Directed by Metin Erksan
Cinematography by Ali Ugur

Erol Tas ... Kocabas Osman
Hülya Koçyigit ... Bahar
Ulvi Dogan ... Hasan
Alaettin Altiok


**ULVI DOGAN ... Hasan** (b. November 2, 1931 in Istanbul, Turkey) appeared in 1 film, 1964 Dry Summer, which he also produced.


**Metin Erksan (from Wikipedia)**

Erksan was born in Çanakkale. Following his graduation from Pertevniyal High School in Istanbul, he studied art history at Istanbul University. Starting in 1947, he wrote in various newspapers and magazines on cinema. In 1952, he debuted in directing with the films Karanlık Dünya and Aşk Veyser’in Hayati written by Bedri Rahmi Eyüboğlu. He directed two documentary films in 1954 with the title Büyük Menderes Vadisi.

Metin Erksan gained success with films depicting the problems of people from the countryside he adopted from the literature. Susuz Yaz won the Golden Bear Award in Berlin, Germany. Titlanlarım Öçü (1962) was awarded in 1966 at the Carthage Film Festival in Tunisia. He was named “Best Director” with his film Kuyu (1968) at the first edition of International Adana Golden Boll Film Festival. Along with renowned film director Halit Refiğ, he was credited as the representative of the national cinema in Turkey.

From 1970 on, he directed films aimed for commercial success. In 1974-1975, he filmed five Turkish stories (Hanende Melek by Sabahattin Ali, Geçmiş Zaman Elbiseleri by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, Bir İntihar by Samet Ağaoğlu, Müthiş Bir Tren by Sait Faik Abastan and Sazlık by Hulusi Koray) as short films for television. His 1977 film The Angel of Vengeance – The Female Hamlet was entered into the 10th Moscow International Film Festival. His 1974 horror movie Şeytan is known as the "Turkish Exorcist" due to the movies' similar plots.

He directed 42 films, 2 of which he produced himself; and he wrote the scripts of 29 films. He also starred in the 1998 film Alim Hoca as the title character.

He died on August 4, 2012 at the age of 83 in a hospital in Bakırköy, Istanbul, having been hospitalized ten days earlier with kidney failure.

**Bilge Ebiri: “Dry Summer: The Laws of Nature” (Criterion notes)**

When Dry Summer won the Golden Bear at the 1964 Berlin Film Festival, its director, Metin Erksan, was already among the biggest names in Turkish cinema. One would have thought that after the award—not just the first major international one given to a Turkish film but arguably the highest honor given to any cultural product from Turkey until then—he would become one of his country’s foremost artistic figures. But while the win was momentous, the ground beneath Erksan and his industry was already shifting. Dry Summer was, in many ways, the surprising, abrupt end of an incomplete chapter in the nation’s film history.

Although various films were made in Turkey throughout the early twentieth century, a self-sustaining and stable industry didn’t take hold until 1948, when the government introduced a 50 percent tax cut for theaters showing domestic films. The resulting boom in production enabled a new generation of filmmakers to breathe life into a cinema whose aesthetic to that point had been frustratingly stage-bound, even as they struggled with many of the same limitations as their forebears (prehistoric equipment, unforgiving schedules, overzealous censors). Among the directors in this new wave, a small group stood out for their more cinematically sophisticated works. Starting in the early 1950s, headstrong directors like Erksan, Lutfi Akad (Strike the Whore, Port of Lonely Souls), and...
Atıf Yılmaz (The Girl Who Watched the Mountain, This Land’s Children) sought to create more distinctly humanist and personal works, inspired in part by Italian neorealism.

Erksan had been one of Turkey’s first film critics in the early to mid-1940s and in 1952 directed his first feature, The Dark World, a biopic of the blind folk troubadour Âsik Vaysel. The film included numerous documentary scenes of the elderly musician himself—a docu-narrative hybrid avant la lettre. It also represented an early attempt to convey an authentic portrait of life in the impoverished Anatolian heartland, something Erksan would return to numerous times over his career. As such, it ran afoul of the authorities and was released only in a butchered version, thus marking the first of the director’s many confrontations with censor boards.

Most Turkish cinema during this period sought to mimic popular Egyptian melodramas and American genre pictures. Respected auteurs like Erksan and Akad made their share of such films too. But they also attempted to connect more with the lives of average citizens in a rapidly modernizing country, still deeply divided along cultural, economic, and geographic lines. Erksan’s 1960 film Beyond the Nights, for example, was a crime drama about a group of wayward friends planning a robbery, but it emphasized the hopes and fears of its troubled, rootless protagonists over the story’s typical policier elements. His 1962 adaptation of Fakir Baykurt’s novel of a rural land dispute, Revenge of the Snakes, again ran into trouble with censors—until, amazingly, Turkish president Cemal Gürsel intervened, deeming the work “a service to the nation” and noting that its depiction of the harsh realities of village life was not only accurate but underplayed.

Revenge of the Snakes had been a look at the corrosive nature of property, focused on the land. Now Erksan wanted to follow that up with a similar tale focused on water. He had written his own story around this theme but abandoned it in favor of Dry Summer, an adaptation of Necati Cumali’s novella of the same name. (Several years later, the director would complete this unofficial trilogy with The Well, about the treatment of women as property.)

After films like The Dark World and Revenge of the Snakes, with Dry Summer Erksan wanted to create an even more faithful depiction of rural life. This film would be far more ambitious, made outside of Turkey’s traditional production houses. Financed personally by producer Ulvi Dogan, who also played the young romantic lead Hasan, the film reportedly shot for nine months, on location in the Aegean town where Cumali had once served as an attorney. The production even used real villagers as extras, some of whom claimed to have witnessed the events that inspired Cumali’s story. Adding to the realism were the voices of the rural characters in the film. Turkey is a nation with a staggeringly broad range of dialects and vocal inflections, but for decades, characters in films spoke proper Istanbul Turkish—even if the films took place in remote Anatolian villages. In Dry Summer, however, the characters speak with Aegean accents. (This was a departure from the novella as well.)

But perhaps more importantly, Dry Summer evinces Erksan’s feel for the textures of rural life—its monotony, sensuousness, and violence. The film opens on repeated shots of Osman (Erol Tas) and his two mules making their way through the streets of his village—six shots in a row of basically the same thing. This odd, willful repetition is echoed at the end, when we get repeated shots of Osman’s dead body floating down the spring he sought to control. It’s a frame that places the events of the film within the rhythms of the countryside, lending it the quality of a fable.

The characters in Dry Summer are extensions of the natural world around them. Osman’s decision to block the spring that runs from his and his brother Hasan’s land to the neighboring farms below is seen by his fellow villagers as an act of violence against the earth. “Water is the earth’s blood!” they repeatedly protest. Hence the heavily symbolic ending, in which Hasan repeatedly rises out of the water as he approaches and finally overwhelms his brother, as if the very water is taking revenge on Osman. Similarly, an early romantic exchange between Hasan and his lover, Bahar (Hülya Koçyigit), takes place in a thicket of tall reeds—groping and grasping in the dark, the two might as well be creatures of the earth giving way to their most natural impulses. This was an earthiness, a forthright animal magnetism, rarely found in the urbane Turkish cinema of the 1960s.

With a kind of dark, subtle wit, Erksan contrasts the raging passions of the main characters—Hasan’s for Bahar, and Osman’s for, first, the water and his land and, later, also for Bahar—with the powerlessness of the authorities and elites. The local officials who get involved in the water dispute force Osman to make his water available to the other villagers. But further legal recourse results in the same authorities standing over Osman again as, just a little while later, he closes the water supply off. Similarly, after he goes to prison, Hasan is seen chatting with a fellow inmate named Kamel, who lectures him about the importance of “legal technique” and seems to want to awaken our hero’s class consciousness. Coded as an intellectual—he’s reading a paper, wearing a vest and glasses, and smoking with a cigarette holder—this refined, bookish older man seems like a typical directorial stand-in, a voice of reason who argues against impulsive violence and for unified, organized action. But such ideas go out the window as soon as Hasan returns to his village.

Alongside Dry Summer’s “realist” virtues, the film also displays some of the more idiosyncratic qualities of Erksan’s cinema. In fact, today the film is more notable for the bizarre, stylized avenues down which it pursues its villain’s gathering madness. Obsession had always been a key theme in Erksan’s work, but this film becomes downright surreal as Osman is consumed by lust for his brother’s wife—watching her, groping
Within a year, the battle lines would become even more stark, with the founding of the Turkish Cinematheque, an institution inspired by the Cinémathèque française and focused on bringing foreign films into the country. Its founders looked down on Turkish cinema as technically backward, aesthetically incompetent, and politically conservative. This was a particularly troubling development for Erksan, who had not only tried to spearhead a “national cinema” but had also proven his leftist bona fides in regular battles with government censors. Along the way, Dry Summer’s Berlin win began to seem less like a high point and more like a fluke. There was even a silly rumor that the film had won only because Erksan seduced one of the jury members, an Egyptian actress.

Unfortunately, domestic filmmakers had to live down the intelligentsia’s contempt for years. That the industry was moving increasingly toward cheaper, more vulgar product didn’t help. By the early 1970s, Turkey was churning out well over two hundred films a year, but the majority of these were porn flics, and many of the rest were foreign knockoffs. (Even Erksan was forced to take some of these gigs: until the restoration of Dry Summer, the only one of his films to find any real audience abroad was Sefat, his 1974 remake of William Friedkin’s The Exorcist, embraced in later years by cult audiences looking for an irony fix.) Such developments also echoed Dry Summer’s fate, in an odd way. Although the authorities had been ready to welcome it with open arms after Berlin, the negative of the film never made it back from Germany, and for many years it was very difficult to see. Meanwhile, it was reportedly chopped up and distributed in the West (by Dogan) as a soft-core film titled My Brother’s Wife, with new scenes starring a Hülya Koçyiğit look-alike and added by others.

Embittered with the industry that he’d helped to shape, and resentful of critics, Erksan gradually withdrew from filmmaking. Aside from a TV miniseries in 1982, his last film was 1977’s Female Hamlet. In later years, he devoted himself to teaching and to writing books about politics and history. However, he lived long enough to learn of Dry Summer’s 2008 restoration by the Cineteca di Bologna and the World Cinema Project, and its renewed embrace by the international community. He also lived long enough to see his own countrypeople rediscover the national cinema he had fought so long to forge—ironically, through the medium of television, where the films that he, Akad, Yılmaz, and others had fought to make in the fifties, sixties, and seventies found new life as classics, even for the intellectuals who had scorned them back in the day.

Erksan died in 2012. Akad had preceded him by a year, but not before writing these words about his friend and colleague, which could have served as a kind of epitaph: “He struggled on, repressing the pain of all the films he didn’t get to
make . . . Under different circumstances, I have no doubt that he would have numbered among the great names of world cinema.”

Kent Jones: Word Cinema Project: Recalled to Life
When I was young and becoming impassioned by the cinema, there was this thing known as “foreign films”—a category, to be sure, but also a promise of something exciting, something “foreign” . . . From the perspective of my younger self in the early 1970s, it looked like this: a stream of new movies from Ingmar Bergman and François Truffaut and Federico Fellini, dubbed into English; ravaged 16 mm prints of older acknowledged classics by Sergei Eisenstein and Akira Kurosawa and Vittorio De Sica and Bergman, shown on Saturday nights on public television or programmed in repertory houses; the Classic Film Scripts and Modern Film Scripts series published by Simon & Schuster (once again, wall-to-wall Bergman); a handful of names that were on constant display in the film section of the local bookstore and that were dropped regularly by certain Hollywood directors in interviews (Jean-Luc Godard, Bernardo Bertolucci, Michelangelo Antonioni, and, yet again, Bergman); the category known as “Fringe Benefits” in Andrew Sarris’s The American Cinema (no Bergman there, for reasons that elude me)—and ads in the New York Times for films that, if we were lucky, might eventually make it up to western Massachusetts.

At that time, there were great swaths of the world that were not commonly associated with cinema, including Africa, Mainland China, and Southeast Asia. Certain countries meant certain directors. India was Satyajit Ray. Japan was initially Kurosawa and Kenji Mizoguchi, then Yasujirō Ozu was added, then Shohei Imamura and Nagisa Oshima. There were a handful of filmmakers behind the Iron Curtain—like, Miklós Jancsó was Hungary, Andrzej Wajda was Poland, and Jirí Menzel was Czechoslovakia (Mišo Forman and Ivan Passer had already become American directors). And by the middle of the decade, another handful from Germany: Rainer Werner Fassbinder, Wim Wenders, Werner Herzog, Volker Schlöndorff. From the perspective of a young boy struck with rapture who lived far from New York, this was a name game, an extension of collecting baseball cards, reciting the names of Academy Award winners, or making Kulturtalk, captured perfectly by Woody Allen in Annie Hall: “Saw the new Fellini film . . . Not one of his best.” This probably all seems quaint and fairly distant now.

In the late seventies and eighties, things changed, and our shared picture of the world of cinema started to become increasingly vast and varied. For this, we have an army to thank: programmers like Sid Geffen, Jackie Raynal, Richard Roud, Tom Luddy, Edith Kramer, Richard Peña, Peter Scarlet, and James Quandt; distributors like Janus Films, New Yorker Films, Cinema 5, Orion Classics (later to become Sony Pictures Classics), Zeitgeist, Kino, IFC, and Wellspring; and critics, advocates, professors, or some combination thereof, such as Tony Rayns, Pierre Rissient, Manny Farber and Patricia Patterson, Elliott Stein, J. Hoberman, Max Tessier, David Overbey, Bérénice Reynaud, Jonathan Rosenbaum, Godfrey Cheshire, Chuck Stephens, and David Chute. If I’ve neglected to mention anyone, that’s because these people have inspired so many younger writers and programmers and distributors, who share a missionary zeal to find, see, describe, and disseminate unknown work.

In 1991, I began working as an archivist for Martin Scorsese, not long after he started the Film Foundation. We’ve worked on many projects since then, and in all the years that I’ve known him, he has always wanted to see and learn more. I will never forget the intensity with which he delved into South Korean cinema, or his excitement when he saw Souleymane Cissé’s Yeelen or Tian Zhuangzhuang’s The Horse Thief. In fact, when Marty appeared as a guest on Roger Ebert’s nineties wrap-up show, he named Tian’s film as his favorite of the decade—despite the fact that The Horse Thief was made in 1986.

Over the years, I saw this excitement come into close alignment with his untriring commitment to restoration and preservation. The Film Foundation began as a bridge between the Hollywood studios and the archives when there was none, and then broadened its mission to either participate in or directly oversee the restoration process. Later, the foundation would focus on many titles made outside of the U.S., by Wajda, Ray, Fellini, Antonioni, Renoir, Kurosawa, Powell and Pressburger, and others—in other words, the artists who already appeared as giants in our midst before our shared sense of cinema had expanded. At some point after the turn of the century, Marty started to envision another organization, dedicated to films and filmmakers from other parts of the world, countries and regions where film culture has necessarily taken a back seat to more pressing economic concerns, or where it has been culturally marginalized. He understood that these films would need something beyond simple restoration. They would need exposure. They would need a shot at another life.

The World Cinema Project began in 2007, as the World Cinema Foundation. It was announced at that year’s Cannes Film Festival by Marty, who was surrounded by members of his advisory board, including Cissé, Ermanno Olmi, and Wong Kar-wai (Tian, who was not present, had also agreed to join). Present as well were Ahmed El Maânouni, the director of the first title to be restored, Trances, and Gian Luca Farinelli and Cecilia Cenciarelli from the Cineteca di Bologna, where almost all of the organization’s work has been undertaken, in partnership with the Cineteca’s affiliated lab L’Immagine Ritrovata, overseen by Davide Pozzi. I was asked to come aboard in 2009 as executive director, and my colleague Doug Laible assumed the role of managing director a year later. Recently, it was decided that this endeavor would join forces with the Film Foundation (where Margaret Bodde serves as executive director and Jennifer Ahn as managing director), and that the WCF would be renamed the
World Cinema Project, to avoid confusion. The name has changed. The mission has not.

Since 2007, the World Cinema Project has either fully restored or participated in the restoration of nineteen features and one short, from Senegal, Egypt, Morocco, Turkey, Hungary, Brazil, Mexico, Thailand, the Philippines, Taiwan, South Korea, India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Iran, and Kazakhstan. And it has supported the restoration of on-set footage and home movies that were used in two documentaries on . . . Bergman. Some of the restored titles have been recommended by advisory board members, others have been suggested by or to people within the organization. Some titles had had no previous exposure in the West, and for many others, exposure had been limited and brief. In certain cases, the negatives were either suppressed or destroyed—no one knows for sure—and the restoration was undertaken with nothing but a single positive print to work from. In one case, we had to match material from the original negative with different material from an interpositive; for Kim Ki-young’s The Housemaid, two reels of the negative were lost, and the best surviving material was a positive print with English subtitles, which had to be digitally removed. In every case, we have worked to achieve the best possible result, and our goal has always been to make every title easily available. This collection—including DjibrilDiop Mambéty’s Touki bouki, Ritwik Ghatak’s A River Called Titas, Fred Zinnemann, Paul Strand, and Emilio Gómez Muriel’s Redes, Metin Erksan’s Dry Summer, The Housemaid, and Trances—is the first in a series with Criterion that will bring these films to that many more North American viewers.

Cinema is fragile. It is—or was—physically fragile. And the memory of cinema is fragile as well, the very framework of our understanding of all these flickerings, the secret story that we’ve been following from Lumière and Méliès on. These titles are precious, illuminated fragments of that story. It was an honor for us to be able to restore them, and—to quote Dickens—to help recall them to life.

The online PDF files of these handouts have color images
Coming up in the Spring 2014 Buffalo Film Seminars:

March 4 Monte Hellman, *Two-Lane Blacktop*, 1971, 103 min
  Spring break March 17-22
March 25 Agnes Varda, *Vagabond*, 1985, 105 min
April 1 Gabriell Axel, *Babette’s Feast*, 1987, 104 min
April 8 Louis Malle, *Vanya on 42nd Street*, 1994, 119 min
April 22 Tommy Lee Jones, *The Three Burials of Melquides Estrada*, 2005, 120 min
April 29 José Padilha, *Elite Squad*, 2007, 115 min
May 6 John Huston, *The Dead*, 1987, 83 min

CONTACTS:
...email Diane Christian: engdc@buffalo.edu
...email Bruce Jackson bjackson@buffalo.edu
...for the series schedule, annotations, links and updates: http://buffalofilmseminars.com
...to subscribe to the weekly email informational notes, send an email to addto list@buffalofilmseminars.com
...for cast and crew info on any film: http://imdb.com/

The Buffalo Film Seminars are presented by the Market Arcade Film & Arts Center
  and State University of New York at Buffalo
with support from the Robert and Patricia Colby Foundation and the Buffalo News