography? These were the seeds for my intellectual process on the historiographical performance of historical films.

The diegetic film with a world design of its own and that progresses by its own gravitational rules conducts a sensual experience. In the case of diegetic historical films, the sensational experience would be about the historical event that is narrated in the film. Within the diegetic historical films, I attribute blockbuster historical films great importance for their extensive reach. Being widespread is one of their natural characteristics as they reach huge populations. To be a blockbuster historical film means they influence the historical conscious in a broad sense.

Another natural characteristic of the blockbuster film lies in the intimate relationship it presents with the social tendencies of a society through its enacting of the dominant discourses of the ones with the power to lead in a

society. The idea that establishes the relationship between the dominant discourses in the society and the contexts of a blockbuster film became known to me in Kaya Özkaracalar's MA class on science fiction films in 2009. In the discussion session after the screenings of *The Day the Earth Stood Still* (1951) and the remake of the film from 2008, Özkaracalar emphasized the differences of the two versions. He has reasoned the variances with the differing discourses of Barack Obama during his election campaign from the broad dominant discourses of 1951 in American society. Installing the connection between the dominant discourses on blockbuster films in the field of historical blockbuster films, the issue of the historiography the blockbuster films perform is relative to the dominant discourses in a society. But how would a blockbuster film be interrelated with the political power in a society? What is the essence of this association between the dominant discourses in a society and blockbuster films? What are the consequences of this association once the blockbuster films perform historical representations? These issues broadly constitute the framework of my study. To investigate these issues and their interrelations, I will start working primarily on the notion of historiography to reach a broad understanding in order to reflect on the historiographical performance of diegetic film.

The second chapter, "Historiography as a Construct That Houses Historical Facts," defines historiography as a constructed material that is far from an inborn entity. To understand the conception of historiography, I will relate the notions of fact, truth, and historical fact within the dynamic social tendencies which history interprets. The main influences on this chapter will fundamentally be derived from the ideas of E. H. Carr and Eric Hobsbawm on the constructed nature of historiography that is reflexive to the current tendencies of the society. To determine and associate the notions of fact, truth, and knowledge, I will enlist the ideas of Nelson Goodman's interpretation of Carr's conception of historical fact.

Carr defines narration as an essential tool for historiographical practice, and hence I will endeavour to understand the characteristics of narration based on the ideas of Nick Lacey. To understand the involvement and function of narrative in the practice of historiography, Fatmagül Berktaş's and Ernst Breisach's assertions will guide me along with those of Carr.

The assertions of the Gulbenkian Commission's report that the historiographer is a vibrant and reflexive individual who exists in society become another significant point for work on historiography. The historiographer practices historiography among the current social,

economic, and political tendencies in a society. The historiography of the same historical incident performed at the same time may differ due to the position or point of view of the historiographer. The perception, and hence the expression, of the historiographer comprises the positioning by means of an assenting or dissenting standpoint they establish with the dominant current tendencies in a society. To understand and designate the significance of the positioning of the historiographer as a part of society, Fatmagül Berktaş's, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's, Ranajit Guha's, and Zeynep Tül Akbal Süalp's interpretations will guide me.

Historiography, as an expression of an historical event that is performed in the present, inevitably houses the present conditions in its constitution. In Carr's and Hobsbawm's considerations, the historiography of the same historical event may shift due to the dynamism that historiography acquires in its texture, which is susceptible to current social tendencies. As I mentioned above, the social positioning of the historiographer that is bound to the social tendencies of their time would be an effective method in determining the historiographical product. Another notion that effects historiographical practice would be the kind of historiography performed. In my study on the historiographical performance of blockbuster historical films, I intend to work on the representative diegetic historiography that generates a sense of historical experience. In the effort to separate and reflect on the historiographical performance of diegetic historical film, I will gather the practices of historiography under the titles of official (dominant) historiography, independent historiography, and popular historiography. Placing the historiographical performance of diegetic film in the popular practices of historiography, I will try to interpret the relation of these three kinds of practices with the dynamic tendencies of a society. By doing so, I will endeavour to bring the concept of historiography as close to the field of fiction as possible by emphasizing its constructed nature to draw the distinction between the space of historiography and diegetic historical representation that brings about the sense of historical experience.

In the third chapter I will concentrate the discussion on representative diegetic film as a tool of historiography. In the effort to study the historiographical performance of diegetic film that operates on the historical consciousness of the spectator, I will primarily work on the generation of the sense of experience diegetic films perform by following the perspective of "apparatus theory." Through the arguments of apparatus theory and the neo-formalist approach of Thompson and Bordwell, I will

endeavour to express the sense of experience diegetic film presents in its narration.

To understand the effects of the sensed experience that diegetic films perform through historical representation, I will use the perspective of Vivian Sobchack as she defines the situation by designating that history happens. Towards my positioning that highlights the transmission of sensual experience by diegetic historical films, I will discuss the arguments of Robert Rosenstone determining the film medium as a significantly convenient tool to perform historical representation.

In order to progress, I will focus on the historiographical performance of the Hollywood blockbuster film to discuss the relationship between the formation of blockbuster historical films and the dominant discourses of the society. To determine the nature of this dynamic relationship I will enlist Douglas Kellner's interpretation of the Frankfurt School's notion of culture industries.

The fourth chapter is dedicated to analysing the nature of the synchronous shift in the social tendencies of a society and historical representations in blockbuster films. In other words, the study focuses on the reproduction of historiography through the historical representations that the blockbuster films perform according to the shifting tendencies in a society.

I argue that the historiography of blockbuster historical films reflects the ideas of the dominant discourse in a society. Once the dominant discourse becomes different, the historical representation of the same incident shifts in blockbuster historical films accordingly. In an effort to present the bond between the shift in the dominant discourse and the synchronized altering of historical representation in historical blockbuster films, I will analyse blockbuster Second World War films, which were produced in two different periods.

The shifting tendencies of American society that evolved around the discourses of George W. Bush in the period of his presidency and Barack Obama in his presidential campaign will be studied through the historical representations of the blockbuster Second World War films produced in those periods. I will focus the study on the representation of evil in human nature in blockbuster Second World War films of these periods based on the observation I have made on the shift within the discourse in American society for that concept. The discourses of Bush after 9/11 and those of the presidential campaign of Obama (the so-called "Obama Project") and the

concept of evil in human nature will constitute the sources that will be tracked for this study on the blockbuster Second World War films of these periods.

I placed the study on the representation of evil in human nature on blockbuster Second World War films instead of the films that include representations of Afghanistan and Iraq during the US military operations after 9/11. The reason for this choice is based on the necessarily escapist character the blockbuster demands. The blockbuster film establishes the diegesis by means of designing a different environment in terms of space and time to maintain the escapist element for the audience. I have chosen to work on blockbuster Second World War films to detect the shift in the discourse of evil in human nature because the Second World War is by far one of the important time periods that generated the conception. It can be said of this period that humanity experienced the definition of evil through the Nazi party, its leader Adolf Hitler, the progress of the Holocaust, and the operations of the Second World War. It was a time said to approach the limits of humanity.

To understand and reflect on the bond between the concept of evil in Hollywood films and the period of the Second World War, I will call upon Robert Sklar's assertions on the subject. For Sklar, filmmaking practices were also affected by the devastating incident of genocide along with the huge impact it had on Europe and North America, both during the process and afterwards. In Sklar's interpretation, throughout the period of the Second World War, including the time when the United States was discussing whether or not to join the war, Hollywood constructed the stereotypical representations of the rightful use of war to defend freedom as well as the creation of the hero and the concept of evil. These stereotypical representations were continually reproduced. More specifically, representations of the hero and evil, which were produced by Hollywood in the war films during the Second World War, are utilized over and over again in every period during which American society needed a definition for the enemy. Thereafter, the films that establish their narration in the period of the Second World War constitute the direct definition of evil through the representation of Hitler and German society during the war. Hence, the focus I attribute to the Second World War films is based on the acknowledgement of the subgenre for the direct representation of evil in human nature.

The blockbuster Second World War films of these two periods are to be analysed in the framework of this study based on the number of screening

copies. As one of the solid characteristics of the blockbuster syndrome, I attribute attention to the quantity of screening copies to distinguish the film as a blockbuster. The films to be analysed in this thesis will be the Second World War films produced during the specified periods, of which more than two thousand copies were released on the opening weekend. Towards these specifications, the blockbuster Second World War films of the period of George W. Bush will be *Pearl Harbor* (2001) and *Hart's War* (2002), and of Barack Obama will be *Valkyrie* (2008).

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORIOGRAPHY AS A CONSTRUCT THAT HOUSES HISTORICAL FACTS

The aim of the first chapter is to comprehend the characteristics of historiography as a term that constitutes its existence from the intersecting fields of narration and historical factuality. This explanation of historiography as a practice that establishes historical facts with the intention to form fluent expressions of historical events locates the narrative constitution to a spot close to the field of fiction. In the parts of the first chapter, I will endeavour to define the texture of historiography as a constructed material far from an inborn solid entity. Historiography as a structural narrative form is produced from the current social, economic, and political tendencies in a society. Historiography as an expression of an historical event that takes place in the present inevitably houses present conditions within its constitution. The historiography of the same historical event may shift due to the dynamism historiography accesses through its composition that is susceptible to current social tendencies. A shift in current social tendencies would not be the only agent to transform historiography. The historiography of the same historical incident enacted at the same time may differ due to the positioning and point of view of the historiographer. The perception, and hence the expression the historiographer, changes an event by the positioning through the means of either a coherent or dissident point of view which they establish with the dominant current tendencies within the society. By highlighting the versatile, dynamic notions of the historiography that is formed within the conditions of narration, I intend to locate historiography as being close to the field of fiction. The designation of historiography to the field of fiction may engender the utilization of an identical assessment towards any kind of historical representation. However, historiography that is performed in a representative and diegetic form is not qualified to be appraised in the same field with the non-representative non-diegetic forms of historiography. Even though its constructed nature moves the practice of historiography closer to the realms of fiction, the diegetic and representative practices diversify it through the sensation of historical

experience they conduct. The historical narrations that are diegetic and representative expose the sense of historical experience through various techniques, like the use of closural narrative structures or the maintenance of identification.

The practice of historiography bases the selection and establishment of historical facts in narration, hence the debates on solid historical accuracy or credibility would be incoherent considering the nature of historiography. From this perspective, when focused on the issue of historical accuracy and credibility, the historical representation of diegetic narration stays on an equal level with the non-diegetic practices of historiography. The differences in the diegetic and non-diegetic practices would not surface on the issue of credibility, but do on the sense of historical experiment when diegetic representations are bound to memory. The practices of representative and diegetic mainstream historical films and novels may set examples for historiography that conduct a sense of historical experience. In my study regarding the transformative effects of social tendencies on diegetic historical representation performed by Hollywood blockbuster films, I intend to work on a representative diegetic historiography that generates a sense of historical experience. Therefore, I will endeavour to bring the concept of historiography closer to the field of fiction as much as possible by emphasizing its constructed nature so as to draw a distinction between the space of historiography and diegetic historical representation that brings about the sensation of historical experience.

A Brief Historical Survey of Historiography

The search for a methodology of maintaining a readily accessible and comprehensible historical knowledge has a respectable history. According to Fatmagül Berktaş (2010, 15) in *The Gender of History*, because of the clashes between literature and document-based driven approaches, the historiography of the sixteenth century was the significant era for close source analyses. This study defined itself through the accurate work on the records of the past and aimed to find and preserve any possible historical data. In Berktaş's consideration of this approach, the document-based effort stimulated the rise of many other critical studies like diplomacy, numismatics, and archaeology (2010, 15). The orientation of historiography predictably shifted from document-based studies in the eighteenth century towards one that put forward literary properties. As Berktaş states, this tendency rose under the influence of the

Enlightenment, which was trying hard to part from the previous political emphasis on historiography and intended to embrace all layers of society. Specialists such as Montesquieu, David Hume, Condorcet, and Voltaire were leading this tendency in historical writing, and as Berktaý points out, they were determined not to concentrate on historical recordings, but on giving primacy to literary properties. The nineteenth century was another landmark for historiography as it was for all studies of various disciplines. As Berktaý agrees, the nineteenth century was accepted as the era in which historiography became an independent academic discipline that acquired its own critical methodology and approach under the influence of leading specialist Leopold von Ranke (2010, 15). According to Berktaý, Ranke emphasized the impartial and objective properties of the historiographer in determining the close study of historical sources as the rule of historiography. The difference in Ranke's approach from the understanding of historiography in the sixteenth century was to consider the historiographer's existence and the generation of their point of view through the time and place to which they belonged. The understanding of the historiographer as a product of their time and place, and more specifically as a part of their society, acknowledges the subjective interpretations that occur within a historiographer's work. The methodological direction that arose through the acceptance of the historiographer's subjective approach placed historiography near the border of modernist scientific disciplines departing from the intuitive, artistic narrative of classic historicism (2010, 16). The challenge of the understanding of historiography through the subjectivity of the historiographer continued with the interrogation of the historiographer's subjects and the layers of society that the analysis was included in. According to Volkan Aytar (2001, 5), the *Annales* tradition, the history from below approach, the history of everyday life theories, and the women's history movement all challenged the event-centred, individualist and generic approach of the Rankeian model. As Aytar emphasizes, despite their different methodologies and the intentions of their historiographical approaches, they made great contributions to the shift in the comprehension of society as a dynamic formation rather than a stable entity (2001, 5). As Berktaý points out, the historiography of the twentieth century practiced in European and American universities was a dependable and substantial profession that was vivid and rich with constant challenges. However, the twentieth century was also the era in which the hopes of the Enlightenment collapsed under the strong influence of the Second World War. It was a time pervaded by the mood of disappointment and a period of reassessment, where even the most durable

pillars of truth were under interrogation. Predictably, the optimistic belief in historiography's medium-specific property of exposing the truth under the correct methodology was also being challenged. The dependability of historical data and the validity of historic texts from ancestral annalists stood on one side of the question, and the possibility of the objectivity and impartiality of the historiographer was on the other. The historiographer was considered an interpreter and historiography was a narration. There was a belief that the scientific knowledge the historiography produced was collapsing, and therefore it could not have dominance over other types of narration. According to Berkta (2010, 17), the postmodernist approach to historiography defined it as a branch of literature based on historical data. Historiographers defended their position against postmodernist criticism by standing by their methodological interpretations while highlighting their responsibility for giving a voice to the past.

The Fact

Is fact possible? Is there or has there ever been a phenomenon that remained stable under every condition and in the exact same position? Has there ever been a thought or a solid object that kept its stability when approached from various angles through different views? Certainly, this is not possible. The truth about an incident depends upon the approach by which it is examined. Therefore, the truth about an incident is bound to the common value system of the day. The influential position of the common value system of the day in the determination of the truth of that time is inevitable. Once the approach of the common value system transforms, the "truth" about that incident would then certainly change accordingly. I will approach the notions of fact and truth as relevant but separate meanings. I take fact as the end product, the overt result of the incident. Let us suppose a collapsed empire. The collapsed position of that empire is a fact that no longer exists. The truth is the *zeitgeist* effect that goes above and beyond fact. The truth arises from the combination of the fact and the construct built around it according to the perceived forms of the society. The truth is the conveyor of the fact so it can be understood. In this sense the fact is stable, but the truth that encloses it is changeable. Once the understanding of the society evolves, the tendencies that affect understanding evolve and the formation of the items that compose the truth evolves accordingly in order to maintain meaning.

What then is the criteria that characterizes the variable position of the truth as "solid truth"? In other words, which angle of truth is selected and then

exists as history and why? Maybe it has something to do with the power hypocentres of the time, the point of view of the ones who rule. In *Ways of World Making*, Nelson Goodman (2001) defines the truth as a docile and obedient servant rather than a solemn master. In his effort to place the works of art on the same level as science as a mode of discovery, he values an artwork's ability to create alternative grounds of truth. Critiquing the position of the scientist who would search for the only truth, Goodman explains the search as an exercise in tailoring something to the perspective. According to him, the scientist who believes in the "only truth" searches for their foresight and discovers the so-called "only truth" accordingly. To explain the multiple characteristics of truth, Goodman bases his thoughts on the idea that the differing practices of everyday life constitute various points of views. Conceptualizing habit as a conclusion of the inveteracy of values that vary from perspective to perspective, Goodman draws a straight line from the habit and foresight in the act of searching for the truth. The predestined progress of the search would conclude on the very point as was intended. Interrogating the concept of the real in the phrase of "the real world," he parses the reality of "world" and the realism depicted in a picture as a matter of perceptual habit (2001, 18–21).

The designation of fact depends on the approach. The height of the viewing stand, the angle of approach, and even the capacity of sight that Goodman (2001) conceptualizes under the notion of habit determine the registration of the truth. In order to exemplify the dependent characteristics of the truth to the perspective from which it is taken, he applies wordplay such as "Did the sun set a while ago or did the earth rise?" or "Does the sun go around the earth or the earth go around the sun?" (93). Just like the playful case of the phrase asking which comes first, the chicken or the egg?, the answer is simple—it depends. But the challenge in handling the dependent characteristics of the truth arises in the phase of expression. Even though both expressions in the case of the sun and earth refer to the same meaning and are completely transitive of each other, Goodman delves into the question of expressive manipulations, asserting, "As meanings vanish in favor of certain relationship among terms, so facts vanish in favor of certain relationship among versions" (93).

Now I would like to start exploring Edward Hallett Carr's famous question: what is history? Is there a holly board that all the events and happenings take place on simultaneously? Is it something written? Is it a creature (being/entity) or a creation (a narration)?

The “bound variable” characteristic of fact reveals its dubious nature, but still I do not deal with the whole sense of fact through the conception of relativity. The only solid existence of fact may lie in the result. A dead king is a dead king, but the relative making of meaning differs in the narration of how he died, why and if need be, and by whose hand.

In his pioneering work *What is History?* (1990), Carr makes a separation between the facts about the past and historical facts. He stresses the disappearance of the difference between the historical facts and the facts of the past, just because they both happened in the past (13). Historical fact is a piece of solid information. It is evidence, like a sealed letter with an ambassador’s handwriting, or the signed document of a pact. But a piece of historical fact can only be dependable in the utopia of the single existence of its own. In order to make sense of that piece of information, it should be wrapped in a narration. Therefore, that piece of historical fact needs to be padded here and there with the facts of the past. The fact of the past distinguishes itself from historical facts in the concept of validity.

In the article *Truth and Fact Reconsidered* (1977), which furthers the endeavours of his previous book *Introduction to Philosophy of History*, W. H. Walsh takes a position similar to Carr. For him, the past is inconvenient for observation because of the conductive manner historical evidence exhibits through the act of interpretation. Taking one step further than Carr, Walsh claims that historical evidence, the historical fact Carr designates, can’t be valued as an “unvarnished transcript of past reality” for it is significant only with the contribution of the narration. Walsh (55) defines “the remains” as flexible, unfinished, and controversial. In other words, “the remains” of historical evidence are a convenient way of understanding through interpretation.

The facts about the past belong to the certain period of time in which they were produced. They make sense and are valid only for that period. They have a life span that depends on the circumstances that created them. Once those circumstances disappear, the facts of the pasts are no longer viable. Then, historical facts are redressed through the acquisition of myths that arise from current tendencies of society in order to maintain the meaning that was there before. The role of the facts about the past shifts places with the myths in the act of historiography once the patterns of understanding society change. The characteristics of the narration are formed according to the valid circumstances of the time in order to be in accord with the understanding of the society of that time.

In historiography, the conclusion is the actuator for the narration of history. The intention therefore determines the conclusion. The first step is the designation of the conclusion and then the flow of events is navigated accordingly. In *What is History*, Carr (1990, 11) determines the selection and organization of the facts as the most important operational methods of influencing the view. Historical facts are investigated and selected according to the intention and padded with the facts of the past in order to form a comprehensible narration. Carr (123) emphasizes the different levels of importance that are applied through commentary: “The facts of history cannot be purely objective, since they become facts of history only in the virtue of the significance attached to them by the historian” (120). “The facts speak only when the historian calls on them: it is he who decides to which facts to give the floor, and in what order or content” (11). Carr (103) argues that, in the process of constructing a historical narration, the installation of historical facts and the other facts of history (which he denominates as unhistorical) is due to intention. A fact of history that is only valid for the time of the event, as Carr explains, can be advanced to the position of a historical fact by the importance devoted to it by the historian (103). Comparing history to “an enormous jigsaw puzzle with a lot of missing parts,” Carr (12–13) counters the belief of the existence of an objective and autonomous historical fact free from the interpretation of the historian. “The facts are available to the historian in documents, inscriptions and so on, like fish on the fishmonger’s slab. The historian collects them, takes them home, and cooks and serves them in whatever style appeals to him” (9).

The studies that follow the tradition of the Annales School towards the methodology of historiography direct their focus on the social positioning of the historiographer to explain the selection-based characteristic of historiography. The sensation and perception of a historical event forms through the viewpoint of the historiographer. The viewpoint of the historiographer is constituted on their social positioning. The field towards which the historiographer directs their focus determines the selection of historical facts to be established in the historical narration. The effect of the social positioning of the historiographer on the process of historiography is widely debated in the works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Ranajit Guha. The act of selecting historical facts and establishing them in narration would therefore differ through the social positioning of the historiographer.

Narration in Historiography

Why do the historiographers narrate when they are writing historiographical texts? Why can they not just transport the whole of the historical information as it was found, collected, etc.? Because it is simply not possible to do so. Not only can historiographers not do so, but no one can. Either in verbal or written form, no one can express information, an idea, or anything else without narrating it. Human beings narrate while they think, talk, and write. Information or an idea as an abstract form cannot exist as a pure substance and cannot be transferred to the minds of others by telepathy in the way it is. We communicate by expressing the sentiment of an idea with others. The expression of the sentiment depends on the selection and placement of the words and, of course, the utterance. The process of selecting, ordering, and accentuating the words in order to transfer the meaning is narration.

Nick Lacey, in his book *Narrative and Genre: Key Concepts in Media Studies* (2000), states that the word “narration” comes from the Latin *narre* that means to make known, emphasizing the transportation of information the word “narration” holds. He separates narration from other informational tools like a train timetable, when he defines as the carrier of information of a continuous series of events, highlighting its sentimental properties. In the process of transporting the meaning, Lacey (14) attributes great importance to the cause-and-effect relationship in the construction of narration. The single existence of an event, he claims, cannot constitute a sequence, as narration is formed in the causality of events that are placed one after another. Therefore, it needs at least two events. Lacey gives an example in the statement, “the king is dead” for the purpose of defining a non-narration, and he extends the statement into a narration by establishing the cause-and-effect relationship in the phrase, “the king is dead and the queen has died of grief.”

Historiography, in my opinion, involves narration that is based on the argument mentioned above because it is impossible to express ideas without narrating them. Moreover, the historiography of an historical event is also built through the cause-and-effect relationship. The historiographer finds and constructs a series of reasons that they attach to the initiation of the event they are documenting. The act of forming a consistent document about the past that proves itself through the given historical data is bound to its becoming meaningful. What constitutes being meaningful is the narration, the art of expressing the sentiment of the idea, the information. In *Metahistory*, Hayden White (1975) collates

literature and historiography by testing the practice of historiography through the narrative form. His analysis of the style of the historian and the form of the text aims to prove that historiography is an art of construction. According to White, the only distinction between the novelist and the historiographer is that the novelist invents the event while the historiographer finds it.

The comprehension of a historical document, and therefore the construction of the narration, has to involve a cause-and-effect relationship. The resulting event has to be explained with the reasons that caused it. In other words, historical fact has to be explained with the facts of the past. In *What is History*, Carr (1990, 88) mentions that historians constantly endeavour to arrange the past experiences of humans by attaching the cause-and-effect relationship to them. Based on this idea, Carr defines history as a constitution composed of organizing the incidents of the past in an order that involves a cause-and-effect relationship. Carr underlines the rejection of irrelevant data about the past in the act of composing a logical and rational document (147). According to Carr, the historian's point of view and intention effect the causes they attach to the historical event as well as the decision made about which events to document as historical fact. "The relation of the historian to his causes has the same and a dual reciprocal character as the relation of the historian to his facts. The causes determine his interpretation of the historical process, and his interpretation determines the selection and marshaling of the causes" (103). In order to demystify his argument on the selective system of historiography that is accordant with the historiographer's intention, Carr (105) continues:

Just as from the infinite ocean of facts the historian selects those which are significant for his purpose, so from the multiplicity of sequences of cause and effect he extracts those, and only those, which are historically significant; and the standard of historical significance is his ability to fit them into his pattern of rational explanation and interpretation.

Based on the association Carr theorizes about narration and historiography, testing some of the methodologies of the narrative arts on historiography would be a useful effort in order to elaborate the concept of historiography as a branch of narration. According to Lacey (2000, 10), the beginning of a narrative text works as a hook that catches the audience. Without the hook, the text would not be tempting and the audience would not focus their attention to comprehend the whole text. The historian also has to choose where to start writing. The composition of the introduction

phase of a historical text should also be chosen carefully in order to work as a narrative hook. Returning to Lacey's analysis on narrative theory, the narrative hook consists of a process of prediction where the text directs the audience according to the clues given. The clues that are given at the beginning should be clear in order to introduce and co-opt the audience into the diegesis of the narration. The engaging clues for the construction of the process of prediction that Lacey (2000, 10) specifies are firstly the identification of the hero and villain. The positioning of the good and bad guys is important to build the perspective of the audience. The point that needs to be taken seriously by the narrator or the historiographer is forming the characteristics of the hero and the villain in accordance with the audiences' prejudices in order to furnish consistency within the narration. In other words, the construction of the hero and villain should address the target audiences' field of experience in order to set the recognition of the positioning of hero and villain. The second specification Lacey makes on the items of engaging clues is to construct a recognizable setting, which is mandatory for a narrative hook and has more or less the same function as the positioning of the hero and villain in the introduction. The act of inviting and placing the audience into the gravitational universe of the narration comes into play one more time in the third specification, which is the usage of an understandable narration style. The fourth and last item in Lacey's analysis is the construction of a conventional narrative structure, which includes cause-and-effect motivation in order to excite, invite, and place the audience in the diegesis. The introduction phase of a text is responsible for transporting the sensibility of the audience into the conditions of the narrative. Once the content of the narrative is bound with the sentiment of the audience, the authenticity of the narration would continue no matter where or when the story is happening, such as in outer space or in the Second World War.

The construction of a narration with the intention to express information, an idea, or a tale is the act of structuring a comprehensible and appetizing whole. The comprehensibility of a narration is formed in the bond of compatibility with what the narration presents and the audience's field of experience. Valuing the term "narration" as a tool for producing sense, the harmony being maintained with the conditions of a place and time which the narration targets, instills its comprehensibility.

Historiography puts forward reliability as its trademark, which is built over the transparent characteristics of its evidential texture. However, historiography is composed by placing the historical facts in an order supplied by the historiographer's intention. As a part of the process, the

historiographer fills in the gaps of historical facts with the facts of the past in order to maintain a cause-and-effect relationship. Therefore, narration in historiography may have its roots in the management of historical facts while in the mission of creating its constitution of comprehensibility. As Ernst Breisach (1994, 55) points out in *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval & Modern*, while a narration in historiography justifies itself on the basis of the maintenance of comprehension, history in documented mode can no longer be accepted as the accurate representation of life in the past.

As mentioned above, the historiographer makes choices in the process of constructing historiography. These choices include such pivotal decisions as which historical event to document, which historical facts to include, and which historical facts to exclude in the process of documentation, and, even more crucially, from which perspective these choices will be expressed/narrated.

The choices of the historian are made according to the target audience of the historical document. The perspective of the historiographer would inevitably contain the current tendencies of the society which they are documenting. The issue of maintaining comprehension is closely associated with the representation of past events through the conception of society's current tendencies. Therefore, narration in historiography contains the current tendencies of society as the determining element on the perspective that is developed. In *The Gender of History*, Berktaf (2010) claims that it is necessary for a historiographer to know themselves and their society in order to explain another. According to Berktaf, the understanding of the other society is done through the understanding of the society the historiographer belongs to. The acknowledgement of the other society is done through the determination of the analogous qualities and differences the two societies have. In order to compare the societies, the historiographer or the narrator has to understand the field of shared experience of the society they belong to. The shared field of experience in a society builds the shared juncture of cognition. Therefore, the historiographer or the narrator has to form their perspective, the style of narration, and the choices they make during the act of historiography according to their society's cognition in order to maintain comprehension. The representations of the past events, or in other words the act of historiography, portray events that have taken place in a time that is different from that the historiographer is writing about. The society of the past is a different society from the current one, even if they share the same national flag. Therefore, the act of historiography represents the events of a past society through the circumstances of the current society in order to

make sense to the current society—in other words, to be understood. The comprehensibility of a historical text is based on the perspective directed from the field of experience of the current society. The perspective composed through the tendencies of a society constitutes one of the key characteristics of narration in historiography.

In the effort to understand and explain the interrelation in the narration composed to represent the past events with the current conditions of the society, the historiographer's position as a part of the current society is also worth attention. Arising from the current tendencies of the day, the historiographer is inevitably a part of society. Their perspective would consist of, be effected by, or directed by their field of experience. The narration the historiographer forms consequently houses their perspective as a part of the society that defines its existence on the choices made, and the narrative form used. Carr (1990, 16) argues that no such thing as a naked fact exists before the historian handles and processes it. The utilization of and therefore realization of a historical fact is based on the process the historian performs on it. According to Carr (1990), the historical document is only capable of showing how the historiographer handles the subject. In other words, the historical document reflects the historiographer's point of view. The perspective of the historiographer cannot be considered as a sublime entity that is sealed and free from the dynamics of the society they live in. Carr continues: "When we attempt to answer the question 'what is history' our answer, consciously or unconsciously, reflects our own position in time and forms part of our answer to the broader question of what view we take of the society in which we live" (8).

The Historiographer as a Part of Society

Early biologists were content to classify species of birds, beasts, and fishes in cages, aquariums and showcases, and did not seek to study the living creature in relation to its environment. Perhaps the social sciences today have not yet fully emerged from that primitive stage. (Carr 1990, 47)

In the assertion above, Carr highlights the erroneous approach of the historiographer as one of a solitary existence, an isolated entity, suggesting that we analyse the historian's historical and social environment before studying the historiography the historian performs (44). Carr (40) claims that in order to understand the work of the historian, the place they stand and the root of that standpoint within the social environmental circumstances should be analysed. Referring to the entity of the human

being as a social animal, Carr (31) emphasizes that humankind mutates from a biological entity to a social one, synchronous with birth, through the effect of becoming a member of society. Stressing the transformative character of the society, Carr suggests that no matter the cultural state of history or pre-history, the human being is born into society and is shaped by its tendencies. The effective chemistry of the society transports its collective memory to each and every human being through the permeable regions of human intellect. The collective memory that is being shaped by the present tendencies of the society over and over again is implanted not only in the new born, but in all human beings that form the society. Carr (1990, 31) puts forward language as an example of the embodying activities of the society. Valuating language as a tool to transport the characteristics of the society, Carr asserts that language is not just an individualist communicative instrument but also a social inheritance. Language forms the constitution of thought as much as the methodology for the expression of the thought. Therefore, the dynamic nature of the language the society forms uses and reforms according to the mutating tendencies of the society, refreshing itself constantly through each and every part of the society. Qualifying the conception of individuality in a modern national community as one of the most endemic modern myths, Carr (31) points out that the individual and the society are integral to each other, operating harmoniously to prove each other's existence. He remarks, "no man is an island, entire of itself."

The report by the Gulbenkian Commission *Open the Social Sciences* (1996) also suggests the assessment of the social scientist as a part of society. Intending to highlight the necessity for the restructuring of the social sciences, the report directs its focus on the historical construction of scientific knowledge. The report confronts the diversification of social sciences into standardized exclusive disciplines, acknowledging the social sciences as a monolithic constitution. The report argues that the separation of the social sciences into disciplines isolates the social scientist from the dynamics of the society, prohibiting them from the essential interactivity. In order to constitute a vivid formation of social sciences, the report suggests that the social scientist integrate the various social sciences among social disciplines within the context of their interaction with society's social tendencies.

Berktaý (2010, 8) also stresses the historiographer's relation to society's tendencies. Appraising the historiographer as a natural part of the society (like any other part that forms it), Berktaý pays close attention to the effects of the society's tendencies over the historiographer in the process

of the documentation of history. Berkday claims that the perception directed to a phenomenon is not just formulated from the characteristics of that phenomenon but evolves through the beholder's point of view. The historiographer's perceptual field is inevitably shaped by the society and the tendencies they belong to. The frame that composes the historiographer's point of view, she continues, determines what the historiographer perceives, associates with it, and interprets. The choice made by the historiographer in what to document also houses the existence of the undocumented actualities.

The perspective of the critique made by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1999) and Ranajit Guha (2006) focuses on the obscure actualities that are undocumented due to the historiographical subsidization of the dominant ideologies. These studies imprint the perspective of their historiographical methodology immanent to the histories of social layers that are made to remain silent. The practices of historiography that direct the focus on the areas that are intentionally omitted from mainstream historiography highlight the significance of the perspective the historiographer acquires. The historiographer is interactive with the dynamic tendencies of the society they belong to, which constitutes the environment for the formation of the perspectives. Accordingly, the choice of subjects the historiographer performs in the act of historical documentation is an output of their perspective.

In "A History of Experience, Historical Experience and Experience History" (2006), Zeynep Tül Akbal Süalp exposes the multilayered metabolism of history by highlighting the reflection of different societies in history by means of time and space. Süalp (41) states that history is the perspective of the one who studies history as much as the historiographer in the process of documentation. In Süalp's interpretation, the analyser's perspective, which is directed towards history, is as subjective and permeable to the society's tendencies as that of the historiographer. She stratifies the constitution of history through the periods of time in which the historical event is written, analysed, rewritten, and re-analysed due to the tendencies that evolve within a society. In the relation of the perspectives of the societies of the past and present due to the historical apprehension, Carr (1990, 55) designates the dual function of the history as understanding both the past and the state of the period from whence the past is documented. According to Carr, the past is understood through the present conceptions, and therefore historiography should be evaluated within the tendencies of the society in which the documentation is performed. Carr clarifies the notions of the correlation between the