intervalla: Vol. 2, 2014 ISSN: 2296-3413

Temporalities of Trauma in *Hatufim* and *Homeland*

Michaela Wünsch
Institute for Arts and Media, University of Potsdam

Michaela Wünsch. "Temporalities of Trauma in *Hatufim* and *Homeland* ." *intervalla: platform for intellectual exchange* 2, "Trauma, Abstraction, and Creativity" (2014-15): 108-122. Copyright © 2015 (Wünsch). Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial No Derivatives (by-nc- nd/3.0).

INTRODUCTION

A man's head is held under the dirty water of a bathtub by two men whose faces cannot be seen. When he is hauled out, a third man asks in Arabic: "What's your name?" When the captured man answers "Amiel", the man shakes his head and the drowning starts again. This scene is constantly repeated as flashbacks and nightmares of the protagonist now called Yussuf in the Israeli television series *Hatufim.* It shows how the Israeli soldier Amiel was forced to convert to Islam during his captivity through waterboarding. In the American adaptation of this series, *Homeland,* the process of "turning" is also portrayed in flashbacks experienced by the main character, Brody, and is also associated with water. But rather than being tortured, we see Brody being welcomed by the alleged terrorist Abu Nazir with a bathtub full of water, in which Brody is able to take a warm bath, and then shaved smoothly afterwards by an unseen barber.

This paper discusses how trauma and its aftermath are represented in these two contemporary television series. The article departs from the assumption, as shared by most psychologists and scholars, that trauma escapes representation, and asks what forms it takes when represented in popular television series. I will argue that trauma is translated into a televisual language, which is expressed in modes of temporality. This assumption is based on the importance of temporality for television. Richard Dienst, Nam June Paik, Mary-Ann Doane, and others agree: "the fundamental concept and major category of television is time."[1] In its beginnings, television was merely transmitted and received in real time. For Raymond Williams, the processes of transmission and reception were even more important than the content, which is only parasitically;[2] this does not mean that it is secondary but that it is programmatic. Televisual simultaneous transmission is open-ended. For this reason it has to construct temporalities of viewing, a structure of flow, segmentation and repetition. It was Williams again who developed the term "flow" as a system of interruptions perceived as continuity,[3] while other authors stress the fragmentation of a continuous time.[4] For Mary-Ann Doane, "time is television's basis, its principle of structuration as well as its persistent reference."[5] She differentiates between the steady and continuous flow as a mode television deals with information, while crisis involves a temporal condensation. It names an event of some duration, which is startling and momentous precisely because it demands resolution within a limited period of time.[6] The time proper to catastrophe is cut off from any sense of analogical continuity; it is an "unexpected discontinuity in an otherwise continuous system."[7]

In a very similar way Avital Ronell writes that trauma halts the teleology of time. This disruption of continuity through trauma resembles the temporality of television: "[…] television stops the chronological clock which it also parallels in a fugitive clandestine and according to two modes of temporal assignment. Television stops time by interrupting its simulated chronology in the event of an event. […] Television also stops the chronological clock by miming its regularity and predictability around the clock, running and rerunning the familiar foreignness of traumatic repetition."[8]

The same way a traumatic event enters the psyche "surprisingly" and suddenly from outside, as already argued by Sigmund Freud,[9] an "event" usually enters television from a place of exteriority. For Ronell and for Doane the emphasis of suddenness suggests that catastrophe is of temporal order.[10] "In its structural emphasis upon […] rupture, it often seems that television itself is often formed on the model of catastrophe."[11] Due to the similarity between the sudden experience of trauma for the subject and the suddenness of

catastrophe or event in television, I will further follow this temporal mode. Beside suddenness, I will focus on belatedness and repetition. Repetition is not only the mode which structures the program formats and daily schedules, but it is how television reacts to traumatic catastrophes – think for instance of the recurring images after 9/11. Doane points out that "if Nick Browne is correct in suggesting that, through its alignment of its own schedule with the work day and the work week, 'television helps produce and render 'natural' the logic and rhythm of the social order', then catastrophe would represent that which cannot be contained with such an ordering of temporality. It would signal the return of the repressed."[12] For Freud the repressed trauma also appears again as a compulsion to repeat.[13] These repetitions occur most often unconsciously in dreams or flashbacks – always belatedly.

For Ronell television repeats (reruns) traumatic repetitions. For her television is already connected to trauma because of its history: television was invented during the Second World War; however, "mass invasion of television occurred after the war […] TV is not so much a beginning of something new, but is instead the residue of an unassimilable history."[14] For this reason the history of television is comparable to a traumatic memory that cannot integrate into one's experience and cannot communicate to others. "One problem with television is that it exists in trauma, or rather trauma is on television."[15] Regarding Freud's theory, this traumatic experience of history triggers "technological mutated flashbacks, involuntarily sudden repetitions of traumatic experiences."[16]

"In its most general definition," Cathy Caruth writes, "trauma describes an overwhelming experience of sudden, or catastrophic events, in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, and uncontrolled repetitive occurrence of hallucinations and other intrusive phenomena."[17] Real victims and witnesses of trauma sometimes compare their hallucinations or flashbacks with film clips. The memory of trauma is not only belated but can often only be remembered as images, not in the symbolic form of language. For this reason a televisual or filmic language would be adequate to 'translate' trauma.

Susannah Radstone asks in her introduction to a special issue of the journal *Screen* whether there is a relation between screen media and trauma and whether trauma can revise theories considering the relations between fantasy, memory, temporality, and the subject.[18] She indicates that the term trauma has its roots in the nineteenth century and was developed in association with modernity, industrialization and electronic media. On the one hand, there have been refigurations of space and time by contemporary electronic technologies that only 'trauma' can describe, on the other hand television with its obsession for repetition and a culture of confession and witnessing may be an adequate medium to depict trauma.

Dori Laub, a psychoanalyst and founder of the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, writes about a Holocaust survivor who compares his memory with the movie *Apocalypse Now*. Traumatized individuals often have the impression that their own memory is like a movie that they watch from a distance. Because these experiences are "stored in a part of themselves, which seem to belong to someone else," they build "psychic containers," which are separated from other parts of the self.[19] The flashbacks are produced involuntarily and I would like to stress their similarities to film technology. Maureen Turim suggests that the temporality of trauma as a series of events and the subsequent flashbacks are strongly connected to modern technology, not only because of their seriality but also because flashbacks are abrupt, fragmented, and repetitive.[20] She assumes that "the cinematic presentation of the flashback affects [...] how audiences remember and how we describe those memories."[21]

Subsequently, the question arises if memory in the context of media technology, called "media-memory" by Thomas Elsaesser,[22] always follows traumatic patterns and how

this relates to the non-representability of trauma. Is the subject's relation to history and memory under the medial dispositive of television 'necessarily traumatic' as Thomas Elsaesser suggests?[23] Especially the hiatus and interruptions question continuity, regardless of whether they are traumatic or non-traumatic, fictional or real. According to Ronell, "one problem with television is that it exists in trauma, or rather trauma is on television."[24]

It's true that television is the medium of traumatic events, from the latest tsunami to terrorist attacks to airplane crashes. But does this also mean that television is able to give us a better understanding of how people deal with trauma? Even though some professionals support a therapy for traumatized people where the patient is asked to visualize the traumatic event like a movie, a method German therapists call "Bildschirmtechnik," Caruth cautions against the integration of the trauma into narrative form because of the risk of losing the incomprehensibility of trauma. She interprets trauma in a deconstructive way, which means that the incomprehensibility of trauma questions rationality and linear history. Regarding history, written as a history of trauma, she writes for instance "that a history can be grasped only in the very inaccessibility of its occurrence."[25] Trauma also questions the relation between reference and representation, because "mechanisms of consciousness and memory are temporally destroyed." [26] The breakdown of a sovereign consciousness and the fragmentation of rational conceived history question rational knowledge and self-mastery. "Obsessed with nightmares and the […] truth of the traumatic impact, this view valorizes a whole series of features in the traumatic experience: the unthinkable, lack of witnessing, numbing, the unrepresentable, absence of narrative and failures in language."[27]

Kaplan and Wang question this approach of the incomprehensibility of trauma in the humanities and instead interpret it as a symptom of withdrawal from the social field, which is at risk of ignoring the possibilities of working through and provoking historical change. Kaplan and Wang refer to Dominick LaCapra's examination of the distinction between acting out and working through, and believe that working through is an attempt of a breakout, "not completely freeing oneself from trauma, but in facilitating the subject's freedom by offering a measure of critical purchase on problems and responsible control which would permit a desirable change."[28] Their effort stems from a narrowly therapeutic framework and a focus on a cultural traumatic memory rather than an individual memory to find a place for a critical responsible agency. This effort requires the possibility of a working through and symbolization of trauma. They argue in favor of trauma as a cultural phenomenon and to re-insert history in the psyche, therefore the question "to represent or not represent" marks the allegedly opposition between a therapeutic and deconstructive point of view and a social, cultural and political point of view.[29] For Kaplan and Wang it is more important not to forget and erase traumatic events connected to modern history, rather than finding the most adequate representation of trauma.

Aside from the analysis that the modern and postmodern experience is necessarily traumatic, I would like to follow the suspicion raised in Kaplan and Wang not only about the links between trauma, visual media and modernity, but especially in a global and multicultural context of transnational media. "Cultural memory is subjected to relentless erasure by the transnational media driven by the logic of commodity and consumption," they write. Furthermore, "[t]he transnational media, with their soap operas, talk shows, disaster stories, glamorous geography, and historical dramas, are erasing traumatic memories of oppression, violence, and injustice in both metropolitan centers and developing countries."[30] In the following sections, I will examine two examples of transnational media, the Israeli television series *Hatufim* and its American adaptation *Homeland*. In this reading I am particularly interested in two processes of translation: first the translation of trauma into a television

narrative, and, second, in the temporality and the translation of a media product into another medial, cultural and national context.

BELATEDNESS IN *HATUFIM*

Hatufim is quite radical insofar as it deals with the unrepresentability of trauma. It tells the story of three Israeli soldiers who were held captive by Palestinians in Lebanon for seventeen years. The creator Gideon Raff said in an interview that he was indeed deeply interested in the real-life cases of returned prisoner's of war and did research in preparation for the show and also spoke to psychologists and former prisoners. His aim was to render the problems and trauma of these people more visible for the Israeli public.[31]

The series starts with the release of Nimrod (Yoram Toledano) and Uri (Ishai Golan), while the third soldier, Amiel (Assi Cohen), allegedly returns in a coffin. While the returnees are publically celebrated as heroes, they have great difficulties reintegrating into their family, social, and professional lives. Uri does not work at all and lives in his father's house, in his childhood room. In his absence, his fiancée has married his brother. Nimrod receives pocket money from his wife, Talia (Yael Abecassis), who waited for him but who also has problems to integrate him into her everyday life.

Given these circumstances, their lives does not seem heroic at all and the problems associated with their captivity don't stop with their release. Immediately after their release they are detained again ostensibly to attend a rehabilitation program but in fact they are interrogated by the IDF (Israel Defense Force). In this context they are forced to undress and are searched for traces of torture. Even though one of the agents claims to be a psychologist, he is very insensitive during the procedure: he simply asks which methods of torture caused which scars. In contrast to this interviewing technique in *Hatufim*, Dori Laub states that the "interviewer must participate from the beginning [...] He must offer himself as an object and must be prepared to be entirely present and prepared to participate in the task of experiencing. The interviewer must be within the traumatic experience even before the patient, where he has to wait for him patiently. Bearing witness happens in the form of dialogue as part of an interpersonal process."[32] The interviews with the POWs in *Hatufim*, however, don't have a therapeutic function. The interviewer is not interested in an interpersonal process; neither does he make any effort to participate in the traumatic experience.

Throughout the episodes, Uri and Nimrod do not talk about their experiences. Their silence is not untypical for trauma victims, but in the series it also has another function. To the audience it remains unclear whether they remain silent because they prefer to keep their experiences private, they don't remember, or they are trying to hide something. On the level of visual representation, however, the audience gets to see the content of their memory. The interviews are often interrupted by flashbacks, which mainly show the life and torture in prison. These short clips interrupt the continuous flow of the narrative.

I would like to briefly summarize some insights on the 'nature' of flashbacks in real psychic life in order to ask how they are related to film and television media technology. According to Freud, an event is traumatic if it overwhelms the energetic and homoeostatic balance and cannot be integrated in the psychic system. Doane's definition of crisis and catastrophe in television resembles that of Freud, positing it as a disturbance and condensation of temporality in a continuous flow;[33] furthermore, Ronell's diagnosis that trauma, as well as television, "point to paradoxes of temporal complexities," confirms that

definition.[34] Insofar the different temporalities of television – flow and disturbance of flow through condensation of time – seem to be adequate to represent the temporal and energetic experience of trauma and *Hatufim* with its aim to represent the pain of the former POW's uses exactly these temporal techniques.

After the interrogations by the IDF, the former POWs are forced to recall and restate their memories. After the IDF discovers that there are inconsistencies in the respective stories of Nimrod and Uri, the IDF agent Iris spies on Uri under the false pretense that she is in love with him. During their private encounters she asks a lot of questions, but Uri's emotional life seems to be more occupied with his former fiancée and he does not volunteer much information. Nimrod's wife Talia, who suffers from her husband's nightmares and his silence, also urges him to speak and arranges a meeting with a support group for victims of torture, POWs, and their relatives. Nimrod refuses to do any of the things suggested to him. Meanwhile, another ex-wife of a POW in the support group tells Talia that the reason for his behavior is that POWs relive captivity within the family to destroy it and to break free. Examples of these psychological explanations in the series can be found on the narrative level, specifically in the gaps of memory, and the discontinuity of the traumatic experience that is maintained when the former prisoners continue to behave as in captivity, forget what they did last night, or have several breakdowns.

On the visual level, Nimrod and Uri's 'lost memory' is represented. The series is excessive in its use of flashbacks and these flashbacks lead the audience, not the characters, to the 'truth' that the prisoners indeed try to hide. Under torture, Nimrod and Uri were forced to beat up the third prisoner Amiel and Nimrod believes that he actually killed him. Even though this event is shown several times as a subjective flashback of Nimrod, there is one scene in which the flashback is presented from a non-subjective point-of-view. Uri and Nimrod receive a tape from the widow of a Mossad agent and listen to it together in a car. Only now, in this almost last scene of the first season, the POWs and the viewers are shown what really happened: Amiel wasn't beaten to death but woke up from unconsciousness after Nimrod left. For the POWs this tape is shocking: while Nimrod always wanted to keep his secret and has strong feelings of guilt and shame, it turns out that other people knew and they knew more than them. As a result, Nimrod and Uri's trust in their own private memory is destroyed because they have been under surveillance all along not only by their capturers but also by Israeli secret agencies.

The audience, too, is in the position to know more, even though in this scene the truth is revealed belatedly both for the POWs and the audience. Although it is never revealed to the audience if the captives spoke or confessed under torture and if their torture serves its supposed purpose, the flashbacks of the torture scenes guide the audience to some 'truth' and follow a narrative of suspense: with each scene we get more information about what 'really' happened during their captivity until all is fully revealed at the end of the season. The audience always knows more than the characters, for instance when the captives are lying. When Talia asks her husband if he was sexually abused in captivity, he says no, but we see a flashback of a rape-scene.

Thus, the purpose of torture scenes, which only belatedly show what happened, seems to fulfill the audience's voyeuristic and interrogative desire to find out the truth. Julie Carlson and Elisabeth Weber write in the introduction of their book: "long-standing linkages between torture and truth have been discredited."[35] Despite this claim, *Hatufim* connects torture to truth on another level. Most positions, including pragmatic ones, agree that torture does not get at the 'truth' or "prosecute suspects," but that its goal is to destroy the tortured victims.[36] In addition to the truth-finding, suspenseful process that is connected to the

torture scenes, *Hatufim* also shows the destructive character of torture. First, the scenes are repeated almost excessively, especially that of Amiel's death. This repetition does not only seem to serve a "cinematic (or televisual) pleasure in torture that follows a sadomasochistic game of alternating sovereignty or subordination," as Shafik points out but also reveals the incomprehensibility of torture – why both characters are unable to reintegrate into society, and remain stuck in patterns of repetition.[37]

At the end of the first season it turns out that what Nimrod, Uri, and the audience took for the truth, is wrong. These "false memories" show the constructive character of belatedness. Already Freud discusses in relation to the famous case of the 'Wolf Man' and the primal scene that imagined 'memories,' which project later incidents to the past or never took place can have the same impact as real 'memories.' This is true for the perception of traumatic events that have been repressed and are only remembered later; here the unconscious can just as well produce 'false' memories. Furthermore, the 'truth' that surfaces belatedly in *Hatufim* is not the real truth. Amiel wasn't beaten to death; he is still alive and lives as a Muslim in Lebanon where he fights on the side of his former torturer. In the very last scene of the first season we see – while Uri and Nimrod hear – that Jamal, the leader of the group that caught the three Israeli soldiers, approaches Amiel after the beating and that Amiel asks him for help.

The second season reveals the purpose of torture, not that of truth finding but that of destruction, annihilation and disappearance. It also shows a different dimension of belatedness: the birth of a second identity, which belatedly annihilates the former identity of the prisoner. Amiel says about his life that he was born twelve years ago, before he was nothing. Carlson and Weber quote Jean Améry, a survivor of Nazi death camps, who writes, "The true purpose of torture is to drive the victim 'beyond the border of death into nothingness.'"[38] The encounter with death under torture is what literally happens to Amiel: he crosses the border of death, he is officially pronounced dead and "his" body is buried in Israel while he watches his own funeral on television. Interestingly, in the series he is not portrayed as a walking dead, rather he describes his former life in Israel and his history retrospectively as "nothing." We never see flashbacks of Amiel before his virtual death and "resurrection," the memory of his former life seems to be completely erased. The "traumatic interruption of his self-presence" never seems to let him regain a self-presence, the "nothingness" after his death through tortures replaces his past and his memory ends with his 'baptism,' his forced conversion to Islam, which returns in his frequent nightmares.

The flashbacks of his 'baptism' serve a similar function of representing the 'truth,' while they also show another aspect of torture: the torturer as parental figure. The CIA torture 'manual' KUBARK says about the role of the interrogator:

> In some lengthy interrogations, the interrogator may, by virtue of his role as the sole supplier of satisfaction and punishment, assume the stature and importance of a parental figure in the prisoner's feeling and thinking. [...| This ambivalence is the basis for guilt reactions, and if the interrogator nourishes these feelings, the guilt may be strong enough to influence the prisoner's behaviour.[39]

We never see flashbacks that show Amiel before he was 'turned', or rather, we see only flashbacks of the process of his 'turning.' For instance, there are repeated clips that show how Amiel is waterboarded while his mentor Jamal asks him for his name and expects to hear 'Yussuf', his new Arab name, instead of Amiel. Stephen Eisenmann writes that the practice of waterboarding, like "most forms of torture, is not [geared toward] the extraction of truthful testimony" but rather belongs to "emotional love approach" and has a quasi

religious meaning of "forced baptism" and moral suasion.[40] In Amiel's case, this forced adult baptism makes total sense: he must agree to both his new name and his new religion. On the other hand, the "forced baptism" does not make sense in this Muslim context, because there is no baptism in Islam and the question of conversion to Islam is complex, as in Islam there is the believe that everyone is Muslim at birth. A later conversion would simply be a belated return to an original religion.

We see a belated temporality in *Hatufim* in many ways, the belatedness of the traumatic memory, the belated annihilation of a former identity through the traumatizing torture and the conversion to Islam, which is a belated return to a primal identity.

We see a belated temporality in *Hatufim* in two ways, the belatedness of the traumatic memory on the one side and the belated annihilation of a former identity through the traumatizing torture. On the screen this deferred temporality is represented through repeated flashbacks. Beside the belated time structure I pointed out the form of repetition in the recurring nightmares and compulsion to repeat the behavior in captivity. The repetitive temporality is even more obvious in the American adaptation of the series, *Homeland*.

REPETITION AND DIFFERENCE IN *HOMELAND*

While the second season of the Israeli original was still in production, *Showtime* already began broadcasting the US adaptation of *Hatufim* as *Homeland* in 2011. The co-producers included Howard Gordon and Alex Gansa, who also ran the U.S. espionage-themed television drama *24* (nine seasons running from 2001-2010). The creator of *Hatufim,* Gideon Raff, was involved in the production, too. Even though *Hatufim* and *Homeland* are based on the same script, the plot and style are significantly different. With regard to genre and narrative alone, *Homeland* is a form of repetition and difference, in the sense of Linda Hutcheon's definition of adaptation as "a repetition, but repetition without replication."[41]

The process of adaption can be described as a form of translation from one cultural context to another; and this is even more important in the case of a transnational adaptation. Robert Stam claims "adaptations are inevitably inscribed in national settings."[42] The transfer of a format from one nation to another is more than just the import of an idea into another cultural context. Yuri Lotman describes this transmission as a dialogue: "Dialogic reception and transmission happens in the relationships between units at all levels from genres to national cultures."[43] Albert Moran proposes to use Lotman's semiotic theory to analyze television format adaptations:

> Lotman's theory […] particularly his notion of dialogue, offers [...] a dynamic view of the process of cultural exchange whether the exchange be that of program trade or format adaptation. Indeed [...] format adaptation is a kind of middle stage between text import and text export where the receiving culture is busy learning the new cultural language by developing its own version of textual models from the transmitting culture.[44]

I would argue that in regard to the topic of terrorist threats to the 'homeland,' its portrayal of the CIA trying to rescue and defend the nation, rather than mirroring *Hatufim*, *Homeland* is partly a continuation of *24*. The latter tells the story of a fictitious CTU (Counter Terrorist Unit), specifically of agent Jack Bauer (Kiefer Sutherland), and their fight against ever-new terrorist threats, drug cartel activities, and conspiracies. Each 24-episode season covers 24 hours in the life of Bauer, using the real time method of narration. The terrorist

threats produce a permanent state of urgency that forces the agents to drastic measures, especially torture of suspects. The state of urgency is superimposed by a digital clock, accompanied by a pounding sound, which evokes the sound of a heartbeat. It elapses before the commercial breaks in the most suspenseful scenes. Slavoj Žižek critiques *24* for representing torture as a possible option in the fight against terror. He takes an ethical approach to the sense of urgency created in *24*. The tremendous time pressure of the events makes the suspension of moral standards seem necessary. Agents and terrorists operate in a sphere beyond the law and do "what has to be done" by sacrificing their own bodily integrity and that of others.[45]

Ethical considerations are at the heart of Ronell's text about television.[46] Here, it is not simply the showing of images that Ronell marks as characteristic of television but rather the gap and the disturbance. Television's compulsion to repeat the gap has ethical implications:

> Among the things that TV has insisted upon, little is more prevalent than interruption or the hiatus for which it speaks and of which it is a part. The hiatus persists in a permanent state of urgency, whence the necessity of the series. The series, or seriature, extradites television to a mode of reading in which interruption insists, even it does so as an interrupted discourse whose aim is to recapture its own rupture.[47]

The interruptions in *24* frequently skip the scenes in which the victims of torture suffer the most. Although torture is explicitly shown, the moment of extreme pain is omitted. Thus, the inner reaction of the victim is rendered invisible and identification, empathy, and compassion become impossible. Exceptions are made in scenes where Jack Bauer is tortured, all of which are shown at full length.

Even though *Homeland* is not an adaptation of *24*, the series have some crucial aspects in common. The plot is embedded in the war against terror as well and one could read the figure of CIA agent Carrie Mathison (Claire Danes) as a continuation of Jack Bauer's character, who suffers from the burden of his duty while Carrie suffers from bipolar disorder. But she is confronted with a kind of doppelganger, the POW Nicholas Brody (Damian Lewis), who is found during a Delta Force raid in a prison in Iraq where he has been kept for seven years. Carrie is warned by an informant that a POW was turned by Al-Qaeda and she suspects that this POW is Brody. It is Carrie's bipolarity and Brody's double face, which brings psychological aspects into the series during the first two seasons. Instead of the repetitions of gaps and interruptions in *24*, *Homeland* gives the impression of a complete coverage and 24/7 surveillance, especially when Carrie factually monitors Brody's activities through cameras she has installed in his house. As in *24*, the focus of the plot lies in the investigator's life, while in *Hatufim* the focus rests entirely on the former prisoners. The prisoners are also portrayed differently. Brody is celebrated as a war hero, and, in comparison to his Israeli counterparts in *Hatufim*, he is able to fulfill this role. During his first public appearance, just after he steps on 'American soil' – a term which is used extensively in *Homeland* – again, he wears a uniform, there is a military parade, the vice president is present, and Brody gives a speech broadcasted on television. There seem to be no signs of weakness and lack of male virility, as Brody partakes in male rituals with his former partner, and, instead of 'failing' to have sex with his wife as Nimrod in *Hatufim*, he almost rapes her in the first night they reunite.

On the other hand, he, too, is immediately treated as a suspect: Carrie installs surveillance cameras in his house and observes him around the clock. From the very

beginning, the flashbacks of his time in captivity prove that he lies. On the occasion of his first interrogation, during which he does not have to undress but is 'only' questioned, Carrie asks him about the top terrorist Abu Nazir (Navid Neghaban), and, while Brody says that he was not in contact with Nazir, the audience sees images of Nazir giving Brody water. Brody also denies that he was with his former partner Thomas Walker (Chris Chalk), while we see in a flashback that it was apparently him who beat Walker to death, as Nimrod did allegedly to Amiel. After Abu Nazir forced Brody to beat his partner, he later comforts him after he breaks down crying. Abu Nazir seems to use the same method of punishment and comforting, carrot and stick as Jamal. Later it becomes clear that Brody does not only have feelings of love for Abu Nazir but also feelings of guilt: it turns out that his decision to work for Abu Nazir and his subsequent attack on the vice president were caused by the military operations of the United States itself, among them a drone attack that killed Abu Nazir's son, with whom Brody had a deep relationship.

The juxtaposition between captivity and torture in his prison—where it is always dark and dirty and he himself is dirty and has a long dirty beard and hair— and his 'rescue' by Abu Nazir—where everything is bright, clean and full of fresh fruit—is highlighted even more than in *Hatufim* and becomes less associated with violence. In addition, the washing ritual before prayer is represented widely in *Homeland*. Islam becomes associated with enlightenment, peace, privacy and purity, while Christianity is tied to a restrained and controlling community, politics, and the military (as seen, for instance, at the memorial for Tom Walker, but also on other occasions, such as church visits where everyone seems to control everyone else). However, Islam is also connected to terrorism. Not only has Brody become a Muslim, he has also turned into a terrorist. The series has been criticized for its depiction of Muslims as terrorists. But in contrast to most shows that belong to the genre that Yvonne Tasker calls "terror TV," in which political violence is often linked to Islam and people of Middle Eastern origin, the main suspect in *Homeland* is a white male war hero, although his conversion to Islam can be read as an indication of his terrorist activities. The category "Muslim" here is also associated with the characteristics mentioned above: purity, peace and privacy.

Even though the intention of *Homeland* and *24* is to show the patriotic battle against terrorism, I would argue that they present a mix of 'terror TV' in Tasker's sense and 'trauma TV' in Ronell's sense. Here is Tasker's definition of terror TV:

> The characteristic narrative and thematic elements of terror TV include the figuring of the United States as a nation under threat, personal bravery on the part of men and women operating in dangerous situations, deployment of racial and ethnic stereotypes alongside an evocation of the state itself as benignly multicultural, and a drive toward a somewhat perverse reassurance that the forces of the state can be relied on. The reassurance offered seems perverse for at least two reasons: first, because the heroic individuals represented are often viewed as at odds with authority, either in the form of their own agency or with other aspects of government; second, because reassurance seems to reside in a potentially disconcerting amalgamation of surveillance, forensics, and gadgetry, all of which work to keep the agencies dedicated to preserving homeland security informed about the movements of citizens and others. That "they" are watching seems intended as a source of both pleasure and reassurance. [...] Their capacity to witness and to manage trauma is itself reassuring because, it is implied, good people are watching. Thus, "the working-through and witnessing of trauma becomes itself a drama. In an extension of this reassuring authority, the necessity and virtue of state surveillance goes unquestioned in these shows.[48]

While I agree with this definition in regard to *24* and, for the most part, *Homeland,* I question whether Tasker's interpretation applies to the capacity to witness and to manage trauma as

reassuring authority, and the unquestioned acceptance of surveillance in *Homeland*.

It is interesting to note that Ronell's argument that television exists in trauma and trauma exists on television is connected to the aspect of surveillance. For Ronell, the medium of video surveillance is the site of the conscience and self-reflection of TV. While I cannot discuss this aspect of surveillance in all shows in further detail, I want to draw attention to some aspects of the surveillance scenes in *Homeland*. In *Hatufim* surveillance takes place mostly without video. But in *Homeland* video surveillance makes reference to our own voyeurism (for instance when Carrie observes Brody's private life and sexual activities) and to the discomfort of being observed, to the fact that we are at the same time both inside and outside and that television makes the home homely and *unheimlich* (un-homely or uncanny)[49] at the same time. The surveillance scenes in Brody's home make his home and activities uncanny, also his most innocent activities, "because the closed-circuit of surveillance can be only experienced in the mode of estrangement."[50] Ronell writes: "if TV has taught us anything, it is the impossibility of staying at home. In fact, the more local it gets, the more uncanny, not-at-home it appears,"[51] and this not-being-at-home is reflected by the POWs and partly by the character of Carrie. Perhaps this is what Raff meant when he said, the more local TV is, the more universal it becomes.[52]

What all the prisoners and torture victims in *Hatufim* and *Homeland* have in common is that they have lost their Heideggerian "Being-in-the-world," which Weber describes as "fundamental trust"[53] in relation what is lost because of torture and Heidegger calls a mental feature.[54] I have described how Uri and Nimrod have become unable to return to their former homes and loved ones, and how they are excluded even after their return.

This is even more the case for the 'traitors' Amiel and Brody. Weber writes about the treatment of 'confessing' torture victims as 'traitors' and how this perpetuates their expulsion from the world of the living. It "confirms how not only their bodies but also their minds and language have been turned into weapons against them."[55] In Brody's case he becomes a weapon against the US. As for Amiel, we don't learn much about what he does back in Israel, since he does not appear again until the very end of the second season, when we see flashbacks of his waterboarding and conversion again.

At the end of the third season of *Homeland,* Brody says he does not have a home anymore, and that he does not want to return to the US. In this season, he is a main suspect of an attack against the CIA and is publicly announced as such on television. With Carrie's help he flees to Venezuela where he is captured and tortured again. Thus, the third season is a repetition of the past. This time, however, Carrie believes that he is innocent. He gets rescued by the CIA again and works for them on a mission in Iran. But Brody is being celebrated as a hero who betrayed the US again, so the CIA wants him dead and sends a killer. When Carrie tries to rescue him one last time, he does not want to go with her. Brody dos not want to leave because he has nowhere to go – the US is not an option anymore.

Other scenes show that for him 'home' is wherever he finds a group of Muslims, for example in Caracas, where he visits a mosque and takes a shower (the association between Islam and purity again) or when he meets Abu Nazir's widow in Teheran. Whenever he creates a home, it seems to be in a Muslim community, even though some of the members of this community reject him, while others celebrate him, for instance in Iran, where he is considered a hero. Thus, Brody is stuck in a pattern of being captured and rescued, celebrated and expelled and there does not seem to be a way out of this compulsion to repeat. Compulsion to repeat is a usual symptom of trauma, especially when the traumatic incident cannot be remembered or integrated into the everyday life, as in Brody's case.

Besides the fact that this portrayal of an American war hero is quite unusual, as well

as the circumstance that he is hanged in Iran at the end of the third season while *Homeland* continues, the series shows that for some the homeland is not a comfort-home, even for those who defend it. For Brody, the repetition of captivity, torture, turning, and turning again ends in his death, while in *Hatufim* it remains unclear if Amiel still works for the Palestinians. It is the seriality of the TV media format that allows these turns and open-ends. The longer a series proceeds, the less its plot is connected to its origins, both in the sense of 'the national original' and the 'home' where the story started, because the characters are spread around the world; in *Hatufim*, the fourth season takes place in Pakistan and the fifth in Germany. As Ronell suggests, TV is "about being-not-at-home, telling you that you are chained to the deracinating grid of being-in-the-world. [...] We miss being-at-home in the world, which never happened anyway, and missing home, Lacan associates, has everything to do with being sick of *homme*."[56]

The question arises what the loss of 'being-in-the-world' of the traumatized POWs has to do with the homesickness and the being-not-at-home of the audience. Television which is consumed at home has the special relation to the un-homely, because it let the outside in, it is a "window to the world." With the world it also permits the horrors of the world to enter in the news of accidents, wars, terrorism, and catastrophes. Series like *Homeland* and *Hatufim* show the other side of these catastrophes, how human beings deal with them, which may remind the audience of their own hidden memories, which are already strongly connected to television, for instance everyone remembers on which television screen she/he watched the incidents on 9/11. As Elsaesser already analyzed: we can't separate a trauma from mediality, the images itself have a traumatic effect based on a gap "between the (visual, somatic) impact of an event or image and the (media's) ability to make sense of it, in order to make it enter into the order of the comprehensible and translating it into discourse."[57]

One can ask if the temporalities of trauma, the fragmentation, urgency, belatedness, and compulsion to repeat are less an attempt to represent trauma authentically, but rather tell us about the subject's relation under the medial dispositive of television in regard to history and memory which is 'necessarily traumatic.' For this reason the fascination with trauma on television and the compulsion of the audience to see it again and again might be an attempt to comprehend the trauma members of the audience themselves experience through television.

The question of whether television provides a true or false understanding of trauma leads in the wrong direction, because trauma also suspends the categories of true and false.[58] Gideon Raff explains that his intention was indeed a better understanding of the trauma of former prisoners of war and how society deals with it. It is questionable if the more action-packed series *Homeland* intended to address the issue of trauma, or means to erase traumatic memories, as Kaplan and Wang suspect. The shift from a psychodrama to a thriller is not necessarily an indication that trauma is not being taken seriously, because, as Janet Walker points out, we find ample topics that deal with trauma in the action genre: "being kidnapped, being taken hostage, terrorist attack, torture, incarceration as prisoners of war."[59] All these traumatic events take place in both series, but it is interesting that in *Homeland*, although it is a transnational product itself, the series conducts transnational encounters as per se traumatic, especially for US-Americans. The series implies that a contact of US-Americans with the Middle East leaves the subject unable to return to Western society. Hutcheon writes that transcultural adaptations often mean changes in racial and gender politics.[60] In the process of a global adaptation there does not seem to be willingness for a dialogue with the 'other' culture. Rather, this encounter is portrayed traumatic itself. This might be a symptom

of the trauma of the audience situated in a globalized technological world, but it also strengthens the assumption that this circumstance has to be traumatic.

REFERENCES

Carlson, Julie A. and Elisabeth Weber. "For the Humanties." In Julie A. Carlson and Elisabeth Weber, eds. *Speaking about Torture*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012.

Caruth, Cathy. "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History." *Yale French Studies*, No. 79, Literature and the Ethical Question (1991): 181-192.

Dienst, Richard. *Still Life in Real Time: Theory After Television*. Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1994.

Doane, Mary-Ann. "Information, Crisis, Catastrophe." In Patricia Mellencamp, ed. *Logics of Television: Essays in Cultural Criticism,* 222-239. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Elsaesser, Thomas. "Postmodernism as Mourning Work." *Screen* 42/2 (Summer 2001): 193-201.

Feuer, Jane. "The Concept of Television: Ontology as Ideology." In E. Ann Kaplan, ed. *Regarding Television,* 12-22. Frederick, MD: University Publications of America, 1983.

Freud, Sigmund. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. James Stracey, Vol. XVIII.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. London and New York: Routledge 2006.

Kaplan, E. Ann and Ban Wang. "Introduction: From Traumatic Paralysis to the Force Field of Modernity." In E. Ann Kaplan and Ban Wan, eds. *Trauma and Cinema. Cross-Cultural Explorations,* 1-17. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2004.

Laub, Dori. "Das Erzählbarwerden traumatischer Erfahrungen im Prozess des Zeugnissablegens." In Julia Bee, Reinhold, Johannes Kruse, and Elke Mühlleitner, eds. *Folterbilder und – narrationen: Verhältnisse zwischen Fiktion und Wirklichkeit,* 23-42. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2013.

Leys, Ruth. *Trauma: A Genealogy*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Lotman, Yuri. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. London: I.B. Taurus 1990.

Moran, Albert. *Copycat TV - Globalization, Program Formats and Cultural Identity*. Luton: University of Luton Press, 1998.

Radstone, Susannah. "Trauma and Screen Studies: Opening the Debate." *Screen* 42/2 (Summer 2001): 188-193.

Raff, Gideon. Studio Q. http://blip.tv/q-tv/homeland-creator-gideon-raff-in-studio-q-6718544.

Ronell, Avital. "TraumaTV: Twelve Steps Beyond the Pleasure Principle." In Diane Davis, ed. *The Über Reader: Selected Works of Avital Ronell*, 63-88. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007.

Shafik, Viola. "Rituals of Hegemonic Masculinity, Cinema, Torture, and the Middle East." In Julie A. Carlson and Elisabeth Weber, eds. *Speaking about Torture*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012164.

Stam, Robert. "The Theory and Practice of Adaptation." In Alessandra Raengo and Robert Stam, eds. *Literature and Film - A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*, 1-52. Malden, MA: Blackwell 2005.

Stephen F. Eisenmann, "Waterboarding: Political and Sacred Torture." In Julie A. Carlson and Elisabeth Weber, eds. *Speaking about Torture*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012.

Tasker, Yvonne. "Television Crime Drama and Homeland Security. From *Law & Order* to Terror TV in Cinema Journal." *The Journal of the Society for Cinema & Media Studies* 51/4 (Summer 2 012): 44-65.

Turim, Maureen. *Flashbacks in Film: Memory and History*. New York and London: Routledge, 1989.

Turim, Maureen. "The Trauma of History: Flashbacks Upon Flashbacks." *Screen* 42/2 (Summer 2001): 205-210.
Walker, Janet. "Trauma Cinema: False Memories and True Experience." *Screen* 42/2 (Summer 2001): 211-216.
Weber, Elisabeth. "Torture was the essence of National Socialism: Reading Jean Améry today." In Julie A. Carlson and Elisabeth Weber, eds. *Speaking about Torture*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2012.
Williams, Raymond. *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. New York: Schocken, 1974.
Žižek, Slavoj. "The Depraved Heroes of 24 are the Himmlers of Hollywood." *The Guardian* (January 10th 2006). http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2006/jan/10/usnews.comment.

Michaela Wünsch is currently a Marie Curie Fellow and visiting scholar at the Institute for Arts and Media at the University of Potsdam, Germany. She conducts a research project in Potsdam and at the University of California, Los Angeles, on transnational television, especially television series originated in Israel. Her further research interests include psychoanalysis and media philosophy. Her book the unconscious of white masculinity and edited books on Lacan's seminar on anxiety, the politics of queer space and the political of mediality have been published in Germany.
wuenschm@uni-potsdam.de

---

1 Richard Dienst, *Still Life in Real Time: Theory After Television* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 1994), 159.
2 Raymond Williams, *Television: Technology and Cultural Form* (New York: Schocken, 1974), 25.
3 Ibid., 105.
4 Jane Feuer, "The Concept of Television: Ontology as Ideology," in *Regarding Television,* ed. E. Ann Kaplan (Frederick, MD: University Publications of America, 1983), 15-16.
5 Mary-Ann Doane, "Information, Crisis, Catastrophe," in *Logics of Television: Essays in Cultural Criticism,* ed. Patricia Mellencamp (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 222.
6 Ibid., 223.
7 Ibid., 228.
8 Avital Ronell, "TraumaTV: Twelve Steps Beyond the Pleasure Principle," in *The Ueber Reader: Selected Works of Avital Ronell,* ed. Diane Davis (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2007), 85.
9 Sigmund Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle" in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. James Stracey, Vol. XVIII, 12.
10 Ronell, "TraumaTV," 85.
11 Doane, "Information," 229.
12 Ibid., 232.
13 Freud, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle," 34.
14 Ronell, "TraumaTV," 66.
15 Ibid., 72.
16 Ibid., 82.
17 Cathy Caruth, "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History," *Yale French Studies*, No. 79, Literature and the Ethical Question (1991), 181.
18 Susannah Radstone, "Trauma and Screen Studies: Opening the Debate," *Screen* 42/2 (Summer 2001), 189.
19 Laub, "Erzählbarwerden," 31. [my translation]
20 Maureen Turim, "The Trauma of History: Flashbacks Upon Flashbacks," *Screen Screen* 42/2 (Summer 2001), 207.
21 Maureen Turim, *Flashbacks in Film: Memory and History* (New York and London: Routledge, 1989), 5.
22 Thomas Elsaesser, "Postmodernism as Mourning Work," *Screen* 42/2 (Summer 2001), 198.
23 Elsaesser, "Postmodernism," 198.
24 Ibid., 72.
25 Caruth, "Unclaimed Experience," 187.

[26] Ruth Leys, *Trauma: A Genealogy* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 66.
[27] E. Ann Kaplan and Ban Wang, "Introduction: From Traumatic Paralysis to the Force Field of Modernity," in *Trauma and Cinema. Cross-Cultural Explorations,* eds. E. Ann Kaplan and Ban Wang (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2004), 4.
[28] Kaplan/ Wang, "Introduction," 6.
[29] This is an opposition made up by Kaplan and Wang, which I would not necessarily follow. I would argue that a deconstructive view on trauma also includes a critical aim to subvert narrative teleological patterns.
[30] Kaplan/ Wang, "Introduction," 11.
[31] Gideon Raff in Studio Q. http://blip.tv/q-tv/homeland-creator-gideon-raff-in-studio-q-6718544. (last seen: April 2 2015)
[32] Dori Laub, "Das Erzählbarwerden traumatischer Erfahrungen im Prozess des Zeugnissablegens," in *Folterbilder und – narrationen: Verhältnisse zwischen Fiktion und Wirklichkeit,* eds. Julia Bee, Reinhold, Johannes Kruse, and Elke Mühlleitner (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2013), 28. [my translation].
[33] Doane, "Information," 223.
[34] Ronell, "TraumaTV," 82.
[35] Julie A. Carlson and Elisabeth Weber, "For the Humanties," in *Speaking about Torture*, ed. Julie A. Carlson and Elisabeth Weber (New York: Fordham University Press 2012), 3.
[36] Ibid., 4.
[37] Viola Shafik, "Rituals of Hegemonic Masculinity, Cinema, Torture, and the Middle East" in *Speaking about Torture*, 164.
[38] Carlson and Weber, "For the Humanities," 4.
[39] Stephen F. Eisenmann, "Waterboarding: Political and Sacred Torture," in *Speaking About Torture,* 133.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (London and New York: Routledge 2006), 7.
[42] Robert Stam, "The Theory and Practice of Adaptation," in *Literature and Film - A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Film Adaptation*, eds. Alessandra Raengo and Robert Stam (Malden, MA: Blackwell 2005), 44.
[43] Yuri Lotman, *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture* (London: I.B. Taurus 1990), 144.
[44] Albert Moran, *Copycat TV - Globalization, Program Formats and Cultural Identity* (Luton: University of Luton Press, 1998), 173.
[45] Slavoj Žižek, "The Depraved Heroes of 24 are the Himmlers of Hollywood," *The Guardian* (January 10th 2006) http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2006/jan/10/usnews.comment. (last seen: July 3rd 2015)
[46] Ronell, "TraumaTV," 63-89.
[47] Ibid., 68.
[48] Yvonne Tasker, "Television Crime Drama and Homeland Security. From *Law & Order* to Terror TV in Cinema Journal," *The Journal of the Society for Cinema & Media Studies*, Summer 2012, 51, No. 4, 47.
[49] The usual translation for the German word "unheimlich" is uncanny, while "unhomely" is the literal translation.
[50] Ronell, "TraumaTV," 75.
[51] Ibid., 110.
[52] Gideon Raff in Studio Q.
[53] Elisabeth Weber, "Torture was the essence of National Socialism: Reading Jean Améry today," in *Speaking about Torture*, 92.
[54] Ibid., 75.
[55] Ibid., 92.
[56] Ronell, "TraumaTV," 110.
[57] Elsaesser, "Postmodernism," 197.
[58] Ibid., 199.
[59] Janet Walker, "Trauma Cinema: False Memories and True Experience," *Screen*, Summer 2001, 42.2., 214.
[60] Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 147.