

6 Trauma, Testimony and the Survivor: Calling Forth the Ghosts of Bosnia-Herzegovina

STEPHENIE YOUNG

'Why have the Jews been killed?'¹

I

Claude Lanzmann, the director of *Shoah* (1985), believes that there are tremendous risks in asking a question such as the one posed above, and perhaps even more in believing that a single answer exists. To ask such a question, to seek to place an historical moment such as the Holocaust into explanatory terms, is to take part in what Lanzmann calls an 'obscene' practice.² For Lanzmann, 'there is an absolute obscenity in the very project of understanding', and not seeking to understand was the philosophy by which he lived throughout the eleven-year process of filming *Shoah*.³

Setting new parameters about what testimony is, and how it should be recorded, relayed and studied, *Shoah* sets an historical precedent by repositioning the ways in which we have thought about testimony over the past 25 years or so. The film underscores an awareness of the responsibility that comes with listening to testimony, and the ethics involved in relaying or transmitting the traumas of others to an audience. Lanzmann's film also illustrates Shoshana Felman's assertion that in the transmission of testimony, the 'truth' relies heavily on the process of art for 'its realization in our consciousness as witnesses'.⁴ As he became aware of his responsibility as a witness, and the role of his art in the transmission of testimony, Lanzmann realized that he must approach the subject of the Holocaust with as few presuppositions as possible about what is real and what is false, what is truth and what is fiction, what is moral and what is immoral.

The task of 'presuming not to know' led Lanzmann to practise 'blindness', which he understands to be the 'purest mode of looking'.⁵ 'Blindness' is a way of conceptualizing how we bear witness to testimony by facing our subject

with the admission that we may never understand his or her experience. We must be sensitive to our subjects, but also willing to confront the limits of our own understanding as we engage with the survivor's testimony. The process of making the film is a transmission, a creation of testimonial space, and Lanzmann insists that the '[...] act of transmitting alone is important and no intelligibility, that is, no true knowledge, preexists the transmission. It is the transmission that is knowledge itself.'⁶ The transmission itself – the exchange between the survivor and the secondary witness, in this instance, through the medium of film – is the arbiter of the modern testimonial.

In his controversial essay 'Lanzmann's *Shoah*: "Here There Is No Why"', Dominick LaCapra makes the claim that Lanzmann's '[...] self-understanding and commentary give priority to his personal vision of the film as a work of art', bringing to the foreground the need for further examination and discussion of the ethics involved in translating testimony through an artistic medium.⁷ I wish to take up these issues surrounding Lanzmann's concept of the 'obscene' and examine the relation between the filmmaker/witness and the survivor in *Calling the Ghosts* (1997), a film directed by Mandy Jacobson and Karmen Jelincic about two female survivors of rape in Bosnia.⁸ I am concerned with the process of how we listen to testimony and I question whether we can place what we hear into a coherent narrative, while still avoiding the closure which comprises Lanzmann's notion of the 'obscene'. In other words, how does the film *Calling the Ghosts* function as a medium for witnessing? How does the film succeed or fail at sensitively translating both the language and the silence of the survivor, and placing them into a viable narrative without crossing into the 'obscene' or without 'presuming to know'? The film raises such questions as the nature of the importance of the relationship between the survivor and the filmmaker, and the process which is involved in first listening to and then transmitting the survivors' testimony, and seeks to uncover a new language not only for the translation of pain and violence into words, but also to articulate the wordless silences, breaths and gasps of the witnesses that accompany them. It is imperative for Jacobson and Jelincic that we listen to the survivor with an awareness that her testimony may further traumatize or violate a woman who has already suffered, and that she may suffer again each time she retells her story. As with Lanzmann's own philosophy regarding his creative process in relation to *Shoah*, Jacobson and Jelincic do not seek definitive explanations, nor do they question why the women have been raped in a direct manner – rather, they approach the survivor through a relation of ethical responsibility, by not presupposing that they know which questions to ask, or which answers to expect.

Beverly Allen, in her study *Rape Warfare: The Hidden Genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia* (1996) has argued that, during the war in Bosnia (1992–95), countless atrocities were committed and, among these crimes, thousands of women were raped and tortured under the auspices of ‘ethnic-cleansing and genocide’.⁹ Allen points out that, although there is nothing unusual about ‘mass rape’ in war, in Bosnia this mass rape had a rigidly systematic paradigm that coincided with a Serbian theory of ethnic genocide.¹⁰ According to Allen, women were raped in great numbers, with the aim of causing pregnancy, in the desire to eventually abolish Muslim identity.¹¹ Many women were forcibly detained in ‘detention centres’ or ‘camps’ set up by the Serbs, and the first rumours of these rape/death camps in Bosnia reached Zagreb in late 1991.¹² As the women slowly emerged from the camps, stories circulated that in the ‘detention centres’ were nightly vigils of torture, which included seemingly indiscriminate rapes, beatings and murders.

Calling the Ghosts is a documentary that picks up the thread of the victims’ memories and attempts to reconstruct a cohesive portrait of what life after ‘rape’ has been like for two Bosnian women. The film retraces the route by which two professional women, Jadranka Cigelj and Nusreta Sivac, were forced from their homes in Prijedor in April 1992 and taken to Omarska, one of the most notorious camps for human-rights abuses. In the film, the women describe how they survived with dirty drinking water and little food, while being raped and beaten over a four month period. The women also describe how they were deprived of a sense of identity, and were made to scrub blood from the walls and furniture of the offices, in which men were tortured during the day, and in which the women slept at night. The second, longer portion of the film, concentrates on life after the two women’s release from Omarska, and the long walk back into their destroyed lives in Prijedor. The film portrays the women telling their own story of the brutal acts committed at Omarska, and sharing them with other women who were also raped and abused during the war. It retraces and documents the story of Jadranka and Nusreta through the process of them giving their testimony, taking action against their perpetrators, and seeing their accusations to the Hague, where they hope to find justice and restitution for themselves and the thousands of other women like them.¹³

II

In her moving essay, ‘The Return of the Voice: Claude Lanzmann’s *Shoah*’, Shoshana Felman makes the vital statement that ‘[...] truth does not kill the

possibility of art – on the contrary, it requires it for its transmission, for its realization in our consciousness as witnesses'.¹⁴ *Calling the Ghosts* is a film which explores the notion of witnessing, and which maps the intimate relationship that exists between the survivor, her testimony and its reception. Seeking to elude the space of the 'obscene', or of understanding, Jacobson's and Jelincic's documentary gestures toward a new way of thinking about survival and victimhood, as the directors are cognizant of the problems for the survivor of reintegrating into society, and also of the dangers inherent in the testimonial project of re-traumatizing the survivor. The film explores the relation between testimony and transmission, both in terms of the transformation of trauma into language, and the transmission of testimony through film. It is both a study of the relation between the survivor and language, demonstrating how the filmmakers assist the two women to find the language that bears witness to their pain, and an exploration of trauma and victimhood.

The role of the witness and her importance in the transmission of testimony is evident from the beginning of the film, as the directors struggle to transmit the thoughts and feelings of the survivor.¹⁵ *Calling the Ghosts* opens with a staged shot of Jadranka in the shadows of her house, avoiding the camera as it enters her domestic space and plays her in slow motion. This opening moment is structured to begin our relation to Jadranka, by reminding us that we do not know this nameless woman. She is a stranger, a foreigner, someone with whom we have no connection and of whom we have no understanding, except in our relation to her anguished gestures. Slowly, the scene is transposed as Jadranka's face fades away, and in its place appears a blazing field, with houses in the background, obscured by smoke. As the camera gradually pulls back to encompass this scene in its entirety, we first hear Jadranka's unsteady voice as she says, 'In the beginning I had the reruns of my own film'.¹⁶ All that Jadranka had was the imprint of her own traumatic memory, which left her without space to breathe, to clear her mind, or to move on and put the past behind her. Here, as the film opens, we are not faced with a re-enactment of Jadranka's time in Omarska, rather Jacobson and Jelincic bring us to a different space and setting. They have chosen the privacy of Jadranka's home to begin the transmission between the filmmaker and the survivor, although it is clear that the traumatic past still obtrudes upon this familiar space.

The film then cuts to a scene on an empty beach, and we see only the back of a pale woman in a red bathing suit, sitting on the sharp black rocks, staring out to sea. In this stark setting, the camera hesitatingly approaches the woman from behind, in the same slow motion that was used in the opening shot, and

the mood is one of dreamy surrealism. Once again, we see the woman, but we do not know her intentions. As viewers, we cannot interpret the woman's action, and we are unable to discern whether the scene represents thoughts of suicide – an ending of life – or of the immersion of baptism – a renewal of life. The position of the woman also recalls our own stance as secondary witnesses to the testimony of the survivor. Comparable to Jadranka, seated on the edge of the rocks while contemplating the next move she will make, we too are seated precariously on the edge of our own knowledge and understanding, where we face our limits and reside in an ambiguous position.

The camera follows Jadranka as she tentatively moves towards the sea and asks herself some of the most difficult questions a survivor can formulate. Splashing her face as if preparing for the shock of bodily exposure, Jadranka immerses only half of her body in the water as she asks: 'To stay silent or to speak?'¹⁷ Should she take further steps and immerse herself in her memories? Should she risk facing the reruns of her personal tragedy? Or should she remain only half immersed, stranded in the void between language and survival, unable to move on and to begin to heal? All of these are questions that the survivor must face before she begins to tell her story. In the next cut, we see Jadranka swimming in slow motion, completely immersed in the water, except for her head. It is at this point that Jadranka says, 'If I stay silent how moral would that be?'¹⁸ In this potentially baptismal scene, we are watching Jadranka's struggle to come to a conscious decision to speak out, and to expose herself to the camera, to the viewer, to the dangers that coincide with the decision to confront her oppressors. At the same time that she is questioning her own morals and ethics, Jadranka is not only facing the physical dangers of possible retaliation by Serbs, but she is making the equally hazardous decision to confront a part of herself which she may never fully be able to articulate. If she confronts such hazy depths, she may find the horrifying reruns of her own film, the repetition of her trauma. If she does not confront her terror and chooses to remain silent, what might be the outcome for herself and other women who are suffering? As viewers, we watch as Jadranka swims through the heavy, cold water of the sea, and we view her solely from the outside, as spectators. We have no part in her movement – the position of the camera insists on our position as mere onlookers and reminds us that we are secondary and contingent to the testimonial process.

The camera then shifts to its second movement as Jadranka begins to speak out, to attempt to remember. As she articulates a fragmented phrase, 'When I remember the night I was taken out [...]', the camera's position swings around and attempts to bring us toward Jadranka, to 'become one'

with her.¹⁹ The camera position shifts as Jadranka treads water, struggling to make a decision as to whether she should keep her head above the water, where she can breathe, or enter into the darkness of the blurry depths. In this pivotal moment, the camera looks out in the direction of the coast and follows Jadranka's glance, so that the viewer enters into what we are led to believe must be Jadranka's vision. Echoing Jadranka's movement, the camera begins to go beneath the surface of the water. We follow the camera moving upwards to the crystal-clear view of the coastline and then back downwards to the opaque and shifting depths of traumatic memory. The camera is attempting to identify with Jadranka, to enter into her traumatic history through her vision. If only for a moment, the filmmaker seeks to locate herself in the space of Jadranka's indecision as to what step to take next. Jadranka's slow motion, moving up and down in the waves, becomes a metaphor for remembering and repressing.²⁰ The lucid moments where her testimony will come alive in the film are followed by dark spaces, in which she slips back beneath the surface, to find herself tumbling out of language. It is a suffocating space where there is no air available, except for that which she is holding in her lungs, not willing to let go for fear of death, and the camera attempts to follow the testimonial process. As Jadranka makes the decision to dive into her memory, to try to understand what has happened to her, it is to this dark and fluid space that she attempts to take us, down into the abyss that trauma represents. If Jadranka enters this space, she must return to nightmares of screams and brutal shouts and endeavour to order them, so that both she and the listener can begin to make some sense of what she suffered at the hands of her torturers. It is as if the camera, too, has been pulled into this dark space. It is a moment between the survivor and the witness that seems dangerously close to crossing a boundary, but at the same time, it also briefly explores the possibilities and the limits of identification, which are created in the process of testimony.

The camera's third and final movement, in this opening scene, positions the listener for the remainder of the film. The camera moves away from Jadranka as she looks at the coastline, and observes, 'My own broken bones begin to hurt [...]'.²¹ After Jadranka has submerged herself in the water and in memory, and has made the decision to speak, the camera retreats from its attempt to position itself and the viewer within her perspective and watches her from a distance once again. As Jadranka utters the words, 'If I speak how good is that for me? I would have to expose myself', she swims towards the coast, as if having made the decision to speak, she seeks some protection and begins her return to dry land.²² Now that she is going to expose herself, the camera retreats, as if the filmmakers now realize that a point of complete

identification is impossible: the remainder of the film requires us to question the position in which we are located in relation to Jadranka's narrative, and to ask what our role will be in the transmission of her story. The film interrogates the role of the camera, and confronts the possibilities of identification available to the filmmaker, without understanding *too* much – without crossing over into the space of the 'obscene'.

The opening scene occurs between the credits and the title, as if the connection between the survivor and the listener must be explored before the film can properly begin, and both parties take the plunge and immerse themselves in language and relation. Encapsulated and isolated from the main body of the film, the first minutes provide a meaningful framework and question the position from which the audience will receive the painful, personal testimony of Jadranka. The filmmakers move to bring us closer to Jadranka, and with that move, to attempt to begin to see the world through her eyes. Stranded in the repetition of her own nightmare, the 'reruns' of her own film, Jadranka seeks to break out of the trajectory of the return, which characterizes trauma. It is at this moment, when Jadranka begins to articulate her trauma, that a central question of the film comes to the forefront of her concerns: 'When I speak, who will be there to listen to me?'²³ Now that Jadranka has begun to move out of silence, into the foreground, and to risk exposure, the film questions what kind of witness will receive her testimony. As a survivor, Jadranka shares her testimony with the filmmakers and the film's audience. The film also explores Jadranka's sharing of her testimony with Nusreta, and with a group of other female survivors, who share similar experiences. Testifying risks exposure and re-traumatization, but it also entails the hope of progression and a tentative movement forward.

In the opening minutes of *Calling the Ghosts*, the camera captures both Jadranka's struggle to speak out and to begin to name her trauma, and the filmmakers' attempt to follow her words, and enter her trauma, by making the camera's movements parallel her language. Beginning with the encounter on the edge of the water, the camera makes three movements during this scene on the beach. We move from not knowing Jadranka's intentions, to her contemplation of the future and the possibility for remembering, and finally to her determination to testify. Each of these stages is signalled by a shift in the camera position, from observing Jadranka on the rocks, to merging with her viewpoint as she swims, and to following her return towards the coast. Each of these camera movements explores the filmmakers' attempts to approach the survivor without doing violence to her. The camera performs a visual reading of Jadranka's emotions, attempting to transmit to the viewer

the fragile space between knowing and not knowing. The directors attempt to communicate meaning, but do not presuppose understanding, as they translate the witness's language into visual imagery. The first minutes of exchange between Jadranka and the camera explore the hazardous nature of witnessing. Jacobson and Jelincic must be sensitive to the dangers of witnessing and question whether Jadranka's immersion in memory represents, at each moment of her testimony, a baptism or renewal of the self, or a suicidal act, which can only result in self-harm.

In translating testimony, the filmmaker inevitably superimposes his or her own experiences and desires onto the survivor; one desire which is particularly hazardous is the wish to 'understand' the survivor. For Lanzmann, a refusal to understand is the 'only possible ethical and at the same time the only possible operative attitude' that he could take, in relation to his own film direction.²⁴ Basing his knowledge on Primo Levi's phrase, 'Here there is no why', Lanzmann argues that the filmmaker can never understand trauma, particularly through a causal approach, which seeks to determine reasons why.²⁵ Lanzmann's views surrounding the notion of 'understanding', and asking the question 'why', come to the forefront in *Calling the Ghosts*. In the second movement of the camera, during the opening scene, there is one brief moment when the filmmakers, through the camera, attempt to put themselves in the place of the survivor, and to see the world through her eyes. However, this moment is also an illustration of an astute self-awareness by the directors, that they can never be in the position of the survivor. When Jadranka says, 'When I remember the night I was taken out', she is recounting her memories for the first time, and the camera slips carefully into position, as if now ready to travel with her to the depths of her memory and to share her trauma.²⁶ But in the very next shot, as if the filmmakers have become aware of the slippery space in which they are playing, the camera withdraws, and switches back to the view of the outside. Aware of the dangers of putting themselves in the place of the survivor, Jacobson and Jelincic quickly pull the camera back from Jadranka, and once again it is clearly placed in a position outside of the survivor's pain. For one instant, the camera position swings around to look at the world through the survivor's eyes, but then rapidly withdraws from the position. This gesture by the filmmakers suggests an intelligent self-examination, an introspective look at their own work, and reflects upon current debates that surround questions of history, testimony and aesthetics.

Having pulled back from the survivor, in order to give her space to breathe – not to suffocate her with the belief that they can take up her position as easily as they can change a film shot – *Calling the Ghosts* explores the

connection between testimony and spatiality. Shoshana Felman has questioned this point of connection in relation to the testimonial project of *Shoah*: 'Is it possible to witness [...] from inside? [...] Or are we necessarily outside [...] and witnessing it from outside?'²⁷ The filmmakers of *Calling the Ghosts* face the same dilemma, because the story that Jadranka tells is always and inevitably a retelling of an original event, never the event itself, and it is difficult for the filmmakers to know from where Jadranka speaks, and from where the camera should take its position. The film questions whether it is ever possible to witness from the inside of another's trauma. For one brief moment, the camera takes up Jadranka's position, and goes below the surface to witness what she sees, but all that it films are the black depths of the sea. The filmmakers must withdraw the camera from darkness and film from a distance, marking an acceptance that they may be 'necessarily outside' of something unnameable and therefore unreachable. The film also acknowledges that Jadranka's narrative of her experience is consciously altered for those who are 'outside' of the experience, or have not encountered a similar trauma in their own lives. The filmmakers' highlighting of spatial, as well as temporal modes of thinking through trauma, enables the conceptualization of an ethical relation between testifier and witness, which is marked not only by identification, but also by a necessary recognition of otherness and difference.

The narrativization of trauma also involves an ethical dimension. Trauma calls out to be ordered into a comprehensible narrative which provides meaning both for the subject and for the listener, but the process of ordering also has its dangers, because 'the capacity to remember is also the capacity to elide or distort', and with this narrative transformation comes the loss of the 'essential incomprehensibility' of the original story.²⁸ The filmmaker is, in one sense, bound to this paradox of telling, and must confront the elisions and distortions which are inherent in the narrative process. However, even with mistranslations and missed encounters, the testimonial project can make a record of something that before that moment was 'non-existent' and still 'a record that has yet to be made'.²⁹ The filmmaker must engage with the complexities involved in bearing witness, and understand that the record that she helps to make is of a moment that has not yet occurred until the testimonial act – until the moment of transmission. In this way, the witness resembles an empty notebook, or in the case of *Calling the Ghosts*, the filmmaker represents the unexposed film, she is a 'blank screen' upon which the event will become inscribed.³⁰ The vicissitudes of witnessing are a central force in the transmission of testimony and mark the relation between the survivor and the filmmaker with an ethic of accountability and of presence.³¹ The filmmaker must approach a testifier

sensitively and intimately and have the patience to wait, to listen, to observe, and to know when to speak and when to remain silent, when to turn the camera on and when to turn it off. The filmmaker is a subject, an *other*, a being whose presence has an effect on the testifier, and her camera not only records, but also affects the testimony which is produced.

Listening, waiting and watching are all integral to the process and transmission of testimony throughout *Calling the Ghosts*. In the opening scenes, Jadranka makes motions without attaching words to them, leading the filmmaker and the viewer to watch her body closely and attempt to read her gestures. In this way, her silences are as important as her words, and demand a form of interpretive witnessing, based as much in the physical gesture as in verbal language. The camera films patiently and allows Jadranka to arrive at her own articulation. The camera emphasizes that 'what is important is the situation of *discovery* of knowledge – its evolution, and its very *happening*'.³² Jacobson's and Jelincic's camera attempts to be present at each moment of this 'happening', each moment of discovery, and through this painful journey, the survivor and the filmmakers of *Calling the Ghosts* have become inextricably linked.

III

In the representation of trauma, the story may end, the film may run its course, but the trauma of the survivor persists. Even though we have finished watching their story on the screen, Jadranka and Nusreta must continue to confront what they may just be beginning to understand. *Calling the Ghosts* is not concerned with narrative resolutions, but rather with thresholds. The end of the film reveals the hazards of attempting to represent closure and finality, in relation to something which inevitably is still in progress. That is to say, the film suggests that there is always something more to convey, that we cannot reach a position of understanding or final resolution. *Calling the Ghosts* is a stark reminder that trauma represents a forever missed encounter and that no amount of text on the subject, no amount of film footage, will ever fill the void. Instead, testimony carries with it the potential to create new histories, and new ways of thinking about traumatic events. Jacobson and Jelincic have begun to redefine the testimonial genre in film, through self-examination and an awareness of their limitations. They have sought to give an account of trauma from the voice of those who have suffered. They have attempted to write the story of Jadranka and Nusreta not as a 'fiction of the real', but as a

world where reality parallels fiction in one of its most horrifying moments. The filmmakers have used the film to explore and reflect on the nature of testimony, and to think through new modes of conceiving the relation between the testifier and the witness.

In their attempt to follow Felman's statement that 'truth' requires art for its transmission and 'for its realization in our consciousness as witnesses', the filmmakers of *Calling the Ghosts* have addressed the historical situation in Bosnia and the traumatic experiences of two women, in particular. However, the film also reflects on the nature of the testimony which it produces. Historically, women who are victims of rape, in war or in peacetime, have not been listened to, so that the role of the addressee assumes a particular importance in *Calling the Ghosts*.³³ The opening scene of the film demands that the viewer come forward and take the risk of putting herself in the terrifying space of the survivor of trauma. At the opening of the film, we view Jadranka at a safe distance, as someone entirely separate from our own body, our own experience. But through Jacobson's and Jelincic's camera, we elide with Jadranka – we dive with her into the water, and are forced (albeit momentarily) to look through the survivor's eyes. Finally, *Calling the Ghosts* functions as an important testimonial device for survivors of rape in Bosnia, and as a political intervention in transmitting trauma. The film ends by refusing the possibility of closure for the traumas of rape it has represented, partly because many of the men who committed these crimes against humanity are still at large.³⁴ The directors of *Calling the Ghosts* appear to suggest that the personal and the political are inextricably linked, and that there can be no closure on the level of personal trauma until the political level has achieved a more satisfactory resolution.³⁵ It seems that the 'ghosts' of Bosnia (and Kosovo) which the film has called up cannot be 'laid to rest', but may continue to live on without justice or repatriation.³⁶

Notes

- 1 Claude Lanzmann, quoted in Cathy Caruth, 'Recapturing the Past: Introduction' in Cathy Caruth (ed.), *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), p. 154.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Shoshana Felman, 'The Return of the Voice: Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*', in Shoshana Felman and Dori Laub, *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis and History* (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 206.

- 5 Claude Lanzmann, 'The Obscenity of Understanding: An Evening with Claude Lanzmann', in Caruth (ed.), *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, p. 204.
- 6 Claude Lanzmann, quoted in Dominick LaCapra, *History and Memory After Auschwitz* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), p. 101.
- 7 LaCapra, *History and Memory*, p. 96.
- 8 *Calling the Ghosts*, directed by Mandy Jacobson and Karmen Jelincic (Bowery Productions, 1997). Hereafter abbreviated as *CTG*. The film is available through the New York distributor, 'Women Make Movies'.
- 9 Beverly Allen, *Rape Warfare: The Hidden Genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), p. 76.
- 10 Allen, *Rape Warfare*, p. 88. For a detailed study on 'mass rape' in Bosnia, see Alexandra Stiglmayer (ed.), *Mass Rape: The War Against Women in Bosnia Herzegovina* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).
- 11 Allen, *Rape Warfare*, 'Foreword'. For an interesting account of Omarska by one of its prisoners see Rezak Hukanovic, *The Tenth Circle of Hell: A Memoir of Life in the Death Camps of Bosnia* (New York: Basic Books, 1996).
- 12 Allen, *Rape Warfare*, p. 58.
- 13 It is important to emphasize that there are no actors in this film and no narratorial voice to tell their story for the survivors. The only people who speak in the film are Jadranka, Nusreta and other survivors, who are giving their own testimony of what happened to them in Bosnia.
- 14 Felman and Laub, p. 206.
- 15 Here I am referring to the filmmakers, who, as the witnesses, must attempt to transmit language and testimony to the viewer of the film.
- 16 *CTG*.
- 17 *CTG*.
- 18 *CTG*.
- 19 *CTG*.
- 20 This is in reference to Cathy Caruth's comment in response to a presentation of an earlier version of this essay at the conference *Refiguring History: Between the Psyche and the Polis* (University of Newcastle upon Tyne, May 1999).
- 21 *CTG*.
- 22 *CTG*.
- 23 Felman and Laub, p. 218. Jadranka does not ask this question, but I am arguing that the idea is present throughout the film *Calling the Ghosts*.
- 24 Lanzmann quoted by Felman in Caruth (ed.), *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, p. 204.
- 25 Lanzmann quoted by Felman, *ibid*.
- 26 *CTG*.
- 27 Felman and Laub, p. 227.
- 28 Caruth, 'Recapturing the Past: Introduction', in Caruth (ed.), *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*, p. 154.
- 29 Dori Laub, 'Bearing Witness or the Vicissitudes of Listening', in Felman and Laub, p. 57.
- 30 *Ibid*.
- 31 *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 62.
- 33 Mandy Jacobson, telephone interview, 21 April 1999.

- 34 The text which concludes the film notes: 'A full year after the signing of the Dayton Peace Accords, 50,000 NATO troops stationed in Bosnia and Herzegovina had not yet apprehended any of the Serb, Croat or Muslim individuals indicted for war crimes' (CTG).
- 35 The concluding text of the film records that on the political level: 'Prijeedor remains under the administration of the same Bosnian Serb leadership which seized power on April 29 1992' (CTG). This lack of political change or transformation also hinders personal development: 'Jadranka and Nusreta believe that they will never return to live in Prijeedor again' (CTG).
- 36 I would like to thank Tom Keenan for introducing me to *Calling the Ghosts* in his seminar on Bosnia and the Media in Autumn 1997. I would also like to thank Mandy Jacobson for her encouragement and willingness to discuss the work at length.