A GENERIC ANALYSIS OF TURKISH SOCIAL REALIST CINEMA: 1960-1965

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ALKIM YALIN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE PROGRAM OF MEDIA AND CULTURAL STUDIES

SEPTEMBER 2017

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Tülin Gençöz
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science/.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgür Avcı
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members (first name belongs to the chairperson of the jury and the second name belongs to supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan	(METU, PADM)	
Assist. Prof. Özgür Avcı	(METU, PADM)	
Prof. Dr. L. Doğan Tılıç	(Başkent Üni., PRP)	

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Alkım YALIN

Signature　　　　:

ABSTRACT

A GENERIC ANALYSIS OF
TURKISH SOCIAL REALIST CINEMA: 1960-1965

Yalın, Alkım

M.S., Department of Media and Cultural Studies

Supervisor   : Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgür Avcı

September 2017, 142 pages

This study is devoted to a generic analysis of social realist films made in Turkey between 1960 and 1965. This cinematic tendency emerged in the period following the coup of May 27th and started to fade away after 1965. Most notable filmmakers who contributed to social realist cinema of the period were Halit Refiğ, Ertem Göreç, Metin Erksan and Duygu Sağıroğlu. This study attempts to analyze a group of chosen social realist films, according to their common generic features both in terms of content and form, and to evaluate these films based on the concrete historical and social conditions of the period. At the end of the study, it is concluded that the so-called 'social-realist' movies in Turkish cinema cannot be considered as a genre; what was common to all these filmmakers, or the major reason behind the emergence of a wave of films in the early 1960s, was their common concern with and exclusive focus on the social issues of the period.

Keywords: Turkish Cinema, Social Realism, Genre Analysis

ÖZ

TÜRKİYE SİNEMASINDA TOPLUMSAL GERÇEKÇİLİĞİN
TÜR ANALİZİ: 1960-1965

Yalın, Alkım

Yüksek Lisans, Medya ve Kültürel Çalışmalar

Tez Yöneticisi   : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özgür Avcı

Eylül 2017, 142 sayfa

Bu çalışma Türkiye'de 1960-1965 yılları arasında yapılan toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin türsel analizine ayrılmıştır. Türk sinemasında bu eğilim 27 Mayıs darbesinin hemen ardından belirmiş ve 1965 yılının ardından kaybolmaya yüz tutmuştur. Dönemin toplumsal gerçekçi sinemasına katkıda bulunan yönetmenlerin başında Halit Refiğ, Ertem Göreç, Metin Erksan ve Duygu Sağıroğlu gelmektedir. Bu çalışma, toplumsal gerçekçi filmler arasından seçilen bir grup filmi hem içerik hem de biçim açısından ortak türsel özellikleri bağlamında analiz etmeyi ve bu filmleri dönemin somut tarihsel ve toplumsal koşullarına dayanarak değerlendirmeyi hedeflemektedir. Bu çalışma sonucunda Türk sinemasında toplumsal gerçekçi olarak adlandırılan filmlerin bir tür oluşturmadığı; bütün bu yönetmenlerin ortak özelliğinin, ya da 1960'lı yıllarda böyle bir sinema eğiliminin ortaya çıkmasının temel nedeninin dönemin toplumsal meselelerine dair ortak ve özel bir ilgi olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türk Sineması, Toplumsal Gerçekçilik, Tür Analizi

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Özgür Avcı. His insights and criticisms contributed to the development of this study and motivated me throughly. Without his guidance, support and patience, I would not be able to complete this study.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Necmi Erdoğan not only for his helpful insights and advises from the very beginning of this study, but also for his for guidance and support throughout my graduate studies.

I also would like to thank my examining committee member Prof. Dr. L. Doğan Tılıç for his criticisms and suggestions.

I owe the deepest gratitude to my parents and my family, who have supported me and given me strength to complete this study. They have been there for me in the hardest of times.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to examine the social realist tendency seen in the Turkish cinema between the years 1960 and 1965. Although it is not always considered as a movement and was short-lived, a group of social realist films appeared in the Turkish cinema in the aftermath of the coup of May 27[th,] and they marked Turkish cinema history by introducing new themes and stylistic preferences while seeking to discover a realistic and national cinematic language.

For many years there had been a disinterest towards Turkish social realist cinema amongst scholars. It was even debatable if social realist movies form a cinematic entity or not. For example, Nijat Özön claimed that it was barely a cinematic movement (1995a: 217). Similarly, Giovanni Scognamillo has defined "social realism" as an arbitrary name (Daldal, 2005:57). As a result, many of the studies on social realist cinema evaluated films individually (see Coş, 2015 or Morva Kablamacı, 2011), or based on the auteur theory (Coşkun, 2005). And other studies that took Turkish social realist cinema as a movement were generally constituted of descriptive studies that focused on the parallels between the film narratives and concrete social events of the era (see Coşkun, 2009 or Daldal 2003). And if there was an even more common trend, it was to compare Turkish social realism with Italian Neorealism (see Daldal, 2003).

Unlike above mentioned examples, what we have tried to do was to discover the generic aspects of these films, to find out if there were any shared patterns in these films, both in terms of content and form. Our aim was to find out the peculiarities of Turkish social realist films made in 1960s. We have chosen generic analysis as our method, not because social realist cinema necessarily constitutes a genre, but because it is the best way to discover the common characteristics of these films and the standards that cause them to be classified in an ensemble.

A generic analysis takes texts as ideological formal structures. Therefore, the theoretical background of this study is based on a threefold discussion. In the first part of our discussion we have focused on a more general discussion about the relationship between form, content and ideology, since genre study is concerned with understanding different classes of texts according to their shared formal features and their content. Moreover, in a deeper level, genres have capacity to reveal the constitutive traits of the society in which they were born, since a society "chooses and codifies the [speech acts] that most closely correspond to its ideology" (Todorov, 1976: 164). The second part of our theoretical discussion is based on genre theory, in order to highlight how the genres should be understood and analyzed. The third part of our theoretical discussion is based on the notions of realism and social realism, a step that we find necessary for being able to discuss social realism in Turkish cinema of 1960s.

Therefore, Chapter II is devoted to a general discussion on the concepts of ideology and form, the significance of genre study and theoretical discussion on realism and social realism. In the first part of this chapter, we have first tried to highlight the relationship between artworks and ideology. Through Marxist literary criticism, we have tried to demonstrate how artworks cannot be thought separately from the society which they were born into, and how they are related with the hegemonic ideologies of their time. We have adopted Jameson's presupposition that "cultural artefacts" should be considered as "socially symbolic acts", since evaluating films as cultural artefacts has a revelatory aspect that makes possible to understand the "political unconscious" of a society (Jameson, 1991: 20).

A generic analysis of texts requires discussing content as well as formal aspects. In a similar fashion, an inquiry on the ideological nature of cultural artefacts requires constructing a dialectical relationship between form and content. Therefore, in the second part of Chapter II, we have focused on this relationship, and based on Lukács' (1969) discussion in *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism* and Ernst Fischer's (1971) interrogation on the impact of content over the form, we have tried to demonstrate that between form and content, it is the content which shapes the

form. We have tried to ground this argument on the fact that content is also a product of social relations in a given period of time and society.

In light of these discussions, we have devoted the second part of Chapter II to explaining the significance of genre study. We have tried to demonstrate how the relationship between content and form is relevant for genre study and how a generic analysis of these films might contribute to a wider discussion on ideology and representation. While discussing genre study, we have mostly made reference to the arguments by Bakhtin, Jameson and Todorov. We have also argued that the best way of comprehending a genre is an approach that involves both semantic and syntactic aspects of a text.

The emergence of social realist cinema in the 1960s, was not independent from the economic, political and social processes in these years. The aim of these movies, which centered on social issues, often was representing social problems and changes with an objective, realist gaze and through a modern cinematic language (Daldal, 2005: 58). However, the question of realism in arts is rarely a simple issue. Artistic realism only represents the world in consonance with the conventional, temporal modes of representing reality. Realism is one of the most ambiguous terms, not to be confused with the real or the truth but rather should be discussed within in a broader context, in relation to hegemonic ideologies and social relations of its time. In that respect, the third part of Chapter II is devoted to a general discussion on realism and social realism. Moreover, claiming that some films are realist and others are not implies that the realist cinema has some attributes that the other (non-realist) films have not (Carroll, 1996: 244). This section also aims to discover these attributes and offer a frame of analysis for our work. So, we have first tried to discuss what realism is, and secondly, what kind of realist films are considered as social realist texts.

As a theoretical basis, we have borrowed Samantha Lay's threefold conception of social realism, and Lukácsian notions of typicality and perspective. According to Lay (2002), social realist films differ from other films in three aspects: practice and politics, content, form and style. Lay (2002) asserts that the politics indicates the

intent of the filmmaker, which eventually determines the way in which the film was produced, its content and style. In that respect, social realist films generally function with a "moral intent", whereas its content is based on underrepresented contemporary issues or characters (Lay, 2002: 10). We argued that the intent of the filmmakers might be discussed with Lukácsian notion of perspective which determines the content and the form of an artwork (1969: 19). According to Lay (2002), social realist cinema tend to focus on contemporary issues and give the characters in relation with their social environment. This emphasis on characters might also be found in Lukácsian concept of "typicality" according to which humans are *zoon politikon* and cannot be thought separately from concrete social conditions that define them (Lukács, 1969: 19). As for the form and style, the social realist films generally have a more observational film style, and unpredictable solutions in terms of the narrative form (Lay, 2002: 21). We have decided to ground our analysis on Lay's threefold conception of realism, also because related with our previous decision to analyze the films both according to their semantic and syntactic aspects. Through Lay's categorization, we would be able to discuss films' semantic aspects in relation to content and style, whereas a discussion on form would lead us to understand the syntactic aspects of the films.

Chapter III devoted to the analysis of a group of social realist films produced between 1960 and 1965 in Turkey and the political, cultural and social perspective that organized them. This cinematic tendency, namely social realism, emerged approximately in the period following the coup of May, 27th and started to fade away after 1965.

Amongst the films which are thought to be in the scope of social realism, Metin Erksan's *Gecelerin Gecelerin Ötesi* (*Beyond The Nights*, 1960), *Yılanların Öcü* (*The Revenge of the Serpents,* 1962), *Acı Hayat* (*The Bitter Life*, 1963), *Suçlular Aramızda* (*The Culprits Are Among Us*, 1964), *Susuz Yaz* (*Dry Summer*, 1963); Atıf Yılmaz's *Dolandırıcılar Şahı* (*King of The Swindlers*, 1961); Halit Refiğ's *Şehirdeki Yabancı* (*Stranger in the City*, 1963), *Şafak Bekçileri* (Wardens of the Dawn, 1963), *Gurbet Kuşları* (*Birds of Exile*, 1964); Ertem Göreç's *Otobüs Yolcuları* (*The Bus*

Passengers, 1961), *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* (*Awakening in the Darkness*, 1964) and Duygu Sağıroğlu's *Bitmeyen Yol* (*The Never Ending Road*, 1965) might be listed. Refiğ's *Haremde Dört Kadın* (*Four Women in the Harem*, 1965) was first evaluated under this list but evaluated later by himself as part of National Cinema (Coşkun, 2009: 38).

There are some other films from the same period that are thought to have realistic approaches. These have been given different names, such as romantic realism, urban realism and village realism. In fact, even some of these films are considered under these groups. In this respect, Daldal remarks that these films standing are at the "periphery" of social realist tendency were diverse:

> Other films at the periphery of the movement range from 'romantic realist films' that tried to come up with a deeper personal analysis (Memduh Ün's *Kırık Çanaklar*[1], Refiğ's *Yasak Aşk*[2], *Seviştiğimiz Günler*[3], the Tokatlı Brothers' *Denize İnen Sokak*[4] and *Son Kuşlar*[5], Başaran's *Murtaza*…), and urban realism that includes an Italian type of humanism (Atıf Yılmaz's *Suçlu*[6], Erkan's *Acı Hayat*), Lütfü Akad's *Üç Tekerlekli Bisiklet*[7]…) to village realism glorifying the innocence and the bravery of Anatolian men and criticizing the remnants of feudalism (Refiğ's *Şafak Bekçileri*, Yılmaz's *Murad'ın Türküsü*[8], *Keşanlı Ali Destanı*[9]…), and socialist inspired films with

---

[1] *The Broken Pots* (1961)

[2] *Forbidden Love* (1961)

[3] *The Days We Made Love* (1961)

[4] *The Street Descends to the Sea* (1960)

[5] *The Last Birds* (1965)

[6] *The Guilty One* (1960)

[7] *Three-Wheeled Bicycle* (1962)

[8] *The Song of Murad* (1965)

an 'unmediated' political message (Göreç's *Kızgın Delikanlı*[10], Yılmaz's *Yarın Bizimdir*[11], Haldun Dormen's *Bozuk Düzen*[12]…) (Daldal, 2003: 144).

Therefore, if we look at two lists, some of the films are placed at the periphery of social realism and defined by Aslı Daldal by other terms. As a result, we have chosen nine films, which we believe to be the most representative amongst all, for our analysis. The list of the chosen films is as below:

Title	Director	Year
Gecelerin Ötesi	Metin Erksan	1960
Otobüs Yolcuları	Ertem Göreç	1961
Yılanların Öcü	Metin Erksan	1962
Susuz Yaz	Metin Erksan	1963
Şehirdeki Yabancı	Halit Refiğ	1963
Gurbet Kuşları	Halit Refiğ	1964
Suçlular Aramızda	Metin Erksan	1964
Bitmeyen Yol	Duygu Sağıroğlu	1965
Karanlıkta Uyananlar	Ertem Göreç	1965

In this chapter, have tried to focus on the intent of the filmmakers, by giving special consideration to historical, social and political processes that paved the way for this cinematic tendency.

---

[9] *Kesanli Ali's Epic* (1964)

[10] *The Angry Lad* (1964)

[11] *Tomorrow is Ours* (1963)

[12] *The Corrupt Order* (1966)

In Chapter IV, we have focused on the content of these films under two main titles. Firstly, we have discussed the common themes and issues in these films based on our idea that the content of individual works are always related with a more general social context. We have divided these films into two groups as village and urban films. And we have argued that while issues such as class conflict and working class struggle, discontents of modernization, rural migration and urbanization are at the center of urban films, village films tend to focus on the village life. In the following part, we have tried to focus on different character types spotted in these films based on Lukácsian notion of typicality. In the final part of this chapter, we gave place to formal and stylistic aspects of these films in light of our previous arguments on the dialectical relationship between form and content, and tried to discuss whether these films might be regarded as a genre.

We think that this study is significant for two reasons. First of all, a generic analysis of these films may contribute to understanding further social realist tendency in Turkish cinema. According to Chatman, genre studies do not deal with the question of "What makes Macbeth great?" but rather "What makes it a tragedy?" (1978:17). Likewise, our point of start was not the question what makes Turkish social realism great or not, but what makes these films social realist. Why do we categorize them as such? What are shared semantic and syntactic elements that help us categorize them under social realism? Yet our aim was not only classify them. This brings us to the second significance of this study. By discussing these shared traits, we also tried to understand the ideological counterpart of these traits and what these works say about the society which they were born into. An inquiry on cinematic genres evaluates cinema not only as an art form, but rather as a socially symbolic act which may contribute to reveal the political ideologies of a given period, and class relations lying underneath them.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL BACKGROUNGS OF THE STUDY

2. 1. Artistic Form and Ideology

The aim of this chapter is to introduce some of the theoretical discussions that we will profit from in the analysis of Turkish social realist films made in 1960s. This section derives its roots from two congener ideas: first, any work of art could be understood only in relation with the society in which it is produced; and second, there lies a dialectical relationship between form, content and ideology of an artwork. In that respect, firstly we will discuss the relationship between art and ideology, secondly the relationship between form and content, and finally how artistic forms should be understood as ideological structures.

2. 1.1. Art and Ideology

According to Eagleton, dealing with artworks does not only involve dealing with their "themes" or "issues", but also involves understanding the relations that are manifested through form of an artwork (2012: 21). However, this is not an easy work for ideology is practically never a simple reflection of the ideas of the dominant class (or classes), but rather the complex phenomenon, which entails conflicting and even contradictory views of world (Eagleton, 2012: 21). Social consciousness of a specific historical period is conditioned by the social relations of its time and artworks cannot be thought separately from economic, social and political conditions in which they were born into (Eagleton, 2012: 21). There are certain ways of interpreting the world and they are largely marked by the hegemonic ideologies of a given epoch (Eagleton, 2012: 20). Ideology is a product of human's concrete social relations in a given time and space and it is also the way through which class relations are experienced, legitimated and sustained (Eagleton, 2012: 21). Therefore, while dealing with literature, cinema and other artistic products, or cultural artefacts the matter should be to understand the complex relations between these works and the ideological

words in which they reside in.

And, if art is a part of superstructure, it cannot be thought separately from the base. However, just as Engels (1999) asserts in his famous letter to Joseph Bloch, the changes in superstructure are not a mere reflection of changes in the base:

> According to the materialist conception of history, the *ultimately* determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. Other than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. Hence if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the *only* determining one, he transforms that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure (…) also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form.

In this respect, Engels contends that art's relation with ideology appears to be more complex than the law or the political theory, which materialize the interests of dominant class, since it has rather a high degree of autonomy (Eagleton, 2012: 31). Marxist criticism, which notably draws attention upon these characteristics of an artwork, do not imply going directly from "text" to "ideology", and from "social relations" to "productive forces". Instead, it offers a framework in which the unity between these "level"s are taken into consideration (Eagleton, 2012: 23).

Pierre Macherey too, leans on similar issues and he asserts that "a writer's work does not present itself in terms of a knowledge (…) the act of the writer, on the other hand, can become the object of a certain knowledge" (Macherey, 2006: 13). According to Macherey, a work of art is rarely "what it appears to be" (Macherey, 2006: 22) and "the text possesses and contains its own kind of truth" (Macherey, 2006: 58). This characteristic of artwork depends on the "ideological distinction between realities and appearances" (Macherey, 2006: 22) and therefore, a scientific inquiry on an artwork, any attempt to reach its "truth", requires discovering its ideological content. Yet, according to Macherey, the specificity of the work lies in its

"autonomy" (2006: 22). Artworks are not to be considered as purely ideological, for art may distance itself from ideology by giving it a form and stabilizing it in certain fictional boundaries (Eagleton, 2002: 33). Nevertheless, the autonomy of an artwork is not to be understood as its independency. Macherey explains this point as follows:

> (…) autonomy must not be confused with independence. The work only establishes the difference which brings it into being, by establishing relations to that which it is not; otherwise it would have no reality and would actually be unreadable and invisible. Thus the literary work must not be considered as a reality complete in itself, a thing apart, under the pretext of blocking all attempts at reduction; this would be to isolate it into incomprehensibility as the mythical product of some radical epiphany (2006: 60-61).

In this respect, artwork can only be understood as a "second reality, though it does have its own laws" (Macherey, 2006: 61). Therefore, a scientific inquiry tries to explain an artwork with regards to the ideological world to which it belongs and tries to find the principal that creates both a link and distance between the artwork and ideology (Eagleton, 2012: 33).

Jameson proposes us to consider "cultural artefacts" as "socially symbolic acts" and he contends that an ideological inquiry of texts is crucial in the evaluation of the "political unconscious", and because the history of existing society is the history of class struggle, "it is in detecting the traces of that uninterrupted narrative, in restoring to the surface of the text the repressed and buried reality of this fundamental history, that the doctrine of a political unconscious finds its function and its necessity" (1991: 20). Here, he emphasizes on the importance of understanding artworks as the carrier of existing class contradictions and he asserts that if only organizing categories of analysis are constituted as those of social classes, "individual phenomena" come out as "social facts and institutions" (Jameson, 1991: 83). But more importantly, within his analysis scheme, he stresses upon the formal structure of the text and contends that "the production of aesthetic or narrative form is to be seen as ideological act in its own right, with the function of inventing imaginary or formal 'solutions' to

unresolvable social contradictions" (Jameson, 1991: 79). This implies understanding formal structure of an artwork in relation with hegemonic ideologies. Therefore we are going to focus on the relationship between form, content and ideology in the following parts.

2.1.2. Form and Content

"The interaction of form and content is vital problem in the arts," writes Ernst Fischer (1971: 116). In this respect, he asserts that since the problem of form first posed by Aristotle, it has been generally considered as the higher, essential component of arts, whereas the content is seen rather secondary. According to this view, accomplishment of the proper form is considered as the ultimate goal of action (Fischer, 1971: 116).

Marxist criticism seems to reject this idea concerning the superiority of form. Post-Revolutionary Marxist criticism, especially of the 1920s, which is mainly dominated by the reflection theory, conflicts with Formalism (Bennet, 2003: 21). Therefore, Georg Lukács' emphasis on the form as the real social component in literature, may be seem contradictory for a Marxist literary critic, given that Marxist criticism dissents any kind of formalism as far as it jeopardizes the historical consciousness and reduces the artwork to a mere problem of aesthetics (Eagleton, 2012: 39). As a matter of fact, the special relationship between form and content actually holds an important place within the Marxist literary theory. Yet, if the problem of form is considered as having significance in Marxist criticism, it is not due to its superiority but rather on account of the dialectical unity between form and content. In this respect, Lukács asserts that even though bourgeois critics are criticized for they give an enormous importance to the form, the main problem stems from their inadequacy to detect real formal problems and their ignorance of the inherent dialectics of the problem in hand (1969: 17).

According to Lukács, between form and content, the determining element was the content. In this respect, the following passage might be very enlightening:

What determines the style of a given work of art? How does the intention determine the form? (We are concerned here, of course, with the intention realized in the work; it need not coincide with the writer's conscious intention). The disctinctions that concern us are not those between stylistic "tecniques" in the formalistic sense. It is the view of the world, the ideology or *weltanschauung* underlying a writer's work, that counts. And its is the writer's attempt to reproduce this view of the world which constitutes his 'intention' and is the formative principle underlying the style of a given piece of writing. Looked at in this way, style ceases to be a formalistic category. Rather, it is rooted in content; it is the specific form of a specific content. (1969: 19)

As Terry Eagleton points out, Marx himself was tending to look the problem of form as something deeply intrinsic with the content (Eagleton, 2012: 37). According to Marx, the literature had to perform a unity of form and content (cited in Eagleton, 2012: 37). In this respect, Eagleton asserts that the form is the product of content and the content also reciprocates to the form (Eagleton, 2012: 37). Marx's defense of the relation between the form and content actually can be traced back to Hegel who states in his *Philosophy of Fine Art* that any specific content defines its proper form (Eagleton, 2012: 37). However, it would be a mistake to think that Marx had completely adopted Hegel's aesthetics, since Hegelian aesthetics is idealistic (Eagleton, 2012: 37). Nevertheless, both Marx and Hegel share the idea of artistic form is not a mere artistic adornment (Eagleton, 2012: 37). According to this approach, forms are defined by types of content through which they are historically materialized (Eagleton, 2012: 37). But forms also transform, evolve, and depending upon the changes of content, they may change fundamentally at the end (Eagleton, 2012: 37). In this respect the content is predecessor of the form, just as the society's material content – production style – is determining upon superstructure (Eagleton, 2012: 37).

In this respect, Ernst Fischer (1971) draws a parallel between social forms and artistic forms. However, before dwelling upon his arguments on the parallelism of

social and artistic forms, we should first explain his conceptionalization of form and content.

According to Fischer, "form is the manifestation of the state of equilibrium attained at a given time" whereas the principal characteristics of content are "movement and change" (1971:125). In this respect, he defines form as "conservative", i.e. tend (or even insistent) to remain stable, whereas the content is "revolutionary", i.e. evoking the changes in the form (Fischer, 1971:125). He draws his first examples from the inorganic and organic nature and states:

> The "form" of living organisms is not immutable. If we give a plant a new "content" (by changing its nourishment in the broadest sense, by cross-breeding, or by grafting, all of which amounts to no more than establishing a special new kind of metabolism by imposing new external conditions in a concentrated matter), its form will change too. And though the tendency to revert to the old form is very strong, new forms nevertheless become firmly established in their turn and acquired characteristics can under certain conditions be inherited. Goethe's words in praise of nature still apply: "It is forever changing and not for an instant is there any standing still in it. It has no notion of remaining, and it has put its curse on everything static..." Form, "standing still" in a relatively stable state of equilibrium, is always liable to be destroyed by the movement and change of new content. (Fischer, 1971: 127)

In this respect, Fischer gives a revolutionary meaning to content. And he states that, as the main force of change in organic and inorganic nature is the content, the same is applicable for the social reality, though it functions in a different level and under more complex mechanisms (Fischer, 1971: 127).

For social relations, Fischer asserts the base, i.e. "the material forces of production" serve as the "content", whereas the social organizations, institutions, laws etc. constitute the forms in which such processes occur. He states that the changes in

social forms are rooted in the changes in the material forces of production, and the change forces itself where there is a conflict between them (Fischer, 1971: 127). At this point, Fischer refers to famous passage of Marx in *The Critique of Political Economy*:

> At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or- what is but a legal expression for the same thing - with the property relations within which they had been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. (cited in Fischer, 1971: 128)

In this respect, he contends that the basic content of society, i.e. the forces of production are destined to change constantly throughout the time. However, the forms of a society tend to remain stable. Here the conflict between social forms and content gains a class character. According to Fischer, "Always it is the ruling classes with their political and ideological machinery that cling to the traditional forms and make enormous efforts to invest them with the character of something eternal, immutable, and final. And it is always in the oppressed classes that new forces of production rise in revolt against antiquated production relations" (Fischer, 1971: 129)

After explaining the relationship between social forms and content, Fischer comes to the domain of arts in which he found a high resemblance to the functioning of social relations. At his moment, he gives a special importance to "form" and states that "art is the giving of form, and form alone makes a product into a work of art" (Fischer, 1971: 152). However, there lies a dialectical relationship between the form and content in arts. The form of an artwork is directly related with its function, i.e. its content; therefore, the form emerges as "the social experience solidified" (Fischer, 1971: 152).

According to Fischer, the changes in the content and the form of the arts are a result of economic, political and social changes, and it is the new content that evokes the new forms (Fischer, 1971: 142). And this is from this point of view that we must discuss the relationship between the ideology and form.

2.1.3. Ideology of Form

The relationship between form and content attests to the significance of the relationship between ideology and form. Lukács' emphasis on the importance of form may be enlightening, since he asserts that form is not free of ideology. But also, in his *History and Class Consciousness* he show that critiquing literary form is "always dialectically connected to a process of critiquing both the concept of form and forms of thought" (cited in Nilges, 2009: 74).

Jameson asserts that, "the history is the experience of necessity" (1991: 102). The same might be true for the history of forms. In *Literature and Revolution* (2000), Trotsky wrote that "The relation between form and content (the latter is to be understood not simply as a "theme" but as a living complex of moods and ideas which seek artistic expression) is determined by the fact that a new form is discovered, proclaimed and developed under the pressure of an inner need, of a collective psychological demand, which, like all human psychology, has its roots in society". Therefore, one can simply contend that the changes in form stem from the important ideological changes rooted in the political, economic and social changes in the history of a given society. In that respect, Plekhanov asserts that the passage from classical tragedy to emotional tragedy in France reflects the passage from aristocratic values to bourgeois values (Eagleton, 2012: 40). In a similar fashion, Lukács (1969) indicates that the change in the novel form is related with the change in views of the world. Ernst Fischer describes the relation of form and content with existing social relations as follows:

> The evolution of subjects in literature and arts is well worth considering, for the choice of subject reflects prevailing social conditions and social consciousness. The change from mythical to 'profane' subjects, the

penetration of the world of kings and noblemen by the common people, the secularization of sacred subjects by the depiction of daily life in town and country, the discovery of human beings at work as a fit theme for the arts, the replacement of "noble drama" by "bourgeois tragedy" - all these new social subjects indicate a new content and demand new forms, such as that of the novel. (1971: 142)

When the changes in aesthetic form are considered through this kind of a historical point of view, the ideological character of the form becomes more visible. This is what Jameson calls "the ideology of form". According to Jameson, "the symbolic messages transmitted to us by coexistence of various sign systems which are themselves traces or anticipations of modes of production" (1991: 77).

Eagleton asserts that form is the complex unity of at least three components (2012: 41). First of all, form is partially shaped by the "relative autonomus" history of artistic forms; secondly, it reveals some ideological structures and finally it involves a special relationship between the writer and the receptor (Eagleton, 2012: 41). Marxist criticism deals with analyzing dialectical unity between these components (Eagleton, 2012: 41). Therefore, while choosing a form, the artist is already bounded by ideological restrictions (Eagleton, 2012: 41). The artist transforms and unifies the forms which are already established by a tradition of forms, and forms themselves already carry and ideological significance (Eagleton, 2012: 41). The changes in the form are related with things beyond the individual prodigy, i.e. the historical change in the views of world and ideology (Eagleton, 2012: 41). This is what Plekhanov emphasizes by indicating, "everything depends on time and place" along with the whole of social relations (1953: 195).

However, there is not a exact symmetrical relation between the changes in literary or artistic forms and ideological changes, since as Eagleton points out, artistic form has a high degree of autonomy. Artistic form has its own inner dynamics and it relatively evolves according to these dynamics. As Fischer remarks "social conditions rarely find direct reflection in the arts, and new artistic forms and ideas do not completely

coincide with a new social content." (1971: 149). In a similar fashion, Jameson (1991) contends that the changes in the aesthetic forms are not necessarily have to be synchronic with the changes in the modes of production. In this respect, the relationship is neither synchronic or diachronic, but rather might explained with the term "nonsynchronous development", or *Ungleichzeitigkeit* as Ernst Bloch prefers to refer it (cited in Jameson, 1991: 96-97).

As a result; form, content and ideology in art cannot be thought separately. Content determines the form, but the content itself is the product of the hegemonic ideologies. However the relationship between ideology and arts might be far from a direct causality, the significance of the relationship cannot be ignored. Therefore, analyzing art and "unmasking cultural artefacts as socially symbolic acts" (Jameson, 1991: 20) requires a multifaceted approach, in which all these components are taken into consideration with a historical and political consciousness.

In light of these ideas, what we are going to propose for the methodology of our study will be to pursue a generic analysis, in which the inherent dialectics of form, content and ideology will be taken into consideration. In this respect, we will discuss the significance of genre study in the following part.

2.2. Genre Study and Cinema

What is genre and why does it matter for those who study cinema? But more importantly what could it bring to study genres while focusing on the formal, aesthetic and discursive tendencies of an era in the history of cinema? In this chapter, we will lean upon these questions and try to formulate an answer while designing our path of study.

Though a detailed interrogation of different stances within genre theory is beyond the scope of this study, a deeper understanding of historical existence of genres and relating it with the film genre requires grasping different stances within genre criticism and theory, since "The historical existence of genres is indicated by the

discourse on genres" (Todorov, 1976: 162). Furthermore, it would serve us to define our path of study and the approach we are going to adopt.

2.2.1 Why Does Genre Study Matter?

The term genre comes from the French and originally from Latin and it is basically employed to indicate "kind" or "class" (Chandler: 1977). Thus, the term, which is widely used and discussed both in literary and cinema theory or criticism, indicates categorization between different "kinds" or "classes" of texts. But genres do not solely serve this purpose. They mainly function as a "contract" between the writer and the reader, showing the ways of writing and interpreting a text. As Jameson puts it:

> Genres are essentially contract between a writer and his readers; or rather, to use the term which Claudio Guillén has so usefully revived, they are literary *institutions*, which like the other institutions of social life are based on tacit agreement or contracts. The thinking behind such a view of genres is based on the presupposition that all speech needs to be marked with certain indications and signals as to how it is properly to be used (1975: 135).

Similarly to Jameson, Todorov underlines that genres function as "horizons of expectations" for readers and as "models of writing" for authors (1976: 163). The idea behind this kind of comprehension of genres is notably related with the presupposition that all speech acts require to consist in certain indications and signals that reveal, at the end, how they should be interpreted (Jameson, 1975: 135).

However, all speech acts do not have same sort of indications and signals, since their natures are not identical. Bakhtin asserts that there exist two different genres of speech, respectively the primary (simple) speech genres and the secondary (complex or ideological) speech genres. Literary genres fit into second category, thus they are defined as more complex forms of speech genres (1986: 61-62).

In everyday life, content of the utterance and the physical presence of the speaker

(gestures and intonations) serve as indications and signals for the primary speech acts (Jameson, 1975: 135). In literary genres, generic conventions perform this task (Jameson, 1975: 135). Given Bakhtin's (1986) assertion that without genres, there would be no communication; we can say that genres have a communicative function. But genres' communicative function does not remain limited by interpersonal communication; they also communicate with the society.

As Todorov puts it, "Genres communicate with the society in which they flourish by means of institutionalization. It is also through this process that they most interest the anthropologist or the historian" (1976: 163). The emergence of a new genre, progression of an existing genre or any change in genres' hierarchical positioning among themselves, reveal a lot about the society in which they exist. Todorov (1976) argues that each historical era has its own system of genres which is contingent upon the dominant ideology. If we are to think genres as institutions, we can say that as other institutions, genres show the constitutive traits of the society in which they born into:

> A society chooses and codifies the [speech] acts that most closely correspond to its ideology; this is why the existence of certain genres in a society and their absence in another reveal a central ideology, and enable us to establish it with considerable certainty. It is not chance that the epic is possible during one era, the novel during another (the individual hero of the latter being opposed to the collective hero of the former); each of these choices depends upon the ideological framework in which it operates. (Todorov, 1976: 164)

In this respect, genre criticism deals with three variables: firstly, the individual work; secondly, the intertextual sequence into which it is placed by means of ideal construction of a series of forms and systems; and finally a series of concrete historical situations into which individual works had been created (Jameson, 1975: 157). Jameson refers to these variables as a "*combinatoire*" and he contends that these variables form "a set of parallel series articulated into complexes of features or factors such that a variation in one results in a shift or transformation in the other";

19

this kind of a *combinatoire* carries a hierarchical trait, meaning changes in the infrastructure correspond to an eventual switch in the superstructure (1975: 157-158).

One important point here is that, the infrastructural series such as changes in the social life and mode of productions and so on, do not constitute the cause for the establishment of individual works. According to Jameson, individual works are symbolic responses of individual consciousness to historical conditions and the concrete historical situations in the *combinatoire* do not form a direct causal relationship (Jameson, 1975: 158). The best term to define this relationship might be "exclusion", because the concrete historical circumstances curtail some of former formal possibilities while paving the way for emergent ones (Jameson, 1975: 158). That is to say, "the *combinatoire* aims at revealing, not the causes behind a given form, but rather the *conditions of possibility* of its existence" (Jameson, 1975: 158). From this point of view, genre study gains a socio-historical significance. Since the emergence and progression of genres is related with the historical and social changes of the society in which they come into existence, studying genres can provide the means of revealing the relationship between individual works and social life.

Any probe on the historicity of genres evokes also an interrogation on the ideological nature of the form. We have already stated that Bakhtin groups speech genres under two main headings: firstly the primary (simple) speech genres and secondly, the secondary (complex) speech genres. And, it is important to remember that he also refers to the secondary (complex or literary) speech genres also as "ideological genres" (Bakhtin, 1986: 62). Todorov states that "since genre is the historically attested codification of discursive properties, one could conceive the absence of each of the two components of this definition: historical reality and discursive reality" (1976: 164). And when we talk about any discursive reality, we also have to deal with the ideological content of the discourse.

It is not merely the discursive trait of the genres that requires ideological interrogation. Inter-generic relations between different genres also consist an

ideological nature. According to Alastair Fowler, there are different relation types between genres (1979: 100). They may have a relation of "inclusion", "combination", inversion", "contrast", "hierarchy" and so on (Fowler, 1979: 100). Yet the hierarchical relation appears to be the most significant and active one. Fowler's notion of "generic hierarchy" emphasizes the dominant modes, and implies that in each epoch, different generic forms are favored and cherished as they are regarded as higher, greater forms amongst them all (Fowler, 1979: 100). A similar treatment of generic hierarchy may also be seen in Bakhtin's illustrious text on speech genres. According to Bakhtin, in each epoch and social environment, there are always more dominant utterances that serve as a model to others, which are imitated or cited in artistic, scientific or journalistic works (1986: 88-89).

Given all these aspects of genre, genre study gains a considerable significance for those who study cinema. As literary works, films may also be considered as complex speech genres. Studying cinematic genres therefore requires studying individual cinematic works and their relationship with the concrete historical situations and social circle in which they came into being and their relation with hegemonic ideologies.

In this respect, the emergence of social realism in the mid 1960s, into the Turkish cinema which until then mainly had been dominated by Yeşilçam model of filmmaking[13], raises the very question of how this mode[14] of filmmaking had found its historical socioeconomic setting in this particular era and what was its relationship with the hegemonic ideologies of the time. But before coming into these issues, we shall first discuss about the cinematic genres.

---

[13] According to Hilmi Maktav (2001a) until 1970s, the Turkish cinema was dominated by a Yeşilçam mode of filmmaking in which a rich and poor paradigm was constructed but it was not based on a class paradigm.

[14] Since the inquiry whether social realist cinema might be called as a genre or not deserves further discussion, we deliberatelty prefer to call it as a mode for this moment.

2.2.2 Cinema and Genres

As we have already asserted in the previous section, films are constituted of complex speech genres. Therefore, understanding film texts requires sorting out generic formations of these utterances, their discursive nature and their involvement with existing social relations.

When we look at existing studies on cinematic genres, we encounter generally with the studies on popular genres, classic Hollywood films and so on. In the meanwhile, the rest of the films in cinema history seem to be less studied in terms of genre criticism, probably because, it is not known how to be dealt with them. The reason behind this reservation may be related with the difficulty of the task at hand. Richard Altman contends that a series of texts, which remain outside of simple definition of genre, are merely studied under genre criticism (1984: 7). Similarly to Altman, Grant asserts that genre movies are often considered as the same thing as the popular cinema (2007: 1). But if the critics and theoreticians are willing to comfort into a familiar canon by frequenting the same films, it is not only because they are of better quality or more famous, but because they rather resemble to represent the given genre more appropriately (Altman, 1984: 7). Therefore, the question of why some films seem to represent a genre better than the others, gains a critical importance.

When we talk about genres, we talk about different classes of texts. And when we talk about different classes of text, we divide texts into separate groups; we draw a boundary between them and claim that they are different from each other in several aspects, whether these aspects may be thematic, structural or stylistic. However, sometimes these boundaries get blurry and it may be difficult to decide whether a specific text belongs to one genre or another. Indeed, a text seemingly may be carrying the characteristics of multiple genres, or genres may go through such a change in time that, it might become impossible to treat and identify them with formerly established rules. In this case, sorting texts may become problematic. The reason of this contradiction lies in the very nature of genres. As Thomas O. Beebee points out, "a text's generic status is rarely what it seems to be, that is always already unstable" (1994: 27). A text may belong to certain genre or genres but it generally

requires a more complex inquiry to determine it.

In "The Origin of Genres", Tzetvan Todorov leans into same problem, and in order to find an answer, evokes his famous question of "From where do genres come?" (1976: 161). According to Todorov genres fundamentally come from other genres and a new genre always emerges as a transformation of one or multiple former genres, by means of "inversion", "displacement" and "combination" (1976: 161).

In this respect, if a work does not obey the rules of a genre, this does not deny the existence of genres. On the contrary, it only validates the historical existence of genres. The reason is twofold; firstly because, a transgression always justify the existence of a law to be transgressed, and secondly, once a work's distinct mode is recognized, it may constitute a new norm (Todorov, 1976: 160).

Obviously, Todorov was mainly referring to literary genres. Nevertheless, it does not diminish the validity of his assessments for our research, since Altman too, makes similar remarks while discussing film genre.

> Whereas one Hollywood genre may be borrowed with little change from another medium, a second genre may develop slowly, change constantly, and surge recognisably before settling into a familiar pattern, while a third may go through an extended series of paradigms, none of which may be claimed as dominant. As long as Hollywood genres are conceived as Platonic categories, existing outside the flow of time, it will be impossible to reconcile genre theory, which has always accepted as given the timelessness of a characteristic structure, and genre history, which has concentrated on chronicling the development, deployment, and disappearance of this same structure. (Altman, 1984: 8)

This kind of an approach situates genre study into an historical position and tries to rescue the genre theory from ahistorical approaches.

Todorov (1976) asserts that, shared characteristic between the works belonging to a particular genre are either rooted in the semantic aspect of the text, or in its syntactic aspect (the association of the parts), or in its pragmatic aspect (the relation with the audience, reader, etc.), or in its verbal aspect. However, Frederic Jameson (1975) seems to prefer a more binary division between different approaches in the history of genre criticism and asserts that there are two main, seemingly counter approaches to genre, namely the semantic and syntactic approaches.

Semantic approaches generally try to group films according to their common traits, attitudes, characters, shots, locations and such. Therefore, we can briefly assert that semantic view generally emphasizes "certain constitutive relationships between undesignated and variable placeholders"; whereas, syntactic approaches generally dwell on the structures of a film text and how they are organized or arranged amongst them (Altman, 1984: 10).

Each approach comes with its advantages and disadvantages. The advantage of semantic approach lies in its power to give meaning to the genre, whilst its weakness is its "imaginary entities and abstract personifications" such as in the case of German idealism ("spirit" of comedy or tragedy and so on) (Jameson, 1975: 136). Dilthey's system of Weltanschauungen – also adopted by Lukács – is a perfect example to such kind of abstraction level. As Jameson points out "the essence of genre is apprehended in terms of what we call *a mode*" (1975: 137). The second approach, that is to say the syntactic approach, does not seek for the meaning, but rather deals with establishing *a model* (Jameson, 1975: 137). According to Jameson, as Lévi-Strauss has demonstrated in his critique of Propp, the weakness of this kind of an approach, lies in its persistency concerning a given structure is thus and not otherwise (1975: 137). Therefore, he prefers to define the main position of this approach with the "fixed form" term (Jameson, 1975: 137).

Furthermore, Altman contends that whilst syntactic approach has more explanatory power on generic structures than the semantic approach, semantic approach has a broader applicability – since it is more easily applicable to a larger number of films

(1984: 11). In this respect, he states that "This alternative seemingly leaves the genre analyst in quandary: choose the semantic view and you give up *explanatory power*, choose the syntactic approach and you do without *broad applicability*" (Altman, 1984: 11). Therefore, choosing only one this approaches and rejecting the other, may result in the denial of the "dual nature of any generic corpus" (Altman, 1984: 11). All genre films do not suit into their genres equally. Thus, applying both semantic and syntactic approaches, we can deal with the problem of genre more accurately (Altman, 1984: 11-12). Altman also supports this proposition by dwelling into the phases of emergence and development of genres. Altman proposes that genres emerge in two principal ways. Firstly, a relatively steady set of semantic components may establish a coherent and permanent syntax, or secondly, a present syntax may embrace new semantic attributes. The stability of a genre lies in its ability to carry both functions (semantic and syntactic) at the same time, and most durable genres are generally the ones, which have the most stable syntax (Altman, 1984: 15-16).

The first half of 1960s was a significant era for Turkish cinema in terms of new modes of filmmaking being introduced. Thus, it was a rupture in the old ways of filmmaking, both influencing the syntagmatic and semantic features of existing genre rules. In this respect, while studying the emergence of social realism in Turkish cinema, we are going to embrace a dualistic approach, both semantic and syntactic. However, before dwelling into analysis, we shall first discuss two significant terms for our study, respectively the "realism" and "social realism".

2.3. Understanding Realism and Social Realism

This part is devoted to the explanation of two important concepts for our discussion, namely realism and social realism. Before moving on to an analysis of the films categorized in the literature as "social realist", we would like to visit the discussions on the meanings of realism and social realism. In this way, we can both determine highlight line of our work and start revealing some issues related to our study. The aim of this section is not to make a discussion on social realism in the case of Turkey or to start the analysis of the films but, to introduce the basic concepts and our main position in the discussion. To that end, firstly, we will define realism in the arts and

secondly, we will explain where social realism falls within this category, and finally we will describe our frame of analysis.

2.3.1. What is Realism?

The Oxford English Dictionary[15] (2017) defines realism as "the quality or fact of representing a person or thing in a way that is accurate and true to life". In social life, however, the visible aspects of things may not always reveal their actual constitutive traits. In order to understand the true nature of things, going beyond the surface is might be necessary. Therefore, a more elaborate definition of realism is required, if we seek to understand what realism is. Also, we cannot talk about realism, without addressing different kinds of realisms.

Realism is often thought with a particular form of literary production, namely the nineteenth century realist novel (MacCabe, 1974:52). However, this kind of a view is deficient because it is based on two main misconceptions of realism. First, it limits realism only with the scope of literary production, which is not the case. "Realism is an issue not only for literature: it is a major political, philosophical and practical issue and explained as such - as a matter of general human interest" (Brecht cited in MacCabe, 1974: 51). And secondly, thinking over realism through 19th century novel includes viewing realist discourse only with its "adequacy" to real, even though there are different types and understandings of realism (Maccabe, 1974: 51). Over the course of this part, we will try to evaluate more on these two points.

Roy Armes defines realism as "an attitude of mind, a desire to adhere strictly to the truth, a recognition that a man is a social animal and a conviction that he is inseparable from his position in society" (Armes 1971: 17). This definition of Armes, is of course, very similar to Lukácsian concept of realism according to which human beings are *zoon politicon* and the realism is nothing but the truthful representation of

---

[15] Realism [Def. 2]. (n.d.). In *Oxford English Dictionary Online.* Retrieved: September May 2, 2017, from https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition-/realism

human beings in their social surroundings and under concrete historical circumstances (Lukács, 1969: 19).

The agreement between Roy Armes's and György Lukács does not imply that there is a universally adopted and accepted definition of realism. As Terry Eagleton points out "realism is one of the most elusive of artistic terms" (2003: 17). The reason behind this ambiguity might be found in the widespead understanding and reception concerning the term realism and the common approach that tries to explain this term in relation with the literary tradition of the 19th century novel. In this framework, realism is thought in parallel with the notion of verisimilitude[16]. However, the verisimilitude of a work of art does not necessarily imply that what it shows is reality. To better illustrate this argument, we can refer to Hollywood films. While many of the Hollywood films give a depiction of reality by using factual settings, characters, and so on, they do not refer to a social verisimilitude (Neale, 1990). Also, verisimilitude is not a relation between the discourse and its referent, but rather between the discourse and reader reception – or what is believed to be true by the readers (Neale, 1990: 47). Therefore verisimilitude does not always offer guarantee accessing the "truth". In fact, the entire cinema history is full of conflict over what constitutes reality and how it should be represented, as in the case of Eisenstein's and Bazin's different approaches to the "real"[17]. As Neale points out, there are two different types of verisimilitude in the general sense; first, "generic verisimilitude" and secondly, "social" or "cultural" verisimilitude. Yet, neither of these types of verisimilitude can substitute for the "reality" or "truth" (Todorov cited in Neale, 1990: 47).

---

[16] Steve Neale defines "verisimilitude" as "probable" or "likely" (Neale, 1990: 45).

[17] In *Two Types of Realism,* Brian Henderson (1971) asserts that main film theories might be divided into two groups according to their approach to reality. First one is the approach of the Russian Formalists such as Eisenstein and Pudovkin, that is based on the montage theory; and second approach is the one of the theoricians such as Bazin and Kracauer, who are mostly interested in cinema's relation with the reality. However, for both of these groups, the origin is the "real" (Henderson, 1971: 34).

According to Brecht, "reality changes" and "in order to represent it, modes of representation must also change" (1980:82). In a similar fashion, Ernst Fischer asserts that "new means of expression are needed in order to depict new realities" (1971: 114). Artistic realism only represents the world in consonance with the conventional, temporal modes of representing reality. From this point of view, we can argue that realism is a term the particular meaning of which changes according to different modes of art making in different times. Thus, realism is a more complex notion then it appears to be. This ambiguous nature of realism should be dealt with before developing on a more elaborate discussion on the related concepts such as realism.

Ernst Fischer defines artistic realism as an "elastic" and "vague" concept and he contends that realism is depicted as an "attitude" at times, and then as a "style" or a "method" (1971: 105). He also indicates that the distinction between them is often unclear. Whatever it may be, Fischer emphasizes that realism should not be reduced to external world detached from human consciousness (Fischer, 1971: 105). He asserts that reality involves diverse interactions with human experience and consciousness (Fischer, 1971: 105). Therefore, what is portrayed in art, however it may be grounded on external objects, cannot be thought separately from human experience. Besides, the art maker belongs to a certain class, age, nation or time and her experience is based on this concrete whole of social relations which determine the essence of the relationship she establishes with her object of art (Fischer, 1971: 105-106). In this respect, Fischer defines reality as "the sum of all relationships between subject and object" (Fischer, 1971: 106).

If we remember what we have already discussed in this study, the relationship between realism and ideology becomes more visible in the light of these assessments. The artistic reality is a matter of representation. Thus, it can be read as a discourse, a certain arrangement and transmission of partially real life components into a fictional narrative. And when the discursive character of artistic reality is taken into consideration, it is possible to see how artistic realism possesses an ideological character. The ideological character of artistic realism lies also in its historically and

politically contingent nature. The artworks, thus the style of an artwork cannot be thought separately from the time, the society and the social relations into which they were born. In turn, the ideological character of realism necessitates the emergence of different types of realism in different historical and social conditions and that is also why we should make a differentiation between different kinds of realisms.

In parallel with the idea above, there are different types of realism in cinema. The classification of these different kinds of realism is grounded on a complex relation between exclusion and inclusion. Noël Carroll shows how this relationship is established in cinema by illustrating a large pool of realist styles or movements. According to Carroll, realism pertains a style and referring to a film or a group of films as "realistic", implies that these films have some attributes that the others have not. In this respect, Carroll's explanation of what is cinematic realism - or what it is not – would be very enlightening:

> Realism is not a simple relation between films and the world but a relation of contrast between films that is interpreted in virtue of analogies to aspects of reality. Given this, it is easy to see that there is no single Film Realism -no trans- historical style of realism in film. Rather there are several types of realism. … Because "realism" is a term whose application ultimately involves historical comparisons, it should not be used unprefixed - we should speak of Soviet Realism, Neorealism, Kitchen Sink and Super realism. None of these developments strictly correspond to or duplicate reality, but rather make pertinent (by analogy) aspects of reality absent from other styles. (1996: 244)

When the term "realism" is used with a prefix, it indicates the temporospatial dimension of the mentioned cinematic movement, or tendency; it shows us "realism" is depended upon a specific time and place. It also it reminds us popular conventions settled in a society, concerning realism and reality. Since discussing different modes of realism or different approaches to realism is beyond the scope of this study, we

will only focus on defining one particular mode of realism, namely the social realism.

2.3.2. Defining Social Realism

According to Samantha Lay, social realism is a difficult term to define, because it is politically and historically contingent (2002: 8). Parallel to society's evolution and change over the time, social realist practices in art also tend to change and evolve (Lay, 2002: 8). Therefore, in different eras, social realism is thought in different terms. However, all these definitions have several common points. In this respect, Lay asserts that social realist texts are generally tend to be independent, low-budget, standing out of mainstream ways of filmmaking, and also having a contrasting perception of realism in regard to mainstream cinema or classical Hollywood films (2002: 8).

Hallam and Marshment portray social realism as "a discursive term used to describe films that aim to show the effects of environmental factors on the development of character through depictions that emphasize the relationship between location and identity" (2000: 184). There are also still some other definitions of social realism as a genre that places its emphasis on exploring social issues. In this respect, Lowenstein regards social realism as being "bound up with moments of contemporary social crisis" (cited in Lay, 2002: 9).

Samantha Lay (2002) groups different aspects of social realism under three main titles: practice and politics, style and form, content. In our study, we will form our categories of analysis taking Lay's categories as a starting point, since it offers a very useful frame of analysis. However, Lay's categories require some additional explanations since they are all very broad concepts. So first, we will explain what Lay means by these categories.

We will start by defining what does "practice and politics" means. Briefly, the practice indicates the ways in which a film is produced. It involves whether the films are produced independently or under the roof of big production companies, the

employment of professional or unprofessional actors, the preference of shooting locations and so on. As for the politics, it indicates the political intent of the filmmakers, since filmmakers' political intent has an effect on how they express themselves with cinematic means (Lay, 2002: 9-11).

The practice and politics remains outside of the cinematic text. However, they have an impact on the form, structure, content and the style of a film. They define the cinematic mode of expression and it should be also noted that the politics or the intent of the filmmaker generally shapes the production practices. In this respect, Samantha Lay asserts that British social realist films tend to have diverse purposes or ideals. And this purpose generally shows itself as a "moral realism"[18] (Lay, 2002: 10).

The intent actually holds a significant place in the discussions on realism. And we believe that it is important here to return Lukácsian concept of "perspective". According to Lukács (1969), perspective is the main determinant of a text, according to which, the chosen themes, content, style and form are used and developed. Lukács (1969) asserts that writers are a part of something bigger than themselves, and their individual works cannot be separated from the social environment in which they born into. Therefore, even though multiple texts may have similar styles or themes, they differentiate through their makers' different comprehensions of the social reality. He names it as "the perspective", the channel through which different approaches to social and historical reality is merged in to the text. In this respect, the perspective - and the "purpose" by extension - holds an over-all determining place in the creation of the artwork. We will return to concept of "perspective" in the following parts. Until then however, we should continue with the other aspects of social realist texts, for preserving the integrity of this part.

The second aspect of realist texts, according to Lay, lies in the determination and the operation of the content. Lay defines content as constituted of two aspects; first,

---

[18] The term moral realism belongs to Andrew Higson (1984), who explains it as a form of committed filmmaking.

issues and themes and second, types of representations constructed especially through characters (2002: 12).

In the previous parts, we have stated how according to Lukács (1969), the determinant component between form and content was the content. And the content was a product of both social conditions and perspective of the artist. Similarly to Lukács, Lay (2002) emphasizes how content of a work, usage of certain themes and issues are related with the filmmaker's intent. Samantha Lay indicates that, in the case of British social realism, since the intent is generally *educative* and *reformist*; and a social aim is pursued, and the selection of themes and issues is generally correlated with this moral intent. This is pretty much the same with Turkish social realism. And one can easily assert that a true understanding of the content, the usage of certain themes and issues may reveal a lot on the political, social and cultural constituents of a given period in the history of a society. Therefore, as we have mentioned before, the understanding of the content goes hand in hand with the comprehension of cinematic text as a *socially symbolic act* and revealing the *political unconscious* lying beneath it. Besides, the usage of themes and issues may change from one historical period to another, and why certain themes and issues are central in a given period of time and pushed back in others may reveal its relation with the political unconscious. Another point is not to forget how realistic texts are also constructed realities and is to realize that by pursuing a temperospatial study of the realist texts, we can understand what is considered realistic in particular historical periods and societies, along with its relation to why that particular piece of reality was chosen to be constructed as such (Lay, 2002: 13).

It is also important to distinguish themes from issues since they address different things, which operates in different levels. The "issue" is a term employed to indicate the social problems that are introduced in the cinematic texts, which are generally considered as of importance at the time of filming. Issues are often easy to spot and they are explicit. In contrast, the themes are more difficult to determine since they are generally implicit and often revealing the origins of the issues, social problems that are depicted in a film (Lay, 2002: 13-14).

Another component of the content may be registered as the characters. At this point, it is important to remember how the characters hold a crucial place in discussions concerning realism, especially in Lukács' literary theory. Lukács' understanding of realism is based on the fact that man is *zoon politicon* and that human reality can only be represented in concrete social conditions and relations that define itself:

> (…) man is *zoon politikon*, a social animal. The Aristotelian dictum is applicable to all great realistic literature. Achilles and Werther, Oedipus and Tom Jones, Antigone and Anna Karenina; their individual existence – their *sein an sich* in the Hegelian terminology; their 'ontological being', as a more fashionable terminology has it – cannot be distinguished from their social and historical environment, their human significance, their specific individuality cannot be separated from the context in which they were created. (Lukács, 1969: 19)

While, Lukács' conceptualization of realism most prominently finds its expression in his novel theory, the roots of this idea can be traced back to Engels' approach to realism: "Realism, to my mind, implies, besides truth of detail, the truthful reproduction of typical characters under typical circumstances" (Engels cited in Eagleton, 2002: 43). In Lukács' theory of novel, this approach is addressed by the notion of typicality. Realistic characters, according to Lukács, are distinguished by their typicality (Jameson, 1997: 169). In this sense, they represent something larger than themselves, their isolated individualities and destinies (Jameson, 1997: 169). They are concrete individualities, but at the same time, they represent something bigger than themselves (Jameson, 1997: 169). The typicality for Lukács is never equivalent to a photographic accuracy. In this regard, it is possible to say that Lukács' understanding of realism lies in the way in which he conceptualizes typical characters as the expression of a more general world view or philosophy of life – *Weltanschauung* (Tihanov, 2000: 108). Therefore it reveals the perspective or the intent of the artist.

In Lukácsian conceptualization of realism, characters should be considered only within the concrete social and historical conditions surrounding them. In this sense, as long as the society is understood as a changing organism, the novel hero does not see the distance between herself and the world as unchangeable, but would try to change it. (Jameson, 1997: 178) Realism, in this sense, depends only on the possibility of approaching the forces of change at a certain moment in history (Jameson, 1997: 178)

The social realist texts approach to the characters both as individual beings and as a part of collective being. Similar to Lukács' emphasis on humans' inextricability from their "social and historical environment" (1969: 19), social realist texts are based on the relationship between the characters and their environments (Hallam & Marshment 2000: 184). Since this relationship changes through the time, the representation of characters changes accordingly and by analyzing this relationship we can reveal how class relationships are constructed.

Social realist texts often favor certain types of characters, especially the characters that are seldom represented in the mainstream films. Hallam and Marshment (2000) indicate that social realist texts give a special place for the characters that are located in the margins of society. And we will see later in the cinematic examples of Turkish social realism, the characters were generally from the urban poor, the working class, the rural migrants or peasants. However it is not only a matter of representing the under-represented classes, but also the characters are represented in social realist texts through a certain social "perspective" and this perspective is often grounded on socio-historical conditions of the time and in a certain understanding of social relations. Therefore, these representations generally tend to change over the time.

The last basic aspect of social realism, according to Samantha Lay is the form and style. The form is used to indicate the "shape" or "mode" according to which social realist texts are formed, but it also refers to the "arrangements of parts". Whereas the form refers to such formal features, the "style" is employed to indicate the aesthetic preferences of a filmmaker (Lay, 2002: 19). The style refers to the aesthetic aspects

of films such as the use of camera, iconography, editing and soundtrack (Lay, 2002: 23). In social realist films, an observational style of filming is generally preferred, in which wide-angled and long shots are favored (Lay, 2002: 23). However, we can say that style is the most contingent aspect of social realist films changing from one director to another, or in different national cinemas or in different historical periods. Later, will discuss more in depth which stylistic preferences are adopted by Turkish social realist directors. For now however, we will continue with the meaning of form and how it should be considered.

Lay asserts that the form should be thought in multiple levels. First of all, social realism is a "form" or a type of realism that she describes by using Raymond Williams' fourfold conception concerning realist artists' and works' motivations. First, social realism is secular in its approach to reality, meaning it seeks to depict a mundane truth rather than divine. Second, the characters are thoroughly associated with place or their environment. The social inequalities have structural reasons and these reasons are materialized in the relationship between the place and the character. In this respect, we often observe that social realist texts have contemporary settings and through the usage of this contemporary setting, social problems and issues are brought into the view of the audience. Third, social realist texts also seek to represent previously under-represented or marginalized groups and strive towards the issues that are denied by the mainstream cinema. Social realism also meets Williams' last criterion of a realist work, which is for the artist or the filmmaker having a specific moral intent which effects the representation of social reality (Lay, 2002: 19-20).

Secondly, the form implies the use of diverse artistic mediums in the social realist works. Social realism is not only in the cinema, but a mode of representation that can be found in literature, fine arts, theatre, radio or television. The medium has the biggest impact on the employment of the form. Therefore, there cannot be found a single or unified social realist form. Nevertheless, there are some shared characteristics between social realist texts with respect to their formal features. Lay argues that in all forms of social realism, "there is a high degree of verisimilitude, placing an emphasis on ensemble casts in social situations which suggest a direct

link between person and place. And finally, that these films, documentaries and series have something in to say about *things as they really are*" (Lay, 2002: 20). Of course, the first and second level of form, therefore all of these aspects of form are related with the narrative form and should be considered under the content of social realist films.

But the final level of form is more related with the syntagmatic aspects of the films, i.e. the arrangement of the filmic parts. It is also the final level in which the social realist cinema differs from the mainstream cinema. Social realist texts are different from mainstream texts in many respects. As Carroll puts it, it is this relationality that differs and marks them out as realist texts (1996: 243). In mainstream cinema, the chain of the narrative is somewhat simpler and the text often adopts more predictable resolutions. In this respect, Lay asserts that mainstream texts seem to prefer "more or less stable resolutions: the monster is killed, the criminal is caught or gets his or her comeuppance, mistaken identities are unravelled, the romantic couple are united, and so on" (Lay, 2002: 20-21). However, in the case of social realism, the narrative usually resist to familiar resolution schemes; a happy ending is rare, "future is rarely bright" even though the degree of resistance to the common schemes may change (Lay, 2002: 21). This also implies that contrary to popular genres; social realist cinema does not adopt schematic resolutions and conventions. It also differs from the mainstream cinema both in terms of content and form.

In the following section, we will try to analyze Turkish social realist films of 1960s, according to these three main titles: politics and practice, content, style and form. We will not however, consider them as separate levels. As Lukács points out, the form of artworks depends on their content and cannot be thought separately from the perspective of the author (Lukács, 1969: 19). By keeping that in mind, we will use them as categories that will help us to define the generic characteristics of Turkish social realist cinema.

CHAPTER III

POLITICS AND PRACTICE

According to Brian Henderson, the principal film theories may be divided into two main groups based on their treatment of reality and understanding of realism. In this regard, he refers to the first group as "part-whole theories" and the second group as the "theories of relation to the real" (1971: 33-34). While the first group indicates the approach of Russian Formalists such as Pudovkin and Eisenstein, the second group indicates the approaches to reality and realism of theoreticians such as Bazin and Kracauer (Henderson, 1971: 33-34). In other words, whilst the first category is employed to indicate formalist approaches to "truth" and "reality", the second one indicates a certain realistic approach, especially the one which is referred by Susan Hayward, as "aesthetically motivated realism" (2006: 334).

"Aesthetically motivated realism", as Hayward puts it, contrary to "seamless realism"[19] whose ideological function can only be explained as to give an illusion of realism or a false "reality effect", recognizes this "reality effect" and avoids it by preferring a more or less objective cinematic gaze (Hayward, 2006: 334-335). While we look to the cinema history, we can generally relate social realist movements with the second group, which is defined by Hayward as "aesthetically motivated realism" and for which Italian Neorealism and British Social Realism may be considered as relevant examples.

Italian Neorealism rejects seeing realism as something "external", something to be invented or to be constructed, but rather to be found in the everyday life of the

---

[19]Seamless realism might be understood as a surface realism. Similarly to Hayward, Richard Armstrong (2005) and Andrew Higson (1984) refers to the same category as "surface realism". And the "reality effect" in this kind of a realism should be understood as a "surface verisimilitude" only to be remained in the surface, but does not seek to discover the truth beyond the surface.

common people. To better illustrate, Rossellini's definition of realism may be enlightening:

> I think there is till some confusion about the term 'realism' even after all these years of realist film. Such people still think of realism is something external, as a way out into the fresh air, not as the contemplation of poverty and misery. To me realism is simply the artistic form of truth (Rossellini, cited in Williams, 1980: 31-32).

We can also assert that Italian Neorealism approaches to the mundane world as its main object and favors a deeper understanding of its material. According to this point of view, storytelling and its spectacular formulations considered to have a secondary importance.

> The realist film has the 'world' as its living object, not the telling of a story. What it has to say is not fixed in advance, because it arises of its own accord. It has no love of the superfluous and the spectacular, and reject these, going instead to the root of things. It does not stop at surface appearances but seeks out the most subtle strands of the soul. It rejects formulae and doesn't pander to its audience, but seeks out the inner motives in each of us. (Rossellini, cited in Williams, 1980: 32)

Here, the idea of pushing audience's desire into the background, and emphasizing the discovery of an inner truth has a revelatory meaning for understanding social realistic approach to realism.

Even though British Social Realism seeks to depict reality in favor of the greater social good, and it is often called a moral realism. For this reason, it shares with Italian Neorealism, same characteristic of denying to appeal to the audience. In this sense, it differs from Russian Formalism, for the main aim of these films may be summarized as representing the real man, rather than educating them. Christopher Williams asserts for the case of British Social Realism that "(…) it would be

mistaken to associate Grierson and Eisenstein too closely. Grierson[20] wants to see 'real man' on the screen, Eisenstein is perhaps more interested in the 'real man' as a spectator" (1980: 22). The division here is very enlightening. And to show it more clearly, Williams draws upon the very own words of Eisenstein: "Absolute realism is by no means the correct form of perception. It is simply the function of a certain form of social structure" (cited in Williams, 1980: 22). Therefore, whereas a Formalist approach such as Eisenstein's would see the truth something to be constructed, a realist approach would consider it as something to be found or showed.

The above-mentioned examples serve us to distinguish two main types of approaches to realism to see the difference between Henderson's two types of cinematic reality: in the one hand the construction of truth on the screen; and on the other, the depiction of it. As we have already stated, social realist cinema generally tends to conform to second approach. However, if we look at social realist tendency seen in 1960s Turkish cinema, we face with a different picture. It constitutes a very peculiar example since it cannot be easily categorized according to any of these classifications.

Social realism in Turkish cinema at that time carries the aim of transferring the stories of the common men to the silver screen, just as it was in Italian Neorealism and British Social Realism. Likewise, as we are going to discuss in the following parts, it is possible to say that it shares some stylistic, aesthetics aspects of this sort of a realist style. However, similarly to Russian formalism, the main focus of these films is actually "the real man as the spectator": Social realist tendency in the1960's Turkish cinema aimed to educate and enlighten the masses. For this reason, it carries the defining characteristics from both sides.

It seems interesting then to ask, how Turkish social realism is often thought together with Italian Neorealism. When we look at the existing studies on the topic, they are

---

[20] John Grierson was a British filmmaker, often considered as the pioneer of the British Social Realism.

often compared one to the other, especially in terms of some aesthetic preferences, and their formal features and at the level of content, their willingness to bring "ordinary men" and their social problems onto the silver screen. These two movements do not however, draw from the same understanding of realism. Somewhat these comparisons in the literature tend to emphasize somewhat formal features of the films, but they overlook the problem of perspective in the Lukácsian sense. In other words, they are insufficient to see the dialectical relationship between the form and content.

For sure, highlighting the similarities between Italian Neorealism and Turkish social realism is not totally irrelevant, since Italian Neorealism did influence Turkish social realist directors. As Aslı Daldal puts it:

> Like the French Nouvelle Vague and the Brazilian Cinema Novo, Turkish social realism was also related to the legacy of Italian Neorealism whose leftward oriented politics and realist-minimalist aesthetics fitted well with the socio-political concerns of a new generation of Turkish filmmakers eager to develop a 'national' film language. (Daldal, 2013: 183)

However, the two had more differences then their similarities. According to Bazin, the reality in Italian Neo-Realism was not represented or reproduced, but instead it was encountered (Deleuze, 2012:7). As for the Turkish social realist movies, we don't face with this kind of a direct reality. The realism in these movies was rather a pragmatic and carefully constructed reality, with the intention of educating or informing the society on the concerned issues (Daldal, 2005: 56). But only divergence point cannot be deduced to this pragmatic or moral regard of the filmmakers. It is true that social realist cinema had a moral purpose, but it was the perspective behind these films that defined their moral purpose. And discover this particular perspective at the utmost importance for understanding how they represent social issues and their actors. Turkish social realist filmmakers of the 1960s often had an external gaze to their subjects, and they were often incapable of explaining the motives behind their actions and giving them an individuality. We are going to

discuss these issues more in depth in the following parts. But perhaps without going into details, we shall clarify the notion of perspective and why it matters.

According to Lukács: "In any work of art, perspective is of overriding importance. It determines the course and the content; it draws together the threads of the narration; it enables the artist to choose between the important and the superficial, the crucial and the episodic" (1969:33). This line of thought would assert that the perspective is the main constituent element in any work of art. For Lukács, the perspective also has a historical meaning. It was not possible to think it independently from the ideologies that were influencing the era in which any work of art was produced. Therefore, any work of art is a product of both its creator's individuality and the historical or social processes marking the period in which it is created.

If we follow this argument, we should consider that the historical and social processes or mechanisms behind the emergence of Italian Neorealism and Turkish social realism were extremely different. Although some scholars such as Aslı Daldal (2003), makes a generalization by asserting that a certain realistic tendency can be seen in cinema after major social events, no such generalization is sufficient to understand Turkish socialist realism or Italian Neorealism. In the literature, these films are also compared in terms of their formal features, such as location shootings, the use of multiple camera angles, or in terms of their subject matters; that is to say, the organization of the stories around current social events and common men. Such a comparison, however, is insufficient in terms of seeing the specifics of the social realist cinema in Turkey and pointing out the perspective differences between the two cinematic movements. Thus, our aim will not be to offer a comparative analysis on Turkish social realism and Italian Neorealism or British Social Realism that ends up with emphasizing similarities, but to focus on the peculiar generic features of Turkish social realist films, if there is any shared perspective behind these features and the historical or social roots of these films.

41

3.1. Politics and Practice

The Turkish social realism seen in the 1960s were mainly dependent upon Yeşilçam industry. If we look at the films we often see that their production practices are generally in accord with popular cinema. This can be seen especially in the selection of the actors, since they were generally the part of the star system. But also, their production was realized through the production companies in Yeşilçam industry. As we have previously stated, in certain times in a society certain forms are considered to be higher from the others. Fowler's notion of "generic hierarchy" shows us there are dominant modes in each epoch, and they are favored accordingly (1979: 100). As a result, although many of these films were the victims of censorship law, after a while they have gained a popularity, attended the festivals abroad (Refiğ in Hristidis, 2007: 107-108) and when producers noticed this interest towards social realist cinema they supported these films (Daldal, 2003: 154). Therefore, even though these films did not differ from popular cinema in terms of production practices, as it was constructed around social issues, and a moral, educative purpose; the political intent behind these films affected their content and form. In that respect, this part aims to introduce the intellectual background of these and the social processes that prepare this background. The importance of these films can only be understood if considered together with political and economic events that occurred in the country after 1960s.

3.2. 1960 Coup d'Etat and Social Realism

The decade of 1960s was an important period for Turkish cinema. It was rich in terms of the increase in the number of the films produced. But it was also the period when new cinematic quests were pursued. Alim Şerif Onaran defines these years as a period in which the moral climate for the development of the art of cinema was created (Onaran, 1994:103). And Özön states that the coup of 27th helped to ensure a more democratic climate, paving the way for the young and "well-intentioned" directors who want to focus on social problems (Özön, 1995b: 32).

The years following 1960 coup d'état were as important for political history of Turkey as for union activities, organization and struggle of the working class. The Turkish Labor Party (TİP) was established this period. The workers' movement and the union struggle, which had emerged as a result of socio-economic developments, began to fulfill their functions they had failed to do before because they had been under pressure for years during the Democrat Party (DP) era. In parallel to the post-1960 period, in which the struggle of the workers has increased not only in our country but also in the world, unionization became increasingly important. As a consequence of the legal arrangements within the freedom environment recognized by the 1961 Constitution, workers' struggle and the unionization process gained momentum as well. After the 1961 Constitution, new laws regulated unions and collective bargaining agreements, strike and lockout rights (Morva Kablamacı 2011: 60).

However, it is questionable to which degree the political atmosphere of the 1960's was liberal in terms of the regulations concerning cinema industry. The 1939 Censorship Regulations were not abolished at this time and they were still in force. We know that Turkish Labor Party has appealed to Constitutional Court for abolishing the censorship law, but their demand was rejected and many films produced in this period were subject to censorship (Esen, 2010: 72). However, by that time, many filmmakers had found ways of dealing with censorship. They made habit of sending the "suitable" scripts for censorship board, by altering their scripts and re-adding erased scenes to the filming and screening process. Besides, after *Yılanların Öcü* is rejected by censorship board and later seen and supported by the president of that time, Cemal Gürsel, and this incidence gave an additional reassurance to filmmakers (Coşkun, 2009: 41). With this assurance and with the influence of political atmosphere of the era, one film followed the other and the number of social realist films increased in a five-year period of time. This period, marked by important transformations in the economic, political, social and cultural fields, also corresponds with a rupture in the Turkish cinema, differentiating it from the previous periods. The directors influenced by the progressive atmosphere of the

period and produced films that were usually referred as social realist cinema (Daldal, 2003: 142).

Moreover, in the years following 1960 coup d'état; the number of cinema magazines, clubs and festivals increased considerably and they also started to politicize. The "Sine-İş" (Union for Turkish Film Workers), "Club Cinema 7", "Ankara Sinematek Association", "Film Club of the Institute of French Studies" and Sinematek have also been established in these years. Many new intellectual film journals have been also published within this period, including *Si-Sa*, *Yeni Sinema*, *Sine-Film* and *Sinema 65* (Daldal, 2003: 141-142).

However, it would not be correct to suggest that these developments in cinematography are only related to the political environment after the 1960 coup. Starting from the 1950s, many discussions were made in the cinema circles to establish the intellectual foundations of Turkish cinema and these debates were influenced by international developments like the foundation of intellectual film journals such as *Cahiers du Cinema*, *Sight and Sound* and many other. Turkish cinema followed the developments elsewhere, particularly Europe, with a delay of five years to ten and it was highly influenced by them. The cinema movements such as Italian Neorealism were an inspiring example for Turkish filmmakers. Halit Refiğ's arguments below support this argument:

> The idea that cinema is art was reflected in the new market. The *Cahiers du Cinema* magazine, which began to be published by André Bazin in France in the 1950s, was a very influential magazine, and the British Film Institute's *Sight and Sound* magazine was launched a few years later; I say these for Europe, *Bianco e Nero* magazine is published in Italy. These are very new formations. They are not publications that appeal to great masses. It is possible to read Eisenstein and Pudovkin only in English. Or Russian-speaking people could read from the original (...) Intellectually, Turkey followed these events by a delay of about five years. When *Cahiers du Cinema* has begun to be published at the beginning of the 50's, Attila İlhan

was making instant translations. But the beginning of a cinema idea in Turkey is the middle of the 50's. *Cahiers du Cinema* started to be published in 1951, we have released the *Sinema* magazine in 56, so there is a difference of five years intellectually. As for the practice, *Rome Open City* was in 1945 and *Kanun Namına* was in 1952. (Refiğ in Hristidis, 2007: 62-63, my translation)

To sum up, after the coup of 27th May, a sense of new liberal socio-politcal atmosphere has prevailed and it influenced the Turkish cinema and a new generation filmmakers. As a result of this new political context, the filmmakers search for a modern, intellectual, national cinema, a realist tendency emerged in Turkish cinema and new films started to focus on current social issues and rights. These realist attempts continued until the mid-1960s and referred by some as "Social Realist Movement" (Coşkun, 2009; Daldal, 2003). However, we cannot say that the first realist attempts in Turkish cinema were made in the early 1960s. Even before that, there were also such attempts. Metin Erksan had already tried a realistic approach in his first film *Aşık Veysel'in Hayatı* (*The Life of Aşık Veysel*, 1953) or in *Dokuz Dağın Efesi* (*The Swashbuckler of the Nine Mountains*, 1958). It is also possible to mention such an approach in some films of Atıf Yılmaz, especially his films about country life and some other films carrying the traces of American crime movies (Coşkun, 2009: 34). However, these films are not considered "social realist" like the films of 1960s. The difference between the realisms of these two eras is explained by Esin Coşkun (2009) by referring to their approach to the social issues. She asserts that before 1960s, there was no concern with highlighting a social problem or voicing criticism against it. However, we can see such features in the films made in 1960s. The films that are categorized as "social realist" shares the same characteristic of expressing a social criticism directed towards society and willingness to depict existent social problems (Coşkun, 2009: 34).

The film critics from that period directly refer to the effects of the political and economic changes occurred in Turkey in that era and how they are reflected on Turkish cinema environment:

The Revolution and the new constitution brought all of them to the surface if there was any serious problem of trying to be prevented by force, oppression and police state methods until then. These were an inexhaustible treasure for filmmakers. The filmmakers who learned the language of cinema between 1950 and 1960, but had to spend it on superficial issues, could now turn to these problems. The problem of how to explain to filmmakers has been solved, now the problem of what to tell has arisen. With no changes in control, the practice seem to adapt itself to a new air. Thus, many of the directors who started their work in the 1960s with pre-1960 filmmakers who are willing to do something with good intentions have been eagerly embracing the work and have begun to tackle social problems. Thus, for the first time in Turkish cinema between 1960 and 1965, a series of films tried to reflect the problems of society. (Özön, 1995b: 32, my translation)

Halit Refiğ, one of the social realist directors of 1960s, affirms Özön's assesment by arguing that films of this period cannot be considered independently from the 1960 coup d'état:

The 1961 Constitution, the newly formed political parties and the elections have created a suitable environment for dealing with diverse issues of our society from different aspects. This political vitality, initiated by May 27th, did not show any delay to exert its effects on the cinema. It contributed to the emergence of a movement which is sometimes referred as "Social Realist Movement" and trying to depict the structure of our society, the relations of people from different strata within this structure. (Refiğ, 1971: 24, my translation)

Perhaps the most striking point regarding Halit Refiğ's remarks on certain films made during this period is his consideration of these films as a movement. Even though there is a consensus between scholars, critics and directors concerning the richness of this period regarding the production of social realist films, the social

realist cinema of 1960s is rarely defined as a movement. Contrary to Refiğ, Nijat Özön and Gülseren Güçhan refuse to say that these films constitute a movement, although they agree that they focus on the current problems of the society (Coşkun, 2010: 37). They emphasize more on the emergence of a liberating atmosphere after the coup d'état which eventually influenced the cinema, and contributed to a new "trend" of filmmaking that focused on social problems (Coşkun, 2009: 37). In a similar fashion, Giovanni Scognamillo defines social realism as an arbitrary denomination (Daldal, 2005:57) and Şükran Kuyucak Esen, who comes essentially from Özön school, states that these films were too few to constitute a movement (2010: 73).

Nevertheless, there is still a certain consensus on the emergence of social realist movies and their common characteristics, the most important one being these movies bring social problems to the fore. As Abisel puts it, the main problem in these movies may be summarized as the contradictions created by the process of modernization and concomitant social changes (1994:86). Likewise, Aslı Daldal states that the social realist directors were moving with two main motives: representing the social problems with an objective and a modern cinematic language (2005: 58).

The 1960s were an extremely active period for Turkish cinema. In terms of popular cinema, the number of films shot during this period has increased considerably compared to previous periods. However, there was also another important feature of this period; it was the beginning of new searches in Turkish cinema. Therefore, some filmmakers (i.e directors and script writers), attempted to find new ways of filmmaking by focusing on the social problems of the country, on the life of common men and creating a national cinema language.

As we have already stated previously, the main social change that evoked the emergence of social realism in cinema was the 1960 Coup and as the reformist movements that followed the military coup were mainly city based and reflected more or less the progressive ideology of a new intelligentsia that was constituted

mainly of western oriented urban middle classes (Daldal, 2003: 139). In this regard, Turkish social realist cinema was based on this new intelligentsia's aspirations of finding a new national cinematic language, which is trying to blend a western oriented progressivism with founding Kemalist principles of the republic. In that respect, Aslı Daldal, makes this remark on Turkish social realist cinema of 1960's:

> Although a failed and later completely abandoned experience, social realism in film, within the progressive middle-class rule of 1960-1965, reflected a search for national identity within this traditionalism-modernism axis. They looked for a "self-image" in the sense used by Godard, an image that could both describe the current Turkish society and Turkish cinema. Thus the social realist movement had a double mission: To reflect the current social order in a critical and revolutionary perspective, and to create an original and mature film language. These two intentions were not mutually exclusive and, in many cases, they complemented each other. (2003: 142)

The social realism was mostly influenced by the leftist cultural discourse in Turkey and official ideology of Kemalism. That is why, as in Turkish social realist literature, it had a strong populist tendency (Daldal, 2003: 143). In this sense, Turkish social realist filmmakers in 1960's had a "utilitarian" approach to art, with a similar perspective to Plekhanov (Daldal, 2003: 143). This tendency reflects upon the selection of themes and to their representation. All of these films focus on prominent social issues and carry the aim of educating common people or showing the social truth lying underneath them:

> We had a major aim in those days. We tried to defend something in *Kızgın Delikanlı*, *Otobüs Yolcuları*, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, *Şehirdeki Yabancı* and others… We wanted to contribute to the process of democratization in Turkey. We wanted to give clear democratic message to the masses. The new rights brought by the coup was not well understood… For example the right to strike and to form labour unions… Most of these rights were not obtained in the wake of harsh class politics but were rather imported from abroad.

Thus the filmmakers had an important popular duty: to make the masses understand and accept these rights. (Türkali cited in Daldal, 2003: 143)

3.3. 1960s and Left Kemalism

The decade of 1960s carries a significance for the leftist movements in Turkey. After its foundation in the 1920s, even though TKP (Turkish Communist Party) reached a considerable political influence in the national struggle era, due to the constraints during the one party rule, it managed to preserve its existence, but could not transform into a real political agent (Şener, 2017: 359). However, from the beginning of 1960s, new movements and initiatives revived the political atmosphere of Turkey. And the two movement that marked the first half of the 1960s were Yön Movement and TİP (Turkish Labor Party).

In the political atmosphere of 1960s, a tendency of introducing socialism as a further phase of Kemalism has emerged. Yön Movement was one of them. It was founded in the leadership of Doğan Avcıoğlu and organized around *Yön* magazine between 1960-1971 and around *Devrim* magazine between 1969-1971 (Şener, 2010).

The emergence of Yön as a tendency occurs in the DP period. DP accedes with promises of development and democracy and in the first years of its rule, it successfully united certain democratic steps with populism. However, at the end its decennary rule, gravitated towards an oppressive regime and gave considerable damages to the economy (Atılgan, 2002: 121). Eventually, its populist tendency grounding upon a large rural political base, and moving accordingly with the interests of agrarian bourgeoisie and powerful landowners; faced the opposition of the industrial bourgeoisie that was growing since 1950s (Savran, 2011: 163). As a result, the industrial bourgeoisie moving away from the line of DP constituted an opposition bloc around Hürriyet Party and CHP (Republican People's Party). According to Savran, in that time this opposition bloc that was constituted of industrial bourgeoisie, officers, intellectuals, students and a growing part of the working class was a minority in a society in which the economy was based on

agriculture; and this circumstances prepared the preconditions of the purge of 27th May (Savran, 2011: 164-65). In that time, the main notions that were framing the oppositions towards DP rule were enlightenment, development and Kemalism. And Yön emerged from the opposition that was designed around these notions (Atılgan, 2002: 123).

Yön was in the footsteps of Kadro Movement and aiming to unite Kemalism's superstructural reformism, based on education and culture with economic revolutionism (Bora, 2017: 165). Development economy constituted the agenda of Yön, and in that respect, national bourgeoisie was assigned a progressive role (Şener, 2010: 93). Although Yön movement accepted that Turkey was a class society, did not attribute a revolutionary character to the working class. According to Yön Movement, working class in Turkey was weak and rudimentary; besides, due to their economic and cultural conditions, people were tending to follow the reactionary groups, therefore the involvement of the army and progressive intellectuals was necessary in the road to revolution (Atılgan, 2008: 27).

Yön influenced some leftist movements by this position in the Turkish left after the 27th May. For instance some parties like TİP developed their thesis contrary to Yön (Atılgan, 2002: 120). Contrary to Yön, TİP was a political party founded by unionists, and although at the beginning it had a Kemalist stance, its main argument was based the working class of Turkey was sufficiently developed to pursue directly a socialist revolution (Şener, 2010: 17). The fact that the predominant part of Turkish society was constituted of peasants did not change anything (Varel, 2017: 417). TİP considers enti-emperialist struggle together with socialist struggle (Şener, 2010: 249). And contrary to Yön, proposes a non-capitalist development model (Şener, 2017: 257).

For sure, it is impossible to discuss in depth; the opposition to the DP rule, left Kemalist tendency in 1960s and two movements that marked the political history of Turkey in such a limited discussion. However, it was never our primal aim. With this section, we have only wanted to outline the political atmosphere of 1960s and

introduce the background of some themes that we are going to discuss while analyzing the films.

3.4. Social Realism and Social Criticism

All of the directors and filmmakers who contributed to social realist cinema were more or less politically engaged. Vedat Türkali was a Marxist and Ertem Göreç was a unionist. Halit Refiğ was one of the petitioners of Yön manifesto. And Metin Erksan was close to the line of TİP until 1965 (Yıldırım, 2015: 216). As they had a moral and educative purpose of filmmaking, they considered themselves progressive intellectuals of their time. Their movies did not only aim to educate people on the chosen subjects, they also aimed to offer a social criticism concerning contemporary issues. This critical core of social realist cinema constitutes one of the most prominent characteristics of these films. Aslı Daldal remarks that all these filmmakers had an explicit anti-bourgeois and anti-capitalist attitude which is reflected upon their films whether as a direct social criticism or through the depiction of modernist capitalization processes and its discontents (2003: 143).

This socio-political concern of the filmmakers affects the themes employed in films, the construction of characters and their storytelling. In a similar fashion, Mesut Uçakan asserts that social realist cinema is grounded upon a political and aesthetic attempt to struggle with the effects of underdevelopment (1977: 26), in which the dramatic tension points concentrate around the issues of class conflict, exploitation of the working classes, class consciousness and organization; as well as the conflicting effects of modernization and urbanization.

To conclude, we can say that all these movies shared some defining characteristics in terms of the perspective of the artist or filmmaker. As in the other social realist movements in world cinema, they make part of a moral realist tradition. This moral realism, takes mostly a form of pragmatic and educative characteristic in the Turkish social realist tendency of 1960's cinema. But, as we have already stated in the previous parts, artworks and their creators cannot be thought of separately from the

concrete social, historical circumstances in which they were born into, and the hegemonic ideologies of their time. In that respect, these movies throw light to a certain period of Turkish cultural history, the political stances of the intellectual circles and their relation with the contemporary social reality.

Yet, not all of these movies are identical. Since political engagements of directors are diversified, their handling of the issues differs considerably. Just as the political arena of Turkey at that time, these movies constitute a hybrid body, "an eclectic mixture" (Daldal, 2003: 144) in terms of their political inspirations. Daldal remarks above might be enlightening:

> (…) we generally have the combination of Marxist inspired social realism and metaphysical, even, theological elements in films. While Ertem Göreç and Vedat Türkali opt for socialist realism, with a strong emphasis on "chirality" and "positive types", Halit Refiğ describes, in a tragic mode, the irreparable loss of human qualities in a decadent society, and reflect faithfully Yön's social and political messages. Metin Erksan on the other hand, oscillates between class-conscious urban realism and village based "chaos" and "alienation (Daldal, 2003: 144).

Nevertheless, in every film of social realist tendency, an event of social significance underlies the story and the narrative is shaped by a socio-political concern. This concern ultimately determines the construction of the plot, characters and the adopted style. In that respect, Uçakan asserts that:

> These (socio-political) concerns changed the whole pattern of dramatic construction: the plot as well as the rise en scene assumed a more sober, scientific outlook; artistic expressions got rid of false mannerisms; stories were based on everyday problems of the common men; the protagonist assumed a social responsibility and none of them were treated in isolation from their socio-political milieux. (Uçakan cited in Daldal, 2003: 142)

We have mentioned in the previous chapters, how much the perspective of the artist has a determining force over the content and form of an artwork. In this part, we have tried to briefly summarize the perspective of Turkish social realist filmmakers and its relation with concrete social, historical circumstances. In the following parts, we will analyze and discuss how this perspective is reflected in the content and style of the films, and even perhaps how it determines them.

CHAPTER IV

CONTENT AND FORM

4.1. Content

In this part, we will try to examine the content of the chosen social realist films made in the early 1960's. While trying to conceptualize realism and social realism, we have already stated that in terms of the content, the most attention grabbing aspect of the social realist themes is the choice of themes and characters. In that respect, we have asserted that social realist cinema has the peculiarity of focusing on the contemporary issues and live of common men or the underrepresented characters such as the working classes. Therefore, while analyzing the Turkish social realist cinema of 1960's we will try to see if it matches with this attributes, and if so what are its common aspects in terms of the depiction of these attributes. For this aim, we have divided this part to two sub-sections, firstly we will try to analyze around which themes and issues they are constructed, and secondly we are going to analyze the representation of the characters.

4.1.1. Themes and Issues

As we have already discussed in the previous parts, the content of a film is often related with the intent, or the "perspective" of the filmmaker. The social realism in Turkey was directly related with economic, political and social changes in Turkey and filmmaker's response to these changes. All of the social realist films produced between 1960 and 1965 tell the story of contemporary social and political issues. In this part, we are going to discuss the themes and issues handled in chosen films, try to understand the filmmakers regard to this issues and to discuss why the selection of particular themes and issues is prominent for understanding this social realist tendency. As we have already reflected before, the choice of particular themes and issues may reveal a lot on the political, social and cultural constituents of a given

period in the history of a society. And a proper examination of the content of a given film means to comprehend cinematic texts as cultural artefacts that constitutes *socially symbolic act,* which gives us the opportunity of revealing the *political unconscious* lying beneath it.

The themes employed in social realist cinema are diversified. For instance while Vedat Türkali and Ertem Göreç's *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* tells a story of strike in a factory, and the working class struggle; Metin Erksan's *Yılanların Öcü* emphasizes on the problem of landownership. However still, if we look these movies, we can see that they might be categorized according to their focus points. These focus points in Turkish social realist cinema of 1960s mainly based on the setting or the space.

In that sense, it is possible to analyze social realist films in two groups as village and urban films. Whereas the issues of water and landownership lie at the center of village films, urban films are constructed around issues such as class conflict, working class struggle, rights of organization and union, rural migration, housing problem and the discontents of modernization. However, urban films focus on a wider range of issues and they might be also divided into two sub-groups regards to their selection of themes and issues. In that respect, we suggest to group the favored themes and issues by Turkish social realist cinema of 1960s, under four main titles: class conflict and working class struggle, discontents of modernization, rural migration and urbanization, and the village life.

4.1.1.1. Class Conflict and Working Class Struggle

Nezih Coş (2015) states that until 1960's, working classes were not thoroughly covered in Turkish cinema and their everyday life and issues had been found merit only after 1960's. According to Coş, even though there are many films that give place to working class characters, the class position of these characters does not hold an important place within the story, rather it is used as any other motif. For instance, in *Ayşecik Şeytan Çekici*[21] (1961), which is one of these films, Ayşecik's father

---

[21] *Ayşecik the Imp*

works in a factory but the film does not focus on his working conditions or class experience in everyday life; the main tension of film is constructed around Ayşecik's struggle to unite together her estranged parents (Coş, 2015: 160). In these kind of examples, the main problem of the film is not constructed around concrete issues or living experiences of the workers and the films fail to cover working classes' everdayday life experience and issues (Coş, 2015: 160).

Likewise, there are also films, in which the protagonist is temporarily employed as a worker. For instance, in Şadan Kamil's psychological thriller movie, *Kaçak*[22] (1955), a man who committed murder for self-defense works in a farm for avoiding the police (Coş, 2015: 165). In a similar fashion, in *Mahalleye Gelen Gelin*[23] (1961) by Osman Seden, a young woman coming from a rich family starts to work in her uncle's factory for collecting material for the novel that she wants to write. The film tells her eventual love story with a truck driver from this surrounding and focuses on this love story (Coş, 2015: 165).

These examples might be multiplied. The important point here is that the issues of the working classes come into Turkish cinema's area of interest with social realist cinema. Even though social realist films made in 1960s have different approaches to the working classes and their problems, a significant amount of films that fall into category of social realism focus on the problems of working classes and embrace certain issues that have not covered before in Turkish cinema. It is possible to say that both filmmakers' political engagements, the growing industrial bourgeoisie, following increase in the working class struggles in 1960s and certain rights provided with the new constitution play a part in this. And it might be said that most attention-grabbing examples amongst these films are *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* and *Şehirdeki Yabancı.*

One of the most prominent films in this era is *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, which is made by the cooperation of Ertem Göreç and Vedat Türkali carries the quality of being the

---

[22] *Fugitive*

[23] *Bride Coming to the Neighborhood*

first film that give place to working classes and union strike in Turkish cinema (Scognamillo, 1979: 101).

This film might be considered as a very bold move for the period in which it has been made. Especially certain events occurred during the screening of this film are significant in this regard. At first, the film cannot find place in the theaters and later, it is introduced to the public eye by the protection of "Türk-İş" (Turkish Labor Union), "Türkiye Milli Gençlik Teşkilatı" (National Youth Organization of Turkey) and "Ankara Üniversitesi Talebe Birliği" (Ankara University Student's Association) (Özön, 1995a: 183). Later the film is released in five different cinema theaters in İstanbul and while it rains the appraisal of leftist media, it gets the reaction of rightist media (Özön, 1995a: 183). In Antalya Film Festival nationalist and conservative youngsters causes violence acts and Burhanettin Onat who occurs to be a member of jury demands if the film is "made in Moscow" (Özön, 1995a: 183).

The filming process of the movie shares some similarities with its content, especially in its collectivity. The film is produced by an independent production company called "Filmo" and co-founded by Göreç, Türkali, Ayla Algan and one of their American friends (Daldal, 2003: 191). In that respect, it presents the perfect combination of practice and politics. The background of the filmmakers holds a crucial part in this aspect of *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*. In return to Vedat Türkali's Marxist stance, even though not Marxist as Türkali, Göreç happens to be one of the devout labourists of Yeşilçam and also a union executive. He plays an important part in the foundation of "Sine-İş" with Metin Erksan, and in the first strike in our cinema industry with Lütfi Akad (Özön, 1995a: 184). During the shootings of the film, the producer of the film, Lütfi Akad, meets many times with Kemal Türker and the last scene of the film is realized with the participation of "Boya-İş" (Labor Union For The Painting Industry). Even though film does not get any financial support from TİP, certain figures such as Mehmet Ali Aybar and Behice Boran welcomes the film with praise and congratulate the filmmakers for their valuable attempt (Daldal, 2003: 191).

As we have already stated, until 1960's, working class protagonists were visible in Turkish cinema, but the emphasis was never on their class position, rather on their familial relations or love affairs. However this film directly focuses on the problems of working classes and their relations with the dominant classes, thus offers an honest portrayal of existent class antagonisms. The film focuses on the working classes, their work and everyday lives by also bringing their struggle and process of gaining class consciousness to forefront. The film does not only depict the class conflict and working class problems, but also offers a concrete solution to these problems. In that respect, the film carries a twofold importance. First of all, as we have already stated in the previous chapter, it shares the moral realist approach of the social realist cinema. And secondly, it carries the quality of being first working class movie in Turkish cinema history.

Naturally, the emergence of a film such as *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* in 1960s' Turkey cannot be thought separately from capital accumulation processes and the social relations organized by them. 1960s' was an important period in terms of the evolution of the industrial bourgeoisie in Turkey. Undoubtly, the evolution of industrial bourgeoisie comes with a significant change in Turkey's labor history, especially on how labor movements gain momentum (Savran, 2010). Under the lights of these changes, the film pursues the goal of contributing these movements and remind working classes their newly gained rights such as unionization and strike.

Title of the movie refers both to the workers who wake up before sun rises and their metaphorical awakening, i.e. the process of gaining class consciousness. The story takes place in a painting factory and mainly tells the events developing around a strike, focusing on the organization of the workers and their class struggle. Indeed, film's main motive might be summarized as to encourage workers to use their constitutional right of unionization and strike. Throughout the film, it is often emphasized that the strike is a legal right. For example in one of the banners seen in the strike scene at the end of the film, it says: "Turkish worker is the defender of the constitution" (Appendix A.1). Likewise, one of the older workers in the factory, Nuri explicates strike with these words: "So the law says us do not work until the

employer gives the recompense of your labor, and do not make work the factory either. Until you claim your rights… That is the strike!" (Appendix A.2). In this respect, it is not only emphasized that strike is a legal right, but also a struggle of rights.

The emphasis that workers should be unity is often repeated throughout the film. We can also say that what is essentially shown in the film is that how the workers slowly left aside their individual fears and how they eventually gain class consciousness. In that respect, this definition of union defines film's regard to the union amongst the working class:

> You are the union, you, me, him, all of us… Would 'this' come into existence without our labor? If we do not receive the recompense of our labor that creates this, who gives it to us? (…) Bud, what you got to loose! The law gives you a right. Instead of trembling with fear like a dog, hold on to each other, and see if anyone can quarrel with your bread and butter, with your humanity? (Appendix A.3)

Film makes emphasis both on the importance of struggle against bourgeoisie and solidarity amongst workers. And when in the film, the solidarity is concretized in the labor union and the strike, the workers constitute a class. In T*he Critique of German Ideology* Marx and Engels states that "The separate individuals form a class only insofar as they have to carry on a common battle against another class" (Marx & Engels: 2000). Therefore the film might be summarized as a story of turning from "class in itself" to "class for itself". After the factories change hands, newcomers give support to workers who refuse to work on the factory - on the grounds that they don't eat ill-gotten gains. In the same way, when the greetings and participation from other unions are received, they are enthusiastically welcomed with the motto "Our worker brothers are coming!" The fact that the women and children in the neighborhood are going to be supported by greetings and the fact that this process is conveyed with a festive atmosphere also emphasize the collective nature of the strike.

Throughout the film, as well as class contradiction, imperialism is dealt with. The factory in the film is depicted as a victim of the hostile-takeover project of the paint importers collaborated with American capital: "The situation depicted in this film is American imperialism. However, it is not an imperialism coming with cannons and rifles, but instead an imperialism in suits, coming with its capital and welcomed by national media" (Özkaracalar, 2009: 87, my translation).

Within the film, it is also emphasized the conflict between national and international capital and dwelled on the negative impacts of the international capital on the working classes. In that respect working class is indicated as the force that will protect the country face to imperialist forces. Among the writings read in the banners at the end of the film, and the slogans; the selected ones are are as following: "We stand against the those who are trying to steal from our nation, to enslave it!" (Appendix, A.4), "There is no development without labour" (Appendix A. 5). In this sense, a special place has been attributed to the working class, which is also seen as the actors who will contribute to the development of the country.

Even though film gives place to character's love stories, contrary to Yeşilçam movies, the main dramatic tension is not constructed around their romantic lives. On the contrary, through the differences of both couples, the filmmakers emphasize on the differences between bourgeoisie and working classes. In the following parts, we are going to dwell more on this subject, however for now, we would like to continue with other movies that give place to working classes.

Another film, leaning on the problems of working classes is *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, which is made with the cooperation of Halit Refiğ and Vedat Türkali. In this film, directed by Halit Refiğ and written by Vedat Türkali, the story belongs to Aydın, who comes from a working class family, yet sent to England by his father's boss for his university education. The film starts with Aydın's return to his hometown, Zonguldak, as a mine engineer and develops around the events occurred after his

return, his relationship with the local politicians, businessman and also the workers of the mine.

Contrary to *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, *Şehirdeki Yabancı* is not film that directly focuses on the working classes. In that sense, it differs from the film *Maden* (*Mine*, 1978) that will be made a decade later by Yavuz Özkan. Nevertheless, even though it seems to construct the narrative around a love affair, the main emphasis remains on the tension between Aydın and corrupted political figures and riches of province, and Aydın's (who is depicted as a positive intellectual figure) relationship with mine workers. In this sense, Aydın's idelism and his attempts to raise work safety in the mine gets ahead of the affair that he lives with his boss' wife. Moreover, the indication of bourgeoisie's money and power hunger as the main reason behind the workplace accidents in the mine, and discussion of labour exploitation of the dominant classes on the working classes, constitutes another important feature of the film.

It had better to remind that usage of a cliché love story as the main dramatic component of the film is not only related with the intent of the filmmakers but also closely connected with other dynamics effecting the making process of the film. Before filming *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, Halit Refiğ gets a request of film from newly founded production company (Be-Ya Film). They demand from Refiğ a film in which Göresel Arsoy and Nilüfer Aydan would be cast as protagonists but other than that they leave free Refiğ in his choices. Refiğ and Türkali writes the script together and Refiğ directs the movie. And while they work on the movie, they both produce a film in line with the desires of the industry and they use it as an opportunity to carry their narrative onto the screen (Refiğ in Hristidis, 2007: 116-117). In this sense, we can claim that the film serves the pragmatic purpose of the social realist cinema concerning the usage of popular forms to educate the masses or pass their messages. Thus, even though *Şehirdeki Yabancı* does not directly give place to a working class narrative, it differs from the Yeşilçam films, in the representation of the working class issues, because the working classes are not employed barely as a motif. The main story in the film is Aydın's struggle with the system of exploitation in the mine.

61

In the later parts, we are going to dwell more on this topic while analyzing the characters, however for now, we would like to continue with the other films that might be discussed under this title.

In *Gecelerin Ötesi*, it is told the story of seven young men who live in the same neighborhood who dream to become rich from the short cuts and decide to rob a gas station. While four of these men are unemployed, one of them works in a factory and other as a long-distance truck driver. Through these two characters, Metin Erksan touchs upon the notions such as alienation and labour exploitation. Hence, what encourages these men to commit robbery is shown as how their hard work throughout the years were not awarding for them. Even though Erksan makes emphasis on the exploitation of labor in some scenes, he does not give any place for options such as class consciousness or class struggle. Film's main problem is constituted of the contradictions brought by Turkey's process of capitalization and it holds the qualification of being a direct criticism towards DP politics. However, its emphasis on alienation and exploitation differs it from classical Yeşilçam movies.

Another film made within the collaboration of Vedat Türkali and Ertem Göreç, *Otobüs Yolcuları*, does not give place to a strike such as of the *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, however, movie's main emphasis remains on the class struggle. The film takes action from a real story known as "Scandal of Güvenevler" and tells the story of common people who live in a shanty town called Yeşiltepe, and deceived by a contractor with the promises of housing (Daldal, 2003: 190). Ayşan Işık who is in the lead role of the film, as the IETT (Istanbul Electricity, Tramway and Tunnel General Management) bus driver Kemal, convinces the neighborhood for seeking their rights and support them throughout this process by helping them to get organized. Although the film is progressed in the axis of the love story between Kemal and Nevin, the daughter of the contractor, since Yeşiltepe is a working class neighborhood and the struggle is against the profiteer bourgeoisie, it causes film's main axis to be constructed around an implicit working class struggle. Another attention-grapping attribute of the film might be deduced as Yeşiltepe's proximity to a stone pit and screening of the conditions of the workers in this pit.

4.1.1.2. Discontents of Modernisation and Urbanisation

The process of westernization and modernization in Turkey also refers to a process of capitalization. In that respect, Hikmet Kıvılcımlı's remarks on Turkey's westernization process might be considered as a significant assessment: "Westernization means constructing capitalism in a country. Thus, every Westernization activity made in Turkey until now, has yielded anything but capitalization as result and it could not be in any other way" (Kıvılcımlı, 1970:43, my translation). In the first chapters, we have tried to demonstrate how changes in productions relations eventually reflect upon cultural artifacts. Likewise, Turkey's process of modernization and capitalization echoes in the 1960's social realist cinema. Many of the films produced within this era lean on the discontents of modernization and implicates an oppositional attitude towards capitalism.

Karanlıkta Uyananlar and *Şehirdeki Yabancı* directly carries this stance towards capitalism, however since their construction is designed around a working class struggle, we have considered evaluating them under an autonomous title is a better approach. Now we are going to talk about other films that are leaning on other issues, such as modernization and urbanization process of Turkey, and giving place to urban poor or new urbanites as characters, even though having a certain class emphasis.

Doubtlessly, one of the most prominent ones of these films is Metin Erksan's *Gecelerin Ötesi*, which also happens to be the first social realist example in Turkish cinema history (Daldal, 2003: 179). *Gecelerin Ötesi* focuses on the story of seven young men, who live in the same neighborhood and aspire to be rich from cut corners. Metin Erksan evidently makes a correlation between DP's liberal politics and these young men's stories. The film opens with a bold remark referring to famous phrase of Adnan Menderes, "to raise a millionaire in the every neighborhood", and it says : "This film is the story of seven young men. The subject is directly retrieved from the real life. In the era when a millionaire has appeared in every neighborhood, these youngsters have appeared to" (Appendix A.6).

The interesting point here is that Metin Erksan defines the film as the precursor of "anarchy events" at the end of 1960's:

> In that time, there was a catchy phrase of the political rule: "We are going to raise a millionaire in every neighborhood". I said by myself, yes, there might be this kind of a view; however, while there is raised a millionaire in every neighborhood, other things grows as the same. I took a group of youngsters and made this film… Towards 1970s, the issue that I thought at that time came into appearance with anarchy. I saw the seeds of these events in that film. That film is based on the years following 1965… Which clues are given the film about that era? For instance, while making the movie, I did not know 27th May would happen. However, in the process of screening, the coup started. I cannot say that I was surprised. Because the political rule was suffocating Turkey then. There were some political, social, economic constraints. There were other formations in the society. (1985: 25)

In that respect, it might be said that even though he realizes the distress brought by the political power of DP government, Metin Erksan is seemingly ignorant of the concrete social dynamics of the 1960's, i.e. the working class and student movements. His emphasis on "the events of anarchy" reveals his stance concerning the social movements of 1960's. We will come to this argument later, but firstly we would like to talk about how the relationship between poverty and crime is depicted in this film.

Erksan makes a causal correlation between poverty and crime. However while doing so, he does not give any chance of activity to his characters and misses to construct them as active subjects. In the film, he gives place to notions such as alienation and exploitation of labour, but instead of inferring a political struggle out of it, he constructs a gangster story. Here I would like to make a differentiation between two different figures: the social bandit and the gangster. According to Mike Wayne, as Hobsbawm's social bandits, there are examples of bandit figures in cinema, who

fights with social inequalities and oppression (2009: 103). However according to Wayne, the bandits in cinema should be differentiated from gangsters or robbers. The gangster or the robber, actually represents capitalist values, as a pro-assimilation figure who tries to reach a capitalist fortune and imitate bourgeois values (Wayne, 2009: 104). Gangster represents a political deadlock, thus might be considered as an apolitical answer to social inequalities (Wayne: 2009, 105). All of the young men in Erkan's film, act with an envy of being wealthy and it leads them robbery. They do not object to social inequalities that make them suffer but they try to assimilate into them. Therefore, Erksan does not endow them with a real agency.

Moreover, at the end of film, Erksan condemns his characters with the death of one of the young men and by this act, it is implied that committing crime is not a solution and always punished whether with juridical laws or the law of nature[24]. With this point of view, Erksan who does not offer any viable choice to his characters and correlates poverty directly with crime, prescribes to be a good citizen and by doing so he recreates the hegemonic ideology of the bourgeoisie that extolls private property. It might also be seen one of many contradictory points of Erksan's cinema, which in surface seem to act towards property relations.

Another film aiming to examine similar issues is *Suçlular Aramızda* by Metin Erkan, focuses this time on existing society type both by the vantage point of riches and the poor. According to Dönmez-Colin, this story "foregrounds the malaise of quick-riches schemes in a society that creates degenerate characters that determine the fate of the disadvantaged" (2014: 289).

The story begins with the shadow images of two characters that try to steal an expensive necklace from the mansion of a rich and well-known businessman. The necklace is given as a gift by the Anatolian businessman - who made his wealth through illegitimate business - to his daughter in law, Demet. Once the thieves stole the necklace they try to sell it but they learn that it is in fact false. When they found

---

[24] Aslı Daldal defines this final resolution of the films as the characters finally understand "the ends do not always justifiy the means" (2003: 179).

out the fact about the necklace, their efforts were in vain, they call the businessman and the son of the businessman, Mümtaz tells his father that he will deal with this issue to avoid a scandal. When he goes to thieves for giving them their hush money, he kills one of the thieves and after that the necklace changes hand for many times, while Mümtaz spends money with his mistress and tries to find a way out of his scheme. In the meanwhile, Demet learns about the infidelity of his husband and his schemes, and develops a relationship with the surviving thief, Halil. At the end of the film, when Mümtaz's acts are revealed, he suicides claiming that he is a product of his society and only he can punish himself.

For many, the film was a disappointment especially after the success of Susuz Yaz[25]. The story was a criticism directed towards the corrupted, decadent bourgeoisie through a narrative of crime and punishment[26]. Aslı Daldal reads movie as an open criticism to DP government's liberal politics, however it might be exaggerated in style and its surreal symbolism (Daldal, 2003: 183-184). Indeed, the movie lacks any kind of realist approach in style, even though the story actually grounds on a real story. Metin Erksan tells the background of the story and its failure with these words:

> There were respected families then. Incredibly rich families, a class is emerging in Turkey. One of them is Gülbekyan. I read it in the papers. Gülbekyan had given a very valuable necklace to his bride in law as a gift. After a while, the necklace was stolen, but the thieves were surprised when they tried to sell it, since the necklace was imitation. Gülbekyan gave his bride an imitation necklace. I loved this incident. There could not be any disgrace as such. The film is based on that. There is a big satire. Though if I would make this film right now, I would not do as the same. However within the conditions of that time, it was the movie of which I like the form most. The film is finished and released. There is no sound from anybody, I mean

---

[25] Rekin Teksoy describes the movie as "mastership that goes to waste" (see Teksoy, R. (1964). Evet, Suçlular Aramızda. Yön, 89, 14-15).

[26] According to Birsen Altıner (2005), one of the main themes of Erksan's cinema might be deduced as crime and punishment.

positively. Instead, film critics has an attitude like "What is that?". And these are the critics who claim to be progressive, revolutionary. They have not understood what I said a bit (1985: 33-34, my translation).

According to Daldal, Erksan finds difficulty in balancing his "subjective philosophy" and "socio-political commitment" (2003: 184). And it might be said that the film's main failure lies in that aspect. Erksan turns a real story into a parody and thus its social root loose all its weight. It might be especially seen in the construction in the characters, however we will discuss this under another section concerning the representation of characters in Turkish social realist films of 1960s. For now, we would like to continue introducing other issues depicted in these films.

4.1.1.3. Rural migration and Urbanization

Like other developing countries, Turkey went through a rapid urbanization process following the years World War II (Tekeli, 2009: 1) and a time period of twenty years between 1960 and 1980 was especially peculiar for Turkey in terms of social, economic and cultural changes. Starting from the 1950's, the urban centers are subjected to increasing migration from rural areas, and between the years of 1960 and 1970, the urban population underwent a significant transformation with a population increase of five millions (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:6). The urbanization process of Turkey was not in parallel with industrialization. The urbanization process was faster then industrialization and the result was a rapid increase in the urban population, the unemployment and housing issues (Dönmez-Colin, 2008: 58). That followed the emergence of new shantytowns on the outskirts of big cities, referred as "gecekondu"[27] districts (Dönmez-Colin, 2008: 58).

Gurbet Kuşları by Halit Refiğ was the first film to problematic the migration issue, and along with *Bitmeyen Yol* by Duygu Sağıroğlu is often considered one of the best works on migration that were produced in the 1960s (Dönmez-Colin, 2014: 160). In this part, we are going to try to analyze how these movies deals with the issue of

---

[27] "Gecekondu" literally means "placed during the night".

urbanization and rural migration.

Gurbet Kuşları tells the story of a family that migrates from Maraş to İstanbul, due to the collapse of their small business. They sell their home and come to İstanbul with dreams of pursuing a better life. The film begins at Haydarpaşa Train Station, one of well-known chronotopes in Yeşilçam cinema, used for demonstrating Anatolian migrants' arrival and first gaze to city of İstanbul (Dönmez-Colin, 2014: 164). The family arrives cheerfully to İstanbul and when they set their feet on the terrain, the father states that they will become the "kings of İstanbul". Similarly, while they cross the sea on a ferry and savoring the landscape, Haybeci[28] (the beggar they have just met), states that the city should fear him for he will become its "king". Following this statement of Haybeci, the extra-diegetic sound of the father of the family expresses his equal wish to "conquer the city". This cry sets the ton of the film. However, they do not succeed in their wishes. As Dönmez-Colin points out:

> The family embarks on the ferry with others carrying the same fate expressing amazement at the magnificent Topkapı palace, the mosques, the Galata tower and the modern buildings. "Whore İstanbul! I am coming to conquer you", one character shouts, "I'll be your king!" But for some, the river to be crossed is Acheron, the river of sadness. The film ends in the same location when the family return home the way they came, except for some missing members - chased by her brother who caught her prostituting, the daughter threw herself off the roof-top and the youngest son remained behind to marry a city girl. As they leave, a new family arrives, with the same actors repeating the same dialogue. Migration continues. As Sophocles claims "the gloomy Hades" keeps enriching himself with their "sighs and tears". (2014: 160-161)

---

[28] The story of *Gurbet Kuşları* is based on a theater play by Turgut Özakman. However, Refiğ makes considerable changes in the script an makes a loose adaptation. Although it was not in the script, Refiğ migrates the family from Maraş to İstanbul and he adds the character Haybeci to the script of the film. Although he works on the script with Orhan Kemal, *Gurbet Kuşları* is not related with Kemal's novel, carrying the same name (Refiğ in Hristidis, 2007: 129).

Every member of the family is faced up with the difficulties of living in the big city and sees their dreams collapse. Two of family's son get involved with women, taxi driver Murat with a bar girl and the garage mechanic Selim with their rival's wife. They are both misdirected by these women, and eventually they whether spend their family fortune on them or neglect their own business. The little daughter of the family fall in love with a rich man and after deceived by him with false pretences of love, she engages in a sexual intercourse with him without marital bond, and after getting left by him, she becomes a prostitute, leading her to end her own life at the end of the film due to her fear of older brothers.

The film therefore, tells the story of degeneration in family's moral values; as if they were not capable and deserving of living in the big city, with the exception of family's youngest son Kemal. Kemal, who attends university to study medicine, does not share his family's dream of conquering the city, but to be a useful for his country. He meets with Ayla in university with whom he falls in love with. He eventually decides to get married with her, who comes from a rich and old family of İstanbul and when family's business in İstanbul collapses and they understand their dreams were not to come true, Ayla's family loans money to them for they return to Maraş and start a clean slate.

Even though the film is received as the first movie to realistically telling the issue of rural migration (Dönmez-Colin, 2014: 160), the film in general does not deal with the concrete reasons behind the urbanization process and rural migration. Unlike the migration films of 1970s and 1980s, in Halit Refiğ's İstanbul, different classes live side by side and a class conflict is missing in this imaginary, artificial İstanbul depiction; the shantytowns are not part of the narrative, only seen in a long shot landscape scene from the vantage point of Ayla and Kemal (Dönmez-Colin, 2014: 161). Moreover, instead of analyzing social inequalities, Refiğ seeks family's failure in the city within their incapacity to adapt to city life and other private reasons, such as their illiteracy and greediness. The film has been compared to Luchino Visconti's *Rocco and His Brothers* (1960). However, Visconti's film foregrounds the class struggle in an industrialized society, whereas Refiğ's film echoes early Republican

era's conception of classless, unprivileged, fused population. Furthermore, the migrants arrive in İstanbul with a conqueror mentality while Visconti's modest family does not have such aspirations (Türk cited in Dönmez-Colin, 2014: 162)

Bitmeyen Yol by Duygu Sağıroğlu, tells the story of rural migration. And just as in the *Gurbet Kuşları* the film opens with a scene in Haydarpaşa Train Station where protagonists come into the big city for the first time. In *Bitmeyen Yol*, unlike *Gurbet Kuşları*, the new comers to the city are depicted not as cheerful but instead fearful. Another difference is that this time, it is not a whole family coming into the city with desires of becoming rich but a group of young men in need to find a job and make their living. And contrary to *Gurbet Kuşları*, shantytowns come into screen as the living environment of these new urbanites.

As reflected above, *Bitmeyen Yol* tells the story of a group of young men who comes to İstanbul with hopes of finding a job an acquiring a better life. Once the males come to the city, they go to a shantytown where their fellow townsmen are living. The protagonist Ahmet, settles in the house where of one his relatives, Güllü, who lives with her two daughters and grandson. Film focuses both on his relationship with Güllü's daughters and his struggle to find a job and survive in the city with his friends.

Daughters of Güllü, both Cemile and Fatma falls in love with Ahmet and Ahmet pursues a relationship with two of them, respectively with Fatma and Cemile. Both of Güllü's daughters work in different jobs. While Cemile works in a textile factory, Fatma works in a rich house as a maid. The characterization of two different daughters are offered in contrast. While Fatma is depicted as an ambitious and malicious character that envies a bourgeois and urban style of life, Cemile is depicted as a kind and naïve character. In that respect, it is also meaningful Cemile's pure love towards Ahmet is put in opposition with Fatma's sexual desire towards him. While Cemile represents the moral values of the virtuous and pure rural life, Fatma represents the corruptness of city life; and the contradiction between two sisters reflects this opposition between urban and rural areas (Daldal, 2005: 115).

Ahmet's enduring search for a job, stress how new urbanites who have no social security are exploited by urban capital forces. In that respect, contrary to Halit Refiğ's emphasis on laziness, Sağıroğlu seems to be aware of the determinant aspect of the relations of productions. However, especially Ahmet's killing of an industrialist after he decides that he will not be able to find a job, constitutes a questionable part of the film. Therefore, even though the film carries a value for focusing on the everyday life of the characters, the depiction of characters and the motives behind their actions, do not always seem to be very plausible. In the following parts, while examining the construction of the characters, we are going to dwell more on this subject, however we would like to focus more on the themes and issues of the films for now.

4.1.1.4. Village Life

In the beginning of this part, we have talked about how social realist films might be divided into three main categories according to employment of the themes. Until now, we have tried to how class struggle and conflict is effective in the determination of the axis of social realist films, along with the processes of modernization and urbanization. We have also tried to demonstrate how the filmmakers deal with these themes. In this last part concerning the themes and issues of the films, we would like to dwell on the final common theme of this cinematic tendency: the village life. In that respect, we will focus two films, both made by same director, Metin Erksan: *Yılanların Öcü* and *Susuz Yaz.*

While examining the urban films, we have discussed how class conflict is a prominent part of many of them, whether explicitly or implicitly. Even though the village films do not have a class conflict in this sense, they both try to use the determining force of propriety and ownership as a substitute for class conflict.

Before attempting to analyze these films, we should remark that both of these films are literary adaptations, *Yılanların Öcü* belongs to Fakir Baykurt and *Susuz Yaz* to

Necati Cumalı. However, even though Erksan borrows these stories from respective writers, he writes the script of the films, the dialogues and changes the stories significantly. A comparison between the books and the films is beyond the scope of the story. Therefore, we will only try to focus on how Erksan's adaptations.

In Erksan's cinema the main oppressor and oppressed relation is constructed around the concept of ownership and these movies represents Erksan's view on the propriety. Birsen Altıner states that in one of his writings, Erksan defines words "tapudaş" and "vatandaş" while he emphasizes on the importance of the concept of "citizenship" and how country lands are citizen's common propriety (2005: 138). According to Erksan, the main conflict about propriety lies in the emergence of it, just as Jean Jacques Rousseau points out (Altıner, 2005: 138). Propriety emerges with someone claiming a piece of land and putting a fence around it; at this point, Erksan is interested in the same question as Rousseau "How does it become yours?", as if nobody did claim it, it would not belong to anyone (Erksan cited in Altıner, 2005: 138). According to Altıner, *Yılanların Öcü* and *Susuz Yaz* consist the answer of this kind of a question (2005: 138).

In *Yılanların Öcü*, Metin Erksan deals with the issue of land ownership. The story is based on the conflict between a family that tries to make a house in front of another family, and the family in front of whose house the new house will be made. Irazca, her son Bayram, her daughter-in-law Haçce and their son, are a peasant family making their livings by planting the field in front of their house. The local authority sells the field in front of their home to Haceli, by the permission of village board. In the rest of the film, the narrative focuses on the conflict between these two families.

According to Daldal, in *Yılanların Öcü*, Erksan depicts village as an allegorical place which represents the "state of nature" where the relationship between people is defined by constant war based on who is more powerful (2003:180). Moreover, Daldal states that this state of constant war is grounded also upon metaphysical conflict between the good and the evil (2003: 180). However, this metaphysical good

and evil antagonism remains in the secondary plan, since Erksan constructs this binary through the notion of private propriety.

Susuz Yaz, as *Yılanların Öcü* deals with the problem of "obsessive ownership" (Dönmez-Colin, 2014) but instead of land ownership, it focuses on the water ownership. Metin Erksan tells his regard to the issue, and the background of the film as below:

> While making the film, I thought about the ownership issue. The issue of ownership intrigued me since the very beginning. What is or what is not ownership? Where did it come from, and so on. The water ownership affected me that time. There was this current law back then. Saying "lakes, coastal waters and streams are the propriety of on whomever's private-registered land they flow". I was seeing certain things. You can put a fence around a land and say it is yours. But you cannot own the water (1985: 28, my translation).

The film tells the story of two brothers, Osman and Hasan. Osman refuses to share the water source found in his field with his neighbors thus leaving their fields to drought. Osman does anything to claim the water including building a primitive barrage in front of it and when the other villagers kill his dog, he responds with killing one of them. He convinces his newlywed brother Hasan to assume the murder, and Hasan is sentenced to prison for this crime.

In the film the issues of water ownership is given in parallel with the ownership of women (Altıner, 2005: 139). Osman harbors a sexual desire for his brother's wife Bahar who is also living under the same roof with him. For demonstrating this desire, Osman is depicted as a peeping Tom, who constantly watches Bahar without her noticing. Osman's desire for Bahar is shown with rather exaggerated scenes in which Osman is seen grabbing and sucking the udders of a cow in front of Bahar and masturbating with his pillow. After Hasan is prisoned, Osman lies to Bahar and convinces her to the death of his brother. After a while, Bahar who is left helpless

and desperate accepts the advances of Osman. Later, Hasan gets out of prison with an amnesty and comes back to his village. At the end of the film, he kills Osman in a brutal fight within the water.

The film is received as one of the most prominent examples of social realist cinema, however those who question whether it truly falls into category of social realism, claim that it was actually a product of bourgeois realism for it was showing the conflict between small landowner instead of showing more crucial issues such as the conflict between the landlord and landless peasants (Dönmez-Colin, 2014). It is also stated that Erksan's approach is lack of revealing the true dynamics of an oppressed/oppressor relationship and turning the conflict into a metaphysical war between good and evil:

> Erksan's approach to village society was from a metaphysical perspective with a focus on the conflict between the good and the bad, a typical Yeşilçam cliché. The sadomasochistic Osman looking appalling, deprives the villagers of the water, kills for trees and lusts after his sister-in-law, whereas his good-looking brother assumes a murder he does not commit, forgives his unfaithful wife and releases the water. The audience is relieved when he finally kills Osman after a long graphic scuffle in the water. (Nezih Coş, cited in Dönmez-Colin, 2014: 291)

Undoubtly, both who claim that *Yılanların Öcü* and *Susuz Yaz* are grounded upon propriety relations and those who objects that by asserting that the mains conflict is based on a metaphysical war between good and evil, are right to certain extent. The reason behind that can be found Erksan's eclectic and ambiguous attitude towards social issues. However, we are going to dwell more into this topic in the following parts, concerning the construction of characters. Therefore, we would like to end this discussion for now and after a brief summary, we will and pass to our next and final part of the content analysis proceed with an analysis of common characters to be found in social realist films made in the first half of 1960s.

4.1.1.5. Concluding Remarks

As we have already discussed before, the realist texts are historically and politically contingent. The reason behind might be found in the genre history, in which genres are understood as a relationship between the creators of the texts and their audiences. What is considered realist in a particular historical period or society is directly related with how the audience interprets certain texts. If we look to the Turkish social realist texts of 1960s, we may not find them enough realistic according to our tastes. However, these movies carried certain issues to the silver screen, and even only for that they constituted a novelty for the audience in terms of introducing social issues to Turkish cinema. Since there is not any study on the audiences of these films, to understand these films relationship with the audience, only things we can do is to look for clues hidden in articles on Turkish cinema history or filmmakers' comments on the films. The events in the screening of *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* might be read in that respect. Similarly, after the censorship story of *Yılanların Öcü* is heard by the audience, the film is screened in many theaters all over the country and attracted the crowds (Altıner, 2005: 43), according to Erksan, nearly sixty theaters were attacked, vandalized, even burned (Coşkun, 2009: 41).

To conclude, social realist films made in the 1960s focus on current issues with a moral and educative gaze. In that respect, they fit into the category of "moral realism" we have previously discussed. Moreover, it is not a rare coincidence that the issues and themes of films are borrowed from the real life. Even if they do not refer to real life events, they address significant social problems of their time. The issues such as modernization, development, working class struggle and rights, the emergence of industrial bourgeoisie increasing rural migration are placed at the center of these films. In this regard, they also show the characteristic of constituting a similar picture with the left Kemalist discussions of 1960s. However, just as the leftist thought of 1960s, social realist films constitute a complex structure, in terms of filmmakers' approach to current issues and problems.

4.1.2. Characters

In the previous parts, while trying to define what is social realism, we have emphasized social realist text generally tend to represent marginal or underrepresented groups of a society – such as working class characters – and we have contended how social realism indicates a way of filmmaking in which the characters are considered together with the environment surrounding them. This sort of an understanding of realism reminds Lukácsian notion of "typicality". Lukács conceptualization of realism in *Meaning of Contemporary Realism* is grounded on Aristotelian notion of *zoon politikon* (Lukács, 1969: 19). Thus, characters cannot be thought separately from concrete historical social conditions and relations surrounding them. As we have discussed in the previous parts, this approach finds its equivalent in the notion of "typicality". According to Lukács, realistic characters differ from other types of characters in their "typicality". They do not only represent individuality, but also something bigger than themselves (Jameson, 1997: 169). To put it another way, even though they are individual beings, at the same time they serve as the representatives of the class which they belong to, and as an expression of the *Weltanschauung* (Tihanov, 2000: 108).

Likewise, Turkish social realist films of the early 1960s, seek to find this kind of a view of world. As we have reflected before, Turkish social realism emerges with the desire of finding a new, national film language that focus on the contemporary social issues. In that respect, their themes and issues are directed towards to define the social relations in the moment of a change, similarly to Hallam and Marshment's (2000) definition of social realism. For instance, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* focuses on the working class struggle, while *Gurbet Kuşları* and *Bitmeyen Yol* bring rural migration to forefront, and *Suçlular Aramızda* and *Gecelerin Ötesi* try to criticize the impacts of capitalization process of Turkey. Thus, the characters in these films, do not only appear to be as individualities, but also as the representatives of certain social classes or groups, at least as they are reflected from the perspectives of the filmmakers. For instance while in *Suçlular Aramızda,* after Mümtaz acts are revealed, he addresses to the crowd and says: "All you heard is true. I stole and I killed. But, I do not consider guilty myself for what I have done. It is not my fault. I complied with the conditions of the environment in which I live. You are that

environment!" (Appendix A.7). In a similar fashion, in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, while Nuri talks about Turgut with Ekrem, he states "Don't bother yourself son, everybody is human according to where they live" (Appendix A.8). These examples might be multiplied. The important point there is that, the filmmakers try to explain the behavior of individual characters according to their social surroundings and class positions. This also implies that characters, as in Lukácsian notion of typicality are seen and represented not only as individualities but also representatives of their social classes. As a matter of fact, even though she does not approach it in depth, while analyzing *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, Aslı Daldal states that the film tries to analyze class based behaviors and attitudes in a similar fashion with Lukács' notion of typicality (2003: 191).

Aslı Daldal thinks that Vedat Türkali's main deficiency lied in his "reductionist" manner of representing the characters (2003: 191). However for Lukács, typicality was never the same thing with photographic accuracy, but rather related with discovering how characters would act under certain circumstances (Tihanov, 2000: 108). Therefore, typicality was a term used to designate the "potentiality's" of characters, and for understanding the dialectical relationship between individual subjectivity and objective reality (Lukács, 1969: 23). In that respect, for Lukács, a truthful criticism of existing system was more important, contrary to a pseudo-realism which was actually concerned with providing an excuse for the existing system (Lukács, 1980: 31). For that reason, reductionism was the least of the problems of social realist filmmakers.

In the previous parts, we have discussed how much the perspective has a determining importance on the constitution of content and form. Moreover, we asserted that "reality" and "realism" are not necessarily the same things, since artistic realism is more concerned with representing world with conventional modes of representing reality. Here, we face up with the ideological dimension of artworks and this leads us to assessment that they should conceived as "socially symbolic acts" as Jameson (1991: 20) proposes. Therefore, a proper analysis of cultural artefacts may reveal its

relation with hegemonic ideologies and the class relations through which they come into being.

Until now, we have tried to discuss around which issues and themes social realist films are constructed. In this part, we will continue to unfold the generic attributes of the films by focusing particularly how the social actors of these issues are represented. We hope that it will help us to reveal the ideological positioning of these movies and if they share any common characteristics in that respect.

As reflected above, the social realist filmmakers tend to see characters as typical characters and try associate certain classes or social groups with certain behaviors. In the previous parts, we have tried to show how themes and issues of the films are determined according to the seeting and how village and urban films focus on different issues. The setting is not only a determining factor in the selection of themes and issues, but also in their actors. For example, while the urban films give place to working classes, urban poor and the new urbanites, village films establish the main dramatic tension through an oppressed an oppressor relationship. For that reason, we have determined the most prominent character types in the chosen films and we are going to discuss them under five different titles: (1) working classes, (2) bourgeoisie, (3) urban poor and new urbanites, (4) peasants; and last but not least (5) intellectuals and students.

4.1.2.1. Working Classes

As we have already mentioned the previous parts, working class issues and struggles constitute a significant part of the addressed themes by social realist cinema. And even though when they do not take part at the center of the films, many of them give place to working class characters. However, this commonality does not always reflect upon represented issues. The representations are often diversified according to filmmakers' approach to their subjects.

In Vedat Türkali and Ertem Göreç's films, workers are generally depicted as a collective entity. Even though the narrative is often based on characters' individual stories, the main emphasis is mostly on the collectivity of the struggles they give together. Especially in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, we see that in the depiction of working class the collectivity and solidarity holds a crucial place. The working class neighborhood is used as a setting to represent this collectivity. Throughout the film, we see many times that the streets of the neighborhood are depicted as crowded and very animate setting where people greet, talk and help each other. Workers go to the factory by walking on the muddy roads where the rumble of playing or running kids is never missing. When a mother scolds her child for playing football and wearing of his shoes, and she later begins to cry for not having enough money due to job loss of his husband; other neighborhood inhabitants seem already aware of the problem since they used to work in the same factory and supports the woman. When Ayla gets permission from his grandfather to marry Ekrem, she runs in the streets of the neighborhood for giving the good news to her friend. And when she learns that the factory workers will go to strike, she runs the streets with same enthusiasm to inform the neighborhood. After learning this news all the women and children starts to run in the streets and carry necessary gear and supplies to the strike area. Even the market owner who rejects to sell on account gives a sacksful of supplies to an adolescent boy.

In that respect, it is possible to observe an opposition between the working classes and the bourgeoisie. Togetherness of characters such as Ekrem, Kazım, Father Nuri and Ayla, who represent the working class and the solidarity between them are depicted in contradiction with the individual detachment between Turgut and Nevin, who are representatives of the bourgeoisie. This contradiction is reinforced for many times in different fictionalized circumstances within the film whereas the spirit of solidarity and collectivity is represented as the pre-condition of the formation of class.

According to Daldal (2003), Türkali and Göreç emphasize on the positive working class characters. However, even though Ekrem, Kazım and Father Nuri are

represented as kindhearted people who act with good intentions and support each other, it is hard to make such generalizations. The supposition that Türkali emphasizes on positive working class characters is more applicable to movies such as *Otobüs Yolcuları* and *Şehirdeki Yabancı*. In *Otobüs Yolcuları*, the protagonist Kemal depicted as an autodidact bus driver, who is both intellectual and vindicatory at the same time. Being a worker is not only defined through Kemal as a virtue, but also through the workers of the stone pit. Throughout the film, it is emphasized for multiple times how they work under hard and dangerous conditions. Their courage and diligence are praised; they are even compared to ants in that respect. We can claim therefore that they are portrayed with a mist of heroism in a visible epic style. The existence an old folk poet[29] as the stone pit's talisman only fortifies this affect. Likewise, in *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, when Aydın looses his faith in his idealistic views, it is mine worker Nazif who reminds him that his struggle for workers' rights is worthwhile. Contrary to *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, these films are more schematical and made accordingly to Yeşilçam's resolutions. However, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* has a more nuanced structure than that. In the beginning of the film, Ekrem is depicted as an irresponsible man whose sole worry is to get drunk with Turgut and Kazım. His consciousness only begin to develop when Turgut takes his father's place as the owner and the head of the factory. But more importantly, Türkali does not only give place to positive working class types. *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* spares a considerable place to the notion of yellow union. Throughout the film, Mahmut acts in the favor of Fuat, who is the villain of the film and also Turgut's consultant who tires to ruin his business and make a profit out of it. Paid by Fuat, Mahmut does his best to prevent a strike in Yetimoğlu factory. He snitches on his co-workers to the employer and tries to talk out other workers from the strike. And finally, when the factory changes hands to become a package atelier, he tries to dismiss the workers he worked for so long, out of the place.

Vedat Türkali's singularity however, lies in his insistence of attributing an agency to workers. In the end of *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, after workers go on strike, they also take hold of the factory. In *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, while Nazif talks about workers to

---

[29] The voice and the songs of the old folk singer actually belongs to Ruhi Su.

Aydın, he states: "These people know how to appreciate. Someday when they hear your name, the eyes of the ignorant people, who did not understood the good things you have done until yesterday, will fill with tears" (Appendix A.9). And with this simple statement, he hints that one day workers may reach class consciousness. Moreover, when Şeref's men attack Aydın, the workers come into rescue of Aydın as a crowded group. Since Aydın is depicted as a positive intellectual figure that defends the workers' rights, the graphic fight in this scene and the active participation of workers symbolize also their willingness to protect their rights. In a similar fashion, in *Otobüs Yolcuları*, Kemal takes an active part in the fight with the scammer contractor, he defends the rights of the neighborhood and he organizes them to fight for their rights.

Amongst the films, there are also other examples that give place to workers but do not construct them as a class, or do not give them any agency. Amongst this kind of films, *Bitmeyen Yol* and *Gecelerin Ötesi* might be cited.

In *Gecelerin Ötesi*, the story of seven young men is told. One of these men works in a factory and the other one works as a long-distance driver. From both these characters Erksan makes emphasis on the Marxist notion of alienation. In the film, the character who is a long distance driver, Fehmi while explaining his job, states that "One should not think anything if he wants to stay sane" (Appendix A.10). Likewise factory worker Ekrem confesses that: "After a while I think myself as a part of the machine" (Appendix A.11).

Aslı Daldal indicates that "Erksan's cinematography is a strange an eclectic mixture of modernist themes (…), metaphysics (the fight of good vs. evil), and a personalized notion of Marxism" (Daldal, 2003: 178). Although Metin Erksan's "personalized notion of Marxism" is sufficient enough to use notions such as alienation and exploitation of labour, contrary to Türkali and Göreç, he cannot go beyond it and cannot construct working class as an active political subject, not certainly as a class. In that respect, Marxist emphasis in the film serves as a hollow adornment. The relation between the young men is depicted not as a real relationship but a relation

that is organized by personalized interests. In that respect, contrary to Türkalis's emphasis on working class solidarity and collectivity, Erksan's working class characters are depicted as individualized and alone as the bourgeoisie. This approach also distinguishes the film from Yeşilçam tradition, in which the poor are generally represented in a spirit of solidarity against both hardships of the life and the cruelty of the riches.

In *Bitmeyen Yol*, after arriving to city Ahmet and his friends cannot find any permanent jobs. However, they work in the daily jobs as carriers. And while their short work experience the reason of their oppression by urban capital is predicated on their lack of social security or organization. However, this is not directly expressed by Ahmet or other carriers, instead it is deduced from the private conversations between the employers: "These are peasants, they don't have unions or else" (Appendix A.12). For a worker who falls victim into a work accident, the employer comment of " Nothing happens to them. All happened to our money!" (Appendix A.13) is employed both as a criticism of bourgeoisie and a necessity of organization for the workers. If Sağıroğlu makes the employer talk instead of workers, it holds certainly a significance. In an interview, he states that there is not a working class in Turkey, thus his films should not be considered as working class movies:

> Now, between my films and Ertem's [Göreç] film, there are signigicant differences. Ertem's film is based on classic working class discourse. It says what is already known. It says it in Turkish and it becomes one of the first films that says it. However its discourse is in the form of a template. I think that *Bitmeyen Yol* has nothing to do with this sort of templates. In fact, I can say that my film tells about the people who are not workers more than it tells about workers and working classes. You know, this notion has grounded upon a basis with Marx. My workers do not suit to this definition. We have not gone through industrial revolution. In those years, there were an undeveloped class and I still do not think that it had; because the workers do not act like a worker when voting. Though, these are the issues to be

82

discussed. Organized, permanent workers through which employer and worker conflict can be constructed are in minority. (Sağıroğlu cited in Hepkon & Aydın: 2010: 82)

Whether they take workers as a class or not, an important attribute of these films that differentiate them from Yeşilçam cinema is the invalidation of the fantasy of climbing the social ladders. In Yeşilçam movies, passage from an identity to another is the ultimate arena of the fantasy (Erdoğan, 1995: 189). However, in *Bitmeyen Yol*, we cannot come across with a portrayal of transitivity between different classes. The scene in which Ahmet peeps dancing people through the hole on a closed door of a club while wandering in the city, and the following dream sequence hold a significant value in that respect. The fact that Ahmet sees dancing modern people through a hole refers to a class difference that is also materialized in the spatial differentiation. In the following dream sequence, Ahmet sees himself with Cemile in the same place, in modern clothes. Later, people in folkloric clothes replace dancing people around them and the music turns into folk music. This dream sequence, although grotesque, is significant for its emphasis on class and culture conflict. As the film goes by, both Ahmet and Cemile eventually reach the modern clothes in Ahmet's dream. However, Cemile borrows the dress from the factory she works in and when Cemile's sister Fatma learn her relationship with Ahmet, she goes to the factory and informs her boss that Cemile stole the dress. As a result, Cemile gets fired and her loss of job symbolizes her fantasy of climbing the social ladder could not find its counterpart.

The class difference is generally materialized in relationships. Contrary to Yeşilçam love stories that favor poor and rich binaries, in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* both Ekrem and Turgut pursue relationship with women from their own classes. Moreover, the phases of their relationship and differences amongst them are based on the differences of their class positions. The relationships of both couple evolve in parallel to each other, however they contain remarkable differences. For instance, when Ayla and Ekrem decide to get married, Turgut and Nevin get sexually intimate. Both scenes are given in parallel editing and it serves to emphasize working classes'

affinity for traditional values. However, the main differentiation becomes visible in the final resolution of their relationships. Whereas, the challenges and the processes they went trough make Ekrem and Ayla closer, the same events are resulted with the separation of Nevin and Turgut. At this very point, the individualism and loneliness of bourgeoisie constitute an opposition with working class' solidarity and unity.

In *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, after Aydın goes abroad, his girlfriend Gönül looses her father and due to economic struggles she has been through, she gets married with Aydın's boss Selami. Coming from a working class family, Gönül is never truly accepted by Selami and his family. In every dispute within the house, she is reminded where she comes from. Throughout the film, she cannot find a way out from her marriage and as a result, she gets closer with Aydın. Eventually, she returns to Aydın who still loves her, but more importantly, who also comes from a working class family just like her.

The rich and poor paradigm that we are accustomed to see in Yeşilçam movies, appear in *Otobüs Yolcuları* as an exception within the social realist cinema. For some critics (see Coş, 2015), the love story between Nevin and Kemal is perceived as the only problematic part of the film. However, we can say that it is part of a pragmatic and pedagogic approach that we have already mentioned in the previous parts.

4.1.2.2. Bourgeoisie

Tanıl Bora and Necmi Erdoğan (2005) argue that the social history of capitalist modernity in Turkey or the Ottoman-Turkish modernization must be read through an axis of some sort of traumatology. And as a result of this traumatology, the dominant imagination on richness and bourgeoisie in Turkish society focuses on the illegitimate or specular aspect of the wealth, conspicuous consumption and waste. The social realist films of 1960s also act from such prospect when they transmit the richness and the bourgeoisie to the screen.

The effect of this established imaginary firstly reflects on filmmakers' decision of whether representing bourgeoisie as an entity in its own or not. In the social realist cinema of 1960s, bourgeoisie is not generally depicted as an entity in its own, but rather according to its opposition to working classes and to poor. Their attitudes and living styles are given in contradiction with those of urban poor or the working classes. Moreover, even though there are certain attempts to tell the livings of urban poor and working classes honest to the truth, the depiction of bourgeoisie often falls into the same category with Yeşilçam that follows the path of the late Ottoman literary tradition. The class contradiction is materialized in well known motifs such as houses, cars, clothing, daily habits, recreational habits and so on. In that respect we often see that rich people are living in grand houses full of excessive adornment and paintings, driving luxury cars, wearing robe-de-chambres and drinking exported alcohol beverages and cigars. *Otobüs Yolcuları*, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, *Bitmeyen Yol* and *Suçlular Aramızda*, all of these movies include these patterns.

The snob bourgeois figures hold an important place in social realist cinema. The snobbery in the imaginary of richness finds its counterpart in a "Bihruz Bey syndrome" (Mr. Bihruz syndrome) in Turkish literary tradition (Mardin, 1991: 39) and the social realist cinema cannot be thought apart from that. Mardin asserts that Bihruz might be considered as a Turkish Oblomov, for in both of these characters, the same symptom of civilization might be found: lack of root and identity (Mardin, 1991: 39). The lack of identity and root goes in parallel with a desire of emulation and imitation. The snob does not realize himself by grounding upon his own identity, but by imitating the superior other, i.e. the modern West (Alver, 2002: 253). For instance, in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, Nevin and her artist friends suit to this tradition. Nevin often participates to their parties, sometimes with Turgut, in which the western music plays in the background, while the guests talk about art with a glass of drink. The best definition of this group is given by a journalist who also attends these gatherings: "These are the people who will defend the sultanate in Turkey, the day they declared kingdom in France". They never seem to be interested in contemporary political issues and concrete problems. Nevin's decision to make an abstract painting to the factory might be an extension of this attitude and their "snobbishness" is

fortified also with the language they use amongst each other; they prefer to salute each other whether with poetry or foreign salutations.

In *Otobüs Yolcuları*, Kemal's love interest Nevin is not portrayed as a snobbish rich girl. In that respect, her refusal of going to the university with private car, despite of her father's wishes, is deliberately placed in the text. However, she constitutes an exception in her family and her difference in attitude is attached to her close relationship with her uncle Rahmi who lives in the same neighborhood with Kemal. The rest of the family, therefore is represented in a way reflecting the before mentioned "Bihruz Bey syndrome". For instance, when Rahmi comes to the dinner, he founds them listening western music while drinking wine and they salute him in French. Also, we see Nevin's brother while riding motorcycle in a scene, and they look like nothing but like a gang of James Deans.

In 19th century Turkish literature, the snobs as "Bihruz Bey" are represented as foolish types, but in time this representation evolves and the snobs become intelligent, calculating and cunning types and start to use their snobbishness to establish economic and social superiority (Alver, 2002: 262). Many examples within social realist cinema represent rich bourgeois characters in that respect. They try to protect their class positions and wealth before anything else. And these movies try to demonstrate how bourgeoisie's calculative aspect defines its relationship with the working classes, even if it is in a schematic way. For instance in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, while talking about workers' demands, Turgut's advisor tells him "We think about workers too, but capital comes before anything else" (Appendix A.14). In a similar fashion, in *Suçlular Aramızda*, Mümtaz talks in the board of directors about the abatement of the expenses and he first offers to economize from workers' foods by stating: "I suppose, you would not talk to me about unions and labor legislation" (Appendix A.15). Therefore, even though he lives a life based on excessive luxury consumption, he finds solution for sustaining his lifestyle in the exploitation of the workers.

Along with its calculative logic and cunningness, bourgeoisie is also represented as a source of evil, with an emphasis on their moral decadency. For example in *Otobüs Yolcuları,* when Nevin's brother hears a radio announce about need of blood for a patient, he desires to donate blood. However, his father stops him by reprimanding him as a vagabond. When Rahmi hears their conversation and states that donating blood to an indigent person is not vagabondism, he silences Rahmi by asking him to keep his opinions to himself. But most striking example of this attitude appears on *Suçlular Aramızda*.

In *Suçlular Aramızda*, both Mümtaz and his father are depicted as degenerate rich people who are not afraid to do anything to preserve their wealth and class positions. Their acts are defined by their hunger for money, not by any moral values. This approach is set from the beginning of the movie as Mümtaz's father, despite all his wealth, bestows fake jewellery to his daughter in law. And when the necklace is stolen and the thieves informed Mümtaz about how they are aware that the necklace is fake, Mümtaz agrees with them by offering money. However, contrary his son's desire to cover-up any upcoming scandal, his father states that he is not afraid of public humiliation, since rich people would not be humiliated no matter what, and giving that amount of money is worse than humiliation: "I do not fear from falling into disgrace, but being taken for a fool" (Appendix A.16). And when he talks about their social position to his son, he states: "I do not have a bit of nobility, but I am rich. Just as the kids of those in my position; surely, you are noble too" (Appendix A.17). Therefore, nobility is seen as a result of not moral values but of the money one owns. As if he reinforces father's moral values, Mümtaz does not even act honestly towards his father. Even though he deals with the thieves for 40.000 liras, he asks 50.000 liras from his father and he spends the rest of the money with his mistress. He also murders the thief who comes for taking the money from him in exchange for the necklace and when gets back the necklace, he gifts it to his mistress without saying the necklace is imitation. Throughout the film, Mümtaz lies, cheats on his wife, steals and murders. In that respect, not only Mümtaz but also the bourgeoisie is represented with moral decadency and evilness; because as Mümtaz indicates at the end of the film, he is only a product of his environment.

But *Suçlular Aramızda* constitutes an extreme example. Many scenes in the film might be fall into category of surrealism. For instance the charity event organized in a ship and to which people are attended in diving suits and the scene in which Mümtaz seduces his secretary in the board room while playing with a skull might be included to that list. Despite following the common representation schemes of bourgeoisie and richness, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* does not offer this sort unilateral and exaggerated portrayal. Both Nevin and Turgut are not depicted as evil characters but as victims of their classes, who cannot find a way out. In that respect, the scene in which Nevin's artist friends call Turgut as Yakup, carries a significant importance. The name Yakup refers to a particular poem by Edip Cansever, namely *Çağrılmayan Yakup* (Uncalled Yakup). And as in the poem, Turgut cannot construct himself as a separate individual and could not find his real identity. Because of his father's death, once the friends of the worker, Turgut turns into the factory owner. Due to their conflicting interests, even though Turgut means no harm, he cannot keep his promises and falls out with his friends. And contrary to working classes' unity and solidarity his own class does not offer him any comfort. Fuat tricks him and dispossess him from his factory, whereas Nevin and Turgut cannot pursue a relationship due to their individualism, despite actually being in love. The scene in which Nevin calls Turgut, and states "You are alone, aren't you? I am alone too…We were always alone indeed" (Appendix A.18) summarizes the loneliness of bourgeoisie contrary to working classes.

However, the only true exception to the negative depiction of bourgeoisie might be seen in Halit Refiğ's *Gurbet Kuşları* where he tries to depict a positive bourgeois type, not fallen into the category of false westernization and the moral decadency coming with it. In *Gurbet Kuşları*, Kemal's girlfriend Ayla's family is depicted as a wealthy family of Istanbul. Unlike *nouveau riches*, Ayla's family emerges as a representative of the urban bourgeoisie with economic capital as well as cultural capital. The curiosity for history of Ayla's father is embroiled in his interest for Turkish antiques brought by him from abroad. Although Refiğ criticizes Ayla's

family for sending their son to USA and desiring to the same thing for Ayla, this constitutes a minor problem in their over all depiction.

The reason behind this approach might be found Refiğ's own class position and regard to bourgeoisie. Halit Refiğ was coming from a rich factory owner family and he tells his position against bourgeoisie as such: "I was an anti-capitalist that day, and I am now too. But I should confess that whenever I saw an honest, honorable capitalist against me, I respected him" (Refiğ in Hristidis, 2007: 14-15).

But, far from that, it would be reasonable to search for the meaning put by Refiğ on the progressive bourgeoisie, in the general line of Yön movement. Yön movement accepts the existence of social classes in Turkey but does not attribute autonomy to them, especially to the working classes that it considers to be weak (Bora, 2017: 613). Likewise, Yön Movement's emphasis on liberty is not possible without development is often read as its proximity to a class struggle actually in the service of dominant classes (Şener, 2017: 368). In that respect, the progressive role attributed by Refiğ on bourgeoisie that may contribute to the development process of Turkey might be found in the intellectual foundations of Yön Movement.

4.1.2.3 Urban Poor and New Urbanites

As we already stated, *Gurbet Kuşları* aims to examine the effects of rapid economic and social change that Turkey went through after 1950s. The shift of political power from CHP to DP refers a structural change in Turkish politics and economy. DP's policy of modernizing agriculture was not in the benefit of landless peasants and that was one of the main reasons of rural migration in 1950s and 60s (Dönmez-Colin, 2008: 57). The movie focuses on these changes through the phenomenon of rural migration, however it fails to answer the questions of "who are these people?" and "why did they come to the city". As reflected before, the new urbanites are depicted as occupants of the city, arriving with the desire of "conquering" İstanbul, nevertheless incapable of surviving in the metropolitan city, due to their laziness,

lack of cultural capital and tendency to degeneration. For that reason, there is not any visible class antagonism in the film but rather a culture conflict.

When the family comes to the city, they open a small car repair shop, but they cannot maintain this business. As reflected above, family's failure in the city is attached to individual reasons rather than social inequalities. Murat spends his money on women and Selim spends his time with the wife of their rival. According to Daldal, they cannot succed because "they were lazy and could not resist their primitive desires and appetites" (2003: 187).

Contrary to their failure, Refiğ designs a portrayal of success through the beggar (Haybeci) they met when they first arrived to the city. They meet multiple times with this character and throughout the film, while their family business collapse step by step, Haybeci climbs the social ladders and becomes rich. According to Daldal, with this character, Refiğ promotes hard work and patience, and shows him as a man who understands how to succeed in the big city (2003: 187). Daldal asserts that this attitude, reflects Refiğ's involvement with the Yön movement that favors a socialist development with emphasis on nationalism and work ethic (2003: 187). However, even though Daldal might be right on Refiğ's insistence on work ethic and nationalism, it is hard to correlate these notions with Haybeci. Indeed, Haybeci knows how to survive in the city, but Refiğ does not portray a positive image of a hardworking man through Haybeci. Instead, he criticizes his opportunism and holds his distance, even considers him as a threat to settled city life. Haybeci is shown as an evidence that migrants can conquer the city if necessary precautions are not taken.

In the film, the lacking class antagonism leaves its place to a morality and modernization disccussion. In that respect, especially the portrayal of feminine characters is striking. Family's youngest member, Fatma and her neighbor Fatoş are both depicted as the "envious social climbers", who wish to look like and act like the bourgeoisie, dressing up like them or attending to their parties, making acquaintances and so on (Koçer, 2009: 137). By Fatoş and Mualla, Refiğ focuses on the loss of moral values and through that he denies dwelling on the class antagonisms.

Therefore it is not directly capitalism that has been attacked in the film, but gives a moral message which emphasis the consequences the false modernization. Similarly, Naciye, the love interest of one of the family's son, another habitant of their hometown who migrated to İstanbul long before them and became a prostitute, is employed to strengthen this message.

According to Koçer, the sexual interaction between Fatoş and Orhan (a rich man whom Fatoş meets in one of the parties that she goes to with Mualla), reveals Refiğ's regard to possible threats of consumerist logic brough byt the Turkey's process of capitalization, since Orhan "uses" Fatoş and leaves her after (Koçer, 2009: 138), which is followed later by Fatoş's becoming prostitute and killing herself:

> Fatoş is used as a metaphor to underline the threat to the community, if the boundary between the national identity and westernization is not kept well. Her suicide becomes a metaphor of the possible collapse of society. She dies because in between her traditions and Westernization, she does not have the nation as the mediating link. Since she cannot hold on to the idea of a nation and national unity, she was overly westernized. She is the victim who needs to be saved in order to save the nation (Koçer, 2009: 138-139).

Even though Koçer's assertment has merit, it might be also argued that Fatoş and people like her constitute another type of threat for the society, but to be able to understand it we have to also discuss some aspects of *Bitmeyen Yol*.

At first appereance, contrary to *Gurbet Kuşları*, *Bitmeyen Yol* seems to be aware social inequalities that new urbanites have to endure in the city. The film focuses on Ahmet's search of job and gives place to his wanderings in the city, and throughout the film we see how he is incapable of finding a job despite his enduring efforts. In that respect, the depiction of the city plays a crucial role in the representation of the characters. The images of traffic jam and human crowd generally are given in a specific way to show how the big city is frightening in the eyes of the new urbanites. At the same time, city holds a certain charm. Throughout the movie, the newcomers

use the phrase "The streets of İstanbul are paved of gold" (Appendix A.25), they derive great pleasure from eating white bread, which is not available in the village, they admire the beauty of the city women. These beauties represent also their hope to find a job and even become rich in the city. However, the more the story progresses, they understand that their dreams are in vain. In that respect, the little gambling game they play in a city park holds a significant role, for it corresponds to the time when they realize the streets of İstanbul are not paved of gold. The scene also in the job market are significant for the film, since they indicate how all those men are desperate to find a job, despite only few of them are employed. This depiction is only fortified with the despising attitude of those who hire them.

Against the difficulty of surviving in the city, the characters support each other. And in this sense, we can say that Sağıroğlu tries to depict them with a spirit of solidarity. Occasionally it includes some religious patterns too. For instance, after going out to seek for job, six men get hungry and they combine the money in their pockets to buy bread and one of them states that: "Muslim's property is common" (Appendix A.26). But contrary to Vedat Türkali films, this spirit of solidarity is not resulted with a class consciousness. The reason behind this approach might be found behind Duygu Sağıroğlu's regard to working classes in Turkey, as we have mentioned before.

The film also seems to include the daily life of the rural migrants. The film begins with a view of the shanty house that Ahmet will going to move in, with Güllü's house. It differs from the traditional wood houses that Yeşilçam's poor characters live in not only in style but also in the attitude of the habitants towards each other[30]. During the film, we see that they dine and sleep in the same room. The brawl and the physical fights in the house also differs it from Yeşilçam type of houses in which even though families are poor, they live in peace, harmony and happiness.

---

[30] Hilmi Maktav states that the heroes of popular Yeşilçam movies do not live the misery of poverty. They live poverty as a nobility and pursue a poor but noble life in the old houses of İstanbul (2001a: 175).

However, even though Sağıroğlu tries to depict their everyday life with a seemingly realist attitude, most of his depictions fall far from this aim due to their inflatedness and interrupts the superficial realism of the film. As we have stated before, typicality in Lukácsian sense requires establishing how typical characters would react under certain circumstances according to concrete historical conditions surrounding them and their class positions. However, in *Bitmeyen Yol* certain acts of the characters are not supported enough to give a realist impression. For instance, when others are sleeping in the same room, Fatma and Ahmet makes love; when Cemile and Ahmet spends time in the city, out of nowhere they decide to go into a museum and horrified by the statues in it, but more importantly Ahmet's reason to kill the businessman at the end of film is not supported with a valid reason. And the lack of a rationalization behind characters' acts may reveal a lot about the film's main approach to new urbanites.

In both *Bitmeyen Yol* and *Gurbet Kuşları*, the main characters are constituted of new urbanites. Both of these films hold an importance place within Turkish cinema history. But unfortunately, there is a tendency of showing urban poor or new urbanites as dangerous classes. A discourse on crime which, without any concrete reason making a correlation between crime and poverty says a lot on the mentalities and perspective of the filmmakers. In these films, neither urban poor nor new urbanites are constructed as active subjects, but at the same time their only activity is towards crime.

According to Nilgün Abisel, some films made in 1960s such as *Gecelerin Ötesi* depicts poverty as a notion that push common people into crime (1994: 78-79). However, the crime appears to be abstracted from its social context. In that respect, even though an explanation is implied on why poverty paves the way for crime, the relations behind crime were represented as a natural and insuperable part of urban life (Abisel, 1994: 79-80).

Likewise, if we look at the films that dwell on the struggles of urban poor and new urbanites, we see that men's acts of crime, and women's issue of honor and chastity

93

are placed at the center of this cinema which is self-acclaimed to reveal the contemporary problems and issues of the society. The structural problems of capitalism and class conflict are not problematized enough and thus, the main source of problem is represented as the urban poor or the masses that came from villages to cities to "conquer" them. This attitude through which the filmmakers put forward their urban sensibilities, reveals while they claim making movies for the people, they are incapable of taking themselves from codifying the common people as dangerous classes. For *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, Halit Refiğ plans at first a different ending. According to this ending scene workers were going to lynch Aydın. However, with the insistence of Vedat Türkali, this scene is altered (Refiğ in Hristidis, 2007: 117-118). This might be one of the most explicit examples of this attitude, even though not reflected against urban poor or new urbanites but to the workers. Likewise in *Gecelerin Ötesi*, the gang that decides to rob gas stations in order to became rich from short-cuts, and in *Gurbet Kuşları* Fatoş's becoming a prostitute might be considered as the signifier of the same attitude.

This sort of an attitude cannot unveil the structural relationship and socio-economic dynamics between poverty and crime, but only can condemn its subjects. From this point of view, "common people" is screened as a herd that is conducted by gut instincts and loose morals, ready to commit crime, fall into bad ways and so on. Only exceptional examples within social realist cinema of 1960's, might be the films of Vedat Türkali and Ertem Göreç.

4.1.2.4. Peasants

As reflected before, Turkish social realist films made in 1960s might be divided into two groups as village and urban films. While urban films are constructed around issues such as working class struggle, union rights, rural migration and housing problem; at the center of village films, there lie issues such as water and land ownership. Accordingly, the class conflict and characters in these films constructed around different notions. Even though village films such as *Yılanların Öcü* and *Susuz Yaz* do not have a class antagonism in the classical sense, it is possible find an

oppressor and oppressed relationship through water and landownership in these films (Pösteki, 2012: 152).

Just as other village films that are made after 1960's, landowner appears to be as the villain of the film. In classical Turkish cinema, the landowner is generally depicted as the reason behind the poverty of the peasants and as the absolute villain of village films, with his rudeness, lustfulness and ruthlessness, he does not only represent evil, but also the system of exploitation, brute force, an identity which is the comprador of hegemonic ideologies of the dominant classes (Maktav, 2001a: 169). However, Metin Erksan's two village films diverge from this tradition for they are not constructed around feudal system. Even though, in *Yılanların Öcü* and *Susuz Yaz*, the landowners such as Haceli and Osman are the villains of the films, since they are only small landowners, these movies relatively diverge from this tradition.

In these films, the landowner does not act on his own. *In Yılanların Öcü*, the local authority supports Haceli, the landowner who is depicted as the villain of the story. According to Cantek (2001), this pattern might be found in village literature, which leans on the village institutes. The literature depending on village institutes establish its own opponents in a revolutionist romanticism, such as clergymen, landowners and so on (Cantek, 2001: 195). The local authority appears to be one of these figures (Cantek, 2001: 196). In that respect, it is also significant the difference between the representation of the local authority and district governor. According to Aslı Daldal, contrary to "chosen" local authority that stands by the oppressor, the depiction of district governor as the protector of laws and the oppressed represents Erksan's opposition to DP (Daldal, 2005: 99). According to Levent Cantek, it is a common aspect of village films that state officials are generally the ones who help peasants in distress and especially teachers, soldiers or engineers that come to village are often depicted in conflict with powerful figures such as the landowner or the local authority (Cantek, 2001: 196).

Besides all these, there is another aspect of these films that cause *Yılanların Öcü* and *Susuz Yaz* to diverge from other films produced in the same period, that sometimes

tend towards an image of glorified village life, depicting villages as the source of unspoiled, pure human values. Even though Erksan employs pre-adopted cultural motifs of village life (traditional clothing, an imaginary peasant accent that does not belong to any region and so on), his main characters are not portrayed as purely good characters. For instance, Irazca in *Yılanların Öcü*, is not a "good" or "innocent" person in the proper sense. While talking about how Haceli should be handled, she states "You should be in constant vigilance against your enemy, try to strike before he strikes you". Therefore, although Haceli is portrayed as the villain of the story, Irazca's attitude towards him might be described as an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth and it distinguishes *Yılanların Öcü* from the films in which the peasantry is defined as a virtue in itself (Pösteki, 2012: 160). Similarly, Bayram has an affair with Haceli's wife, and even though he is represented as the most naïve character, he is not portrayed exactly as a purely good character.

In Erksan's cinema, as we have mentioned before, the village is represented as an allegorical place of "state of nature". We have mentioned before that Daldal prefers to read Metin Erksan films through the good-evil conflict. However, it is not always possible to establish such an antagonism. Because, as we have already pointed out, Irazca is not a better character than Haceli, or even Bayram has an affair with Haceli's wife. Therefore, it would be more accurate to say that the main conflict is constructed upon who is powerful or weak. The power of course, is based on the ownership that allows the powerful to oppress the weak. From this point of view, the acts of the characters can be read more easily. Irazca's previous comments on Haceli might as well be read as a part of this depiction. While, in *Yılanların Öcü*, it is actually Haceli who holds this kind of a power, especially with the support of the local authority, Bayram who is softer than Irazca in many cases, is represented as defenseless to their malignity. In one moment of the film, Irazca uses these words to emphasize the power of Haceli: "We should attack Haceli on all hands, local authority aligns himself with him; both money and power is on his side" (Appendix A.28). Indeed, Bayram is beaten by local authority's allies and his sheep is stolen and slaughtered to be served to district governor. In a physical fight with Haceli, his wife suffers a miscariage and so on.

Erksan may seek an authentic way to represent village life but in many aspects, these films support the official state ideology and refer to Kemalist modernization. For instance, at the beginning of the film, Bayram tells with great enthusiasm Haçce about the showers that he saw during his military service, the showers with running hot water. Haçce listens with great interests. And the short dialogue between them represents an envy of modernization. But the most significant scenes in that respect actually take place after the arrival of district governor and the following events. Contrary to local authority that is seen as the representative of DP power, the district governor represents the faith put in the Kemalist state tradition. In this regard, district governor's definition of the peasants as "These are our people, suffered in pain for many years, burned and unwashed faces" (Appendix A. 29) might be seen as a reflection of "köycülük" (glorification of village) discourse that goes back to the 1930s. The emphasis on the glorification of peasantry is probably related with the fact that the film is a Fakir Baykurt adaptation, for Erksan does not actually shares the discourse of the village institutes. According to Erksan, the village represents an area of underdevelopment and ignorance. In that respect, before mentioned "state of nature" is not actually considered as a condition to be envied. While Irazca and Bayram tries to deal with Haceli and local authority with law of nature, the district governor advises Irazca to seek her rights through legal procedures. And contrary to district governor, notable people of the village such as the imam and the doctor, respectively advise submission to god and claiming their rights without applying to futile official channels. And when Irazca decides that the best way is to oblige district governor's advice, she states "we are going to the town, directly to the public prosecution office" (Appendix A.30). These words of Irazca are very significant since they actually reveal how the peasants of Erksan do not talk with their authentic voices but through the voice of the hegemonic state ideology.

In *Susuz Yaz*, even though the peasants apply to the court for suing Osman, the court gives a verdict in the favor of him. This constitutes a difference according to *Yılanların Öcü*, an understandable difference if we remember that Erksan decides to make to film after a new law on water. However, official Kemalist discourse appears

this time in the intellectual figure of Kemal that Hasan meets in the jail. Kemal advises Hasan to fight with Osman and reclaim his rights but not to kill him, stating that murder is not a solution. He states about Osman "All that water should be taken from those like him" (Appendix A. 31), but while he talks about conflict of interest, he states that the truth is beyond that. After returning to village, Hasan kills Osman. And this act of murder represents that Hasan is not totally capable of understanding the real conflict, contrary to Kemal.

Briefly, when we look at Erksan's village films, we do not see peasants that have their authentic voices, but instead whether talking through the language of hegemonic ideologies or obliged to act through these ideologies. In this sense, these films carry a monologic character. Their lack of an authentic voice grounds on Erksan's regard to his subjects, and indicates how his regard to his subjects is the one of an outsider. Similarly in *Susuz Yaz*, while peasants talk among them about why they are incapable of finding a way to defeat Osman, they state "Of course we are not going to find [any solution]. We are illiterate, we are not educated" (Appendix A.32). This exteriority of regard eventually reflects upon not only on the language but overall stylistic representation of the characters, especially on their clothing. In a similar fashion, the local dialect leaves it place to an artificial accent that has no counterpart in the real language. The reason behind this might be found behind Erksan's foreignness to his subjects and the actual village life.

Despite, literary tradition of village novels, Turkish cinema never appears to live the anxiety of how to make peasants talk (Cantek, 2001: 191). In fact, talking on realism in village films necessities talking about Turkish intelligentsia. According to Türkeş, the village literature might be evaluated as a monologue of the Turkish intellectuals trapped in İstanbul and perceives looking into Anatoly as his responsibility (2001: 206). As a result, Anatoly happens to be a distant land for these intellectuals, which they was never able to like or familiarize (Türkeş, 2001: 207). Unfortunately, the same goes for Metin Erksan's regard to the village life and peasants.

4.1.2.5. Intellectuals and Students

Until now, we have tried to analyze the characters in social realist cinema according to their class positions and their strata. However, there is another group of characters that their representation and multiple appearance in films is meaningful for social realist cinema. The representation of the intellectuals and students holds a crucial place in Turkish social realist cinema of 1960s, especially as a result of social realist filmmakers' pedagogic tendencies. Through their voices, it is generally filmmakers who talk to the audience and show what is right or not. Whether they are cast as protagonists or merely figurants, they function as a channel through which the main message of the film is conveyed to the audience. Their voice often reflects the perspective of the filmmakers and thus, we would like to dwell more upon the representation of the students and intellectuals in chosen films.

In all of these films, we see that generally a positive meaning is attached to the students. They are often depicted as the next generation, thus future of the nation. In this sense, their representation on the screen is usually positive and hopeful. They are considered and represented as the carriers of the enlightened Kemalist principles. Therefore, they generally talk through the language of Kemalist state ideology. Sometimes these characters are offered nearly in a caricaturistic way, and sometimes in a more complex representation scheme. But however they may be, they are significant just the same.

In that respect, in *Bitmeyen Yol*, even though he only takes part in few scenes, Fatma's son Osman is constituted as a character with a notable symbolic meaning. He is depicted in the same way in few scenes he has been shown: a little boy in school uniform, trying to learn how to read in a boxy shanty house. In one of the scenes, he reads a national flag themed school poem from his class book and in another he reads a letter coming from his uncle in Germany. The first scene places the kid's speech in a hegemonic place and the second one emphasizes that he is capable of doing what no one in the house can. If these scenes implicate the importance given by filmmakers to education, the end of the film leaves no room for

the doubt. In the end of the film, after Ahmet kills a businessman, the news reach to the shantytown; and we see the reactions of other characters. At this final scene while a song by Ruhi Su plays in the background, and we hear the lyrics "the shortest straw claims its right from the longest straw" (Appendix A.19), all the characters in the shantytown gather together on a cliff against to the city landscape, with teary eyes. In that scene Osman, still wearing his school uniform hugs Cemile. If this image is thought together with the music playing in the background, the meaning becomes clearer. As Nezih Coş points out : "The road is not over, in the mouth of the future roads, likes of little Osman who learns reading in Güllü's shanty house, would be able to join peasant worker Ahmets" (Coş: 2015: 174, my translation). The emphasis on the education however, and the depiction of Osman as the future working class hero, implies also that the one of the reasons that cause new urbanites to fail in city life is their lack of education.

In that respect, *Gurbet Kuşları* by Halit Refiğ seems to adopt a similar approach, but more severe way. In *Gurbet Kuşları*, while the other members of the family cannot succeed in the city due to their laziness, lack of education and cultural capital; Kemal adapts to İstanbul and it is often him who brings his family to their senses. The student character in *Gurbet Kuşları*, Kemal is not a little kid contrary to Osman, but a grown up university student. Therefore, even Refiğ emphasizes through Kemal, the importance of education, it is necessary to point what is specific to the representation of university students.

According to Hilmi Maktav (2001b), in 1960s' Turkish cinema, the university is generally depicted as a space belonging to bourgeoisie. Going to university is not very easy for the hero who grows up in poverty. If the poor hero goes to university in spite of the low chances and economic impossibilities, he becomes the only poor student in the university, whereas the other students are depicted as rich kids. In this frame, it is not rare for hero to be ashamed of his/her poverty and present himself/herself as coming from a rich family. We see exactly this theme in *Gurbet Kuşları*.

In *Gurbet Kuşları*, the son the family migrating from Maraş to İstanbul, presents himself as the son of a rich İstanbul family to his girlfriend going to same university with him, claiming that he does not know any other village than Kadıköy. However, after his girlfriend learns the truth about himself and he accepts his roots, while his other brothers cannot cope with city life, he becomes the one who gives advice to his family members and stays at the end in İstanbul. Kemal is his family's only child that goes to the university and from the beginning of the film, despite the "decadence" of other family members; Kemal's moral attributes and diligence are coded in a positive way. With Kemal, an educated young person who is in the service of his country and attached to Kemalist principles is brought into portrayal. In that respect, even the choice of his name is prominent. Despite Ayla's family's desire to send their daughter abroad, Kemal persuades Ayla to stay in Turkey, for they are needed in their country. At the end of the film, while Ayla and Kemal bid farewell to Kemal's family who are returning to Maraş, they also express their wishes to return after completing their education. However, as Maktav (2001b) points out rightfully, Refiğ uses university as a way of climbing the social ladder. And while the other members are portrayed as invaders in the city, only Kemal is blessed with staying behind. Contrary to his family, his further plans of returning to his hometown are not shaped due to obligation but to free will. According to Maktav (2001a) in Yeşilçam movies, university is generally perceived as the field of modernity, richness and the possibility of transivity between classes. In addition to this, social realist films contruct university as an educational institution that will prepare the hero for his or her stance towards the events that will be subjected to the film. And Kemal's privileged representation according to his family might be an extension of this kind of an attitude, just as Osman's depiction in *Bitmeyen Yol*.

Otobüs Yolcuları offers a more complex depiction of university students according to *Şehirdeki Yabancı*. In *Otobüs Yolcuları*, Türkali and Göreç seems to be aware that the university's doors might be opened more easily to the bourgeoisie, but nevertheless they emphasis on the positive student types by indicating a bond between the students and the working class. For instance, Kemal's love interest, the daughter of a rich contractor Nevin is portrayed as a university student and one of

her friends, Veli seems to envy Kemal's profession. He utters his desire to become a driver as Kemal and he later moves in with him.

Compared to students, the representation of intellectuals has a more complex disposition. There are two types of intellectuals in the films made within this period. First one is a negative type of intellectual who is far from understanding the facts of the society in which he or she lives in, and also incapable of seeing social contradictions and reasons lying underneath them. To this kind of intellectuals, Nevin in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* might be one of the best examples. She plays the role of Fuat's niece, who is educated abroad to be an artist. She comes from Paris to İstanbul for vacation and during her time in İstanbul, she decides to make a mural painting in the factory. Later, she develops a relationship with Turgut and accordingly we both see her relationship with factory workers and people from her own class. Throughout the film, Nevin is not depicted as an evil character. But one of *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*'s most prominent characteristics might be concluded as to perceive characters in relation with their class positions. In that respect, Nevin's attitutes throughout the film cannot be thought separately from her class position. Nevin and her entourage consisted of artists like her, are represented as "snobbish" imitators of the western countries. When Turgut first enters the friend circle of Nevin, he talks with a journalist there, namely Aydın. The choice of name is not a coincidence of course, especially if considered many of positive type of students or intellectuals in Turkish social realist cinema of the 1960s' are named either Aydın or Kemal. Turgut asks him who are all those people. Aydın comes with a very noteworthy response to this question: "These are the people who will defend the sultanate in Turkey, the day they declared kingdom in France."

Even though Nevin claims that she has a conscience and criticizes Turgut for turning his back to his long-time friends, and to other factory workers, she actually speaks with bourgeois conscience instead of sincerity. And this lack of sincerity appears even in the slightest chance. When Nevin goes to Ekrem's house for talking about Turgut, she says that she has left her mural unfinished to defend them. However, when one of the workers defines her mural as whitewash, the argument accelerates

and she cries "You deserve nothing with this attitude" (Appendix A.20). After Ekrem and other workers throw her out of the house, in her next meeting with Turgut she claims that even though she had been kicked out of the house she still loves them and she is filled with ambition to finish her piece more than ever. The sincerity of her proclamation of love for the workers should be argued however, because when the painting on the wall of the factory is ruined, she physically attacks the workers by yelling to them as "barbarians" and "savages".

Contrary to negative type of intellectual figures such as Nevin, the second type of intellectuals are portrayed positively, who are progressive and instructive figures in the good sense. The journalist Aydın in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* is obviously an example to this representational pattern, not only due to his assessment of the bohemian artist circles, but also his participation to the workers during the strike.

Another positive intellectual character appears in *Şehirdeki Yabancı*; as the protagonist of the film, Aydın. Aydın comes from a working class family, but due to his intelligence, he is sent abroad for his university education by his father's boss Selami. After his return to Zonguldak as a mine engineer, Selami asks him what he has learned in England apart from being an engineer. He expresses that he has not only learned how to be an engineer in England but also learned "how people working together might be happy, how they should they work and be in solidarity" (Appendix A.21). In that respect, he appears not only as an engineer but also as the organic intellectual of the working class. Even though the intellectuals in Turkish cinema are often constructed as teachers to emphasize Kemalist intellectuals, Aydın is constructed as an engineer to indicate the union of working class and intellectuals. According to Maktav (2001b), Aydın is the first character in Turkish cinema who represents the leftist intellectuals. Moreover, Aydın shows the importance attached to positive intellectuals by Vedat Türkali. In the article, he writes for the newspaper, Aydın states "Instead of constructing mosques for pulling votes in the elections, we have to ameliorate the conditions of workers" (Appendix A.22). However, although Aydın's overall depiction is positive and idealistic, it includes also some flaws and inconsistencies.

He listens classical music and consumes imported alcohol beverages. He leaves aside his previous idealistic motives for a while due to his relationship with Gönül, until Nazif talks with him. The reason behind this ambiguous depiction might be found Refiğ's initial intent while creating Aydın's character. Refiğ first thought Aydın as an intellectual figure who was alienated and estranged from his country, therefore incapable of understanding the real problems of the country life and the workers (Hepkon & Aydın, 2010: 26). In fact, Refiğ's first design for the end of the film was a scene in which the workers lynching Aydın, instead of saving him. According to Refiğ, it was a more realistic ending. However, Türkali was not in the same idea with him and defended the importance of positive intellectuals, therefore they have changed the ending of the film (Refiğ in Hristidis, 2007: 117-118).

Briefly, Vedat Türkali tires to create a figure with Aydın that might be the organic intellectual of the working class. Moreover, Aydın does not constitute the sole example in that respect. In a smilar fashion, Kemal in *Otobüs Yolcuları* is constructed with a similar aim. In *Otobüs Yolcuları*, Kemal is depicted as a bus driver who also is an avid reader, an auto-didact. When he moves to the Yeşiltepe, we see a box of books, which includes a book by Sait Faik, another from Edgar Allan Poe, and one on French romanticism. When he visits Nevin in the university, he tells her how much he wanted to go to university but could not reach this aim, explaining that after he lost his father he was obliged to work to take care of his family. He also admits he used to envy to write poetry while he was in high school and he defines the poem he would like to write as "a poem like the force of people who stick out to all kinds of malignity" (Appendix A.23) Therefore, we cannot claim that he is not depicted with a romantic attitude especially if considered when Nevin asks if he read everything by himself, he states "Yes, I read when I got bored. And the more I read, the more my nuisance has increased" (Appendix A.24). All these emphasize how his life experience and readings give him a social consciousness. According to Maktav (2001b), in the social atmosphere of the 1960's, characters' sense of justice and intellectual identity was to hold a more important place than university diploma. Kemal's depiction goes in parallel with Maktav's assessment; and the scene in which

Nevin reads her school books in the bus and Kemal's tells her that she is missing "what is not in the books", only reinforces this idea.

In Gramsci's conceptualization of ideology, intellectuals hold a significant place, since they contribute to the establishment of the historical bloc, in other saying, the consolidation of the hegemony of the dominant classes. According to Gramsci everyone is intellectual in some sort but not everyone in the society possesses the function of the intellectuals; the groups of professional activity are formed in relation with the essential social classes (Gramsci, 2010: 378). Every essential social class produces its organic intellectuals. He defines the rest of intellectuals that remain outside of organic intellectuals, such as doctor, lawyers, clergymen – especially of the rural areas - as traditional intellectuals (2010: 383), whereas the most significant difference between rural intellectuals and urban intellectuals lies in the urban industrialization processes (Gramsci, 2010: 383); yet, even though traditional intellectuals seem to be autonomous from essential classes, they actually contribute to the continuum of the system by reproducing the hegemony of dominant classes[31]. In that respect, if we look at the social realist films made in 1960s' Turkey, we see that the group we have previously defined as negative type of intellectuals, generally falls into the category of organic intellectuals of the bourgeoisie. However, positive type of intellectuals are constituted of a more complex imaginary, according to the individual perspectives of the filmmakers. For instance, in Vedat Türkali's films, positive intellectuals are generally portrayed as the potential organic intellectuals of the working class, whereas Halit Refiğ seems to employ characters who are more close to the traditional intellectuals.

4.1.2.6 Concluding Remarks

To conclude, we can say that the characters in Turkish social realist films of 1960s, are depicted as typical characters in the Lukácsian sense. They are not generally

---

[31] The portrayal of traditional intellectuals might also be found in Metin Erksan's *Yılanların Öcü* where the doctor and the imam defends the side of local authority and Haceli, even though they seem to be impartial. However, contrary to Refiğ's film, their portrayal seem to fall into negative side.

represented through their individual attributes, but as a product of their class positions and social environments, trying to associate certain classes or social groups with certain behaviors or attitudes.

The films often give place to binaries such as working class and bourgeoisie, urbanites and new urbanites, landless peasants and the landowner… Contrary to Yeşilçam films these binaries are not only constructed in the axis of a poor and rich paradigm. Instead, they try to focus on the reasons behind the social inequalities and try to ground these binaries on an economic base. However, sometimes, the regard of the filmmakers are ambiguous, as seen in the examples of *Bitmeyen Yol*, *Gurbet Kuşları* and *Gecelerin Ötesi*.

As characters are not generally constructed as individualities, they are employed generally to convey the message of the filmmakers to the audience. In that respect, the construction of the characters serves the moral and educative perspective of the filmmakers. However, that also means that in some aspects characters lack an authentic voice and talks through the voice of the filmmaker. As a result, most of these films carry a monologic character, mostly repeating the Kemalist enlightment ideology or the regard of the filmmakers to certain classes.

4.2. Form And Style in Turkish Social Realist Cinema Of 1960s

According to Ernst Fischer (1971: 116), the relationship between form and content appears as the most significant problem in arts. For Lukács (1969: 19), the determining factor in this relationship was the content, and the "intention" or the "perspective" of the artist. In the previous parts, we have tried to define the relationship between the content of the films and the perspective of the filmmakers. We have tried to analyze which themes and characters are employed in these films and how they are shaped accordingly to the perspective of the filmmakers against concrete historical and social conditions of their time. For this part, we aim the dwell on the particular relationship between form and content within the context of Turkish social realist films made in the first half of 1960s. In that respect, we are

going to analyze stylistic and formal aspects of these films and try to understand in which aspect they are dependent upon the content.

We would like to start to our reflection, by asking what specific characteristics of form and content define their relationship. As we already discussed in the previous parts, while the form refers to a "state of equilibrium attained at a given time", the most defining aspect of the content might be indicated as "movement and change" (Fischer, 1971: 125). According to this differentiation Fischer (1971: 125) asserts that content has a "revolutionary" characteristic that evokes form to change and evolve.

This relationship that defines artistic forms are grounded on the actual social relations. According to Fischer, "material forces of production" which might be seen as the content of a society, and the social institutions are organizations refers to the social forms. The changes in production relations compel social forms to change (Fischer, 1971: 127). From this point of view, Fischer finds a remarkable similarity between society and arts in which the form emerges as "the social experience solidified" (1971: 152). The correlation made by between Fischer between the superstructure and the base might also be found in Plekhanov's (1953: 195) claim that "everything depends on time and place". This simple assessment reveals the ideological nature of the form.

In that case what we can say about the employment of form and style in 1960s' social realist films? As we have previously discussed, 1960s were a significant period of time for the social history of Turkey. The changes evoked by the capital accumulation processes, such as the rural migration, emergence of a new industrial bourgeoisie and the working class movements were all carried to the cinema as a result of the reflection of base to the superstructure. The content of these films were highly respondent to the new social developments. But did these changes reflected on the form and style; and if so, how?

Even if social realist films of the 1960s were not completely revolutionary for Turkish cinema, they brought significant changes both in terms of content and form. But as it can be see in the latest part on the content of the films, the approach of social directors to their subjects are varied. It would be hard to claim that they are all moving from the same perspectives. In that respect, the social realist films of 1960s constitute an eclectic body. However, this eclecticism is not only found in different films, but also in individual films. We see that the filmmakers approach to social issues and their actors might be ambiguous, sometimes even conflicting. This eclectic mixture reflects upon the style and form of these films too and we are determinant to discuss it.

But before starting to analyze the stylistic and the formal aspects of these films, we need a make certain under which titles we are going to discuss them. Under the title of style, we are going to analyze the usage of camera, lightning, sound, setting and the iconography in the chosen films, whereas under the title of form, we are going to dwell more on the syntagmatic aspects of the films, i. e. the elements concerning the arrangement of the parts and the plot. While the discussion on the style of the films will be related with the remaining semantic aspects of the films, the discussion on the form will be in the direction of discussing some syntactic aspects of the films. However, since a detailed syntactic analysis of these films is beyond the scope of this study and deserves to be studied in a more detailed, independent study, we will settle with only discussing the general aspects in this regard.

4.2.1. Style in Social Realist Cinema

The most prominent characteristics of social realist cinema in terms of the style, were the aesthetic innovations in films, such as the depth of field, the use of multiple camera angles and on location shootings (Daldal, 2003: 145). Moreover, Levent Cantek (2001: 195) points out that these films carry a common aim to approach the film language to a documentary attitude. In this part, we are planning to dwell on these stylistic aspects of the social realist cinema, to find out to which degree they were innovative or intrinsic to the films.

The inquiry on whether a film is realistic is not is often considered together with the notion of *mise-en-scène* (Bordwell & Thompson, 2008: 113). The term *mise-en-scène* might be translated as "putting into scene" and refers to filmmaker's decision over what is seen in the film frame (Bordwell & Thompson, 2008: 112). In that respect, the components of *mise-en-scène* are consisted of setting, costumes and makeup, lightning and staging (Bordwell & Thompson, 2008: 115).

The social realist cinema of 1960s cannot be thought separately from Yeşilçam tradition in style. The reason behind that might be found the immature cinematic language of Turkish cinema tradition until 1960s. In that respect, the usage of costumes and make up, the staging or the lightning does not constitute a significant difference according to the Yeşilçam films. However the settings of these films is worth considering due to the fact that it is the filmic element into which the most attention and effort put by filmmakers.

We would first like to start by the setting. None of these films are studio produced. However, we cannot exactly find the reason lying behind it in the intellectual foundations of the social realist cinema. If the scenes were shoot outdoor settings or in genuine places instead of studio conditions, it was due to the limitations of Turkish film industry. In that respect Nijat Özön makes this remark on the employment of the setting in Turkish cinema.

> Many scenes of our films are made outdoors. It stems from not out directors' fondness of realism but from rudimentary studio technique. None of these location shootings are to evoke a feeling of realism in the audience. The location shootings in our films are exactly the same as the cliché place descriptions which happen to be one of main characteristics of mainstream novels and written to describe a certain place but does not indicate any of the characteristics of this place (Özön, 1995b: 67, my translation)

Özön's arguments were aimed mostly to Yeşilçam films. But, even though these remarks are still valid for social realist cinema, we cannot deny that employment of the location shootings, although partly made based on necessity, are used in a defining way in terms of the narrative and characters. We have previously discussed that how in social realism, "there is a high degree of verisimilitude" solidified in the "direct link between person and place" (Lay, 2002: 20). The social realist cinema in Turkey seems to carry both of these attributes.

For instance in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, we see that a considerable amount of scenes are saved for the shootings in the working class neighborhood. These scenes shot in the streets, serve generally nothing for the plot. However, as if capturing the essence of the space would lead to a deeper understanding of the everyday experience of the working classes, these scenes show us how the workers walk in the dusty streets for going to work, and the daily chattering between women and children of the neighborhood. Moreover, these streets become the place where a spirit of unity and solidarity materializes into being especially in the final scene when the entire neighborhood rushes into the strike area. In a similar fashion, in *Bitmeyen Yol*, the depiction of the city holds a crucial place. We see the new urbanites walking and wandering around the city, searching for a job and the city image which is shown with all its crowd, traffic, sounds and flow reflects the confusion and fear of the new urbanites vis-à-vis the city life. The stone pit in the *Otobüs Yolcuları*, is similarly used to represent the hard working conditions of the workers, whereas the scenes in the IETT bus is employed as a space for sharing a common life and experience amongst the people of the same class. The examples might be multiplied. The important point here is to understand why these scenes are significant in terms of the style. Firstly, in many of the scenes the techniques such as long shots, wide angles or depth of field is used to place the characters in the setting, making easier to correlate the character with his or her environment. Secondly, they were also the scenes that carried the most documentary attitude. And finally, these scenes invoke a time-image effect in the Deleuzian (2012) sense, in which the object or the act is not to be seen or viewed, but to be encountered. However, this time-image effect found in some

scenes does not spread to the entirety of the films and this rarity might have two possible reasons.

First reason depends on the intent behind filmmakers' stylistic preferences. For instance, in some of Erksan's films, we encounter certain scenes that happen to be act with the principles of time-image rather than the movement-image. Especially in his rural films, we see those kind of examples, long shots of the rural scenery and the characters in it. Likewise, there might be found many scenes in *Yılanların Öcü* that include low angle shots. However, these scenes are more aesthetically motivated rather than providing any thought or a unity of style. In as similar fashion, in *Bitmeyen Yol*, when Ahmet and Cemile goes to the museum, Sağıroğlu uses multiple camera angles at a time, such as close-up, medium shots and high angles but these angles remains to be only aesthetic preferences, not providing us any means of understanding characters. In fact, quite the contrary, it makes it harder for audience to associate with the situation and the characters in the frame.

Second reason lies in the overall pedagogic character of the film. These time-images are generally interrupted with formalistic tendencies of the filmmakers. As we have previously discussed, Turkish social realism was more interested in common people as the spectator, and the contrary to Italian Neorealism, the realism was not encountered but rather carefully constructed with the intent of educating people or informing the society on the concerned issues. This pedagogic intent of the filmmakers, that was most interested transmitting a message to the masses, calls for the formalist stylistic preferences in many cases, which might be seen especially in the iconography, the usage of sound and the editing of the films.

The iconography elaborated by Erwin Panofsky grounds on his study on Renaissance art and refers to objects and events which have symbolical meanings and employed to indicate certain themes or concepts (Grant, 2011: 10). However, some genre critics such as Lawrence Alloway and Ed Buscombe adopt this term to indicate not the symbolically charged objects in an individual work, but re-appearing patterns in multiple cinematic texts (Grant, 2011: 11). The iconography in genre films generally

indicates the employment of particular objects or archetypal characters (Grant, 2011: 11).

As we have mentioned in the previous parts, social realist cinema was keen to represent the actors of different social classes with particular objects, clothing or habits. We have stated especially, how in the representation of bourgeoisie extravagant houses, luxury cars, dressing gowns, imported beverages and cigars play a significant role. According to Türkeş, such patterns might be diversified, such as air travel to European countries, usage of telephone and so on (2001: 138). These patterns appear from literary to cinematic text, marking the popular culture products in Turkish social history. Therefore, we cannot claim that these are authentic to social realist cinema but a part of a shared cultural imaginary. They are used not because they are close to the reality, but close to the audience's imaginary on certain social types. While we were discussing genres, we have discussed how genres are regulated by expectations or the customs of the audience, and serve as the "horizons of expectations" (Todorov, 1976: 163). To a certain degree, the social realist cinema, tries to speak the language of the audience. As a result, we see that the iconography employed in these films does not fall far from the patterns of Yeşilçam.

Another formalistic aspect of the films might be concluded as the usage of sound. The cinematic sound might be divided into two groups: diegetic and non-diegetic. Diegetic sound, emanates from the narrative world and includes: dialogue, sound effects and ambient (background) sound, whereas the most potent non-diegetic sound is the music (Lacey, 2005: 16-19). The social realist cinema gives a considerable amount of effort to the usage of music whether it is diegetic or non-diegetic. When it is diegetic, such as the dining scene in *Otobüs Yolcuları* where the bourgeois family listens to western music, it is employed to demonstrate the cultural consumption habits of the characters depending on their class positions. In a similar fashion, in *Otobüs Yolcuları*, the folk singer associated with the working classes and in *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, the classical music listened by Aydın reflects his intellectual background effected by the western values. Non-diegetic music however, directly related with the audience often employed to evoke certain feelings such as

excitement or thrill. For instance in *Suçlular Aramızda*, the non-diegetic sound is employed to create a more exciting atmosphere in parallel with the crime story and in the last scene of the *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, the anthem-like music is used to create a an excitement in the audience and increase the affect of the strike scene. And as we have previously discussed, in *Bitmeyen Yol*, the song at the end of the film is used a direct way of conveying a final message to the audience.

Music and the iconography are not the only ways of directing the audience in the social realist cinema. The editing too, is often employed for formalistic reasons, especially to emphasize the binary between characters. This approach to editing might be found in Russian Formalists' texts, such as Pudovkin. For instance, Pudovkin defines that "editing is not merely a method of junction of separate scenes or pieces, but is a method that controls the "psychological guidance" of the spectator" (1992: 125). Pudovkin denominates it as "relational editing" and asserts that there are different aims of relational editing, such as: contrast, parallelism, symbolism, and *leit-motif* (reiteration of theme) (1992: 125- 126). Relational editing is a common technique in social realist cinema, especially to emphasize the contrast between characters. For instance, in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, the streets of working class neighborhood and the house of Turgut are given in contrast to each other, similarly the scenes that show the relationship between Nevin and Turgut to Ekrem and Ayla. In *Şehirdeki Yabancı* too, the contrast between Aydın and the mercenary rural groups – Şeref and his surroundings – when their night in the club and Aydın's drinking home alone is given in contrast with relational editing.

These examples might be multiplied, but to summarize, we can say that as the themes and issues of social realist cinema offers an eclectic mixture, the style of the films carries this characteristic too. Whereas some scenes adopt the universal realistic style of social realist cinema, the others involve formalist tendencies, or popular stylistic aspects of Yeşilçam cinema. This ambiguity of the style is based mostly on pedagogic tendency of the filmmakers and the immature cinema language of Turkish cinema at time.

4.2.2. The Form in Social Realist Cinema

So what all these say on the form of the social realist cinema? Is it possible to talk about a social realist cinema that has gained a formal autonomy for the case of 1960s' Turkey? In order to understand the answer of this question, we should look one final aspect of these films, i.e. the arrangement of the parts in terms of the plot.

According to Richard Armstrong the classical realist narrative forms adopt the essential structure of the nineteenth-century novel and it is structured around three dramatic shifts: a) a situation is established; b) the situation is disrupted; and c) the disruption is resolved and a fresh situation brought into being (2005: 11). Moreover, the relationship between time and space are constructed logically which makes audience to follow the narrative according to natural chain of events (Armstrong, 2005: 16).

The social realist cinema of 1960s grounds on this classical narrative form, every individual event follows each other according to the boundaries of time and space in the prefect linearity. This classic narrative might be found also in the popular cinema. In fact, in terms of the linearity of the events, social realist cinema does not differ from Yeşilçam tradition. But as Carroll puts it, social realist films differ from mainstream cinema in many aspects and this relationality marks them as realist texts(1996: 243). In that respect, Lay asserts that in the mainstream cinema the chain of narrative is simpler and text adopts more predictable solutions, such as happy endings whereas in the case of social realism, the narrative usually resist to familiar resolution schemes (2002: 20-21).

Unfortunately, we cannot say that social realist cinema differs in this aspect from mainstream cinema. The events are folded generally easily and in the favor of protagonists. Only exception to this predictability might be seen in *Bitmeyen Yol*, but it remains to be sole example in that respect.

Moreover, if we discuss social realist films according to popular genres, we see that unlike the general unpredictability of the social realist cinema, they adopt the generic conventions of popular genres. While *Gurbet Kuşları* seems to approach the melodramas of Yeşilçam*, Otobüs Yolcuları* evolves around a romance story, *Gecelerin Ötesi* is constructed as a thriller, and for *Suçlular Aramızda*, Metin Erksan seems to adopt the conventions of film noirs. The pragmatic and pedagogic tendencies of the filmmakers might be behind this narrative structures, since as we have previously discussed, they were willing to profit from popular forms to call out to the masses.

Therefore, if we look especially to stylistic and formal aspects of the social realist cinema, we witness a generic instability. But, as Thomas O. Beebee points out, "a text's generic status is rarely what it seems to be, that is always already unstable" (1994: 27). At this point, it might be useful to remember how genres develop and gain autonomy. According to Todorov (1984: 8), genres develop slowly and change constantly until a definite pattern emerges and stabilizes. And if we remember, Fischer's (1971: 125) assessment on the revolutionary characteristic of the content over the form, we may understand the formal instability of social realist texts better. These movies were based on a new, emerging social content which evoked certain changes in the style, but could not afford a totality of form both due to the freshness of the attempt, the pedagogic concerns of the filmmakers, but also due to the their different perspectives on the concerned social issues.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to discover the generic features of Turkish social realist films made in the first half of 1960s. We have tried to find out the shared characteristics of these films both in terms of their content and formal features. Our general argument was that genres were the product of the society in which they were born into. Therefore, we have spared the first part of this study to understand this relationship.

In the first part of our analysis, we have discussed the emergence of social realist cinema in Turkey in the 1960s against the background of concrete historical, political and social processes. We have indicated how the liberal atmosphere following the coup of May 27th, new constitutional rights and social movements created a suitable environment for a new cinematic tendency seeking to represent social problems and bringing up social criticism in the agenda of Turkish cinema. By referring to the comments and testimony of film critics' and filmmakers' of that era, we have also tried to show how a moral and educative perspective was determinant in their ways of filmmaking.

In the second part of our analysis, we have focused on the content of these films, as well as the themes and characters employed in these films. While analyzing the issues and themes of these films, we have grouped them as urban and village films. Then we have asserted that while village films focus on the issues of water and land ownership, urban films center upon the issues such as class conflict, working class struggle, rights of organization and union, rural migration, housing problem and the discontents of modernization. In that respect we established four categories: class conflict and working class struggle, discontents of modernization, rural migration and urbanization, and the peasant life. We have tried to find out the common

approaches to these issues, but also the divergence points between different filmmakers and films.

We have reached at the conclusion that the moral and educative perspective of the filmmakers was effective in the selection of themes and issues. All of these films were addressing current social issues, sometimes even taking their stories from real life events. We have also asserted that many of these implicit issues were also in the agenda in the leftist movements of that time, such as the emergence of the industrial bourgeoisie and working class struggle. We have also argued that their approach to these issues was often diversified, parallel to the intellectual atmosphere of 1960s. Apart from all these, we have claimed that in the reception of these films as realist texts, the reaction of the audience held a crucial place. Since these movies were introducing certain issues to the Turkish cinema for the first time, the audience must have received them as a novelty in terms of the realist approach.

Regarding the common characters found in these films, we have employed Lukácsian notion of typicality. We have argued that the characters in these films are "types", since they are not generally depicted as individuals, but as the products of their social environment and class position. We have also argued that these films tend to attribute certain attitudes and behaviors to certain types of characters. Turkish social realist films made in 1960s are dominated by five type of figures: working classes, bourgeoisie, urban poor and new urbanites, peasants, along with students and intellectuals. We have argued that these films often involve binary opposition between characters: working class and bourgeoisie, urbanites and new comers to the city, landless peasants and landowner, positive type of intellectuals vs. negative type of intellectuals and so on. We have also remarked that contrary to Yeşilçam films that generally focus on a more abstract rich and poor paradigm these films tend to focus on the reasons behind the social inequalities and try to construct these oppositions according to this point of view. However, we have noted that the interest of the filmmakers in their characters is sometimes ambiguous and even external that they do not always fully comprehend and represent them according to concrete social, historical circumstances. Moreover, since the characters are not constructed as

117

individualities, they serve generally to convey the message of the filmmakers to the audience. The construction of the characters is in parallel with the filmmakers' moral and educative intents. This also means that characters are generally lacking their authentic voices and the films have a monologic aspect, mostly repeating the discourse of Kemalist modernization, or the period's intelligentsia's view of social classes.

The Turkish social realist films made in 1960s brought some stylistic and formal changes in the Turkish cinema, especially in terms of the usage of camera angles, location shootings and a more documentary style. In the last part of our analysis we have focused on these changes, and we have focused on the style and form of the films. Based on Ernst Fischer's (1971) and Lukács' (1969) ideas on form and content, we have argued that the changes in the form are at least in result of the changes in the content, and tried to understand how this relationship is constructed in the chosen films.

One of the most striking features of these films is the use of settings, especially the location shootings. Even though the location shootings were a necessity in Turkish cinema industry, these films had also a desire to make a connection between the characters and their environments through the use of settings. However, it is not possible to say that they are always coherent in terms of the style. Some scenes are employed only with surface aesthetic concerns, while some formalist tendencies also interrupt the documentary style employed in some scenes. Especially in terms of the iconography, these films match with Yeşilçam tradition. Moral and educative perspective of the filmmakers plays a great role in the formalist aspect of the films. In that respect, the reality in Turkish social realist films is often a carefully constructed reality rather than something to be found or discovered.

While analyzing the formal aspects of the films we have looked at the arrangement of parts and the narrative chain. We have contended that the classic narrative form of the 19th century novel is adopted in the films, in which the chain of narrative is linear, confined to the limits of time and space. We have also remarked that these

films do not fit Samantha Lay's (2002) arguments on the unpredictability of the chain of events, in which the resolution schemes of popular cinema are left aside. The films generally have somewhat happy endings. This is mostly due to the fact that these films were made in the Yeşilçam industry, and also due to the filmmakers pragmatist attitude of using these films to address the masses. Also, they are under the influence of popular genres, therefore it is not possible to talk about a generic stability. According to Todorov (1994) genres evolve slowly and later reach to a formal stability. Thus, we have reached to the conclusion that these films are product of a newly emerging social content, however the changes in the content although effective on the form, could not reach a total stability. The moral and educative purpose of the filmmakers had the most share in this aspect of the films.

To conclude, it is not possible to define these films as a genre. However, both in terms of the intent of the filmmakers, the content of the films, their style and form, they have similarities and remarkable peculiarities. Therefore, we might say that they still constitute a unity and a tendency that marked the first half of 1960s. But they are also remarkably different from each other since the political engagements of the filmmakers are diversified. As a result, we have reached to the conclusion that even though these films are similar for they discuss current social issues with the help of typical chracters, it is not possible to find a commonality in filmmakers' regard to social issues and the only shared perspective behind these films is their willingness to offer a political and social criticism, which eventually caused them to be named as social realist films.

Through a generic analysis, we have tried to demonstrate how these films constituted a unity, how their internal contradictions should be understood and how they might be related with the society which they are a product of. Unfortunately, we have not been able to discuss the relationship between these films and their audience as much as we wanted to, since there no data available on this subject, all we know about that is limited to certain fragmentary clues. Also we have devoted a limited space to the syntactic features of the films. This is a more detailed topic that was beyond the scope of this study and deserving to be discussed at length. Similarly, many of these

films were literary adaptions, but we have not talked about original works in this study. A future study might specifically focus on this subject. Also since the aim of this study was to find the generic features of the films, we have not focused on the filmography of the filmmakers. And since the filmography of these filmmakers also go through significant changes in time, a further study might focus on these issues. We only hope that this study may pave the way for further studies, and the cinema of this period could be studied in a more comprehensive way.

REFERENCES

Abisel, N. (1991). Nasıl Yaşıyor Nasıl Düşlüyoruz: Yeli Filmlerin Kurmaca Dünyasında Demokrasi. In *Türk Sinemasında Demokrasinin Gelişmesi*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Milli Kütüphane Basımevi.

Altıner, B. (2005). *Metin Erksan Sineması*. İstanbul: Pan Yayıncılık.

Altman, R. (1984). A Semantic/Syntactic Approach to Film Genre. *Cinema Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Spring, 1984), 6-18.

Alver, K. (2002). Züppeliğin Sosyolojisi: Türk Romanında Züppe Tipler Örneği. *Hece Aylık Edebiyat Dergisi Türk Romanı Özel Sayısı*.

Armes, R. (1971). *Patterns of Realism*. London: Tantivity Press.

Atılgan, G. (2002). "Yön"ünü Ararken Yolunu Yitirmek. *Praksis*, 6: 119-151.

Atılgan, G. (2008). *Yön-Devrim Hareketi: Kemalizm ile Marksizm Arasında Geleneksel Aydınlar*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogical Imagination*. Holquist, M. (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (McGee, V. W. Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Beebee, T. O. (1994). *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of Generic Instability*. Penn State Press.

Bennett, T. (2003). *Formalism and Marxism*. New York: Routledge.

Brecht, B. (1980). Brecht Against Lukacs. In Taylor, R. (Ed.), *Aesthetics and Politics*. London: Verso, 68-85.

Bora, T. (2017). *Cereyanlar*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T. & Erdoğan, N. (2005), Zenginlik: 'Zengin' Bir Araştırma Gündemi, "Yoksul" Bir Literarür. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 104.

Bordwell & Thompson (2008). *Film Art: An Introduction*. New York: MacGraw-Hill.

Cantek, L. (2001). Köy Manzaraları: Romantizm ve Gerçekçiliğin Düalizmleri. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 88.

Carroll, N. (1996) *Theorising the Moving Image*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chandler, D. (1997). *An Introduction to Genre Theory*. Retrieved from: http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/intgenre/chandler_genre_theory.-pdf

Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Coş, N. (2015). Türk Sinemasında İşçi. In Funda Başaran (Ed.), *İşçi Filmleri, Öteki "Sinemalar"*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Coşkun, E. (2009). *Türk Sinemasında Akım Araştırması*, Ankara: Phoenix Yayınevi.

Dönmez-Colin, G. (2008). *Turkish Cinema: Identity, Distance and Belonging*. London: Reaction Books.

Dönmez- Colin, G. (2014). *The Routledge Dictionary of Turkish Cinema*. London: Routledge.

Erksan, M. (1985). Türkiye'de Entelijansiya Yok. *Ve Sinema Dergisi, Book 1*. İstanbul: Hil Yayınları.

Daldal, A. (2003). *Arts, Politics and Society: Social Realism in Italian and Turkish Cinemas.* İstanbul: The Isıs Press.

Daldal, A. (2005). *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik.* İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi.

Daldal, A. (2013). The Impact of Neo-Realism in Turkish Intellectual Cinema: The Cases of Yılmaz Güney and Nuri Bilge Ceylan. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 9. Rome, Italy: MCSER Publishing.

Deleuze, G. (2012). *Cinéma II: L'Image-Temps.* Paris: Les Editions de la Minuit.

Eagleton, T. (2002). *Marxism and literary criticism*. Routledge.

Eagleton, T. (2003). Pork Chops and Pineapples. *London Review of Books*, 25: 20 October 2003, 17-19.

Eagleton, T. (2015). *Marksizm ve Edebiyat Eleştirisi* (U. Özmakas, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Engels, F. (1999). *Engels to J. Bloch In Königsberg.* Retrieved from: Marxist InternetArchive: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1890/-letters-/90_09_21.htm

Erdoğan, Nezih (1995), Ulusal Kimlik, Kolonyal Söylem ve Yeşilçam Melodramı. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 67.

Esen, Ş. K. (2010). *Türk Sinemasının Kilometre Taşları*, İstanbul: Agora Kitaplığı

Fischer, E. (1971). *Necessity Of Art*. London: Penguin Books.

Fowler, A. (1979). Genre and Literary Canon. *New Literary History*, Vol. 11, No. 1, Anniversary Issue: II (Autumn, 1979), 97-119.

Gramsci, A. (2010). D. Forgacs (Ed.), *Gramsci Kitabı: Seçme Yazılar 1916-1935*. Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Grant, B. K. (2011). *Film Genre: From Iconography to Ideology*. New York: Wallflower Press.

Hallam, J. & M. Marshement (2000). *Realism and Popular Cinema*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hayward, S. (2006). *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts*, Routledge.

Henderson, B. (1971). Two Types of Film Theory. *Film Quarterly,* Vol. 24, No. 3, pp.33-42, University of California Press

Higson, A. (1984). Space, place, spectacle. *Screen*, *25*(4-5), 2-21.

Hristidis, Ş. K. (2007). *Sinemada Ulusal Tavır: Halit Refiğ Kitabı*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Hepkon, Z., & Aydın, O. Ş. (2010). Türk Sinemasının Görünmeyen Öznesi: İşçiler. *İLETİ-Ş-İM*, *12* (12).

Jameson, F. (1975). Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre. *New Literary History*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Critical Challenges: The Bellagio Symposium (Autumn, 1975), 135-163.

Jameson, F. (1991). *The Political Unconscious*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Jameson, F. (1997). *Marksizm ve Biçim: Yirminci Yüzyılda Diyalektik Yazın Kuramları* (M. H. Doğan, Trans.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayınları.

Kayalı, K. (2004). *Metin Erksan Sinemasını Okumayı Denemek*. Ankara: Dost.

Lacey, N. (2005). *Introduction to Film Studies*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Lukacs, G. (1969). *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism* (J. & N. Mander, Trans.). London: Merlin Press.

Lukacs, G. (1980). Realism in The Balance. *In Aesthetics and Politics* (R. Taylor, Trans. Ed.). London: Verso.

Kıvılcımlı, H. (1970). *27 Mayıs ve Yön Hareketi'nin Sınıfsal Eleştirisi*. İstanbul: Ant Yayınevi.

Koçer, Z. (2009). Different Understandings Of Modernity In Halit Refiğ's Birds   Of Exile (Gurbet Kuşları). In A. Kotaman & A. Uğursoy (Eds.), *Cinema   and Politics: Turkish Cinema and the New Europe*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Macherey, P. (2006). *A Theory of Literary Production* (G. Wall, Trans.). Routledge.

Maktav, H. (2001a), Türk Sinemasının Öğrenciye Bakışı, *Birikim,* sayı: 142-143. Retrieved from: http://www.birikimdergisi.com/sayi/142-143/turk-sinemasinin-universiteye-bakisi

Maktav, Hilmi, (2001b). Türk Sinemasında Yoksulluk ve Yoksul Kahramanlar, *Toplum ve Bilim*, 89.

Mardin, Ş. (1991). *Türk Modernleşmesi: Makaleler 4*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Marx, K & Engels, F. (2000). *A Critique of The German Ideology*. Retrieved from   https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/Marx_The_ German_Ideology.pdf

Morva Kablamacı, A. D. (2011). Bu Fabrika Bizim: Karanlıkta(n) Uyananlar Filminde İşçi Sınıfının Temsili, *Sinecine* 2 (2), 57-80.

Nilges, M. (2009). Marxism and Form Now. *Mediations* 24.2 (Spring 2009) 66-89. Retrieved from: www.mediationsjournal.org/marxism-and-form-now.

Onaran, Alim Şerif (1994). *Türk Sineması I. Cilt*. Ankara: Kitle Yayınları.

Özkaracalar, Kaya (2009). Anti Emperyalizm / Milliyetçilik Sarkacında   Karanlıkta Uyananlar'da ve Günümüz Türk Filmlerinde Emperyalizm Temsilleri, *Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler 8: Sinema ve   Politika* , Ankara: Bağlam Yayıncılık.

Özön, Nijat (1995a) *Karagözden Sinemaya, II. Cilt*, Ankara: Kitle Yayınları.

Özön, Nijat (1995b) *Karagözden Sinemaya, I. Cilt*, Ankara: Kitle Yayınları

Plekhanov, G. V. (1953). *Art and Social Life*. Bombay: People's Publishing House.

Pösteki, Nigar (2012). Türk Sinemasında Toprak Mülkiyetine Bakış, *Acta Turcita*, Yıl:4 Sayı:1.

Pudovkin, V. (1992). From Film Technique [On Editing]. In G. Mast, M. Cohen & L. Braudy (Eds.), *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Refiğ, H. (1971). *Ulusal Sinema Kavgası*. İstanbul, Hareket Yayınları

Savran, S. (2011). *Türkiye'de Sınıf Mücadeleleri*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap

Scognamillo, G. (1979). Bir dönemin anatomisi: Türk sineması 1960-1977. *Kurgu Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi Uluslararası Hakemli İletişim Dergisi*, *1*(1), 98-107.

Şener, M. (2010). *Türkiye Solunda Üç Tarz-ı Siyaset*. İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Şener, M. (2017). Yön ve Milli Demokratik Devrim Hareketleri. In M. K. Kaynar (Ed.), *Türkiye'nin 1960'lı Yılları*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Tekeli, I. (2009). Cities in Modern Turkey. *Istanbul: City of Intersections*, 16-17.

Teksoy, R. (1964). Evet, Suçlular Aramızda. *Yön*, 89, 14-15.

Tihanov, G. (2000). *The Master and the Slave: Lukacs, Bakhtin, and the Ideas of Their Time*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Todorov, T. & Berong, R. M. (1976), The Origin of Genres. *New Literary History*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Readers and Spectators: Some Views and Reviews (Autumn, 1976), 159-170.

Trotsky, L. (2000). *Literature and Revolution.* Retrieved from: Marxist Internet Archive: https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1924/lit_revo/

Türkali, V. (1985). Bu Gemi Nereye. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi

Türkeş, A. Ö. (2001). Taşra İktidarı!. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 88.

Varel, A. (2017). Altmışlı Yıllar Türkiye'sinde Sınıf ve Siyaset: Meşruiyet Savaşımı, Siyasal Yükselişi ve İç Bölünmeleriyle TİP. In M. K. Kaynar (Ed.), *Türkiye'nin 1960'lı Yılları*. İstanbul: İletişim.

Wayne, M. (2009). *Politik Film: Üçüncü Sinemanın Diyalektiği* (E. Yılmaz, Trans.). İstanbul: Yordam Kitap.

Williams, C. (1980). *Realism and The Cinema*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Yıldırım, T. (2015). Halit Refiğ'in Bir Türk'e Gönül Verdim Filminde Oyun ve Oyuncak Teması Üzerinden Yayılan Kültürel Temsiller. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Yıl: 3, Sayı: 13, Haziran 2015, 210-228.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TRANSLATED MOVIE LINES

1. "Türk işçisi anayasanın koruyucusudur."

2. "Yani kanun bize diyor ki işveren size emeğinizin hakkını verinceye kadar çalışmayın, çalıştırmayın fabrikayı da. Ta hakkınızı alıncaya kadar… İşte grev bu!"

3. "Sendika sensing be, sen, ben, o, hepimiz… Şu meydana gelir miydi emeğimiz olamdan. İşte bunu yaratan emeğimizin karşılığını almazsak, kim verir bize? (…) Ulan neyiniz var kaybedecek! Kanun bir hak vermiş size. Köpek gibi korkup titreşeceğinize hele sımsıkı tutun birbirinizi, bakın o zaman kimse sizin ekmeğinizle, insanlığınızla oynayabilir mi?"

4. "Bu memleketi soymaya, köle etmeye gelenlerin karşısında biz varız."

5. "Emeksiz kalkınma olmaz."

6. "Bu film 7 gencin hikayesidir. Konu olduğu gibi hayattan alınmıştır. Her mahallede bir milyonerin türediği devirde, aynı mahallelerde bu gençler de türedi."

7. "Dinlediklerinizin hepsi doğru. Çaldım, öldürdüm. Fakat bu yaptıklarımdan ötürü kendimi suçlu saymıyorum. Suç bende değil. Ben içinde yaşadığım çevrenin şartlarına uydum. Sizsiniz o çevre!"

8. "Üzme kendini oğlum, herkes yaşadığı yere göre insandır."

9. "Bu millet kadir kıymet bilir oğlum. Düne kadar senin yaptığın iyilikleri anlamayan cahil insanların bir gün gözleri yaşaracak Aydın Bey deyince."

10. "Delirmemek için hiçbir şey düşünmemek lazım."

11. "Bir noktadan sonra kendimi makinenin bir parçası sanıyorum".

12. Bunlar köylü kısmı ne sendikaları var ne bi' şeyleri

13. "Onlara bir şey olmaz, olan bizim paralara oldu."

14. İşçileri biz de düşünürüz ama her şeyden önce sermaye gelir."

15. "Bana sendika ve iş kanunlarından söz açmaya kalkışmasınız herhalde."

16. "Ben rezil olmaktan değil enayi yerine konmaktan korkarım."
17. Bende asaletin zerresi yok ama zenginim. Benim durumumda olanların çocuklarının hepsi gibi sen de şüphesiz asilsin."

18. Yalnızsın değil mi, ben de yalnızım. Hep yalnızdık zaten biz."

19. "Kısa çöp uzun çöpten alır hakkını elbette."

20. "Hiçbir şeye layık değilsiniz bu kafayla."

21. "Birlikte çalışan insanların nasıl mesut olabileceğini, nasıl çalışmaları ve dayanışmaları gerektiğini öğrendim."

22. "Seçimde rey toplamak için cami yaptırmaktan ziyade çalışanların durumunu düzeltmek zorundayız."

23. "Bütün kötülüklere direnen dayatan insanların gücü gibi bir şiir."

24. "Evet, sıkıldıkça okudum. Okudukça da sıkıntılarım arttı."

25. "Taşı toprağı altın İstanbul"

26. "Müslümanın malı ortaktır ağam."

27. "Düşmanına karşı her zaman uyanık olacaksın, o indirmeden sen indirmeye bak."

28. "Haceli'yi her yanından vurmak lazım. Muhtar onunla birlik, para da kuvvet de onun yanında."

29. "Bunlar bizim milletimiz, yüzlerce yıl acı çekmiş, yanmış, yıkanmamış yüzler…"

30. "Kasabaya gidiyoruz, doğrudan cumhuriyetin müddei umumuisine!"

31. "Bütün o gibilerin elinden bütün o suları almalı."

32. " Elbet bulamayacağız. Cahiliz, kafamız taş, okumamışız."

TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

TÜRKİYE SİNEMASINDA TOPLUMSAL GERÇEKÇİLİĞİN TÜR ANALİZİ: 1960-1965

Bu çalışmanın amacı 1960 ve 1965 yılları arasında Türk sinemasında gözlemlenen toplumsal gerçekçi sinema eğiliminin ele alınmasıdır. Her ne kadar her zaman için bir akım olarak adlandırılmasa ve varlığını ancak kısa bir süre boyunca koruyabilmiş olsa da 27 Mayıs Darbesi'ni izleyen süreçte Türk sinemasında bir grup toplumsal gerçekçi film ortaya çıkmış, gerçekçi ve ulusal bir sinema dilini ararken ortaya koyduğu yeni temalar ve biçimsel yaklaşımlarla Yeşilçam filmlerinden ayrışarak, Türk sinema tarihine katkıda bulunmuştur.

Uzun yıllar boyunca literatürde toplumsal gerçekçi Türk sinemasına belli bir ilgisizlikle yaklaşıldığını görmek mümkündür. Toplumsal gerçekçi sinemanın bir akım teşkil edip etmediği dahi bu dönemde tartışma konusu olmuştur. Söz gelimi Nijat Özön toplumsal gerçekliği küçük çapta bir hareket olarak değerlendirirken (1995a: 217), Giovanni Scognamillo ise toplumsal gerçekçiliği keyfi bir adlandırma olarak nitelendirmiştir (Daldal, 2005: 57). Bu yaklaşımın sonucunda toplumsal gerçekçi filmler literatür içinde genellikle tekil olarak ya da *auteur* kuramının bir uzantısı olarak değerlendirilmiş, toplumsal gerçekçi sinemayı bir bütün olarak ele alan çalışmalar ise genel olarak ya dönemin toplumsal olayları ile toplumsal gerçekçi sinema arasında paralellikler kuran betimsel çalışmalar ya da Türk toplumsal gerçekçiliğini İtalyan Yeni Gerçekçiliği ile kıyaslayan çalışmalarla sınırlı kalmıştır.

Bu örneklerin aksine, bu çalışmanın amacı 1960-1965 yılları arasında çekilen toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin türsel özelliklerine odaklanmak, hem içerik hem de biçim açısından bu filmler arasındaki kesişim noktalarını ve ayrışmaları tespit etmek, toplumsal gerçekçi sinemanın özgüllüklerini ortaya koymak olmuştur. Bu anlamda

yöntem olarak tür analizi belirlenmiştir. Ancak tür analizinin yöntem olarak seçilmesinin ardında yatan neden toplumsal gerçekçi sinemanın bir tür olarak ele alınması gerektiği savından ziyade, tür analizinin filmlerin ortak özelliklerini ve özgüllüklerini tespit etmek ve bu filmlerin toplumsal gerçekçi olarak adlandırılmasının ardında yatan sebepleri tartışmak açısından en elverişli yaklaşım olduğunun düşünülmesidir.

Analizin ampirik materyali dokuz filmden oluşmaktadır. Hangi filmlerin toplumsal gerçekçi sinemanın kapsamında değerlendirilebileceği konusunda görüş ayrılıkları bulunmaktadır. Söz gelimi, Esin Coşkun'a göre, toplumsal gerçekçi filmler arasında Metin Erksan'ın *Gecelerin Gecelerin Ötesi* (1960), *Yılanların Öcü* (1962), *Acı Hayat* (1963), *Suçlular Aramızda* (1964), *Susuz Yaz* (1963); Atıf Yılmaz'ın *Dolandırıcılar Şahı* (1961); Halit Refiğ'in *Şehirdeki Yabancı* (1963), *Şafak Bekçileri* (1963), *Gurbet Kuşları* (1964); Ertem Göreç'in *Otobüs Yolcuları* (1961), *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* (1964) ve Duygu Sağıroğlu'nun *Bitmeyen Yol* (1965) filmleri sayılabilir. Halit Refiğ'in *Haremde Dört Kadın* (1965) filmi de başta bu filmler arasında sayılmış, daha sonra Refiğ tarafından Ulusal Sinema'nın bir parçası olarak gösterilmiştir. (Coşkun, 2009: 38). Aslı Daldal' göre ise toplumsal gerçekçiliğin merkezinde on film bulunmaktır. Bunlar, *Gecelerin Ötesi*, *Yılanların Öcü*, *Susuz Yaz*, *Suçlular Aramızda*, *Şehirdeki Yabancı*, *Gurbet Kuşları* ve *Harem'de Dört Kadın*, *Otobüs Yolcuları* ve *Bitmeyen Yol*'dur (2005: 60).

Aynı dönemde çekilen ve gerçekçi bir yaklaşıma sahip olduğu düşünülen başka filmler de vardır. Bunlar yer yer romantik gerçekçilik, kent gerçekçiliği ve köy gerçekçiliği gibi isimlerle de anılmaktadır. Hatta bu filmlerin bir kısmı Coşkun tarafından toplumsal gerçekçi olarak tanımlanan filmlerle de kesişmektedir:

> Akımın "çevresinde" kalan filmler arasında, insan doğasına derinlikli bir bakış getirmeye çalışan "romantik gerçekçi" denemeler (*Kırık Çanaklar*, *Yasak Aşk*, *Seviştiğimiz Günler*, *Denize İnen Sokak*, *Son Kuşlar*, *Murtaza*...), hümanist bir "şehir gerçekliği" yansıtmak isteyen filmler (*Suçlu*, *Acı Hayat*, *Üç Tekerlekli Bisiklet*), Anadolu insanının cesaretini över ve feodal kalıntıları

eleştirirken "taşra gerçekliğini" vurgulamaya çalışan filmler (Şafak Bekçileri, *Murad'ın Türküsü*) ve sitem eleştirisi olmayı amaçlayan sanatsal altyapısı zayıf "sosyalist gerçekçi" çabalar (Kızgın Delikanlı, Yarın Bizimdir, *Bozuk Düzen...*) sayılabilir. (Daldal, 2005: 60)

Sonuç olarak bu filmler arasında toplumsal gerçekçiliği en iyi temsil ettiği düşünülen dokuz film seçilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın analiz kısmında kullanılan filmlerin listesi şu şekildedir:

Film Adı	Yönetmen	Yıl
Gecelerin Ötesi	Metin Erksan	1960
Otobüs Yolcuları	Ertem Göreç	1961
Yılanların Öcü	Metin Erksan	1962
Susuz Yaz	Metin Erksan	1963
Şehirdeki Yabancı	Halit Refiğ	1963
Gurbet Kuşları	Halit Refiğ	1964
Suçlular Aramızda	Metin Erksan	1964
Bitmeyen Yol	Duygu Sağıroğlu	1965
Karanlıkta Uyananlar	Ertem Göreç	1965

Tür analizinin metinleri ideolojik yapılar olarak ele alması nedeniyle çalışmanın kuramsal arka planı üç kısımdan oluşmaktadır. Tartışmanın birinci kısmında genel hatlarıyla biçim, içerik ve ideoloji arasındaki ilişkiye odaklanılmıştır. Eagleton'a göre metin analizi, metinlerin yalnızca ele aldığı temalara ya da konulara odaklanmayı değil aynı zaman da metinlerin biçemi aracılığıyla dışa vuran karmaşık ilişkiler bütününü çözümlemekten geçmektedir (2012: 21). Ancak ideolojinin yalnızca egemen sınıflarının düşüncelerinin basit bir yansıması olmaması, çatışan hatta birbiriyle çelişebilen dünya görüşlerinden meydana gelmesi nedeniyle, böyle bir çözümlemeye girişmenin kolay olmadığını söylemek mümkündür (2012: 21).

Belli bir dönemin toplumsal bilinci, zamanının toplumsal ilişkileri tarafından düzenlenmektedir, bu nedenle de sanat yapıtları ortaya çıkışlarını hazırlayan ekonomik, toplumsal ve politik koşullardan azade düşünmek mümkün değildir (2012: 21). Bunu yapabilmek içinse sanat formalarının ideolojik yapılar olarak düşünülmesi önem taşımaktır. Tür analizi ise biçim, içerik ve ideoloji ileşkisini bir arada alması nedeniyle böyle bir tartışma kurmak açısından elverişli bir nitelik taşımaktadır. Bunun nedeni, türlerin içinde doğdukları toplumların kurucu özelliklerini yansıtma özelliğine sahip olması olarak gösterilebilir. Todorov'un (1976) da belirttiği gibi toplumlar kendi ideolojilerine uygun söz edimlerini seçmekte ve kodlamaktadır. Todorov'un bu argümanı ideoloji tartışmasının tür analizi açısından gerekliliğini ortaya çıkmaktadır. Kuramsal tartışmanın ikinci kısmı ise türlerin nasıl ele alınması ve analiz edilmesi gerektiği üzerinden tür kuramına ayrılmıştır. Üçüncü kısım ise gerçekçilik ve toplumsal gerçekçilik kavramlarını açıklama kaygısı taşımaktadır. Bu anlamda, gerçekçilik ve toplumsal gerçekçiliğin tanımlanması 1960'larda Türkiye'de çekilen toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin ele alınması açısından da önem taşımaktadır.

Özetle, çalışmanın kuramsal kısmı ideoloji, form ve içerik arasındaki ilişkiye, tür analizinin çalışma açısından önemine ve gerçekçilik ile toplumsal gerçekçilik kavramlarının tanımlanmasına yer vermektedir. İdeoloji, biçim ve içerik arasındaki ilişki tartışılırken Marksist edebiyat kuramından faydalanılmış, sanat yapıtlarının nasıl ait oldukları toplumdan ve onu belirleyen toplumsal ilişkilerden bağımsız düşünülemeyeceğine değinilmiştir. Bu doğrultuda Jameson'ın kültürel eserlerin ("*cultural artefacts*") toplumsal yönden sembolik edimler olarak anlaşılması gerektiği yönündeki argümanına yer verilmiştir. Zira filmlerin kültürel eserler olarak ele alınması bir toplumun politik biliçaltının ("*political unconscious*") da ortaya çıkarılmasına katkıda bulunacaktır (Jameson, 1991: 20).

Tür analizi metinlerin hem içerik hem de biçimsel özelliklerini tartışmaya açmayı gerektirmektedir. Benzer şekilde, kültürel nesnelerin ideolojik niteliklerinin tartışılması da biçim ve içerik arasındaki diyalektik ilişkinin anlaşılmasından geçmektedir. Bu nedenle, kuramsal tartışma içerisinde bu ilişkiye odaklanılmış ve

Lukács'ın *Çağdaş Gerçekçiliğin Anlamı* eserinde ortaya koyduğu tartışmanın temel hatları sahiplenilmiş ve Ernst Fischer'in (1971) biçim ve içerik arasında belirleyici ögenin içerik olduğu yönündeki savından yararlanılarak, içeriğin biçim üzerindeki etkisi tartışmaya açılmıştır. Bu sav aynı zamanda içeriğin belli bir dönemdeki toplumsal ilişkilerin ürünü olduğu fikriyle desteklenmiştir.

Bu tartışmaların ışığında biçim, içerik ve ideoloji arasındaki ilişki özetlendikten sonra tür analizinin önemine değinilmiştir. Biçim ve içerik tartışmanın tür analizinde nereye yerleştiği saptandıktan sonra tür analizinin nasıl ideoloji ve temsil anlamında daha geniş bir tartışmanın sürdürülmesine katkıda bulunacağı gösterilmeye çalışılmıştır. Tür analizi tartışılırken ağırlıklı olarak Bakhtin, Jameson ve Todorov'un argümanlarından faydalanılmış, aynı zamanda bir türü anlamanın en iyi yolunun metinlerin hem semantik hem de sentaktik analizden geçtiği dile getirilmiştir.

1960'lı yıllarda Türk sinemasında beliren toplumsal gerçekçi eğilim bu yıllardaki ekonomik, politik ve toplumsal değişimlerden ayrı düşünülmesi mümkün değildir. Bu anlamda, toplumsal meselelere eğilen bu filmlerin temel kaygısı Aslı Daldal tarafından toplumsal olayları nesnel, gerçekçi ve modern bir sinema diliyle aktarma arzusu olarak nitelendirilmiştir (2005: 58). Ancak sanat ve gerçekçilik ilişkisi sanatın dünyayı alışıla gelmiş ve geçici temsil yöntemleriyle yansıtması nedeniyle karmaşık bir nitelik kazanmaktadır. Bu anlamda gerçekçilik, gerçekle karıştırılmaması gereken, daha geniş bir bağlamda belli bir dönemin ve toplumun hegemonik ideolojileriyle birlikte düşünülmesi gereken, son derece muğlak ve tanımlanması zor bir kavram olarak karşımıza çıkmaktadır. Ek olarak kimi filmlerin gerçekçi olduğunu öne sürmek, bu filmlerin diğer filmlerden ayrılan bazı özelliklerinin olduğunu öne sürmek anlamına gelmektedir (Carroll, 1996: 244). Bu nedenle kuramsal tartışmanın son kısmı gerçekçilik ve toplumsal gerçekçilik kavramlarının açıklanmasında ayrılmıştır. İlk olarak sanatsal gerçekçiliğin ne olduğu tartışılmış, daha sonra ise hangi metinlerin toplumsal gerçekçi olarak tanımlanabileceği dile getirilmiştir.

Bu bağlamda, sinemada toplumsal gerçekçiliğin tanımlanması aşamasında Samantha Lay'in (2002) kavramsal çerçevesine başvurulmuş ve toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin

diğer filmlerden üç aşamada farklılaştığı öne sürülmüştür. Bu aşamalardan birincisi pratik ve siyaset aşaması olarak tanımlanmıştır. Lay (2002) yönetmenlerin siyasi angajmanlarının ve bakış açılarının filmlerin üretim aşamasını, içerik ve biçimsel özelliklerini belirlediğini savunmaktadır. Bu anlamda toplumsal gerçekçi filmler genelde ahlaki bir sorumluluk, pedagojik ve reformist bir yaklaşım ile işlemektedir. Lay'in ikinci kategorisini oluşturan içerik bakımından ise, toplumsal gerçekçi sinemanın ana akım sinemada fazla temsil alanı bulamayan konulara ve karakterlere yer ayırdığını söylemek mümkündür (Lay, 2002: 10). Bu anlamda Lay'in vurguladığı ahlaki sorumluluk, Lukács'ın perspektif ve tipiklik kavramlarıyla birlikte ele alınmıştır. Lukács'a göre bir sanat yapıtının içeriğini ve biçimini nihai olarak sanatçının toplumsal olaylar ve somut tarihsel ilişkiler karşısındaki perspektifi belirlemektedir. Bu anlamda Lay'in ortaya koyduğu kategoriler, Lukács'ın perspektif kavramıyla benzerlik taşımaktadır. Ek olarak, Lay'e göre toplumsal gerçekçi sinema karakterleri çevreleriyle ve içinde bulundukları toplumsal ilişkilerle beyaz perdeye taşıyan bir nitelik göstermektedir. Bu anlamda, Lay'in karakterlerle ilgili vurgusu, Lukács'ın (1969) kavramsallaştırmasında tipiklik olarak adlandırdığı ve karakterlerin *zoon politikon* olarak çizildiği ve kendilerini çevreleyen toplumsal koşullardan ayrı düşünülemeyeceği fikrinin bir uzantısı olarak okunmuştur. Lay'in üçüncü kategorisi olan biçim ve stil özelliklerine göre ise toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin daha gözleme dayalı bir stil kullandığı ve anlatı biçimi açısından tahmin edilemeyen çözüm şemalarını benimsediği görülmektedir. Çalışmada toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin analizinde Lay'in kategorilerin kullanılmasına karar verilmiş, böylelikle filmlerin hem dönemin özellikleriyle birlikte düşünülebileceği hem de içerik ve stil başlıkları altında filmlerin semantik özelliklerinin, biçim başlığı altındaysa filmlerin sentaktik özelliklerinin ele alınabileceği dile getirilmiştir.

Bu çalışmanın iki açıdan anlamlı olduğu düşünülmektedir. İlk olarak, tür analizinin 1960'lı yıllarda Türk sinemasında görülen toplumsal gerçekçi eğilimin daha iyi anlaşılmasına hizmet edeceği düşünülmektedir. Chatman'a göre tür analizi neden Macbeth gibi bir yapıtın önemli olduğunu değil, Macbeth'i bir trajedi yapan ögeleri keşfetmektir (1978: 17). Benzer şekilde, bu çalışma da toplumsal gerçekçiliğin neden Türk sineması açısından önemli olduğunu belirtmek değil, bu filmleri toplumsal

gerçekçi olarak adlandırmamızı sağlayan özellikleri ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bu filmler neden toplumsal gerçekçi olarak nitelendirilmektedir? Bu filmlerin ortak semantik ve sentaktik özellikleri nelerdir? Bu sorular çalışmanın çıkış noktasını oluşturmaktadır. Ancak çalışmanın yegane amacı bu filmlerin sınıflandırılması değildir. İkincil olarak bu çalışma, filmlerin ortak özelliklerinin tartışılması yoluyla bu özelliklerin ideolojik karşılıklarının ve ait oldukları toplumla ilişkilerinin ortaya konulmasına yardımcı olmaktadır. Sinemada tür analizi, sinemayı yalnızca bir sanat formu olarak değerlendirmekle kalmayıp aynı zamanda toplumsal olarak sembolik bir edim olarak görmekte ve belli bir dönemin politik ideolojilerinin ve altında yatan sınıf ilişkilerinin anlaşılmasına katkı sağlayabilmektedir.

Bu amaçlara paralel olarak çalışmanın analiz kısmı Türkiye'de 1960'lı yılların ilk yarısında üretilen toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin ortak özelliklerinin tespitine, filmlerin içerik ve biçimsel özellikleri açısından ortak özelliklerini keşfetmeye ve filmlerle ürünü oldukları toplumsal ilişkilerin bağlantısının anlaşılmasına ayrılmıştır.

Bu doğrultuda, çalışmanın analiz kısmının ilk parçasını oluşturan üçüncü bölümde, 1960'lı yıllarda Türk sinemasında toplumsal gerçekçiliğin ortaya çıkmasını sağlayan somut tarihsel, politik ve toplumsal süreçler üzerinde durulmuştur. Özellikle 27 Mayıs Darbesi'ni izleyen dönemin özgürlükçü atmosferinin, yeni anayasal hakların ve toplumsal hareketlerin toplumsal meseleleri sinemaya aktarmayı ve Türk sinemasının gündemine toplumsal eleştiriyi sokmayı hedefleyen bu eğilimin ortaya çıkmasında ne ölçüde etkili olduğu ele alınmıştır. Dönemin yönetmenlerinin ve film eleştirmenlerinin tanıklıklarından faydalanılarak, Aslı Daldal'ın (2003) da öne sürmüş olduğu üzere Türk sinemasında toplumsal gerçekçiliğin pedagojik bir kaygı taşıdığı dile getirilmiş, bu kaygının yönetmenlerin film yapım süreçlerini nasıl etkilediği tartışılmıştır.

Dördüncü bölümde filmlerin içerik özellikleriyle beraber, biçim ve üslup özelliklerine odaklanılmıştır. Filmlerin içerik ve biçimsel özelliklerine bir arada odaklanmasının temel nedeni, çalışmanın kuramsal kısmında da belirtildiği üzere

biçim ve içerik arasında diyalektik bir ilişki bulunduğu ve biçimsel özelliklerin içerik tarafından belirlendiği argümanıdır.

Filmlerin içerik özellikleri, filmlerin ele aldığı konular ve yer verdiği karakterler olmak üzere iki başlık altında   iki başlık altında tartışılmıştır. Filmlerin genel hatlarıyla güncel toplumsal meselelere odaklandığı görülmektedir. Bu nedenle, filmlerin ele aldığı ortak temalar ve konular, filmlerin içeriklerinin daha geniş bir toplumsal bağlamla ilişkili olduğuna dair argümanımıza dayanarak analiz edilmiştir. Filmlerin konuları ele alınırken toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin köy ve kent filmleri olmak üzere iki gruba ayrılabileceğine; köy filmlerinin su ve toprak mülkiyeti gibi konulara odaklanırken, kent filmlerinin merkezine ise sınıf çatışması ve işçi sınıfı mücadelesi, örgütlenme ve sendikalaşma hakkı, köyden kente göç, konut sorunu ve modernleşme süreçlerinin doğurduğu sıkıntılar gibi meselelerin yerleştiği belirtilmiştir. Bu anlamda filmlerin ele aldığı konular köy hayatı, sınıf çatışması ve işçi sınıfı mücadelesi, modernleşme süreçlerinin doğurduğu sıkıntılar, köyden kente göç ve kentleşme olarak dört ayrı kategoride ele alınmıştır. Ayrıca filmlerin ve yönetmenlerinin bu meseleleri ele alırken hangi ölçüde ortaklaştığı ve hangi noktalarda birbirlerinden ayrıştığı tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır.

Sonuç olarak yönetmenlerin pedagojik ve toplumsal sorumluluk içeren perspektiflerinin konuların seçiminde ve ele alınışında etkili olduğu yargısına ulaşılmıştır. Filmlerin hepsinin güncel toplumsal meselelere odaklandığı, hatta kimi zaman hikayelerin gerçek hayattan alındığı belirtilmiştir. Ayrıca sanayi burjuvazisinin ortaya çıkışı ya da işçi sınıfı mücadelesi gibi filmlerin ele aldığı sorunların çoğunun dönemin sol hareketlerinin de gündeminde olduğu dile getirilmiştir. Ek olarak, yönetmenlerin meselelere yaklaşımlarının, tıpkı 1960'lı yılların entelektüel ortamında görülebileceği gibi çeşitlilik taşıdığı vurgulanmıştır. Son olarak ise, filmlerin gerçekçi olarak nitelendirilmesinde izleyici algısının önemli bir yer tuttuğu ve bu anlamda filmlerin merkezine yerleşen meselelerin çoğunun ilk defa sinemaya aktarılıyor olması nedeniyle, izleyicinin bu filmleri yenilikçi ve gerçekçi olarak nitelendirmesiyle sonuçlandığı iddia edilmiştir.

Filmlerde yer verilen karakterlerin analizinde ise Lukács'ın (1969) tipiklik kuramına başvurulmuş ve bu filmlerin yer verdiği karakterlerin "tip" olarak değerlendirilebileceği, bunun ardında yatan sebebin ise karakterlerin bireyselliklerinin ortaya çıkartılmasından ziyade tıpkı Lukács'ın (1969) tipiklik kavramsallaştırmasında olduğu gibi, toplumsal çevrelerinin bir ürünü ve sınıfsal konumlarının izdüşümü olarak ele alınmalarından kaynaklandığı vurgulanmıştır. Bu anlamda filmlerin toplumsal ve sınıfsal konumlarına göre kimi karakter tiplerine belli davranış kalıpları atfettiği iddia edilmiş ve 1960'larda üretilen toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin ağırlıklı olarak işçi sınıfı, burjuvazi, kent yoksulları ve yeni kentliler, köylüler, öğrenciler ve aydınlar olmak üzere beş tipe ağırlık verdiği vurgulanmıştır. Ayrıca filmlerin, burjuvazi ve işçi sınıfı, topraksız ve toprak sahibi köylüler, pozitif ve negatif tip aydınlar gibi farklı tipler arasındaki karşıtlıkları vurguladığı belirtilmiştir. Ayrıca bu filmlerin zengin ve yoksul ikiliği üzerine anlatılarını kurma eğilimindeki Yeşilçam filmlerinin aksine toplumsal eşitsizliklerin ardında yatan sebeplere odaklanmaya çalıştığı ve bu ikiliklerin kurulmasında bu bakış açısının belirleyici olduğunun altı çizilmiştir. Ancak bununla birlikte, yönetmenlerin karakterlerine bakış açısının çelişkili de olabildiği, bunda karakterlere dışarıdan bakmalarının büyük rol oynadığı da görülmüştür. Bu anlamda zaman zaman karakterlerin somut tarihsel ve toplumsal gerçeklikleri içinde yansıtılamadığı, ayrıca karakterlerin genelde yönetmenlerin vermek istediği mesajın izleyiciye iletilmesinde bir aracı işlevi gördüğü vurgulanmıştır. Bir başka deyişle, karakterlerin inşasının yönetmenlerin pedagojik kaygılarıyla birlikte şekillendiğini söylemek mümkündür. Bu durum aynı zamanda karakterlerin kendi özgün seslerinden de yoksun olması anlamına gelmekte ve filmlerin genelde Kemalist modernleşme ideolojisinin egemen söylemini tekrarlayan ya da dönemin aydınlarının belli sınıflara bakış açısını gözler önüne seren monolojik bir nitelik taşıdığına işaret etmektedir.

1960'lı yıllarda çekilen toplumsal gerçekçi filmler bu özelliklerinin yanı sıra özellikle farklı kamera açılarının kullanımı, dış çekimlerin niteliği ve belgesele yaklaşan bir çekim tekniği gibi nitelikleri nedeniyle Türk sinemasına biçim ve üslup açısından da bazı yenilikler getirmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, analiz kısmının son parçasını oluşturan dördüncü bölümün devamında, bu değişikliklere odaklanılmış ve filmlerin

biçim ve üslup özellikleri tartışılmıştır. Ernst Fischer'İn (1971) ve Lukács'ın biçim ve içerik ilişkisi üzerine argümanlarından yola çıkılarak filmlerin biçimsel özelliklerinde görülen değişikliklerin, içerikteki dönüşümden kaynaklandığının altı çizilmiş ve bu ilişkinin filmlerde nasıl kurulduğu üzerine odaklanılmıştır.

Bu filmlerin en çok dikkat çeken özelliklerinden bir tanesi mekan kullanımı, özellikle de dış çekimler olarak nitelendirilebilir. Her ne kadar dış çekimler Türk sinemasında dönemin koşullarının ve endüstrinin olanakları dahilinde bir zorunluluk gibi görünse de Yeşilçam sinemasından farklı olarak bu filmlerin mekan kullanımı aracılığıyla karakterler ve çevreleri arasındaki ilişkiyi betimleme kaygısı güttüğü görülmektedir. Bu sahneler aynı zamanda filmlerin belgesel tarzına en çok yaklaştığı sahneler olarak da gösterilebilir. Ancak filmlerin üslup açısından her daim bir bütünlük teşkil ettiğini öne sürmek mümkün değildir. Bazı sahneler yalnızca yüzeysel bir estetik kaygıyla kullanılırken, bazıları ise formalist eğilimleri nedeniyle diğer sahnelerde kullanılan belgesel tarzını sekteye uğratmaktadır. Özellikle ikonografi açısından bu filmlerin Yeşilçam filmleriyle büyük oranda benzeştiği tespit edilmiştir. Bunun nedeni de yönetmenlerin pedagojik perspektifi olarak gösterilmiştir. Bu anlamda, 1960'lı yıllarda çekilen toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin bulunmuş ya da keşfedilmiş bir gerçeklikten ziyade özenle inşa edilmiş bir gerçekliği ekrana taşıdığını söylemek mümkündür.

Filmlerin biçimsel özellikleri analiz edilirken özellikle anlatı zincirinin nasıl kurulduğu ve parçaların nasıl bir araya getirildiği de bu çalışma içerisinde tartışılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, filmlerde 19. yüzyıl roman geleneğine dayanan, anlatı zincirinin çizgisel nitelik taşıdığı ve olayların zamansal ve mekansal sınırlar içinde vuku bulduğu klasik anlatı formunun benimsendiği belirtilmiştir. Ayrıca filmlerin Samantha Lay'in (2002) toplumsal gerçekçi sinemada popüler sinemanın aksine olay zincirinin tahmin edilemezliği yönündeki argümanına uymadığı tespit edilmiştir. Bu filmlerde genel olarak mutlu sonların benimsendiği görülmektedir ve bunun ardında yatan temel sebebin filmlerin Yeşilçam endüstrisi içerisinde üretilmiş olmasında ve yönetmenlerin sinemayı kitleleri eğitme ya da toplumsal konularda bilgilendirmeyi hedefleyen faydacı yaklaşımında bulmak mümkündür. Ayrıca filmlerin popüler

sinema türlerinden etkilendiği ölçüde türsel bir istikrara sahip olmadığı da göze çarpmaktadır. Todorov'a göre (1994) türler yavaşça gelişmekte ve ancak gelişimini tamamladıktan sonra biçimsel bir istikrar kavuşmaktadır. Bu nedenle, filmlerin yeni oluşmakta bulunan bir toplumsal içeriğe dayandığı fakat içerikteki değişimlerin henüz biçimde sabitlenmemesi nedeniyle nihai bir istikrara ulaşmadığı belirtilmiş; bu anlamda filmlerin bu niteliğinde yönetmenlerin pedagojik kaygısının da rol oynadığının altı çizilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak bu filmlerin bir tür olarak değerlendirilemeyeceği, ancak gerek yönetmenlerin niyetleri, filmlerin içerik, biçim ve üslup özellikleri açısından kayda değer benzerlikler taşıdığı ve bir bütünlük altında değerlendirilebileceği yargısına ulaşılmıştır. Ancak aynı zamanda, birbirlerinden kimi noktalarda ayrıştıkları, bunun sebebinin de yönetmenlerin politik duruşlarındaki farklılaşmadan kaynaklandığını belirtilmiştir. Sonuç olarak bu filmlerin güncel toplumsal meselelere tipik karakterler aracılığıyla odaklanmalara rağmen, yönetmenlerin toplumsal meselelere bakış açıları arasında bir paralellik kurmanın zor olduğu, filmlerin arka planında yer alan tek ortak perspektifin, en nihayetinde toplumsal gerçekçi olarak adlandırılmalarına da sebep olacak şekilde, sinema aracılığıyla politik ve toplumsal bir eleştiri sunma kaygısı olduğunun altı çizilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma içerisinde tür analizi aracılığıyla filmlerin nasıl bir bütünsellik teşkil ettiği, içsel çelişkilerinin nasıl anlaşılması gerektiği ve içinde üretildikleri toplumla nasıl ilişkilendirilebileceği gösterilmeye çalışılmıştır. Ne yazık ki bu çalışma kapsamında filmler ve izleyicileri arasındaki ilişkiye istenildiği kadar odaklanılamamıştır. Bunun en büyük sebebi bu konuyla ilgili yeterli verinin bulunmamasıdır, konuyla ilgili bilinenler bölük pörçük ipuçlarına, yönetmenlerin ve film eleştirmenlerinin tanıklıklarına dayanmaktadır. Ayrıca, filmlerin biçimsel özellikleri tartışılırken filmlerin sentaktik niteliklerine de yer verilmiş fakat çalışmanın ancak bir kısmını oluşturması nedeniyle bu konu sınırlı bir tartışma içerisinde ele alınabilmiştir. Daha detaylı bir çalışma içerisinde bu konunun ayrıntılı olarak tartışılması mümkündür. Benzer şekilde, filmlerin bir kısmı edebiyat uyarlamaları olmalarına rağmen, orijinal yapıtlar ve filmler arasındaki ilişki bu

140

çalışma kapsamında analiz edilmemiştir. Ayrıca bu çalışma toplumsal gerçekçi sinemayı tür analizine tabi tutmayı hedeflediğinden yönetmenlerin filmografisi bu çalışmanın kapsamı dışında tutulmuştur. Yönetmenlerin çektiği filmler de zaman içerisinde değişim gösterdiğinden, bu konuya odaklanan bir başka çalışmanın bu değişimleri ayrıntılı olarak tartışması mümkündür. Bu çalışmanın ardından gelecek çalışmalar için bir kapı aralayabileceği ve bu dönemin sinemasının daha farklı odak noktalarıyla, ayrıntılı bir biçimde çalışabileceği umulmaktadır.

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	☐
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	x
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	☐
Enformatik Enstitüsü	☐
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı : YALIN
Adı   : ALKIM
Bölümü : Medya ve Kültürel Çalışmalar

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : A Generic Analysis of Turkish Social Realist Cinema: 1960-1965

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans [x]   Doktora [ ]

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. [ ]

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. [ ]

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. [x]

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: