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From Patriarchal Stereotypes to Matriarchal Pleasures of Hybridity: Representation of a Muslim Family in Berlin

Abstract
Sinan Çetin's blockbuster Berlin in Berlin (1993) is a Turkish-German co-production. In contrast to certain representational tendencies with German orientalism or Turkish occidentalism, it deconstructs the intersectional structures of migration, religion, and gender. The portrayal of religion in films about Turkish-German labour migration is a kind of cultural narcissism often projected into national cinema by denigrating the faith of the other and glorifying one's own religion. However, perspectives at such intersections are critical and require sensitivity in filmmaking, as films can create prejudice or help build peaceful relationships around these sensitive issues. The paper employs discourse analysis in linking Derrida's and some Islamic philosophers' notions of hospitality with characteristics of feminine societies. According to findings, the co-production deconstructs -reductive and stereotypical- traditionalist or, conversely, modernist representations in certain Turkish and German films. Berlin in Berlin features a heterogeneous and integrative portrayal of a matriarchal Muslim family with religious-ethnical practices and customs.
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Introduction

Turkish national cinema had its golden age between the 1960s and mid-1970s, after which it began to lose momentum rapidly. This period is similar to the intensity of Turkish-German labour migration. Because of the Turkish-German Labor Migration Agreement of 31 October 1961, millions of Turks immigrated to Germany as guest workers (gastarbeiter). Since then, Turks have become the largest immigrant ethnic group in Germany. The migration phenomenon has therefore played an essential role in many films in Turkish and German cinema. However, with the advent of private television channels, the influence of Hollywood and of some socio-economic and political factors, emigrant cinema also has become a rarely treated subject in Turkish cinema, once one of the world production competitors. On the other hand, the number of migration-themed films produced in Germany has increased over the years. Sinan Çetin’s Berlin in Berlin, which achieved considerable success at the box office in 1993, is an exception among Turkish films, as it attracted a great deal of attention among rare films about emigration in the 1990’s. Berlin in Berlin is a Turkish-German co-production, and deconstructs migration, religion, and gender structures, unlike many films that contain German or Turkish nationalist elements.

This study is necessary because some previous studies on Berlin in Berlin do not include an assessment of the intersections of gender and religious representation or a comparative analysis with earlier and later films. Films have the power to create prejudices about sensitive issues as a media instrument or
effectively establish peaceful relations. To help ensure such positive effects, institutions such as Euroimages and European Union’s Creative Europe MEDIA Programme, which provide film funding, have specific criteria for civic advancements. Certain filmmakers are also engaged in cooperating with the National Integration Plan in Germany. Therefore, filmmakers must pay attention to religion, ethnicity, tradition, and customs when portraying migrant people, who are often a minority in the countries where they live. On the other hand, emigrant cinema should be similarly cautious when depicting sensitive issues that are part of the majority culture of the host country.

This study aims to analyze the representation of the phenomenon of hospitality concerning gender roles, immigration, and religion by referring to glocal cultural codes. Religion, immigration, and gender roles can have both integrative and disintegrative representations and discourses in films. Here one can refer to Deniz Göktürk on Berlin in Berlin: “The film shines [...] through ironic and playful moments and was also able to afford the distanced perspective because it was largely produced outside of German funding structures.” Berlin in Berlin is one of the first films to present “the pleasures of hybridity.” In the words of Rob Burns, who argues about the danger of the tendency to represent and typecast an entire culture in the ‘Cinema of the Affected’ (Betroffenheitskino) as a wholistic construct:

The film Berlin in Berlin (1993) by the Turkish director Sinan Çetin marks a significant step in this shift away from the ‘cinema of the affected.’ This reference to the film’s European audience alludes to the commercial success Berlin in Berlin enjoyed in both Turkey and Germany, which in turn attests to the film’s
capacity to open up a plurality of spectatorial points of view and ‘provoke viewers of different cultural positionalities.’

This study questions the Turkish-German co-production Berlin in Berlin, as a representation of hospitality at the intersection of gender, religion, and ethnicity. In this light, it discusses how it differs from the orientalist and occidentalist approaches in earlier or later films. Since the film portrays a Muslim family, the theoretical section first explores the concept of hospitality: Jacques Derrida’s concepts of unconditional and conditional hospitality, their connection with the doctrines of the famous Islamic philosopher Mevlâna Celaleddin’i Rumi and feminine/matriarchal culture. Before proceeding to the main discussion on Berlin in Berlin, it is worth reviewing the literature on religious representations in Turkish and German cinema. The paper studies the elements of integration and hospitality in the film; the differences with the former “cinema of the affected” in terms of gender, the cultural diversity and religious representation of the matriarchal grandmother and other family members, and the glocality of hospitality. Therefore, discourse analysis is the method of this study, focusing on the actors’ behavior, the dialogues, and the cultural elements.

**Berlin in Berlin, The Plot Summary**

Mehmet, a second or third-generation Turkish immigrant, lives with his extended family in a flat in Berlin, Germany and works as a construction worker. The family resides in an area with a high density of migrant groups, and the
grandmother in particular, practices Islam. Mehmet is married to Dilber and they have a son, Mustafa. The film begins with Thomas, a German engineer working at the construction site where Mehmet works, gazing at people on the streets, taking pictures from a distance and without their knowledge. Thomas also secretly takes photographs of Dilber, who brings Mehmet lunch. When Mehmet sees her photos on the wall in Thomas’ office at the construction site, he suddenly goes crazy and starts beating Dilber. While Thomas tries to stop the violence, a building nail pierces Mehmet’s head, and he dies.

Authorities record this death as a workplace accident, but Mehmet’s brothers learn that the cause of death is not an on-the-job accident. Because Thomas has a guilty conscience, they hear him telling Dilber in Turkish, “I am not a murderer” on the street. Blaming Thomas for the crime, they hunt him down to kill him. While Thomas runs away in fear, he accidentally finds shelter in the house where Dilber and her husband’s family live. Mürtüz, the eldest brother of the deceased Mehmet, tries to kill Thomas out of revenge. However, the grandmother and her son, Ekber, and his wife interfere, reminding them of the traditions. According to their customs, a person who enters one’s house to apologize cannot be killed, even if he is an enemy. They cannot kill the guest of God. Submissive to his family and traditions, Mürtüz waits for Thomas to leave the house with his gun to kill him. Mürtüz is also sexually attracted to Dilber, his deceased brother’s wife, and attempts to abuse or marry her. Dilber believes that family members support such a “levirat marriage.” Apart from his murder attempts, other family members accept their fate with peaceful mourning.
During the forced stay in the house, the plot gradually shifts from negative emotions of hatred and resentment to integrative actions, such as Thomas learning a Turkish song from the grandmother, saving Mürtüz from being stabbed, celebrating a holy festival, dancing, and watching a football match together with family members. Their peaceful approach to Thomas and Dilber probably stems from not thinking he is a murderer. However, due to the Neo-Nazi attacks on Mürtüz and his brothers, Mürtüz resents him again and shows the family the photographs, saying that Dilber posed for Thomas. After days of captivity, Thomas and Dilber leave the house, saying goodbye to family members, and except for Dilber’s son and Mürtüz, no one reacts violently to this liberation.

**Unconditional Hospitality, Feminine Culture, and Integration**

Considering issues of immigration within the concept of hospitality and feminine culture can help to conceptualize *Berlin in Berlin*. Derrida divides hospitality into conditional and unconditional and idealizes unconditional hospitality. One can relate the concept of unconditional hospitality and love to the approach of Mevlâna Celaleddin-i Rumi, an important philosopher in the Islamic religion. Moreover, examples in other religions and cultures indicate that hospitality is glocal.

Derrida defines unconditional hospitality as giving the new arrival all of one’s home and oneself, without asking a name, or compensation, or the
fulfilment of even the smallest condition. He establishes a nexus between absolute hospitality, rights, laws, and justice:

The law of absolute hospitality commands a break with hospitality by right, with law or justice as rights. Just hospitality breaks with hospitality by right; not that it condemns or is opposed to it, and it can on the contrary set and maintain it in a perpetual progressive movement; but it is as strangely heterogenous to the law to which it is yet so close, from which in truth it is indissociable.

Pure and unconditional hospitality is open from the very beginning to both the unexpected and the invited, to the stranger, to all who come and all who are unknown, to everyone. What is unconditioned or absolute is in danger of becoming nothing unless conditions make something of it. Such an argument does not, therefore, completely polarize conditional and unconditional hospitality. These conditions, such as political and legal, allow us to understand that people construct boundaries and divisions, i.e., imaginary cultural constructions. At this point, one can think of Benedict Anderson’s concept of “Imaginary Communities” concerning national societies, and Amartya Sen’s concept of “Cultivated Singularity”. Imaginary societies and conditions of singularity make unconditional hospitality utopian or somewhat conditional. However, even conditional hospitality is preferable to leaving people in danger of starvation and death by not including them inside the imagined borders.

Since Berlin in Berlin focuses on the depiction of a Muslim family, Derrida’s concept of hospitality can be associated with the approach of Mevlâna Celaleddin-i Rumi, a Persian mystic, theologian, and Sufi poet who lived in Anatolia in the 13th century:
Come, come again, whoever you are, come!  
Heathen, fire worshipper or idolatrous, come!  
Come, even if you broke your penitence a hundred times,  
Ours is the portal of hope; come as you are.19

His poetry ties in with Derrida’s claim that the act of hospitality can only be poetic.20 Derrida’s understanding of hospitality includes Rumi’s ideas about a criminal, a sinner, or a non-believer. Rumi eliminates “self” and “otherness” with the following words, “Since you are me and I am you, why all this, you and me?” Also, Hacı Bektâşi Veli, another Sufi philosopher who lived in the 13th century, created an important environment of rapprochement between the Muslim and non-Muslim communities and different sects of Anatolia with his compatibilist understanding of Islam based on Sufi tolerance. The religion/sect/faith, period, and geography of the three philosophers are different, but they all recommend approaching and sharing rather than dividing.21

Today one can give examples of some recommendations of supranational-level organizations related to hospitality. The Council of Europe produced a white paper on “Intercultural Dialogue in European Societies today” which refers to discourses of integration in terms of hospitality. Hospitality imposes responsibilities not only on immigrants but on all sectors of society:

**Effective integration policies are needed to allow immigrants to participate fully in the life of the host country. Immigrants should, as everybody else, abide by the laws and respect the basic values of European societies and their cultural heritage. Strategies for integration must necessarily cover all areas of society, and include social, political and cultural aspects. They should respect immigrants’ dignity and distinct identity and to take them into account when elaborating policies.**22
Here, connections can be made between egalitarian, humane, and constitutional integration in terms of hospitality, mutual responsibility, and the requirement of dignity. It is also possible to link feminine social characteristics with integrated and more harmonized societies. According to Heide Göttner-Abendroth, matriarchy is not a reversal of patriarchy, with women ruling men. Matriarchal societies are mother-centered, based on maternal values such as caring and nurturing. They apply to everyone, so they are more realistic than patriarchal societies, and their principles aim to meet the needs of everyone with the highest benefit. Therefore, by looking at the segments of a society or a family, it can be inferred whether the matriarchal or patriarchal aspect is predominant.

Since integrative and inclusive discourses of men would also fit Geert Hofstede’s characteristics of feminine society, one can consider them together with the features of a matriarchal-feminine community. Hofstede classifies societies as masculine or feminine depending on the shared values in society. Where femininity is at the forefront, the human being is at the core of society. For this reason, these societies emphasize quality of life and value equality and solidarity. Feminine cultures prefer resolving conflicts through compromise and negotiation. Goettner-Abendroth observes that the organizational model in matriarchal societies includes social, economic, political, spiritual, and cultural levels. The matriarchal society selects its older female or male members — “mothers”, “grandmothers of their children”, “brothers of their mothers” and “brothers of their children’s grandmothers” — as advisers. Considering the
important differences in the families of feminine and masculine societies, similar parental role models, genderless modesty, children’s modesty, lack of aggression, and the importance of friends and acquaintances are values found in the matriarchal family in the film Berlin in Berlin. Being an advisor and conflict resolver makes the grandmother (and sometimes her son) in the film a social and political leader.

It is possible to associate the concept of unconditional hospitality more with feminine communities and a non-patriarchal perspective. Goettner-Abendroth shows that matriarchal societies are societies based on gender equality and reconciliation that actively promote peace and sustainability through well-designed guidelines. Cross-country studies show that people are happier in feminine nations that are also economically wealthy. Women in Africa possess and embody the critical skills, spiritual and social capital, human potential and moral imagination to transform conflict from violence to peace and make politics more human-centred. Throughout history, in patriarchal systems, men have mostly been the actors in various macro- and micro-level violent crimes such as wars, conflicts and domestic violence. If literature based on different countries shows the importance of women in building peaceful relations, it is important to open the discussion on matriarchy and feminine society. It was only possible to approach unconditional hospitality with the power and cooperation of women.
Women and Religion in Turkish and German Cinema

Since Berlin in Berlin is a Turkish-German co-production, it is worthwhile to look at migration-themed film trends in both countries in the context of migration, religion, and gender. Because it is crucial how the relations of matriarchy/patriarchy, Muslim/Christian, and woman/man are represented, this also allows us to relate the co-production of a (transnational) film with the concept of “hospitality” by considering the deconstruction of existing stereotypes.

The occidentalist elements of Turkish film production are mostly found in the 1970s with the re-glorification of Muslim and Turkish culture. For example, in the 1970s, Yücel Çakmaklı, one of the essential filmmakers of Turkish-Yeşilçam cinema, produced films that portrayed migration within the framework of Islamic conservative national cinema. These films include stereotypical portrayals of European seductive and alluring women and portrayals of Turkish Muslim women who are expected to behave according to sexual-moral standards. They are idealized in terms of domestic roles, Muslim religious practices, and motherhood (traditionalism) instead of dancing, having fun, drinking alcohol, substance abuse and having sexual freedom (associated with modernism). In Çakmaklı’s film Memleketim [1974, Turkey], for example, one sees the representation of Christianity through a Turkish woman who was horrified at a church wedding and gave up her marriage at the last moment. According to Alkın, it is possible to encounter dichotomous aesthetic discourses such as West/East, Christian/Muslim, man/woman, and
cathedral/mosque, e.g., Occidentalism, in Memleketim’s poster.33 In Alkı’s other study, Turkish films that contain emigration and contain occidental elements deal with re-Islamisation and re-Turkification in a religious and national context.34 One can observe a portrayal of a woman’s return to the religious values of Islam after a lifestyle that is considered sexually inappropriate in Yavuz Figenli’s Tövbekar Kadın [Repentant Woman] (1985, Turkey).35 Therefore, Turkish-emigration film tendencies not only glorify their own culture and religion but also negatively represent the religious and cultural elements of the Other.

On the other hand, (post)-migrant films have been increasingly produced in Germany, and orientalist representational tendencies have been found.36 Migrant and non-migrant communities are often represented as not living in harmony, based on the distinction between them and us. Rather than glorifying their own religious values (Christianity), such films often depict the modern, enlightened Self in opposition to essentialist representations of Muslim Turks, and they associate the culture of the disintegrated migrant with patriarchy.37 Since the headscarf represents religious diversity and a situation related to whether women are free to make decisions, its expression in films and the discourse developed on it are important. There are some relevant examples from German cinema. Burns and Göktürk point to Tevfik Başer’s film Farewell from a False Paradise [Abschied vom falschen Paradies] (1989, Germany).38 The headscarf represents the dependence and insecurity they endure. Losing the headscarf is either a symbol of degeneration in the new country, as in Shirin’s
case, or results in being targeted by tradition, as in Elif’s case. According to the patriarchal point of view of the antagonists in the film, degeneration means the corruption of Turkish migrant women's purity and honor due to contact with the modern West and liberation. For Göktürk, such gendered narratives reveal the victimization of Turkish women through oppression, enclosure, and prostitution, and their need of rescue from their patriarchal communities in Germany. Even though the representation of (headscarved) Turkish women in films produced in Germany tends to be associated with oppression and backwardness, there is still an underrepresentation of the headscarf, especially in the lead female actors in Turkish films even in 2023. Such a trend is most prevalent in mainstream television and online streaming series. On the other hand, there are also rare non-victim and stronger representations of headscarved women in the cinema of both countries other than the examples given above.

In short, religious representations and gender relations change depending on the era, social-cultural happenings, and developments such as migration, movements, changes in national or transnational audiences, funding institutions’ ideologic attitudes, and the directors’ perspectives. The politics of representation regarding the voluntary or forced practice of veiling, the portrayal of places and people associated with religion and hostile and hospitable attitudes recall the dynamics of matriarchy and patriarchy. Since Berlin in Berlin is a Turkish-German co-production, it distances itself from national representational tendencies and benefits from hybridity. As a result, it
moves away from the tendency of source and host countries to devalue and stereotype each other's religion in the representation of migration.

**Cultural-Religious Diversity in *Berlin in Berlin***

In *Berlin in Berlin*, one can observe cultural diversity in the family members’ religious practices and dress codes, dialogues with their German friends, approach to Thomas, emotional reactions, obeying customs, lifestyles, and entertainment dynamics. Such cultural diversity relates to humane and cultural values from local and global perspectives, positively or negatively.

In this film, the death of a family member at work is the most significant source of conflict. The problem of jealousy as the main reason for this conflict is globally prevalent in relationships between men and women. Monogamous marriages require loyalty commitments, and in many films or media, one sees domestic violence and femicide due to jealousy. In *Berlin in Berlin*, one does not see the woman’s murder, but it turns into a fatal accident for him as he inflicts violence on his wife out of jealousy. This occurs because the film’s male protagonist, Thomas, tries to save the woman from her husband’s violence. The subjects of the murder-conflict are the deceased Mehmet, his wife Dilber, and Thomas, who secretly photographed her. One cannot fully identify Mürtüz, who tries to take revenge on Thomas, as the evil figure in the film. Although he wants to avenge himself with murder and, in a way, uphold tradition, Mürtüz is not a born villain. Psychological layers of the trauma caused by the death of his brother (presumed by him to have been murdered) as well as racism and neo-
Nazi attacks against immigrants in Germany are also traces of the socio-psychological conditions of the time.

Mürtüz’s risk of killing Thomas, Dilber’s discomfort over his perception of her as unfaithful, and his sexual gaze on her are conflicts that run throughout the film. The grandmother, the oldest member of the house, prevents the conflict from becoming a crisis. There is a matriarchal structure in the household, with the role of the grandmother as the guardian of the customs and the obedience of the family members to the rules. Since she is the person who knows the mores best, the grandmother acts as a kind of teacher, spokesperson, and advocate. The most important rule the grandmother maintains is constructive, integrative and life-saving. In the film, we do not directly hear Rumi’s teaching, “Come whomever you are.” However, a similar Turkish proverb, “no sword rises for those who ask for mercy” is stated by the grandmother. She also says:

This guy is at the mercy of us. It is not for us to harm him in this house. He has come to our house to beg for mercy. If he dies before he leaves this door, it will be a black mark on our foreheads for years. He is our guest (...) We cannot force him out (...) Give him a plate of food, too.

Given Thomas’ remorse, the grandmother’s statement, “Conscience exists even in non-Muslims or unbelievers (gavurlar)” is significant. This may mean that she has broken with her prejudices and, on the other hand, that she did not previously know the people she considered unbelievers. It is reasonable to consider such discourse as religious representation.
The Spokesperson of the Patriarchy or the Matriarchy?

One must always ask whether the apparent matriarchy is a continuation and confirmation of the patriarchal system. In some films, women speak more than men; however, such a voice can also perpetuate patriarchy, when women suffer or fail to prevent an injustice. For example, in *Nur eine Frau* [A Regular Woman] (Sherry Hormann, 2019), the heroine’s mother blames her daughter and cannot protect her from domestic violence and murder. In *Davaro* (Kartal Tibet, 1981), a mother, who forces her son to kill because of a blood feud, supports the destructiveness of male culture even when she seems strong. However, the grandmother’s profession of honor in *Berlin in Berlin* does not contain any gender codes, so it is a feminine, integrative, and humane culture.

In *Berlin in Berlin*, regarding the pleasures of hybridity one sees a dichotomy of life and death with a first-generation migrant keeping Thomas alive, as custom demands, with the line “The guest of God is not killed when he comes to apologize.” Integration is achieved when the grandmother stops the grandson from killing and keeps the peace. Her sentence, “Thank God, we also have a German friend” as well as Thomas’s kiss on the hand of the grandmother and his attempt to express himself in the Turkish language are among the first signs of integration. German films often portray people with a first-generation migration background as silent, withdrawn, and submissive. There is also a general prejudice that older generations will be stricter about religious and cultural traditions. However, the matriarchal portrayal in *Berlin in Berlin* deconstructs the perception of a headscarf-wearing, first-generation
religious woman. It shows her readiness for peaceful relations in a multicultural society with high integration and transcultural attitudes.\textsuperscript{60}

Despite the life-saving qualities of the grandmother in \textit{Berlin in Berlin}, the employment of family members, and the generally rule-bound and peaceful life, some researchers have noted the family’s lack of integration into German society.\textsuperscript{61} The sexual freedom of the brothers-in-law and the sexual oppression of the widow can be seen as examples that oppose the sexual freedom of women in Germany. However, such a view tends to take a reductionist \textit{dispositif} approach to integration at the cultural level by focusing on their non-conformance to cultural norms.\textsuperscript{62} The legal, moral and humanitarian practices of all figures except Mürtüz integrate matriarchal and feminine social characteristics. Also, there are differences and degrees of cultural diversity in the family’s religious and ethnic cultural behavior. According to Pişkin, along with harsh customs such as blood feuds, the film director reveals that the people of Turkey have qualities such as hospitality and friendship that are not valued in the West.\textsuperscript{63} Pişkin's argument may be based on the scene in which Thomas is refused asylum by a neighbor in the apartment block, possibly of German or other origin. This scene is important because in Turkey, in an occidentalist mindset, the West is seen as inhospitable and more individualistic. Although it is a single scene, it is necessary to question whether this situation re-creates an occidentalist, reductionist and generalizing perception of hospitality because hospitality in various religions/cultures is also a virtue and a moral responsibility.\textsuperscript{64}
Glocality of Hospitality and Gains of Migration

*Berlin in Berlin* reflects on the glocality and difficulties of Derrida’s concept of hospitality with the understanding of the “guest of God” in Turkish-Muslim customs. The fact that the film ends with liberation instead of killing the protagonist shows its unique hybrid approach to the opposing concepts of honor/love, revenge/friendship, hostility/hospitality, guilt/innocence, and violence/peace. Considering the family at the micro level, the gains of migration are positive-integrative indicators such as saving lives, becoming friends, falling in love, taking in each other’s culture, and learning from each other. However, traumatic, and evidence-based issues create certain unfavorable conditions and pose challenges for hospitality.

As a non-migrant background person and guest, Thomas saves Mürtüz at his own risk when he is about to be stabbed by the boyfriend of a girl with whom Mürtüz has had sexual encounter. This is an achievement of migration at a micro level. The transformation of Mürtüz, who feels the most decisive impulses for revenge in the house, begins from this point on. They start to learn about each other’s culture, especially as the guest learns about the host’s culture. Furthermore, they enjoy celebratory activities such as music, dance, and feasting. Thomas’ hand-kissing on religious holidays, the grandmother’s teaching how to kiss a hand as respect, and the singing of Turkish songs reflect Anatolian culture.

When Dilber leaves the house, kissing the hands of family seniors is more a farewell sign than an escape, although some family members are
offended. No one dies when Dilber leaves the house with Thomas, but this departure is reminiscent of the discussion of the white savior complex in some earlier films like *Yasemin* (Hark Bohm, 1988) and *Die Fremde* (Feo Aladağ, 2010). Finding the ending slightly forced, Göktürk wonders if, once again, this is a Turkish woman liberated by a German man. However, she is not silent and expresses herself: “Mürtüz (...) You don’t have the right to kill me. I don’t even know him. Let me go. I am leaving on my own.” According to Rob Burns, the ending of *Yasemin* is open to more ambiguous readings:

First, none of the women in *Berlin in Berlin* appears as the passive victim such a model of liberation presupposes. Furthermore, while Dilber may lack the matriarchal authority that the grandmother exercises over her household in resisting the family’s expectation that she should welcome the solicitations of her deceased husband’s brother, she nevertheless asserts her right to follow her own sexual preferences.

By synthesizing the views of Göktürk and Burns, one can interpret them in two different directions; it is possible to develop an argument for considering friendship, marriage, and partnerships between different ethnic groups as all possible indicators of integration. Whether Dilber and Thomas will marry at the film’s end is unclear. However, when two adults from different ethnicities are set on a path to build a new life together, it is an attempt at integration. Dilber’s self-expression and her mother-in-law’s confidence in her loyalty reveal more of Dilber’s individual choices. Hospitality also means letting someone go. Not allowing a woman to go or harming her is not hospitality when she wants to leave.
Some aesthetic details of Thomas’s conditional guest status are available. A low camera angle from the perspective of Thomas, and the fact that he always sits on the floor, gives him a subnational captive identity within the house and brings him closer to conditional hospitality. Such a stay can be related to the fact that refugees often survive in worse socio-economic conditions in the countries of asylum than most members of host countries. Close-ups allow the viewer to identify with the characters and to get to know them better while making the space appear small. Sometimes Sufi or oriental melodies are heard in the off-screen music to construct meanings such as danger or tolerance according to the scenes.

Paradoxical concepts such as hospitality and blood feuds occur worldwide but may exhibit local geographical, anthropological, and cultural differences. For example, in Buster Keaton’s comedy film Our Hospitality (1923), there is a tradition of not killing guests, parallel to that in Berlin in Berlin. Our Hospitality features a feud between the Canfield and McKay families. The mother and the aunt of the protagonist (Willie McKay) decide to put an end to this feud in the beginning of the film and migrate to New York. The Canfield family hosts Willie by mistake, and when they realize this they do not kill him out of a sense of hospitality. Therefore, we can find examples globally of the notion that even in the context of a blood feud, a person who has found refuge cannot be killed. We can also see this theme in Indian films, e.g., SS Rajamouli’s Maryada Ramanna (2010), Ashwni Dhir’s Son of Sardaar (2012) and Suresh Divakar’s Ivan Maryadaraman (2015). In Maryada
Ramanna (2010), a similar theme of feuding is depicted; killing is forbidden in the house, and the guest can only be killed if he or she leaves the house, as is the case in Our Hospitality and Berlin in Berlin. In the similarly themed Son of Sardaar, a woman’s determination to end a blood feud involves a feminine-peaceful approach. Therefore, examples from different geographies reveal the global nature of blood feuds, the principle of not killing the visiting enemy and the role of women in ensuring peace, considering local and migration dynamics.

In Berlin in Berlin, unlike many earlier and later films, there is a matriarchal and tolerant portrayal of Islamic religion. Even if no other religious references occur, the characters develop a cultural awareness of compassion for non-Muslims. The fact that the family is made up of individuals with different views on the level of religious practice represents the cultural diversity within the family; there is no significant conflict while this diversity is sustained. The conflict here is more related to the disappointment and anger of a family that has lost a loved one unexpectedly and at a very young age when they are unsure if Thomas is his murderer. The traumas following a death/murder make the issue a global one, found in all cultures.

**Conclusion**

This article explored the film Berlin in Berlin in relation to matriarchy, feminine culture, integration, and the concept of hospitality. In the concept of unconditional hospitality, the difference between “them” and “us” should be as slight as possible, even non-existent. The image of the Other or the person alien
to the group is ideologically shaped by religious discourse and representations in Turkish and German films in the migration context. However, a discourse of hospitality is the central theme in the Turkish-German co-production *Berlin in Berlin*, and no religion is denigrated.

Even if it is utopian to grant the unconditional hospitality of Derrida, especially in today’s societies, one can at least question how low the conditional level of hospitality is. Also, since cultures are not entirely patriarchal, matriarchal dimensions should be considered. Hospitality also exists in *Berlin in Berlin*, but it is not completely unconditional. The male protagonist finds a shelter, like a refugee, and as God’s guest—but only through a conditional, matriarchal, and feminine continuation of Rumi’s acceptance does the guest survive, being integrated into the family life. The difficulties of an integration process show the need for a feminine and matriarchal approach at the social, political, spiritual, and cultural levels.

Evaluating the concept of hospitality in religion and gender in the film *Berlin in Berlin*, Derrida’s concept of hospitality and a feminine, matriarchal cultural representation, as well as its destabilizing and deconstructive quality, come to the fore. As in many other religions, patriarchy is a widespread ideology in Islam and is often presented with an orientalist approach in Western films. However, one can see the reflection of matriarchy in Eastern societies and should observe it in films. Being careful about occidentalist or orientalist attitudes is essential when discussing all religions. In *Berlin in Berlin*, religious and ethnic hospitality and glocal hospitality can be linked to the approach of
keeping an asylum seeker or prisoner alive. The forgiveness of a first-generation Turkish-Muslim immigrant in Berlin who wants to keep a person alive instead of carrying out a cultural penalty or revenge by killing is an important detail, focusing on the integrative side of culturally specific religious values, and the inclusive, constructive, and respectful hospitality of the female culture. As a result, a Turkish-German co-production, Berlin in Berlin deconstructs patriarchal and disintegrated stereotypes and provides a matriarchal proposal for hospitality and integration.

1 If we take the boom in erotic productions into account, Turkish film production was still high until the 1980s. However, the number of general audiences watching films with their families in the cinema has decreased. For example, from 1974 onwards, Giovanni Scognamillo, Türk Sinema Tarihi (İstanbul: Kabalı Yaymevi, 2003) associates the decline in film production for the general audience and gives the example of 1979; 131 of the 195 films were “sex films” in this year. Also, with the end of sex film productions due to political/social pressures, the number of films with many themes decreased to 68 in 1980. This data is found on pages 178-183.

2 Gastarbeiter, meaning guest worker, is a German-derived term. It originated in West Germany in the 1950s in the context of a highly demanded temporary widespread workforce from abroad. Still, with the permanent settling of guest workers there, the definition evolved into “foreign workers”, “foreign citizens”, “immigrants”, and “individuals with a migration background”. Berlin in Berlin’s period in (the 1990s) fits the definition of foreign citizens or immigrants.

3 In addition, after the 2010s, the Turkish TV series sector regained the momentum it had lost in film production by rising to the first ranks in TV series exports.


Deniz Göktürk, “Migration und Kino—Subnationale Mitleidskultur oder transnationale Rollenspiele?” In Interkulturelle Literatur in Deutschland, ed. Carmine Chiellino (Heidelberg: Springer, 2000a), 339.


Burns, “From Two Worlds to a Third Space: Stereotypy and Hybridity in Turkish–German Cinema,” 64–76.

Rumi is a universally honoured philosopher of religion; for example, UNESCO declared 2007 as the ‘Year of Mevlâna Rumi’ in honour of his 800th birthday.


One can also compare the rise of women’s voices in the 1980s with those in other countries. For a related study, see Robert Kolker, *Film, Form, and Culture* (Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2016). The rise of women in films is not specific to a country/region, and geographical comparisons of certain trends in films may provide some clues in further studies.

The Turkish female name Dilber means “very beautiful, very attractive (woman).”

*Levirat* refers to a woman’s marriage to her brother-in-law after the death of her husband. The findings of Ayşan Sever and Mazhar Baglı’s interviews with women who have been involved in levirate marriages are significant, “Levirat & Sororat Marriages in Southeastern Turkey: Intact Marriage or Sanctified Incest,” *Women’s Health and Urban Life*, 5, 1 (2006), 27-47. In their interviews in southeastern Turkey, the researchers found that levirate marriages create tensions and trauma, especially for women in establishing sexual intimacy with their new partners.


Amartya Sen recognises that the reductionist cultivation of singular identities is responsible for global violence. Understanding the plurality of our identities can be a huge force in fighting against the incitement of violence based on a singular identity, especially religious identity, in today’s disturbed world. “Violence, Identity and Poverty,” *Journal of Peace Research*, 45, 1 (2008), 7,11.
Many sources attribute this poem to Rumi, and it is often quoted.

Derrida, 2000, p. 2.

Some studies examine the concept of conditional love in terms of integrative attitudes in societies and immigrants. For more information on the concept of conditional and unconditional love, see Jose C Yong, Lile Jia, Ismaharif Ismail and Peiwei Lee, “Conditional Love: Threat and Attitudinal Perceptions of Immigrants Depend on Their Instrumentality to Locals’ Basic Psychological Needs,” Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 47, 12 (2021); Kimiko Inouye, “Conditional love; representations of migrant work in Canadian newsprint media,” Social Identities 18, 5 (2012).


Hofstede, Culture’s consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations, p. 306.


Yücel Çakmaklı’s most important films related to this argument are Birleşen Yollar (1971), Oğlum Osman (1973), Memleketim (1974).

For example, also, in Mehmet Dinler’s Kara Toprak [Black Soil] (1973), the gendered honour of the stereotypical blonde European woman (Helga) is disputed in the homeland village, and Helga is assigned a seductive and alluring role. Ömer Alkın provides a detailed analysis of such reproductions, see Die visuelle Kultur der Migration Geschichte, Ästhetik und Polyzentrierung des Migrationskinos (Bielefeld: Transcript, 2020), 266-271.

Leyla, the leading actress, is alienated from her culture due to the education in Europe and attitudes of her modern family and becomes a Westophile. During her music education in Vienna, she meets Mehmet, who is attached to her religious-ethnic roots. Mehmet will return to his country after finishing his medical degree and work as a doctor. The two start a relationship, but their relationship ends due to cultural conflicts. After a while, Leyla, who has become disenchanted with Western culture and starts to feel lonely, returns to Turkey following Mehmet and starts to love her own culture.

In such films, the mosque represents Islam, and the cathedral represents Christianity. Alkın, in Die visuelle Kultur der Migration Geschichte, Ästhetik und Polyzentrierung des Migrationskinos argues that in this film poster, the two people do not look at each other. The man, with the famous Selimiye Mosque in Turkey in the background, is holding his arms towards the blond woman while the woman, with the famous Paris Notre Dame Cathedral in the background, extends her arms in front of him as a gesture that conveys her readiness to receive
something that comes from just above the poster. His careful analysis of the film is found on page 450. In the cathedral scene in the film, the leading actress is driven to distress at the wedding—this is an existential religious sickness. No Christian or clergy member does anything bad to her, but the sound of the organ, choir and bells and some icons and camera movements give an irritating feeling about the religion—then she feels the need to return to Turkishness and Islam.


35 The leading actress in the film Tövbekâr Kadın (Repentant Woman) is the famous singer Bülent Ersoy, one of Turkey’s first popular transgender singers, who has also appeared in several films. In the 1980s, after the military coup, she experienced political problems because of her sexual orientation. This film tells the story of a famous and beautiful woman who becomes alienated from herself as a sex-worker and photo-model and repents and turns to Islam after the restlessness of a materialistic life. The film is set in Germany as a location. Also, in some historical Turkish films—for example, Battal Gazi Destanı (Atif Yılmaz, Zeki Ökten 1971), Karaoğlan (Suat Yalız, 1965), Malkoçoğlu (Süreyya Duru, 1966), Tarkan (Tunc Başaran, 1969), Karaoğlan Bizanslı Zorba (Suat Yalız, 1967)—it is possible to find examples of the brutal male portrayal of Christian religious officials, especially in Byzantium. On the other hand, one can notice in Turkish cinema a more positive, constructive portrayal of Christianity in Nihat Durak’s Kapı [The Door] (2019) and, especially in terms of the cultural proficiency transition, as well as the portrayal of Judaism in a Netflix series Club (Seren Yüce and Zeynep Günay Tan, 2021).

36 Sherry Hormann’s Nur eine Frau (2019), Feo Aladağ’s Die Fremde (2010), Hark Bohm’s Yasemin (1988), and Tevfik Başer’s Abschied vom falschen Paradies (1989) are examples of such films. For detailed information see Rahime Özgün Kehya’s doctoral thesis, Representation of Women in German & Turkish Films in the Context of Migration and Integration (Eskişehir: University of Anadolu, 2022).


38 In the film Abschied vom falschen Paradies, the heroine kills her husband because of his violence and rape. In the prison she learns German and makes friends. Prison is metaphorically a paradise as it provides security of life by escaping from patriarchal violence.

39 Shirin is the heroine of the German film Shirins Hochzeit (Helma Sanders-Brahms, 1976) which tells the story of a young Turkish woman who escapes from a forced marriage in Turkey to pursue her childhood sweetheart, who has emigrated to Germany. This film shows the exploitation of migrant workers, women being subjected to male violence and rape, and the leading actress being forced to become a sex worker.

40 Elif is the female lead in Abschied vom falschen Paradies.

41 “From Two Worlds to a Third Space: Stereotypy and Hybridity in Turkish-German Cinema,” 273.

42 “Turkish Delight–German Fright: Unsettling Oppositions in Transnational Cinema,” 186.


45 An exception to these series is Berkun Oya’s Bir Başkadır (2020), a Netflix series with high ratings. The television series Kezileş Şerbeti (Hakan Kuvavac, 2022- still) is another example. 

46 For various studies see Ersin Aycan, and Sadık Çalışkan, “A Study on Woman Activists of Bir Başkadır,” İnönü Üniversitesi Kültür ve Sanat Dergisi, 7, 1 (2021), 257; Rahime Özgün Kehya, “Buket Alakuş, Integration Film Director in German-Turkish Cinema,” Diyalog Interkulturelle Zeitschrift Für Germanistik, 11, 1 (2023a); Rainer Tittelbach, Anam – Meine Mutter - Kritik zum Film - Tittelbach.tv, 18 February 2013, accessed April 16, 2022, http://www.tittelbach.tv/programm/kino-koproduktion/artikel-2346.html. Despite the general tendency towards negative representation, it is possible to reconcile some images of confident headscarved women, albeit exceptions, with the characteristics of feminine society. For example, Buket Alakuş’s Die Neue (2015) is based on the conflict of whether the religious orientations and freedoms of Sevda, a student with a migration background who wears a türban, are recognised in a cosmopolitan high school classroom environment. In 8 Saniye [8 Seconds] (Omer Faruk Sorak, 2015), a Turkish-German co-production, religious spaces positively represent cultural diversity in terms of gender. In this film, no religion is denigrated. See Kehya, Beyaz Perdede Göçün Kadınları. There are also other exceptions in Germany that do not associate the practice of wearing the headscarf with oppression and dependency. For example, Türkisch für Anfänger (Bora Dağtekin, 2006-2008), and Einmal Hans mit scharfer Soße (Buket Alakuş, 2013). These films are characterised as integration comedies in Germany.

47 For example, that the grandmother is a devout Muslim is evident from the fact that her alarm clock is a model of a mosque for morning prayers, the religious symbols and holy books hanging on the house’s walls and sometimes off-screen Sufi music. One sees an illuminated environment when the grandmother wakes up to the prayer call. This lighting usually expresses joy, vitality, peace, or happiness and positively portrays Islam and its followers. Such aesthetic detail is noteworthy as there is a tendency to create a dark and depressing atmosphere in public spaces such as mosques and private spaces such as homes in the representation of Muslims—highlighting patriarchy—in immigration films in German cinema. See Alkin, Die visuelle Kultur der Migration Geschichte, Ästhetik und Polyzentrierung des Migrationskinos; Kehya, Beyaz Perdede Göçün Kadınları; Kehya, Representation of Women in German & Turkish Films in the Context of Migration and Integration. In Berlin in Berlin, the religious signs do not contrast with the grandmother’s character, who is integrative, tolerant, and humane; on the contrary, they integrate positively with each other.

48 It is possible to speak of a matriarchal family structure more in line with the social, cultural, and spiritual model of Goettner-Abendroth, Heide. “Matriarchy,” 2012. Also, see the explanations under the subtitle of this paper, “Unconditional Hospitality, Feminine Culture, and Integration.”

49 The subconscious effect of the off-screen Mevlevi-Sufi music heard from time to time, which creates a third dimension, can be directly substituted for dialogue here.

50 In Turkish: Aman diyene kılcı kalkmaz.

51 In Turkish: Bu herif ocağımıza dönüşmüşti. Bu evde ona dokunmak bize düşmez. Evinime aman dilemeye gelmiş. Şu kapıdan çıkmadan ölürse yıllarca almıza kara lekedir. Bizim misafirimizdir. (…) Zorla çıkartamazız. (…) Bir tabak da ona verin.”
The word Gavar is used in Turkish for a non-Muslim, especially a Christian, European, Westerner or heathen. As a slang metaphor, it is often slang for people considered ruthless and merciless.

Nur eine Frau [A Regular Woman] (Sherry Hormann, 2019) has a predominantly orientalist representation in the context of religion and gender. The heroine takes refuge in her family’s flat in Berlin to protect herself from her husband’s violence in Turkey. However, she leaves with her infant son because her parents’ house is too small for a large family, and her freedom is restricted under patriarchy. Her family considers it dishonourable that she leaves home, works, and no longer wears the headscarf, and one brother kills her. Kehya, Beyaz Perdede Göçün Kadınları, states that the mother is also more vocal than the father, but this does not make her matriarchal because she defends patriarchy and serves the disempowerment of her daughter. This data and its interpretation are found on pages 104-109.

This Turkish film tells the story of a young man from a village who returns from Germany after working and saving money and what happens when his mother pressures him to kill the person with whom they have a blood feud.

Sarita Malik uses this description of “the pleasures of hybridity” to go beyond the documentary aesthetics of the 1970s in Britain, which narrated the social problems of immigration from a mission perspective to the dynamics of black film in the 1980s and 1990s. “Beyond “The Cinema of Duty”?: The Pleasures of Hybridity: Black British Film of the 1980s and 1990s,” in Dissolving Views: Key Writings on British Cinema, ed. Andrew Higson (London: Cassell, 1996). In the 1990s, this description was also used to describe the film milieu produced by directors of Turkish origin in Germany.

In Turkish: Özür dilemeye gelen tanrı misafiri öldürlmez.

In Turkish: Çok şükür bir de Alman dostumuz oldu.

In Muslim populations, kissing hands is a customary gesture to express respect of the younger for the older.


Such an astonishing, tolerant, and integrative portrayal of first-generation grandparents is presented in Yasemin Şamdereli’s film Welcome to Germany (Almanyada, Willkommen in Deutschland, 2011), produced to mark the 50th anniversary of Turkish-German migration.


Pişkin, Beşeri Bilimler, 60-61.

Countries’ levels and approaches to hospitality at the macro level are related, among other factors, to hospitality and hostility towards asylum seekers and refugees among today’s displaced people.

66 Kehya, Beyaz Perdede Göçün Kadınları, 2023b, p. 81.

67 This happens after about sixty per cent of the film is finished.

68 The White Saviour complex is often portrayed in popular culture as the desire and sense of superiority of the Self (White), who sees himself/herself as modern and advanced, to help and elevate Others (Non-White) who are supposedly archaic or victimised. For more information, see Felix Willuweit, “De-construcing the ‘white saviour syndrome’: A manifestation of neo-imperialism,” E-international Relations (2020); Kysa Nygreen, Barbara Madeloni, and Jennifer Cannon, “‘Boot Camp’ Teacher Certification and Neoliberal Education Reform,” in Neoliberalizing Educational Reform America’s Quest for Profitable Market-Colonies and the Undoing of Public Good, ed. Keith M. Sturges (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 2015), 116–117.


70 Burns, “From Two Worlds to a Third Space: Stereotypy and Hybridity in Turkish-German Cinema.”


References


Yardımcı, Deniz Günsel. *The Representation of Turkish Immigration to Germany in German, Turkish German and Turkish Cinema*. Egham: Royal Holloway, University of London, 2017.