

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY**

**THE PROBLEMATIC OF DISCUSSING TURKISH
CINEMA OVER THE CONCEPT OF PEOPLE**

**SATILIK
(FEATURE LENGTH FILM SCRIPT)**

Master's Thesis

AYTAÇ KÖKTÜRK

İSTANBUL, 2010

THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
CINEMA AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

**THE PROBLEMATIC OF DISCUSSING TURKISH
CINEMA OVER THE CONCEPT OF PEOPLE**

SATILIK
(FEATURE LENGTH FILM SCRIPT)

Master's Thesis

AYTAÇ KÖKTÜRK

Thesis Supervisor: Ass. Prof. Dr. Nilay ULUSOY ÖNBAYRAK

İSTANBUL, 2010

THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY
The Graduate School of Social Sciences
Cinema and Television Program

Name of the thesis: The problematic of discussing Turkish cinema over the concept of
People

Satılık (Feature Length Film Script)

Name/Last Name of the Student: Aytaç Köktürk

Date of Thesis Defense:

The thesis has been approved by the Institute of Social Sciences

Selime
Sezgin
Director

Signature

I certify that this thesis meets all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Kaya
Özkaracalar
Program
Coordinator

Signature

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that we find it fully adequate in scope, quality and content, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Examining Committee Members
Title Name and Surname

Signature

Thesis Supervisor
Nilay Ulusoy Önbayrak
Thesis Co-supervisor
Ali Murat Akser
Member
Kaya Özkaracalar

ÖZET

THE PROBLEMATIC OF DISCUSSING TURKISH CINEMA OVER THE
CONCEPT OF PEOPLE
SATILIK
(FEATURE LENGTH FILM SCRIPT)

Köktürk, Aytaç

Sinema ve Televizyon Master Programı
Tez Danışmanı: Nilay Ulusoy Önbayrak

Eylül 2010, 54 sayfa

Bu çalışmada Türk Sinemasında kültürel üretimdeki güçlerin hakim ideolojisinin nasıl meşrulaştırıldığına söylemsel analizini yapmaya çalışıldı. Semih Kaplanoğlu'nun olay yaratan filmi Yumurta'ya gelen eleştirilerden yola çıkarak bu otoriter bakışın bir seçici-geçirgen rolü oynayarak Türkiye'de alternatif sinema yapmanın önüne çıkardığı sorunlara işaret edildi. Sorunlar olarak tanımlandı çünkü bir film ne kadar sanat filmi olarak nitelendirilirse o kadar kamusal alanda ötekileştirme ve tanınma sorununa maruz kalıyordu. Bu iki söylemsel bağlamda yapılıyor: ya "sanat için" yapılmış denilerek ötekileştiriliyor ya da "Türk halkı için" yapılmış sinema olarak yerleştiriliyor. Ancak sanat filmi olarak nitelendirilen yapımlar "halk'a göre değil" ve "özentilikle" yaftalanma potansiyelini taşıyorlar. Ancak bu yaftalanmaların arkasında savunulan özelliklerin ironik olarak dünya ölçeğindeki hakim film üretim tarzlarından beslendiğini ileri sürülüyor. Yumurta filminin üç hakim sistem dışı özelliğini inceleyerek hegemonik üretim tarzından nasıl ayrıldığını gösterildi.

Bu durum sadece popüler medya'da değil, Türk sinemasının bilimsel çalışma alanlarında da mevcut. Çalışmanın ilk kısmı bu sorunun akademik boyutu olan tarihyazımının "Halk" ve "Batı" üzerinden kurgulanması üzerine eğilmiş ve soyut ve kuramsal paradigmlar olarak ikiye ayrılan sorunlardan kuramsal olan kısmına eğilmiştir. Bugüne kadar yapılan tarih yazım çalışmalarının perspektifi üç temel yaklaşım tarafından belirlenmiştir. Modernist, post-modernist ve post-kolonyal olarak sınıflandırdığım bu çalışmaların Türkiye'deki sinema tarihini açıklayıcılığı sorgulanmış ve alternatif bir teori olarak Meltem Ahıska tarafından ortaya atılan Garbiyatçı yaklaşım ve bu perspektif dahilinde yapılan örnek bir analiz bu çalışmalara ilaveten sunulmuştur. Garbiyatçılık perspektifi Türk Sinema tarihini kültürel üretime hakim güçlerin hayali bir "Batı" gözü ve "Batılılaşma" ile olan ilişkisi çerçevesinde ortaya çıkardığı zihinsel ve somut bakışı ve söylemi dinamik bir kavramsallaştırma çerçevesinde incelemek anlamına gelmektedir ve tarihsel olarak Türkiye'de "gerçek sinema" yapmanın kuralları bu bakış tarafından söylemsel çerçevesi halk ve sanat sineması olarak tanımlanmıştır. Çalışmanın sonunda çıkan bulgulardan yola çıkılarak yazılan "*Satılık*" adlı senaryo ekte sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türk Sineması, Garbiyatçılık, Modernleşme, Tarih yazımı, Yöntem Belirleme Çalışmaları, Yeşilçam

ABSTRACT

THE PROBLEMATIC OF DISCUSSING TURKISH CINEMA OVER THE CONCEPT OF PEOPLE SATILIK (FEATURE LENGTH FILM SCRIPT)

Köktürk, Aytaç

Cinema and Television Master Program

Thesis Supervisor: Ass. Prof. Dr. Nilay Ulusoy Önbayrak

September 2010, 54 pages

In this study, it is tried to explore the discursive context in which the dominant ideology (of those in power) in cultural production of Turkey is justified. By moving from critiques to Semih Kaplanoğlu's sensational film *Yumurta*, it will be pointed out the problematic of the authoritarian look which is performing itself as a selective-layer to evaluate "alternative" ways of film production in Turkey. This attitude is defined problematic, because what is evaluated as "alternative" has also subjugated to cope with otherization and recognition process in the public sphere. This occurs in two discursive contexts: It is either otherized as "done for art's sake" or localized as "for Turkish People". However, the films' evaluations as "art cinema" are also considered them as potentially "not for People" and "inauthentic". The reasons behind the inauthenticity and inadequacy "for the People" of the "alternative films" in Turkey ironically stem from the very dominant ideological system (mainstream Hollywood cinema) of cultural production in the global scale. Thus, by analyzing three "unconventional dimensions" of *Yumurta* which are digressed from the three modalities of the hegemonic film production in Turkey.

This situation is not only common in popular media but also scientific studies on Turkish cinema. The first part of this study will focus on the academic dimension of this problem namely history writing which is constructed dominantly over the concepts "The People" and "The West" and the history writing on Turkish film studies till recent years were elaborated within three frameworks. It is grouped these approaches respectively as modernist, post-modernist and post colonial and questionize whether these approaches are valid for film making in Turkey. Occidentalism which is a concept suggested by Meltem Ahıska, were offered as an alternative approach in addition to these approaches. Occidental gaze reproduces the discursive context of the definition and should be's of "real cinema" in Turkey through using a problematic binary opposition: the cinema for "The People" and "The Art (Intellectuals or West)". At the end of the study, a feature script named as "*Satılık*" were presented due to the findings of this study.

Keywords: Turkish Films, Occidentalism, Modernization in Turkey, Methodology, History writing

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE PROBLEM OF DISCUSSING TURKISH FILM STUDIES OVER THE CONCEPT OF PEOPLE.....	4
2.1 MODERNIST APPROACH.....	7
2.2 POST-MODERNIST APPROACH	13
2.3 POST-COLONIAL DISCOURSE.....	16
2.4 OCCIDENTALISM: THE IMAGINED “PEOPLE” AGAINST IMAGINED “WEST”.....	19
3. YUMURTA AND ITS INTENTION.....	21
3.1 YUMURTA AND ITS OCCIDENTALIST REJECTION.....	22
3.1.1 Narrating in non-narrativity.....	23
3.1.2 The reformulation of extreme long takes	25
3.1.3 Silence of the characters and the protagonist	27
4. CONCLUSION.....	29
REFERENCES.....	30
APPENDIX	
Appendix A.1 SCRIPT: SATILIK.....	35

1. INTRODUCTION

In this study, I will explore the Semih Kaplanoğlu's prize-won film "*Yumurta*" which has faced with heavy criticisms in contemporary Turkish media. The film is accused of being arrogant¹ and having a boring art-like form which ignores "the people's tastes" in Turkey². Moreover, film's low audience reach is interpreted as a kind of "punishment" of people to the film³.

However, the interesting point here is not the failure of the awarded film in the box office but the "ultimate reasons" and explanations given to the failure of *Yumurta*. The film is evaluated by famous faces (Ilıcak (2007), Sinan Çetin and Hıncal Uluç (2007)) of popular media as being inauthentic, European oriented and antithetical to "Turkish People" (culture).

These views explained the film's failure by the director's ambition for winning a prize at the foreign festivals (mainly Europe), and by his equivocal love for "art for art understanding" which makes the film far from the "Turkish People's tastes.

It can be claimed that we are again in the domain of a years old discussion of Turkish film environment: The definition of the real cinema over the concept of people and the struggle in order to be spokesman of the People. These critiques create a discursive context in which the ideas of "cinema should be done for the people" and "what should be done for that end in Turkey" are dominant.

Ironically the answers given to these discourses are defending the importance of "being local" and "being cultural" but the ways offered to reach this goal refer to global hegemonic types of film production.

It is assumed that the popular way of film-making turns around the concepts of dominant film making, but the justification points are named within the framework of local culture and national identity. This formulation of popular cinema in Turkey includes an immanent desire to be like Western cinema at the same time differs from it. That kind of inconsistency or a lack opens a way to form a fantasy in which the film producers or elites dominant in the film environment can edit their hegemonic positions in the cinematic

¹ See Sinan Çetin, Yaşamdan Dakikalar, Tv8, 16 November 2007

² See Nazlı Ilıcak "Halk için Sanat", Sabah News, 24 November 2007

³ Sinan Çetin used these words for the film: "Thanks to god, there is the audience. They can detect whether a film is good or bad. They punish the bad ones. Yaşamında Kıyısında *makes money* because it is a good film. I don't know how can they feel that Yumurta is boring, but they don't go to the film (Yaşamdan Dakikalar, Tv8, 16 November 2007)

sphere through an imagined West and ideal Westernization.

Meltem Ahıska explained the phenomenon of the fantasy based binary conflict between imaginary West and the People of Turkey as Occidentalism (2003) which is created by those in power in Turkey⁴. Occidentalism is the way in which the elites in the power can govern and construct their popular national hegemony in the society whose face turns to the West since the beginning of Republic.

Starting from its very beginning, cinematic apparatus was seen largely evaluated within context of Western cinema. For instance the first film screening has happened in Pera (currently Beyoğlu.) which was in those days a place of non-muslim and muslim elite people and intellectuals. The white screen has introduced as a magical technical device coming from west and this reflection increased the value of screening. In other words, unlike American which was evaluated cinema as cheap attractions in the early years of cinema, turkey confronted with cinema in relation to its western orientation and a higher signifier of the western culture and technology.

The ambivalent relationship between the Western cinema and Turkish national cinema is common not only in the production sphere but also then academic literature about the cinema as well. The film is first widely accepted by scholars (Özgüç (2003), Özön (1995) and Onaran (1981)) as a Western art form, second a kind of technical achievement and development and thirdly a political popular form of ideological apparatus which is highly effectual on the "education" of the People. This kind of technical and artistic power must be carried to the People properly (Özön 1962).

In this study, I argue that this “real art” definition has also been affected by the occidental gaze who poses itself as a selective-layer that sets what is acceptable or unacceptable in Turkish cinema culture. I argue that what are posed as “unacceptable” because of ignorance of “Turkish people” in Kaplanoğlu’s film by these critiques are also derived from not “locality” but the hegemonic aesthetics of filmmaking in the global scale. This gaze is valid in terms of formulating basically perspectives on the formation of Turkish film industry and culture. I will suggest that this gaze is not only effectual in the popular media but also

⁴ Meltem Ahıska defines the power holders in Turkey as the “Elites” (Ahıska, 2006). However, this term does not only cover Kemalists. It is structurally defined. Elites are defined as those who has historically, bureaucratic/ military, economically and culturally in a privileged position and have capital of representing the nation as well as governing the society (Ahıska, p:19) . In this paper, following this definition reaction of a popular columnist in national press, producer and director in cinema industry and a popular writer in the internet media to the film Yumurta are selected to analyze the Occidental discourse.

the academic studies which are discussing the history of Turkish films.

I also try to reveal how this film conflicts with mainstream film production with its 3 dimensions: narration without having logical continuous narrativity, static camera usage and silence in composition. Finally, I argue that what makes these critiques problematic is not the discussion of the film's quality or structure but evaluating the film within the hegemonic context of whether it is done for "Art (Intellectuals)" or for "real People."

2. THE PROBLEM OF DISCUSSING TURKISH FILM STUDIES OVER THE CONCEPT OF PEOPLE

It may be asked that whether this study can pose its questions over these popular critiques made by those who are not specialized in the field of cinema and therefore whether they are worth to analyze to make assumptions on the ideological climate of the film-making in Turkey.

The discussion of cinema in relation to concept of People is as old as the introduction of the cinema in Turkey. The Cinema was seen as a development in the Western world and evaluated within the context of national identity and mass education (*terbiye*) by the Republican elites. For example the journals published during the early years of Republic introduced films and events on Turkish cinema with connotations to the national identity. Moreover, each improvement in the field of local industry were evaluated in comparison with the Western cinema and its effects on "People" which signifies the source of the pure, fertile national identity waiting for articulation and explanation as well as being shaped and directed. The foundation of the first film studio were presented by *Holivut* journal as ‘‘The Hollywood of Turkey is in Beyoğlu’’ (*Holivut*, 1934, p:3)

However, I will suggest that the dubious relationship between Western art culture and Turkish cinema over the concept of the "Peoples' motivations and preferences can be found in the Turkish academically film researches as well. The concept of people and cinema as an art form played a strategically role to justify not only ideas and theoretical formulations but also interests in the film industry in Turkey. The history writing of Turkish film history can be given as a clear-cut example of this phenomenon.

An analysis in the monumental film history books which are largely used by academic studies without bringing any criticisms to them, displays the problematic of history writing and problems of writing a ‘scientific’ history in Turkish film studies in Turkey. These problems can be grouped into two categories: concrete, structural problems related to the field of study and problems in theoretical frameworks.

What is meant by concrete problems related to the field of study were the challenges for the scholars appeared as the physical incapability’s and technical problems during the process of research. The biggest problem was lack of resources, scientific approaches and documents or records on the cinema or showing the cinema culture in Turkey and systematic archival records in the field of cinema.

Most of the writers' resources are dependent on the personal memories of the directors, producers, critiques and actresses in the Turkish film industry and some documents revealed coincidentally in the personal archives of the people who were interested in films previously or important documents can be founded in the dusty shelves of second hand book stores (Evren 1993). Therefore, it is very hard to find a reliable document related to the early years of Turkish cinema.

This lack is criticized by all of the historians working in the field of Turkish cinema (Özgüç (2003), Scognamillo (1998), Abisel (1994), Özön (1962)). Some historians' preferred to publish the documents without commenting over it, but most of them combines the information extracted from the limited documents with subjective comments and personal interpretation without proof.

For instance, the form of relationship between Muhsin Ertuğrul and Kemal Film is interpreted within the perspective of Muhsin Ertuğrul's lies and deception in one book⁵ and is represented quite positive and friendly in another book⁶. Giovanni Scognamillo (1998) showed in his history book how Nurullah Tilgen, one of the main personal resources about early years of Turkish cinema, shared different views in different times about the same topics in the early years of Turkish cinema. What is told as a completed film were explained as an unsuccessful attempt in the following three years by Nurullah Tilgen (Scognamillo 1998, p:26).

Ali Murat Akser (2003) was criticized these problems and offers some scientific methodologies to write a scientific and unchartered ways of history of Turkish cinema and film industry in Turkey.

Akser offers firstly detecting main resources. These are screen copy of films, negative copy (uncut version of the film), script of the film, memories of the director and film laborers, publications on film, laws and decrees, department of censorship records, records of governmental entertainment tax, records of movie theatres, film critiques published in journals and newspapers, business records, box office revenues, import and export records etc.

After resource verification and classification, Akser offers some methodologies or paradigms of writing history in Turkish Film studies. A researcher can write a history of

⁵ See Özön (1962) Türk Sineması Türk Sineması Tarihi (Dünden Bugüne 1896-1960), 1.Baskı, İstanbul: Artist Reklam Ortaklığı Yay.

⁶ See Gürmen (2007) 'Bir Halk Sinemacısı Osman Fahir Seden', Dergah Yayınları, İstanbul

stars that are very crucial to shape particular form of Yeşilçam. A second type is the history of critiques based on film critiques in the journals and newspapers. Akser offers also the history of milestones, periods, individuals on the film environment and specific themes such as migration, city or rural which are effectual on the film industry in Turkey as well (Akser 2003, p: 45.)

Akser's research is very significant in order to find a proper form of writing history of the film-making process and development in Turkey. His attempts were due to separate elitist and monopolist understanding of history of film-making in Turkey from the academic attempts based on scientific methodology. However his article does not explain why and how were the previous understandings of important theses in history writing of Turkish cinema elitist and heavily influenced by the political and ambiguous conceptualization of history writing⁷ in Turkey.

No matter what the concrete problems are, there are valuable attempts to write a history about the Turkish film history. These attempts are still influenced in the studies as well as assumed to be effective in the future studies as well.

I will group these attempts into three categories. These categories are named according to the underlying dominant logic which determines the framework of the historical outlook. Each perspective tries to relate the development of Turkish cinema in relation to the people or in a relationship with the modernization process of Republican Turkey. These approaches can be grouped as modernist, post-modernist and post-colonial. I am going to look at briefly these theories and its relations to the concepts of 'the people' and cinema as a high art.

⁷ The term history writing were consciously selected during this research. Although historiography connotes neutral investigation of science of history , history writing involves in the process and the ideology of writing a history.

2.1 MODERNIST APPROACH

The first serious attempt about writing the history of Turkish cinema was realized by a film critique and scholar Nijat Özön in 1962. However, before analyzing Özön's history writing of Turkish cinema, it may be very useful to look at briefly the discussions on the problems of Turkish cinema which was held in the *Yeni Sinema* (New Cinema) journal during late 60's and early 70's. Those were the years Özön's ideas on Turkish cinema flourished and he elaborated his views on Turkish Cinema in this journal after he published his monumental work. I suggest that the context of these discussions may be helpful to understand the context of Özön's formulations as well.

Yeni Sinema's writers and critics were harshly discussing about the "how cinema or film-making should be" not only with the Yeşilçam producers and directors but also the directors of National Cinema Movement directors who were accepted as the best film-makers in the Turkish film milieu in the 60's to some extent till 90's.

The journal was published by a group of intellectuals who were embracing author cinema as the ultimate form of filmic art. This journal was a written media of Turkish Cinematekhe which was established by Şakir Ezcacıbaşı who was coming from one of the high upper class families' in Turkey.

Although he was firstly a businessman, Şakir Ezcacıbaşı was a very curious art lover during his lifetime. He was a photographer and translator as well. Ezcacıbaşı family is dominating various economic and financial sectors such as medicine and ceramics in Turkey. Artistic facilities are very important for the company's institutional identity as well. As a result a man from higher classes of Turkish society who was highly fascinated by western auteur cinema was translating articles from the Italian neorealist's and Marxist thinkers such as Cesare Zavattini and Roberto Rossellini⁸.

The association was founded in order to realize three aims. To protect and renovate the archives on Cinema in Turkey, evaluating and elaborating film as an high and precious art form, rescue Turkish cinema environment from the cheap tricks and to increase state support to the Turkish film industry and state oriented organization of Turkish cinema and

⁸ It may be claimed that's the point where most *Yeni Sinema* writers were differentiated from its counterparts namely third cinema defenders suggested by Octavio Gettino and Fernando Solanas(1997). Although *Yeni Sinema* journal published many articles about third cinema, the writers were fond of auteur cinema and they were in line with the logic of developmental modernism. It is necessary that Onat Kutlar must be kept out of this argument.

diffuse the culture of cinema as an art to the people (Yeni Sinema 1966, p.3). Yeşilçam was believed as the opium for masses and is not in the place of what it should be (Yeni Sinema 1966, p:4). A well-organized developed *national* cinema should be constructed (Yeni Sinema 1968, p.3)

Although Özön were writing in various journals during these years, he was mainly part of a Turkish Sinematek. This institution was seriously interested in Turkish cinema and the problems of Yeşilçam. The discussions were primarily get stuck in the debate of underdevelopment and cinema.

Because Turkey is an underdeveloped country, its cinema is backward too (Akerson 1966, Özön 1968). The industrial underdevelopment of the film sector also affects negatively the artistic quality of the films as well. The audience was manipulated by two commercial rules of film-making in Turkey. The first one is block booking and the second one is the blind booking (Akerson 1966, p:26).

Block booking is a system of distribution in which the local film distribution companies are forced to buy a block of films from big companies of the world which is in great proportion dominated by Hollywood. As a result, numerous films entered Turkey without exposing any evaluation of spectator expectations and artistic quality of films. The second system is blind booking in which the local companies order films without elaborating its cinematic tendency but just whether it brings box office revenue or not.

Akerson offers a quality quota which protects good film from the bad films through tax reduction from the good films. The quality censorship must be applied to the films which degrade the honour of the film as an art. Production should be brought under the state control. And finally state should actively engage in the foundation of film studios and film laboratories for editing (Akerson 1966, Yalçın 1968). According to Akerson, unless these were established it is impossible to achieve a noble film art within the framework of producers and spectators.

It is clear that the standards of the quality quota were determined by auteur and realist cinema produced in the Western countries. This kind of relativist understanding is also supported with the author cinema and the realism as the ultimate and the high art form in the cinema (Özön 1995). Most of the criticisms to Nijat Özön's understanding of history were due to his ignorance on the influence of socio political factors in Turkish films.

His views on history are derived on the analysis of lives of the important peoples dominant

in the film industry in Turkey and their active film environment. These views were elaborated and intertwined with the political facts of Turkey in Özön's later publications but the main framework was preserved by him (Özön 1995).

I will argue that this ignorance were consciously made while Özön claimed that because Turkish cinema could not reflect the realities of the society that it belongs to, there is no need to relate the history of this cinema with important socio-economic developments in the republic (Özön 1962, p:11-12). In other words, his methodology was justified upon the shoulders of the concept of the people. Since Yeşilçam did not care about the necessities of people in Turkey, Özön did not tend to write the history of Yeşilçam in relation to social, cultural and political developments in Turkey.

Therefore, the advent of Yesilcam (Green Pine) did not take enough attention for critical scientific inquiry in the area of Turkish film studies till 2000's. The formation years of Turkish cinema and the transition period from inceptive years of Turkish cinema to Yesilcam mode of film-making were analyzed in relation to theory and socio-politic conditions by few film scholars such as Savas Arslan and Nezh Erdoğan.

The reason behind this 'neglect' is explained by the preeminent role of Nijat Özön's history writing of Turkish cinema in the subsequent studies. His approach evaluates the formation years simply not-cinematic, a kind of negativity that prevents Turkish cinema's possible artistic development. Therefore it is not worth to investigate Turkish cinema before 1950 (Arslan 1998, pp: 46-47 and 51-52, Isilay, 2000 p: 196). Another reason is argued as the existence and the hegemony of connoisseur people around the Nijat Özön's narrative who were forming the intellectual's strata of the Turkish cinema⁹ (Arslan 1997, p: 40).

The reply for this argument can possibly be that Özön and his friends around the Yeni Sinema (New Cinema Journal) were seriously criticized and they were trying to explain the legitimacy of their existence in the film milieu during the years that Nijat Özön's work appeared. The cultural production and thus hegemony on the film making in Turkey were under the control of the Yesilcam producers between the years 1950-1980¹⁰

⁹ A question can be asked here why the term connesseieur is used rather than scholars, at that time cinema was not seen as an academic field of study. It is very ironic in a country which was the third biggest film production site in the world during 60's. However, the first film institute under the body of an university was opened in 1975 in Turkey

¹⁰ The consistent answer to the question of indifference of the academic inquiry to the early years of Turkish cinema was given by Nilgün Abisel(1994). For Abisel, the ignorance over these years can probably be stemmed from the lack of archives and institutions making archival research. The destruction of the archival records are very common in the history of modern Turkey. Most of the archives were not only

Nevertheless, Nijat Özön's (1962) history of Turkish cinema is widely accepted as a milestone among the researchers and this work played a keystone role for the film studies articles till today¹¹ However, he provided largely anecdotal data which is presented in a schema of periodization interwoven with subjective interpretation of the development of film industry.

He is not only It seems that his understanding of the development of Turkish cinema is influenced from the modernization theory and the discourse of developed and underdeveloped nations which was very popular in the academia during the years Özön's work published.

The idea of modernization theory was suggested by an American scholar and politician Walt Witman Rostow in 1960. According to this theory, the development of society is divided into five stages. A regular society has to pass each stage in order to reach a full developed economical system.

The first stage is the traditional society. In this era, the means of production and the conditions of production is primitive. It is based on an underdeveloped technology and few knowable laws (Rostow 1960, p:4). Nevertheless this type of society is not static rather keep the potential of inventing new technologies and methods of improvement which led the societal system into the process of transition. This can be achieved through politics, social structure, to some degree social values as well as the growth in the economy (Rostow 1960).

In the transition stage, which is named as the preconditions of take-off, the society is prepared their own conditions to develop and made some revolutionary infrastructure for the take off. The take off were replaced by drive to maturity and ended with mass consumption as the governing logic of free and individualized society.

Similarly Özön divided the history of Turkish cinema into four main phases. The first one is the formation years namely from 1897 till 1922 in which the filmic medium was

demolished by serious fires but also each political party who came into power. For a detailed criticism of the situation archives in Turkey see: Meltem Ahıska Radyo'nun Sihirli dünyası (2005)

¹¹ Although there are two other resources about the history of the Turkish Cinema before Nijat Özön, It is Nijat Özön who brought an scholarly format and historical perspective to Turkish cinema. The other resources one was written by Rakım Çalapala called as Filmlerimiz(Our Films) provide brief information about the Turkish films that was made till 1948. The other attempt was a mere pamphlet by Nurullah Tilgen 1956 was briefly summarizing film-making in Turkey till 1956.

introduced to the Palace first and elites and to the public. During these years, the film production was not rapid because of the ongoing the First World War and Revolution War after the WW1 in Turkey.

The production process is technically underdeveloped and primitive. Then comes the period of theatre-film-makers, a period where was heavily under the hegemony of Muhsin Ertuğrul an elite man of theatre. This period is replaced by transition period in which cinematic ways of film-making was flourished and implemented. Finally, the rapid process of development is ended up with cinema era.

In this period Özön's analysis is not focusing on the structure of the newly founded Republic but kept his analysis within the limits of personal criticism and lack of technical developments were the only responsible actor in the development of Turkish cinema.

He insisted that the cinema in these years were backward because the pioneers had a theatre background, their view of theatre is also backward and old. They lack from the sense of cinema. They couldn't understand the main differences between cinema and theatre (Özön 1995). As a result, Turkish cinema was stayed in a primitive form, mixed with traditional theatre arts like Karagöz and theatre-in-round.

The feeling of belatedness and the need to catch Western cinema made these intellectuals to the impossible point to make an ideal national Turkish film, A discussion that was held in these years in the Yeni Sinema journal may helpful to see the situation. Jean Douchett were tried to be convinced that Turkish cinema is backward.

Giovanni Scognomillo: The topic of today's open session can be summarized as follows: we have observed the expansion of the cinema schools since World War II. This expansion came up in both eastern and western countries. On the other hand, a contradiction occurred in the underdeveloped countries, such that stagnation in the cinema, in some cases lack of participation to the film industry and technical staff was seen. I beseech that Jean Douchett to represents his point of view about this topic and to describe what could be the difference between the developed and underdeveloped countries about the contradiction in the art of the cinema by adding his ideas some questions aroused like "what is an artist's responsibilities in the field of cinema, what has been done and what could be done about that". This problem concerns us especially about our cinema.

Jean Douchett: I shall mention that it is not easy to answer this question because it is more deeply related to you and makes you more qualified to answer than me. you claim that you are a underdeveloped country on cinema. How many movies does turkey produce each year?

Duygu Sağıroğlu:220

Jean Douchett: in France, we are not making 100 pieces. We couldn't reach 100 pieces this year. in that case, are we really underdeveloped on the cinema? That is the problem. You say , we haven't developed about art on the cinema. It might be really

having never seen an important creation which is cultural. But this doesn't mean that there is not an important Turkish film. Only, they aren't broad. I've never thought that you are undeveloped on the cinema just say that you haven't reach an international level so that that is not the same thing... in this regard, initially, I don't think that there is an impossibility which turkey can't represent itself in a valid way. I think that real problems aren't economical or financial; they are observances in tune, personal and psychological. i am sensible of your being suspicious about succession to create a cinema art by producing the problem and i convict you a little bit. I don't think that doing something in turkey is not so hard

Duygu Sağıroğlu: First and foremost, I want to talk to Jean Douchett, to whom I'm sure that has also the same conclusion as me. The cinema is an industry above all and because of this, the cinema of underdeveloped countries is underdeveloped too. These countries have not any industries. And hence, as you said, we don't have adequate technicians. We have some technicians and directors that really want to do something and also we have everything to shoot short movies. But, on the other hand, these are the machines to produce a movie and they are not sufficient. I wonder if you agree with me or not?

Jean Douchett: There is Satyajit Ray lives in India who wants to make the movie "Pathar Panchali". He has spent 3 years for his film. He has sold the jewels of his wife etc. In short, He put everything he had on this work. At the end, he could manage to make a movie that takes 40 minutes. And he is doing this with 40.000 tl that was all the money in his hands.(Yeni Sinema 1966, pp:47-48)

It is very ambiguous that these intellectuals who were the defenders of the creativity and cinema as a art form reduced film making to a pure technical and economical relationship. This inconsistency pushed modernist thinkers to imagine a kind of fully reconciled imagined people as well as an impossible cinema while each attempt to make a film were exposed to the curse of imitation. Yeşilçam were defined modernists concepts like truth-lie, normal-deviant, healthy – unhealthy. The people here stand for the masses, who should reveal their real interests and cinema as an art should raise their educational level.

2.2 POST MODERNIST APPROACH

It is with Savaş Arslan who brought a critical approach to the history writing of film-making in Turkey before him and history of national Turkish cinema. His study investigates film making in Turkey in relation to the nationalist modernization process in Turkey that was pursued since 1923. His theoretical attempt combines, relates and socio-political developments in Turkey and their possible effects to the film industry. Therefore his understanding of transition from early years to this specific mode of production is different than the understanding of his precedents.

According to Arslan, Yeşilçam (Green Pine) is a mere reaction to the republican cultural modernization programme. Republican elites in the early years of the republic turned their face completely to West and their cultural policy was depended on the rejection of traditional arts and replacement of western arts and cultural formations. Their one-sided and repressive cultural politics ignore the desires and ideas of the masses.

Indeed the first five decades of Turkish film can easily be read as a period of development culminating in a prolific popular film industry that increasingly speaks in the voice of the people rather than in voice of elites(Arslan 2002, p:15).

The underlying factor behind the formation of Yesilcam is another transformation namely societal transformation. Mass migration to cities after the economical and political developments realized by democrat party regime was forming a heterogeneous, less elite audience for Turkish Cinema (Arslan 2002).

Arslan also supported his claims by connecting the People to the traditional visual art forms such as Karagöz and theatre-in-round plays.

Yet on the contrary as I will argue in the following chapters, Turkish national cinema emerged not despite the corporation of those traditions but because of them.....The preservation of this tradition was directly opposed to the aesthetics expectations of Kemalist Intellectuals who may have felt that popular Turkish film's failures are related to its traditionalist, in contrast to the attempts of modernization in other arts.(Arslan 2002, p:25).

Basically, he built his formulation on a binary opposition. On the one hand there were republican elites who were trying to impose western culture over the people. These elites were strong nationalists and Kemalists wanted to catch the modernization train. And on the other hand there were the people who were subordinated by the elites but at the same time

reacting to modernization. Arslan ignores elite's subjectivity and blessing Yeşilçam as total voice of the people.

Although this theoretical formulation is very inspiring, it includes many theoretical problems because of the very arguments based on the concepts elites and the People. First of all, the modernization process under the control of republican elites is not such a 'project' that intends a fundamental, precise cultural programme on the path of the modernized West.

As Edward Said (1999) discussed in his book *Orientalism*, the West shaped the East but the modernists born out of this tension. They justify themselves though protecting the people from the harmful effects of the West.

Therefore, the elites were not feeling themselves totally a committed Western intellectuals, on the contrary, the politics and cultural modernization fed itself from the inconsistencies aroused the ideal modernization in fantasy or in mind of the elites and the societal reality in the streets and the actual international and national politics. The result was often a kind of a feeling in which the elites desire to be Western without seeing the West and a reflected image of the People which is described and imagined as an empty and abstract totality.

Second, the elites do not have display a totality with their relation to West. The shift from West-oriented elites to the previously Future and Progression Cadres were discussed by various scholars (Zürcher (2008), Timur (2002), Parla (1991)). This movement can be a natural result of the belated modernity as Arslan also discussed in detail. But the elites did not possess fully reconciled Western characteristics. Rather than they are staying in between.

As Meltem Ahıska show in her article ,Ercüment Ekrem Talu, very important Republican elite in the field of culture, wrote a play as *Karagöz Holivut'ta* which is quite contradictory with the Westernization process(Ahıska 2006, pp:11-29). In this play Karagöz travels in the reflected Hollywood and faces with famous Hollywood stars like Greta Garbo and Charlie Chaplin. Karagöz interpreted and show how the folklore in Turkey is more progressive than its Western counterparts.

Third, *Tuluat* is a modern art form. It is mixture of *Tuluat* is a special form of theatre which is borne out of the need of the modernization in the stage arts. Besides, there is nothing related to Karagöz in the magazines, brochures, books that were remained from and also Özön stated that most of the technicians who gave a light to Yeşilçam came from abroad.

They were educated or worked in the studios in Europe or Hollywood. I have suspects about the search of Turkish film-makings past from the traditional art forms. Many personal memories of famous directors talked about nothing but their fascination with films that they watched in the cinemas.

There was nobody that thought us how to be a film maker. When I act at the film I did't like it at all. I went to the medical school for four years than I left. I was in a football team but indeed I hadn't known exactly what would I did. Because of a football player I could earn some money for save the day. But at the same time I thought I should earn permanent and much money. Thereafter I saw the brilliance of trade success of the film 'Damga', I began to think about film making. If I had made of good film, I could have earned enough money, but how could I find necessary money for that? May be I gather up some money from my friends even my relatives. My father was finance officer so it was difficult to borrow money from him. All in all ten thousand was enough to make a film. In the mean time I really wanted to be a director. I knocked every door to reach my dream like Seyfi Havaeri, Baha Gelenbevi and some others but they didn't answer even though I wanted to work for free. In short nobody wanted assistance; I was alone by myself and thought I had a talent about speed writing like steno. Everyday I went to a film at the cinema with my notebook and a pen. I noted every single part of the film like when director changed the plan of sequence, where and when close up or remote shoot. Indeed I couldn't write for once so I went there again with my drafts and than I engrossed it and made a movie script. At the end I learned how to shoot a film (Arakon 2004 cited in Berktaş 2008)

In fact, Arslan's formulation is precisely based on a theory of center-periphery. This theory was born as a post-modern reaction to the formulations of modernization theory. The development creates not only developed center but also dependent periphery as well. But the periphery can deliver its will to the center in Turkey (Mardin,1992).

According to this theory, the modernization under the leadership of elites formed a kind of center (state) and periphery (those who are excluded from the power). However it should be noted that the authoritarian structure and anti-social tendency in Turkey helps center to absorb the reactions of periphery (Ahıska 2004). Therefore, it can be said that if Özön's formulation fed from imagined West, Arslan's approach imagines an imagined popular reaction. Therefore, it can be said that if Özön's formulation fed from imagined West, Arslan's approach imagines an imagined popular reaction.

2.3 POST COLONIAL FRAMEWORK

The previous discussions were focused on three basic points: the illusionary and imitative character of Yeşilçam, the "underdeveloped" nature of Turkish cinema and the need for true and qualified film-making apart from Yeşilçam the discussions were varying from the cinema culture in Turkey to vis-a-vis insults and accusations of each wings. Which position or camp should we choose when we want to take side in the discussions of the 60's? My reply to that question is anyone. While all three groups were confronting with each other in all fields of cinema, they came into agreement in one term that makes the discussions insoluble and paradoxical: Cinema for The People¹².

Yeşilçam filmmakers defended themselves for the low-quality, assembly line-made star system based works as "that's the will and demand of the people", while National Cinema directors suggested Turkish cinema as the Cinema of People because it can reproduce itself from the tickets of People (Refiğ,1971). Yeni Sinema(New Cinema) film critics and writers also owned the term People and argued that true cinema should feed from the benefits and needs of the People.

Therefore each camp has its own definition of the People but the attributions to the People are same in all camps. The People functions and must be as the arrival and drive point of filmmaking for all the camps.¹³ Which People are real: The people that demand the star system, the people that supports Turkish cinema or the People waiting to find their real interests and good quality of art? Nevertheless one must see here we are in the realm of fantasy.

Different interpretations took ground in the same positive depiction of the People. Although Yeşilçam producers sometimes accuse People's attributes and sources, this indicates the sovereignty of the cinema audiences in Turkey.

However, desires are not inherently aroused in us. We learn how to desire and the cinema is the ultimate place where one learns how to desire (Zizek, 1992). And desires grounds in its constitutive lack. Therefore I argue that the ground for Yeşilçam and its phantasmatical

¹² Although Onat Kutlar have more sophisticated writings over the cinema, most writers in Yeni Sinema milieu were criticizing Yeşilçam with these 3 points that I have already pinpointed.

¹³ It is quite remarkable that among 6 principles of Kemalist regime, only Populism(Halkçılık) remained unquestiable and all groups in the Turkish society from radical right to radical left try to own this word.

space was already in there grounded before the Yeşilçam. It starts immediately after the coming of cinema to Turkey and flourished during 30s and 40s. This kind of relationship was firstly seen in the post-colonial framework of Neziha Erdoğan.

Post-colonial theories introduced Turkish film studies with the works of Neziha Erdoğan. Neziha Erdoğan criticized the national character of Turkish cinema where most of the films were adapted or inspired from the Western cinematic conventions.

In other words How can we attribute a national character to a cinema which is identified with its problems rather than successes and is said to strive for resembling upon its "Other" (Erdoğan 1995, p:180)

Therefore a cinema which is formed with the dynamic relations of other cinemas should be analyzed within the framework of identification patterns. Erdoğan offered colonial discourse to survey the context of the identification patterns and the structure of the relations that Turkish cinema actively.

By moving this argument, one can understand why Yeşilçam had taken this particular form by analyzing the relation between Yeşilçam and its identification with other cinemas. Erdoğan elaborated the concept of identification from the perspective of Lacanian psychoanalysis. For Lacan, the subject gained self knowledge by comparing her existence with the image of the other subjects.

But how can we relate colonial discourse to a neither country that is neither colonized nor act like a colonizer? Erdoğan use Feyerabend's aphorism here. This metaphor emphasizes the sufficiency of imitation through theoretical accessories. What is interesting here is that this metaphor is connected somehow like an argument in order to compare the process of modernization in Turkey and the colonial discourse. The historical realities, its dynamic and particular diversities which are played a significant role in the peculiar shape of film industry are reduced to a pure concepts derived from the psychoanalysis.

Moreover, Erdoğan's argument was flourished over a film called *Karagözlüm*. He reads this film as the internalization of the colonial gaze over the women. The dream scene of Azize is the clear reference to the colonial discourse. In this scene, Azize in oriental clothes where the male protagonists saw the female protagonist and understood that she was in danger. Erdoğan interpreted this imagination as the colonizer gaze because Azize is presented like the colonial phantasm about the East. But this scene can be interpreted as that the male protagonist doesn't want to share Azize with the Western its colonizers as

well.

Although Erdoğan is quite right to analyze Turkish cinema with its relation to the Western cinema, It may be useful then a new theoretical where the elites in the cultural production is positioned not on the side of the actual West but in between imagined People and imagined West. In order to be Eastern and Western at the same time, it produced a fragmented subject in which the occidental perspective enables us to analyze this context in its universality and particularity at the same time.

The West here is not concrete rather it is imagined by those in the power in the cultural production. It is reflected the fantasy of West but at the same time a kind of denial a rejection rather than understanding it impossibility. What I attribute is a kind of subjectivity to the process but Erdoğan's analysis is imprisoned within the framework of model/copy relationship. It can be seen in his historical narrative.

Nezih Erdoğan has a tendency to analyze this period within the perspective of colonialism. He criticized the national character of Turkish cinema where most of the films were adapted or inspired from the Western cinematic conventions.

Therefore I argue that a more dynamic dialogical approach to analyze the development of the Turkish film industry in Turkey. It can be seen this kind of attempts in Erdoğan's formulations. He explained the early development of Turkish cinema thanks to the intellectual and class background, religious bringing, and their close ties with Europe, early managers of cinema had evaluated within the tastes of European pioneers (Erdoğan 1995, p:122).

But Erdoğan's failure comes after this thesis he sees this influence within the context of visual colonialism. The Turkish audience could not only travel around Europe while sitting in a movie theatre but could also travel around the movie theatres of the whole of Europe in a fantasy of westernization. Giovanni Scognamillo argued that Turkish audience wanted action wealth spectacular and glamour, excitement and emotion. They want dreams and they pay to have their dreams.

2.4 OCCIDENTALISM: PROTECTING “THE PEOPLE” AGAINST “THE WEST”

Three approaches to Turkish film history and understanding of national cinema carry some inconsistencies in themselves. The first theory presented by Özön was stuck into the problem of model-copy relationship and imposed the national cinema into the sphere of fake imitation. This model underestimates the peculiarities of the national cinema. The second theory suggested by Arslan explained the popular national cinema from totally a different way. It explains the popular cinema born from the expectations of the People which is imagined here as well. The third theory has the right questions but wrong units of analysis. I am going to offer a fourth way of thinking national cinema. This way is focused on the dominant and resistant powers in the culture industry and their relationship with the imagined West and Westernization process.

The position of West has always been problematic and dubious in Turkey's history. Starting from 18th century, the “West” has always been the place of the “desired” and the “frustrated” for Turkey. This situation is shaped historically by the Western look on posing Turkey as being oriental and Turkey's effort for being modern with preserving its culture under the leadership of those in power. Meltem Ahıska named this phenomenon with term called Occidentalism which can be best understood as describing the set of practices, arrangements justified in and against the imagined idea of “the West” in the non-West (Ahıska 2003). In other words, it signifies the idea of “against West for Westernization”. For this reason it implies internal and external limits for definitions of modernity.

Occidentalism refers to a field of social imagination through which those in power consume and reproduce the projection of “the West” to negotiate and consolidate their hegemony in line with their pragmatic interests. Projection in its psychoanalytical meaning, operates both as the displacement of what is intolerable inside to the outside world, thus as a refusal to know; and as a introjections of what is threatening in the external world so as to contain and manage it. Therefore it designates at the same time what the subject refuses to be and desires to be. In Turkey projection, in its double process, figures in the conception of “the people” on the one hand, and in the conception of “west” on the other (Ahıska 2003, p.18). In this regard, occidental imagination is not contingent with western modernity but always turn around the common ideological formulations of it. It can be said that an embedded Western modernity existed in Occidentalism.

I argue that like the Occidentalism flies around the ideology of dominant Western modernity; occidental look in cinema is fed from the dominant film making norms which is mainstream (Hollywood) cinema. It is very much embedded in the formation of any national cinema but yet does not have complete control over it (Ahiska 2003, p.16). Ideological and socio-political conditions of mainstream cultural production pose itself as a norm through its popular with media-usage and economical box-office success. Occidental look pragmatically owns this ideology and “localizing” it depending on this success in numbers. This success is codified as the cinema for masses. Thus similar types of nostalgia films, space-time usage and narrativity seems (as) if they are reflecting the sole “People’s realities of past, present and future” in Turkey. By positioning itself at the “core” of the cultural production, “alternatives” are excluded normatively in the discourse of the idea of “artistic badly so not for us (People)” or “artistic well but not for us (People)”.

I do not ignore the potential hardships of new wave film-viewing. But I argue that occidental look makes invisible the organic/conflicting relationships between the mainstream films and new wave films at the same time constructing the borders between them simultaneously. For this reason, it behaves pragmatically by playing aggrieved by referring West’s threatening power (High Art) and reasonable by referring to Turkish People’s power (People’s Cinema) interchangeably according to ideological benefits. By using “Nation Cinema” and New wave” parameters, it is possible to discuss New Turkish cinema in a discursive context(Evren 2004) However even if this classification can be functionally meaningful, Occidental look converts its functionality into pragmatic discursive context by using a binary opposition which helps it able to jump over the key question: What is the Nation? Therefore any alternative film is evaluated according to the hegemonic imagination of The (Turkish) People (Nation) and The Art (West).

As Judith Mayne correctly points out, the excessive emphasis on the classical Hollywood cinema as the norm has a constrictive effect on the attempt to study and/or search for an alternative cinema:

The classical Hollywood cinema has become the norm against which all other alternative practices are measured. Films which do not engage the classical are by and large relegated to irrelevance. Frequently the very notion of an “alternative” is posed in the narrow terms of an either-or: either one is within classical discourse and therefore complicit or one is critical of and/or resistant to it and therefore outside of it(Mayne 1989,p.3).

3. YUMURTA AND ITS INTENTION

Why the term People can be imaginable? According to Giorgio Agamben, the political meaning of the People in most of the European languages implies not only a political subject but also a group which is formed by underprivileged, poor in terms of economical status and power position and a sum of relatively lower classes. In other words the term "the people" includes inherently a double meaning through which these sum is assumed to be the constitutive political subject and as well as connotating a class that is excluded *de facto* from politics (Agamben, 2000)

Therefore, the people encapsulates a set of ideas and meanings and functions as a container that has no an exact signifiers. On the one hand, it is valued as the basis and the sole determinator of the democratic government through some technical tools like citizenship and voting and a term that is used to differentiate upper and aristocratic classes from the inferior and subordinated classes on the other(Agamben,2000).

For Agamben (2000), this can not be stemmed from a coincidental ambiguity in the meaning level of the term. It is a concept inherently vague which gains some functional role in politics through its ambivalent nature. On the one hand, there is *the People as a whole* of political state of the sovereign and integrated citizens and *the people* that refers to assisted and degraded groups with multiple and different sort of excluded demands.

One can reach that people as a concept can hold these two extreme poles with complex relations in itself. The People becomes a People as long as the power mechanism calls it as a "People".

Therefore when Yumurta presented its own understanding of People and locality with its own stylistic concerns, it may be appeared as a deviance from the hegemonic types of thinking and imagining People and the life as well as cinema. And this deviance from the archetypes may led to film to face with heavy criticisms and accused as not for the needs and cultures of Turkish People.

3.1 *YUMURTA* AND ITS OCCIDENTAL REJECTION

Based on this historical framework, we can back to reread the criticisms to the *Yumurta*. Burçak Evren (2004) defines New Turkish Cinema which refers to films produced in 90's as a radical break from the previous customs of film production and exhibition of Yeşilçam film-making . The new cinematic production can be divided into two: mainstream and independent namely popular films and new wave films (See: Evren, 2004). Mainstream films mainly have higher budgets, supported with advertisement and popular actor/actresses, entertainment and pursuing the mainstream films in the global scale in order to compete with Hollywood impact (Kırca 2003, p.102).

On the other hand new wave films are independent, small scale production and directors are telling their own problems and films are shaped due to how they interpret the world. However, Enis Köstepen claimed that it is hard to differentiate popular films from the new wave films in terms of production conditions. Because both of them are produced independently (Köstepen 2004). Moreover Burçak Evren used the term “new wave” to emphasize a radical break from Yeşilçam conventions of popular and independent films together (Köstepen 2004). In that sense, contextualizations of film are discursively done rather than analytical categorization. Therefore, in Turkey context, it can be assumed that there can be oscillations in the categorization of films as well as definitions. I argue that these three categorizations are meaningful for analytical considerations but when it is examined discursively, as can be seen in the very name of New Turkish cinema, they are ambiguous.

Therefore, definition problem structurally poses us the problem of hegemony. Within the nation context, questions such as what is New Turkish cinema, ‘whose Turkish cinema is it’ are raised. As “new” implied change, who bring this change and speed to the industry? Therefore, this discussion is turn into the question of representation and belonging in the eyes of world and audience in Turkey politically.

With its slow narration, long shot based editing, unprofessional actors and small budget, *Yumurta* can be a candidate of “New Wave” film in Turkish cinema history. It is a story of a middle-aged poet called Yusuf, who turned back to his hometown (country) after the death

of his mother. It is the final part of “Yusuf’s trilogy”. Starting from its release date, the film is exposed to heavy criticisms in Turkish media. The common points in these critiques are the directors’ desire for art, prize and European recognition.

3.1.1 Narrating in non-narrativity

Nazlı Ilıcak, a popular neo-conservative journalist, claimed that the film fails because it is done “art for art’s sake”. While claiming this, Ilıcak also describes what the good film script is. What should be done for good script writing is first defending “the idea of art for People” and second having “beautiful, action-based story”.

Art For People

Yumurta did not take an attention from the audiences. The reason behind this ignorance is not the quality of the Turkish audience; but it was shot within the very understanding of "art is not done for the people". How did many films, which I adored to watch, like Babam ve Oğlum (My Father and My Son, 2005,Dir: Çağan Irmak), Mutluluk (Bliss ,2007, Dir: Abdullah Oğuz) Yaşamın Kıyısında (Auf der Anderen Seite, 2008,Dir: Fatih Akın) Beynelmilel (The International, 2008,Dir: Muharrem Gülmez & Sırrı Süreyya Önder) Komiser Şekspir (Commissar Shakespeare,2001, Dir: Sinan Çetin, Eşkiya (The Bandit,1996, Dir: Yavuz Turgul) Dondurmam Gaymak (Ice Cream, I Scream, 2006, Dir: Yüksel Aksu) Takva (Takva: A Man's Fear of God, 2006, Dir:Özer Kızıltan) make a great box-office success? Did they not contain art? However, I was not able to understand how Yumurta could win the best script prize. A script is good only if it has a nice and fascinating story. It seems to me that Yaşamın Kıyısında and Bliss were wronged (Ilıcak, 2007).

Ilıcak claims that the film’s script can not capture the attention of “the People” because of film’s lack of fluent continuous narrativity. Mainstream film making’s skepticism is dependent upon on the power of the motion-image narration (Deleuze 1988). The audience should lose himself in the film’s world. So the sequences should have time-space unity. Therefore all frames should be put into the sequence in an economy. In that sense, *Yumurta* stayed away from mainstream narrative plot. There are neither big events, nor physical problems to solve and action to perform.

Moreover, the sequences have big gaps and paid more attention to “state” then to action. But this does not mean that they don’t have any connections. The connections in this film are out of the frame with audience’s own reality, unlike conventional films which limit the connections between the frames rationally, strategically and nurture curiosity. The gaps are filled with the audience’s past experiences. In that sense *Yumurta* stays away from the logical continuous narrativity and narration which is like the final product ready for consumption. What is defined as “fluency” and beautiful story by Ilıcak is referenced to motion-based skeptical script writing. As she said for Fatih Akın’s film

Yaşamın Kıyısında is a first class work of art. A series of unpleasant events is presented to the audiences through a breathless editing. One can feel sorry about losing the opportunities throughout the film but one can not worry about them. Because life is flowing on new opportunities, beauties and friendships..(Ilıcak, 2007)

Let us take 3 sequences where this claim embodies itself. First, the approximately 7 minute long shot of an old woman, who is coming from a foggy place and who reaches to front of the camera slowly; she takes a breath, looks around thoughtful, walks into another direction and finally disappears within the frame. The second one is following the first sequence in which a sexually attractive woman visits Yusuf's bookshop, looking around for a book and at the same time showing her interest in Yusuf. However, she is ignored by him. The following sequence is Yusuf's going back to his hometown after learning his mother's death but not having any emotional reaction to his mothers' death. It seems as if the scenes are loosely connected and if it is evaluated in mainstream dynamics it is so. However, They are related to the trilogy, but in this film alone, the idea of "why questions" is brought into mind.

Where does this old woman come from and why is she looking so thoughtful, what is her problem? Why is not Yusuf interested in this woman, what is his problem? Why is not Yusuf interested in his mother's death, what is the problem between them?

Each question is answered differently according to the viewers' life experiences or memories. I argue that the gap occurred between the film's script and Ilıcak's heavy criticism's is stemmed from the latter's jump over or pass by these "why" questions, which are to understand, recognize and deal with the individual or society's social conditions. Because of the alienation of individuals in city life and dominant ways of being spectatorship while watching a film makes the answers these kinds of "why" questions are very opaque and "illogical" since they are not "strategically connected" and "unknown". Moreover their answers are in a way "sensible. What is problematic is precisely this acceptance of the sensible but not precisely known why questions' answers as "had known". Because answers should be known have to carry a mission of sustaining a "tension curiosity" and reveal "the ultimate truth". Thus questioning and production processes are excluded because the answers of the questions are given in a hunger state, like the feeling of comfort after learning the hidden secret in a thriller films and be ready to learn another. In that sense they jumped directly to the consumption process.

3.1.2 The reformulation of extreme long takes

Among those the heaviest one came from a popular cinema director in Turkey. He defines the film as being “intellectual terror”.

Sinan Çetin overdid his criticism

"This is a bankruptcy of Turkish Cinema. This is an intellectual terror" said Sinan Çetin of the Best film prize in the Golden Orange Film Festival winner film *Yumurta* and continued his criticisms.

Yesterday interviewed renowned director in channel TV8 broadcasted programme "Yaşamdan Dakikalar (Minutes from Life.)" and said "I was unwillingly in hostile in opposition to Yumurta and I am really angry with myself. Because there stands a kid who made a film in front of us. I do not have personal hostility against this guy. Indeed, I have pointed the system there. Namely, I wished to ask "Is it this film that we are offering to audiences in the Antalya Film Festival which is one of the important international film festivals? These people (festival jury) usually are awarding the films in which they say "I am very bored,man" while they are watching it in the cinema. It is very common in such a festival juries. They think themselves like a charity organization's member board. They act as if one said "select a film that needs help". Mutluluk is definitely a better film than Yumurta. But they had such idea in mind: " The boss of Mutluluk,Abdullah Oğuz, is anyhow a rich man. Look at Yumurta, it has an artistic tendency. In my opinion, they are doing such an immoral act. This is not moral behaviour, contrary it is very arrogant behaviour.(www.aktuelhaber.com 2007)

Çetin described the film as being “boring” and in literal sense telling “nothing”. Ironically, he infantilizes 44 year old director and criticizes his tendency for “art filmmaking”. On the other hand, Çetin also described director’s intention as “intellectual terror”. This is the point where pragmatism of Occidental look crystallizes in Çetins’ claims. On the one hand, Çetin as being a film-authority shows his wish to protect the director’s talent (against Western ideology) and on the other defending himself or “The People” against directors’ intellectual terror. In the same discursive context, he is able to play both aggravated and the authority. If we closely look to the idea of “intellectual terror”, “What is problematic here is not the “intellectual” but the word “terror”. Çetin used a term which is commonly used in Turkish politics and equates the director as being “other” for (Turkish) audience. Clearly his reference in that term is the film’s “boring” style and lack of skeptical motion-image narration which is accelerated montage.

Gilles Deleuze identified an alternative film production which he called as time-image

cinema, in which focused on not the action but the time and memories, histories and dreams of the viewer. This cinema is focusing on the optic images which are for attentive recognition of the viewer. Therefore optic-image couldn't be explained through logical determinism and actions. Thus it forced to work the (historical) mind of the viewer. I argue that Kaplanoğlu is also in search for creating time-image cinema. The film is about a confrontation with past and present time of a poet. It is in fact reflecting the sense of oppression and lost of action between the rural and urban.

So what is the possible style of time-image cinema narration? As a contrast to accelerated montage, long shots is one solution but rather a different one, an extreme in which the films frames become meaningful together with audience memory. The long shots cause a kind of break in the continuous space-time and each frame has its own spatio-temporal dimensions. It should be said that these shots are also appreciated by mainstream cinema but the long shots are only tolerable within the borders of particular quantity and visually beautiful landscape framing. Whereas this film used long-shots to face with the past and present temporality of Yusuf as well as face the audience with the experience of film viewing, questioning the intention of the film and the meaning of the scenes. On the ideological level, I argue that Yusuf's position is also conflicting with Turkish ideal modern male power that should be fast and reactionary.

In that sense multiple searches for reality is actively done in this film unlike conventional films poses the audience as passive and ready to identify with the protagonist and waiting for big confrontations. The over-long shots are having a composition which is played like a neo-Brechtian estrangement effect for audience which is also unacceptable for conventional film making. Through occidental look, the presentation of rural with this kind of form are transferred to the idea of "the west", "this is not ours" and the film is reduced to "the boredom" stylist and artistic. Therefore the main features of time-image cinema as described by Gilles Deleuze are made unseen by the Occidental look and a shortcut is created. The film is tied to mainstream cinema's reasonable continuous narrative flow as discursive idea of "you don't like the film because the director is doing films for Europe." Thus unlike Deleuze positioning, time-image stable films are imprisoned to the inauthenticity not because of its themes unrelated to the Turkish people but telling this contrasting with mainstream film production.

3.1.3 Silence of the characters and the protagonist

One of the best *Yumurta* entries of the week in a very popular website (ekşisözlük) was implying director's intention to make films for Europeans:

*"It is a reflection of a food egg which I dislike on white screen after all. It seems very problematic each time Semih Kaplanoğlu claims " I am making a European Cinema. There is a difference between I am making European Cinema and I am making cinema to Europe. But, I think, these two different things are same for Mister Kaplanoğlu. He prepared a technical background through stable camera use and long takes for his film. Crucial is well designated details in such slow tempo films. Robert Bresson talked about for his invention so called minimalist cinema as the audiences' control over every second of frame. In other words, when one show a frame for a minute, we have to look at every millimeter square. Otherwise, we fall asleep if we watch alone, or start to make out if we are with girlfriend. Therefore, it is same to claim.....
I feel sorry. Turkish film industry has not any noticeable film this year. On the other hand, it produced indisputable films like Takva and Beynelmilel and relatively good films like Kader (Destiny) and İklimler (Climates) last year
2.00/4.00 (www.sourtimes.org..2007)*

This popular entry is focused on the director's interest in Europe and defined film as documentary framing without having details. This is neither a new view for new wave films about country produced for neither Western gaze nor films about return back to country is a new thing for West (Özguven 2007). Besides, with its clock tick tacks, wooden voices, cemetery, public pub, relationship with old people, electric cuts, darkness, the family background, daily meals and talks, *Yumurta* contained many detailed descriptions of country. What is contradictory in *Yumurta* is not the representation of the country but doing this with the relation of the protagonist with country and within a context which is contrasting with the imagination of "the county" of the Turkish modernity. Indeed, as a discursive space of the rural is presented as pure intimacy, happiness and excitement in new mainstream cinema (Evren 2004). So the mainstream protagonist is often talkative and intimate in films. He also talks for also the audience for a good and hopeful future. However *Yumurta*'s protagonist is silent and he is the viewer of the events like the audience in the cinema. This situation creates the feeling of uneasiness as well as an inquiry for "experience of being audience".

In addition to embarrassing nihilism of a "modern intellectual" and his close relation to

country, the audiences who are forced to question their relationship with their own realities are introduced with a new understanding of time-space dimension which is filled with optic-images and open to interpretation.

The concepts “the People”, “the Art” and “Europe” are displaced and used according to the ideological tastes and likes-dislike of these critics. But the problem is not here like or dislikes the film, rather the idea defended by these people that “you don’t like the film, because the director does not make film for you (Turkish society). I argue that these criticisms against film are not derived from a cultural perspective but their very organic relationship with the dominant rules of conventional film-making and projection of Turkey through Occidental look. The film is also unconventional with its narration, shooting style and composition with the themes as well.

4. CONCLUSION

Even if the film *Yumurta* can be evaluated as alternative for the Western cinematic culture, the film is being posed as art-based with implication to the West in Turkey. I argue that the main problem here is not the box office failure of the film but the very Occidental ideology which defines why the film fails. Reactions & responses to *Yumurta* show the Occidental look plays a second barrier for recognition in alternative filmmaking. While doing this, the pragmatic concepts operated by the Occidentalism are the People versus the West.

As emphasized in this analysis, the problem of Occidental look is representing “new Wave films” as “enemy-other” of these films. The occidental look is not the only problem waiting for new-wave films but it makes invisible the relationships between new-wave and mainstream films and become an obstacle in front of possible interactions both in production and consumption processes. *Satılık* is an attempt to break down this obstacle and create a possible interaction with merging these three unconventional elements with conventional storytelling.

I have to point that the task of this thesis is not to form a historical analysis of the Turkish cinema as a whole. It is neither a periodization attempt although it is interested in different periods in the Turkish Cinema. But the periods are selected from the give the panoramic view of the concept of People in relation to Occidental fantasy in the film industry in Turkey. Therefore it carries a hope to provide future researchers on this field some problems that was aroused from the usage of this word and the underlying social, political and artistic concerns.

The feature film script which was presented here focused on these three unconventional features of Kaplanoğlu’s technique interwoven with dynamic plot organization. Long takes were inserted throughout the film in order to push audience to think about the theme of the film, the protagonist were set in his existential and social contradictions and the universe of the script were diversified and pluralized with different realities and not presented in social unity.

REFERENCES

Books

- Abisel, N., 1994. *Türk Sineması Üzerine Yazılar*. Ankara: Imge Publications. 1st edition.
- Abisel, N., Arslan, U. T., Behçetoğulları, P., Karadoğan, A., Öztürk, S. R. and Ulusay, N. 2005. *Çok Tuhaf Çok Tanıdık: Vesikalı Yarım Üzerine*. İstanbul:Metis Publication.
- Agamben G., 2000. *Means Without Ends: Notes on Politics*. Minnesota University Press, pp:29-36.
- Ahıska, M., 2006. *Radyonun Sihirli Kapısı: Garbiyatçılık ve Politik Öznellik*. İstanbul. Metis Publications.
- Akser, M., 2003. *Türk Sinemasında Tarih Yazımı: Bir Yöntem Önerisi*. Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler. Bağlam Publications. June 2003. pp:41-48.
- Arslan S., 2005. *Hollywood alla Turca: A history of popular cinema in Turkey*. Ohio State University. History of Art.
- Berктаş E.H., 2008. 1939-1950 dönemi Türk Sinemasının Ekonomik, Politik, Toplumsal ve Kültürel Altyapısı. *Thesis for the p.h.D. Degree*. İstanbul: Mimar Sinan University. Film and Television.
- Deleuze, G., 1988. *Cinema 2: The time-image*, (trans.) Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Evren, B., 1993 *Başlangıcından Günümüze Sinema Dergileri*, 1st edition, İstanbul: Korsan Press.
- Kırca, S., 2003. *Sinema Endüstrisinin Pazarlama ve Promosyon Stratejilerinde Yönelimler: Amerika ve Türkiye*. Türk Film Araştırmalarında Yeni Yönelimler Bağlam Press. June 2003, p:95-103
- Mardin Ş. 1992. *Türkiye'de Toplum ve Siyaset*. İletişim Press.İstanbul
- Mayne, J., 1989. *Kino and the Woman Question*. Colombus: Ohio State University Press.
- Onaran, A. S., 1981. *Muhsin Ertugrul'un Sineması*, 1st edition, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Press.
- Özgüç, A., 1998. *Türk Film Yönetmenleri Sözlüğü*. 2nd edition. İstanbul: Agora, 2003.
- Özön, N., 1962 *Türk Sineması Tarihi (Dünden Bugüne 1896-1960)* 1st edition, İstanbul: Artist Reklam Ortaklığı Press.

- Özön N., 1995. *Karagozden Sinemaya Türk Sineması ve Sorunlar*. C. 1, Ankara: Kitle Publications.
- Parla J. 1992. *Babalar ve Oğulları*. Metis Press. İstanbul.
- Refiğ H. 1971. *Ulusal Sinema Kavgası*, İstanbul: Hareket Publications.
- Rostow W. W., 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge University Press.
- Said E., 1999. *Şarkiyatçılık.Batı'nın Şark Anlayışları*. (trans.) Berna Ülner, Metis Press. İstanbul.
- Scognamillo, G., 1998. *Türk Sinema Tarihi*, 1st edition, İstanbul: Kabalcı Press.
- Scagnamillo, G., 1991. *Cadde-i Kebir'de Sinema*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları, 1st edition.
- Solanas, F. and Octavio G., 1997. *Towards a Third Cinema: Notes and Experiences for the Development of a Cinema of Liberation in the Third World*. New Latin American Cinema. V: 1. Theory Practices and Transcontinental Articulations. Ed. Michael T. Martin. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, pp: 33-58
- Timur T., 2002., *Osmanlı Türk Romanında Tarih, Toplum ve Kimlik*. Imge Publications. Ankara.
- Yoshimoto, M. 1991, The Difficulty of being radical: the Discipline of Film Studies and the Postcolonial world order boundary 2. Vol 18, No:3 Japan in the World pp: 242-25
- Zizek, S., 1992. *Looking Awry.An Introduction to Jacques Lacan Through Popular Culture*. Cambridge. Mass: MIT Press.
- Zürcher E. J., 2008 *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi* (trans.) Yasemin Saner Gönen. İletişim Press. İstanbul.

Periodicals

- Ahıska, M., 2003, Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the modern, *South Atlantic Quarterly*, **V.102**, No.2-3, Spring-Summer, pp:351-379
- Akerson, T., 1966. Azgelişmiş Sinemada Devrim. *Yeni Sinema*. **V:1** (2). April-May. pp:26-27
- Arslan, S. (1998). Popüler Yeşilçam Filmlerinin Eleştirilmesinde Bir Sanat Sineması Söyleminin Oluşumu, 25. *Kare* No:20; pp: 49-56.
- Evren, B., 2004. Türk Sinemasında Yeni Bir Dönem: Bağımsız Sinemacılar. *Antrakt*. **V:3** (76) pp: 14-39
- Holivut*. 8 August 1934. Türkiye'nin Holivutu Beyoğlunda. **V:4** (33).p:3.
- Ilıcak N., 2007 Sanat: Halk İçin... *Sabah*. 24 November 2007 available at <http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2007/11/24/haber,36100B6E7838416BB207C640F78E98CF.html> [retrieved in 20.02.2009]
- Işığın İ. A., 2000. Türk Sineması Çalışmalarında 1950 Öncesinin Dışlanması. *İletişim*. No:7, pp:95-212
- Köstepen E. 2004, Topyekün Arayıştayız, *Altyazı*. **V3** (3).December. pp:32-33
- Özgüven F., 2007. Adak Tutmuş. *Radikal*. 15 November 2007 available at <http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalYazarYazisi&ArticleID=831748&Yazar=FAT%DDH%20%D6ZG%DCVEN&Date=06.09.2010&CategoryID=113> [retrieved in 07.September.2010]
- Yeni Sinema*, 1966. Sinema Sanatı Bakımından Gelişmiş Ülkelerdeki İlerlemeler ve Azgelişmiş Ülkelerdeki Duraklamanın Nedenleri.. **V:1** (2). April-May. pp:26-27

Other sources

Çetin, S., *Yaşamdan Dakikalar*, Tv8, 16 November 2007

Osman F. *Yumurta* . 11.11.2007 at <http://www.eksisozluk.com> [Retrieved in 20.02.2009]

Sinan Çetin eleştirinin dozunu kaçırdı. 24 November 2007 at

<http://www.haberaktuel.com/Sinan-Cetin-elestirinin-dozunu-kacirdi-haberi-98848.html>

[Retrieved in 20.02.2009]

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1

SATILIK

FADE IN

SAHNE 1 DIS. KINALIADA ISKELE. GÜN BATIMINA YAKIN.

(Iskeleye ada vapuru yanaşır. Günöbirlikçi vapur kalabalığı simdiden sahilde yer tutmak için Kınalıada'ya inmeye baslar. Iskele kapısının girişinde kalabalığın içinde uzun boyuyla POYRAZ belirir. Sıcak olmasına rağmen üzerinde kravat, kısa kollu beyaz bir gömlek sağ elinin üzerinde ceket ve küçük bir bavul, sol elinde ise laptop çantası vardır. Iskele çıkışında söyle bir durur. 9 yıl sonra geldiği adasına bir göz atar. Kalabalık saglı, sollu Poyraz'a temas ederek akmaktadır . Deniz ve rüzgarın kokusunu alır. Hemen sonrasında sehirden dönen babalarını karşılamaya gelen çocukları görür. Bir tuhaf olur. Kendisini karşılayan yoktur. Bir tek ada'nın delisi olan sıcakta mont giymiş ve kafasında bir bere olan hafif kirli sakallı, esmer ve yalpalayarak yürüyen, sert mizaçlı ürkütücü bakışlara sahip ALİ DAYI uzaktan ona dik dik bakmaktadır. Poyraz Ali Dayıyı farketmez. Bu sırada kalabalıktan bir adam acele acele hafif koşarken Poyraz'a omuz atarak geçer.)

ADAM 1

İlerlesene be herif.

Buraya mı buldun

dikilecek?

(Poyraz sendeler. Adam'a küfür edecek gibi olur. İri yarı olduğunu görünce korkusundan bir şey diyemez. Kısık sesle)

POYRAZ

Ruhsuz adam!

POYRAZ

Ruhsuz adam!

Fade Out

TITLE IN: SATILIK

FADE IN

FADE IN

SAHNE 2 DIS.EVE GIDEN YOKUŞ. AKŞAM ÜSTÜ

(Poyraz evine giden üst üste iki yokuşun başında belirir. Hemen köşede duran mimoza çiçeklerine bakar. Derin bir nefes alır ve kendinden emin adımlarla bir sporcu gibi gögsünü diklestirerek yokuşu çıkmaya baslar. Ancak yolun yarısına geldiğinde kendinden emin hali yerini perişan bir hale bırakmıştır. Aşırı sıcakta güç bela saga sola yalpalayarak devam eder. Dinlenmek için gölgelik bir köşeye geçer, esyalarını yere bırakır, bir eli belini tutarak yardım edecek birine bakınır. Kimse yoktur. Gömleği terden ıpslak olmuştur. Koltuk altını koklar.Sinir ve sıkıntı basar. Çıkmaya devam eder.Yokuşun bitiminde enlemesine bir sokak baslar. Bu sokagın başında Poyraz'ın beyaz iki katlı bir evi vardır.)

SAHNE 3 DIS. EVIN GIRIŞI. AKŞAM ÜSTÜ

(Poyraz evin dış kapısına gelir. Bahçeye giriş kapısını açar. Kapıda takılı olan zil çalar. Yan bahçede Ermeni komsusu SETA TEYZE zil sesine bakar. Poyraz'ı tanır. Poyraz ilk bakışta tanımaz. Sonra tanır. Teri görünmesin diye ceketini acele üzerine giyer.)

SETA TEYZE

Poyraz, sen misin?
Hoşgeldin yavrum.

POYRAZ

Hayır ben degilim (güler)
Hosbulduk..SETA teyze..
(Esyalarını bulunduğu yere bırakır.SETA Teyze 'nin Elini öper)

(CONTINUED)

SETA TEYZE
Basın sagolsun yavrum

POYRAZ
((Üzülüyormuş gibi yapmasını
düşünerek gülen yüzü aniden
üzüntülü bir hale geçer.)

Dostlar sagolsun teyzecigim

SETA TEYZE
Yasını almıstı ama bir seycigi de
yok gibiydi. Daha bir hafta önce
tüm bahçeyi tek başına halletti.

POYRAZ
(Söyleyecek bir sey arar)

Ölüm iste, vakit dolunca.

SETA TEYZE
Öyle öyle. Fenalaştığında
arayalım dedik. Oglumun işi
vardır, rahatsız etmeyelim
dediydi.. Gerçi numaralaradık da
ulasamadık sana. Başına +9 koymak
gerekıyor dedim Karin'e (Poyraz'ın
içi gıdıklanır). Yaptı mı bilmem
zaten bizi hiç dinlemedi ya ama
yine de allah razı olsun kızım
herseye kosturdu.

POYRAZ
Sagolsun.Karin adada mı hala?

SETA TEYZE
(sasırır)

Hee. Kilisede simdi, çocuklara el
isi dersi veriyor. Akşama gelir
belki. Aksam gelirsen yemege
beklerim oglum

POYRAZ
Sagol teyze. Ama işlerim var
biraz.Onları halletmem gerekiyor.

SETA TEYZE
Baban da hep söylerdi. Oglumun
isleri var, çok yoğun diye. Ne
zaman dönüyorsun yavrum?

CONTINUED:

POYRAZ

Çok kalmayacağım. Birkaç gün sonra dönmem gerek.

SETA TEYZE (ERMENICE)
(Etrafı koklar)

Aman!! Cası ayresav zavagıs
(Eyvah çocuğum yandı yemek.)

SAHNE 4 IÇ. EV. AKSAM ÜSTÜ

Poyraz dışarıdan kapıyı açar, eve girer, etrafına bakınır. Eşyaların üstü örtüktür. Biraz dolaşır. Üzerindekileri daha çıkarmadan, masanın başına oturur. Masanın yan tarafında bir komodin vardır. Dışarıda hava aydınlık ve güzeldir ancak Poyraz karanlıkta oturur ve dizüstü bilgisayarını açar. Wireless düğmesine basar cevap vermez, denemesinin bile saçma olduğunu düşünüp, güler. Çeviri klasöründen 19 yy.'da Türk Resmi adlı makaleyi açar. Çantasından bir sözlük çıkarır. Okumaya çalışır önce ciddiyetle. Birinci sayfadan sonra mouse ile hızlı hızlı geçmeye baslar. Sıkılır. Makaleyi kapatır. Mutfaga gider su içmek için üst dolabı açar bir bardak alır sonra musluga eğilir suyu doldurur. Kapak açık kaldığı için kafasını kaldırdığında, üst kapaga çarpar. Sinirlenir. Odaya gider, Laptop çantasından miras kagıtlarını, cenaze bildirim haber kagıdının yer aldığı bir dosya çıkarır. Dosyanın içinden hazırladığı kartonu çıkarır. Ön gözünden marker alır ve kartonun üzerine büyük harflerle yazar: SATILIK Tel: 0 539 481 45 98. Kartona bakar ve cama yapıstırırken bir an tereddüt eder. Bu sırada cep telefonu çalar. Yurtdışından bir numaradır.

POYRAZ

Yes I'm Poyraz Ertürk.
OK.. yea..Ok. I'm sorry for that. Please Don't call the attorney. I will pay it in a week

(CONTINUED)

CONTINUED:

(Poyraz telefonu kapatır. Ve bu sefer tereddüt etmeden kartonu cama yapıştırır. Daha sonra bir elini cama yaslayarak eski sokaga nostaljik sert adam bakışları savurur. Bu sırada Ali Dayının evine doğru geldiğini görür. Irkilir, bakışları korkak bir hal alır. Göz göze gelirler.

Cut to Kilise

(Poyraz telefonu kapatır. Ve bu sefer tereddüt etmeden kartonu cama yapıştırır. Daha sonra bir elini cama yaslayarak eski sokaga nostaljik sert adam bakışları savurur. Bu sırada Ali Dayının evine doğru geldiğini görür. Irkilir, bakışları korkak bir hal alır. Göz göze gelirler. Poyraz perdeyi çeker. Ali Dayı da eve yönelmeden gözden kaybolur.)

SAHNE 5 DIS.KILISE.GÜNDÜZ

(Masada dersten sonra kalan el isi kağıtları, kurdeleler uçmaktadır. Yere uçanları avucunda buruşturan Karin masadakileri toplamaya başlar. Karin 27 yaşında hamile bir resim öğretmenidir. Yazları ise kilise bahçesinde çocuklara el işi dersi vermektedir. Kalan son kurdeleleri de toplarken çeşmenin yanındaki müstemeliyattan elinde çayla zamgoç Ohannes'in karısı Mari çıkar.)

KARIN

Ah hiç zahmet etme Mari kuyrik, saat 6:30 olmuş vapur neredeyse gelir bu halimle anca inerim. Alen'i karşılamaya iskeleye inmeliyim. Akşama karşılıklı içeriz he?

(Karin, daha Mari'nin cevabını beklemeden fırlar.)

SAHNE 6 DIS.ISKELE.AKSAM ÜSTÜ (Poyraz köşede bira içmektedir. Karin onu

görmez. Kalabalığın içinde
kocasını görür. Kocasının
elindeki torbalardan birini
kapar.)

SAHNE 7 DIS.YOKUS.AKSAM ÜSTÜ

(Karin ve kocası da aynı Poyraz gibi aynı yokuşun basında belirir. Sohbet ederek rahatça yokuşu çıkarlar)

SAHNE 8 DIS.BAHÇE.GECE

(Yine aynı Poyraz gibi evin di kapısından bahçeye girerler. Bahçede Mari ile kocası Ohannes oturmaktadır. Sofra yeni kurulmuştur.)

OHANNES

Gelin gelin önemli havadislerim var.

KARIN

Noluyor? Yine mi dedikodu?

MARI

Yok keske..Sorma be Karin.Ben de yeni öğrendim şimdi

OHANNES

Telaş etmeyin durun oturun bir hele. etmeyin durun oturun bir

ALEN

Hayırdır ahparig (abi) söyle ne var?

OHANNES

Bugün emlakçı Rasim'le lafladık da, seneye sizin evin sahipleri kendileri oturacaklarmış.

ALEN

Deme be ahparig ..

KARIN

Ayyyyy ..Biz öyle uygun bir ev nasıl buluruz? Bu demek oluyor seneye gelemeyeceğiz adaya. Çocugum adada büyüyemeyecek mi? Ne yapıcız biz şimdi?

ALEN

Dur Karin ya hemen panik yaptın. Bir çaresini bulucuz daha 1 sene var kim ölee kim kala..

CONTINUED:

MARI

Hadi hadi bozmayın moralinizi. Atlar kalktı, dogalgaz geldi diye de hemen fiyatlar artmayacak ya?

KARIN

(Sessizlik)

Yok yok bu son gelişimiz artık.

OHANNES

Aman be söylemez olaydım. Tadınızı da kaçırdım

ALEN

Yok be ahparig nasılsa duyulurdu. Hadi koy bir kadeh de içelim.

SAHNE 9 DIS. POYRAZ'IN EVI.GECE.

(Poyraz evden dışarı çıkar. Ayakkabıların giyer kapıyı çeker. Bahçede yürümeye baslar.)

SAHNE 10 DIS. BAHÇE.GECE

(Yemegin sonuna gelinmiştir. Artık Karin ile Mari masayı toplamaktadır. Teşekkür edilerek evlere dağılınır. Karin ve Alen eve girerler. Birkaç dakika sonra ev'in zili çalar. Alen soyunmaya gittiği için Karin kapıyı açmı bulunur. Karşısında bulunur. Karşısında Poyraz belirir. Poyrazın omuz çekiminde karşısında ise Seta Teyze çıkar. Poyraz Seta Teyzeye herşey için tesekkür etmeyi unuttugunu söyler. Kamera Poyraz'ın omzundan karşıyı çektiğinde bir daha Karin çıkar..)

KARIN

Buyur Rasim abi

RASIM

Geçiyordum da buradan ışığı görünce bir ugrayayım dedim kızım.

CONTINUED:

KARIN

Ah Rasim abi haberimiz var
olanlardan, akşam Kirkor
agabeylerdeydik de, demek iş ciddi..

RASIM

Ha söyledi mi Ohannes. Evet kızım
iste böyle simdiden söylememi
istediler.

(Sessizlik)

KARIN

Sagol Rasim abi hiç umudum yok ama
insallah hallederiz.

RASIM

Üzme canını yavrum Allah büyük.
Yarın ugra konuşalım istersen. Hadi
iyigeceler size. Neydi Kişerpari
Kiserpari (gülerek)

KARIN

Olur ugrarım. Luyspari Rasim Abi
(İyi geceler)

SAHNE 11 IÇ.YATAK ODASI. GECE

(Alen son konuşmaları duyar.
Konusmaya dahil olmak
istemez. Yatak odasına geçer.
Karin kapıyı kapatır Alen'in
yanına uzanır)

KARIN

Hayrola neyin var senin?

ALEN

Niye gelmi Rasim Abi
Rasim Abi

KARIN

Rasim Abi evi söylemeye gelmiş.

ALEN

Off.

KARIN

Dur bakalım. Buluruz belki
çaresini. Bak aklıma ne geldi.
Poyraz Rahmetli Ekrem
Amcanın oğlu. Amerikada iyi bi işe
girmi diyorlar. Ben
diyorlar. Ben
konusurum. Çocukluk arkadaşım. Belki
Ekrem amcanın evini bize ucuza

MORE)

CONTINUED:

KARIN (cont'd)
kiralar he..Oraya
geçeriz..Mamamlarla komşu
oluruz hem..

ALEN
Ben de konusurum Poyraz'la. Ekrem
amca kahvede bahsederdi ara
sıra Poyraz'dan..

KARIN
Yok sen konuşma. Ben konuşurum.

ALEN
Karin bana bırak sen bunu.Erkek
dururken kadın mı konuşmuş.

KARIN
Neyse Uzatmayalım.Uykum geldi.Sonra
konusuruz.
(Alen Karin'e sarılır. Alen
ısıgı söndürür.)

SAHNE 12 İÇ.YATAK ODASI.GECE

(Sinek vızıltıları gelmeye
başlar. Işık açılır. Işıgı
açan Poyrazdır. Sinegi bulmaya
çalışır bulamaz. Yatagın
basına oturur. Ellerini başına
alır. Odanın eski
mobilyalarına bakar. Uflar,
puflar. Yataga bırakır kendini
ısık kapanır.)

FADE OUT

FADE IN

SAHNE 13 DIS.MEZARLIK.GÜNDÜZ

(Ali Dayı Ekrem amcanın mezarı
basında uyumaktadır. Gelen
hısırtılara uyanır. Poyraz
babasının mezarını ziyarete
gelmiştir. Takım elbisesi ve
güne gözlüğüyle mezara
gözlüğüyle mezara
yaklaştığını gören Ali Dayı
mezarın arkasındaki ağaca
saklanır.Poyraz gelir mezar
basında birkaç dakika oturur.
Yanında getirdiği suyu döker.
Ali Mezarın hemen aşağısında

CONTINUED:

ise Ermeni kilisesi vardır. Ayin yeni bitmiştir. Poyraz çıkanlar arasında Karin'i görür. Ali Dayı Poyraz'ı izler. Poyraz Karin'i. Ali Dayı Poyraz'ın yanına gidecek gibi olurken Poyraz Karin'in peşine takılır. Ali Dayı da Poyraz'ı. Karin dönemeçte gözden kaybolur, Poyraz nereye gitti bu şimdi işareti yapar. Ali Dayı da kestirmeden çarşıya iner.)

SAHNE 14 DIS.ÇARSI.GÜNDÜZ

(Ali Dayı fırından her zamanki gibi bir paket tuz alır. Sahil kıyısına gider. Bu sırada Poyraz sahile inmiştir. Sahil kıyısına yaklaştığında denize tuz atan birini görür. Göz göze gelirler. Bu Ali Dayıdır. Poyraz artık iyice Ali Dayı tarafından gözetlendiğini düşünmeye başlamıştır. Korkuyla hemen karşısındaki kahveye girer. Masaya oturur. Bir çay söyler. Dışarıyı aydınlıktır. Poyraz kahvenin karanlığına oturur.)

SAHNE 15 IÇ.KAHVEHANE.GÜNDÜZ

(Poyraz sıkıntıdan kahvede cep telefonu ile oyun oynar. BU sırada içeri adadan çocukluk arkadaşları girer. Poyraz arkadaşları HAKAN İLE ARAS'ı görünce oyunu hemen kapatır. Mesajlara bakıyormuş gibi yapar. Arkadaşları onu tanır.)

ARAS

Vay Poyraz Hoş geldin.

HAKAN

Dostum isin varsa rahatsız etmeyelim.

POYRAZ

Yok canım. Oturun söyle.

(CONTINUED)

ARAS
Çok degismissin. Geldigini
söylemeler belki tanımazdım.

HAKAN
Basın sagolsun.

ARAS
Evet evet. Başın sagolsun.
Poyraz.Ne zaman geldin

POYRAZ
Dün Amerikadan uçakla geldim.

HAKAN
Ne i yapıyorsun abi sen oralarda
yapıyorsun abi sen oralarda

POYRAZ
Ben mi..Ben Free-lance
Translating yapıyorum, bir yandan
da doktora devam ediyorum.

HAKAN
Nasıl oluyor abi şimdi bu?

POYRAZ
(Anlasılmaz konuşmaya devam eder)
Medical, financial ve sanatsal
seylerin çeviriyorum ve Türkiye'ye
gönderiyorum.

HAKAN
Bizim kuzenin işinden mi bu
çevirmenlik yapıyor,çok kazanmıyor
ama?

POYRAZ
Amerikadaki farklı..Amerikada
imkan çok.

ARAS
Ekrem Amca'nın evini
satıyormussun diye duydum.

POYRAZ
Ada da hiç değişmemiş. Herşey
aynı. Bisey olsun,hemen yayılıyor
hala.

ARAS
Talip var mı?

CONTINUED:

POYRAZ
Yok daha. POYRAZ

ARAS
Ada da var mı emlakçı.

ARAS
Var var. Hemen 100 metre ilerde.
Karadeniz Emlakçılık. Rasim Abi
adı. Biraz çabuk satmıyor
musun? Hem Ali Dayı.

(Bu sırada Poyraz'ın cep
telefonuna mesaj gelir.
American Bank'in Poyraz'a
dünkü ihtarının mesajıdır bu.
Please make your payments ile
bitmektedir. Poyraz dalar)

ARAS İşin varsa biz
kalkalım.

POYRAZ
Yok. Amerikadan bir arkadaş.
Mesaj atmı da, işle ilgili. Su
da, işle ilgili. Su
Emlakçı nerde demiştin? Bir daha
ne zaman gelirim kim bilir? Ben
kapanmadan bir gideyim.

SAHNE 16 IÇ.EMLAKÇI.GÜNDÜZ

POYRAZ
Iyi günler.

RASIM
Iyi günler.

POYRAZ
Evimi satmak istiyorum.

RASIM
Buyrun. Kimlerden olduğunuzu
sorabilir miyim?

POYRAZ
Ben balıkçı Ekrem'in ogluyum.
Adım Poyraz.

RASIM
Balıkçı Ekrem'in oğlu
var diyorlardı doğru.Kusuruma
bakma Ben yeniyim burada
yigenim. Tanıyamadım daa. Allah
rahmet eylesin.

CONTINUED:

POYRAZ
Dostlar sagolunsun.

RASIM
Geç otursana söyle. Çay içersin
degil mi? Bizim 200 metre
ilerimizdeki ev degil mi bu
beyaz?

POYRAZ
Evet evet. POYRAZ

RASIM
Kaç metrekare, kaç oda, evin işi
var mı?
(Bu sırada Ali Dayı dışarıdan
emlakçının içindeki Poyrazı
kesmeye başlayınca Poyraz
iyice paranoyaklaşır.)

RASIM
Anladım yigenim. Peki bu deliyi
ne yapacağız?(Güler)

POYRAZ
Kimi? (Arkasına bakar)
(Bu sırada içeri Karin girer.
Poyraz karşısında aniden
Karin'i görür. Ev meselesinin
aslını öğrenmek için
gelmistir. Poyrazla göz göze
gelirler bu sırada Poyraz
konusacak gibi olacaken Karin
kararsız kalır ve bir anda
gider. Poyraz biraz bekler
sonra dayanamaz)

Çok tesekkür ederim. Ben biraz
daha düşüneyim. Evin kaç
metrekare olduğuna işinin olup
olmadığına bakayım. İyi günler.
(Poyraz hemen Karin'in
pesinden gider. Yokuşları
çıktıktan sonra Karin sokağı
döner Poyraz'da ondan sonra
döner. 100 metre ilerde
Karinin kocası ile buluştuğunu
görür. Poyraz Çocuklaşır.
Evinin yoluna döner. Eve
gider. Karin'in ise uzakta
kocasından ayrıldığını adanın
daha yukarılarına çıktığını
görürüz. Poyraz görmez.)

SAHNE 17.İÇ.OTURMA ODASI.GÜNDÜZ

(Poyraz yüzünü tam göremediği Karin'i görmek için eski albümleri karıştırır. ının balıkçılıktan kalma mavi gömlekli fotoğrafı, annesinin fotoğrafı, seta teyzelerle olan fotoğraflarını görür. fotoğrafa gelir albümde. Bu bir ağaç fotoğrafıdır. Kolları ikiye ayrılan ve sanki karşılıklı iki koltuk ve ortada bir sehpa pozisyonunda olan bir ağaçtır. Fotoya dikkatli bir şekilde bakar. Fotoğraf iner ve ağac karşısındadır. Arkasını dönük bir şekilde Karin ordadır. Evli olduğu için ve Alen'i ikna edemediği için Poyrazı arayamamıs, Poyraz'da kocasını gördüğü için hareket etmemistir. Tesadüfe inanmışlardır.Bu ağaç adanın bir tepenin en yüksek yerinde manastırın hemen kenarındadır. Ağactan hemen sonra adanın sahiline inen yarı uçurum şeklinde bir yokuş vardır. Bu yokusun üzerinde bir de çukur bulunur.Poyraz Karin'in yanında gelir.)

SAHNE 18.DIS.MANASTIR.GÜNDÜZ

POYRAZ
Sen de mi burdaydın?

KARIN
Ne zaman geldin?

POYRAZ
Dün.

KARIN
Cenazeye niye gelmedin?

POYRAZ
İşlerim vardı.

(CONTINUED)

KARIN

Sen ve bitmek bilmeyen
işlerin..Burda bile işlerin
var. Emlakçıda ne işin
vardı bugün?

POYRAZ

Evi satıyorum.

KARIN

Evi mi? Daha dur babanın
kırkı çıkmadı.

POYRAZ

Bir daha ne zaman gelirim
kim bilir?Kimsem de yok
artık burda

(Konuyu değiştirmeye çalışır.)

Kaç aylık oldu?

KARIN

4 aylık.

(Poyraz eline bir taş alır
ileride olan çukurun içine taş
atmaya çalışır. Karin biraz
endiselenir ve sinirlenir. Ev
konusuna geri döner.)

KARIN

Hiç degismemissin. Herşeyden
çabucak kaçmaya devam he.

POYRAZ

Sen de sorun çıkarmaya

KARIN

Ben mi sorun çıkarmışım.

POYRAZ

Evin bo

POYRAZ

kalmasından iyidir.

KARIN

Ali Dayı var ya?

(Poyraz Karin'in bu son
dedigini ağacın oraya gittiği
için duymaz. Karin'in
hamileliğini kıskanmıştır. Laf
sokmaya çalışarak konuyu gene
oraya getirir .Çocuksu bir
alayla)

(CONTINUED)

CONTINUED:

POYRAZ

Eskiden bu ağaca çok çıkardık,
şimdi sen tırmanamazsın değil mi?
(Poyraz ağaca tırmanmaya
çalışır, ve ilk hamlesinde
birden gömlegi yırtılır.)

POYRAZ

(Ha siktir. Gömlegim yırtıldı.
(Poyraz sinirden ağaca bir
tekme atar.)

KARIN

Ne vuruyorsun ya ağacımıza.

POYRAZ

Sanane!

KARIN

Nasıl banane, bir gömlek diye.

POYRAZ

O gömlek bir maasım benim.

KARIN

Bir maasın mı? (Sessizlik)
zor durumda mısın yoksa?

POYRAZ

Ya ne alakası var. Abarttım tabi

KARIN

Yalan söyleme. Evi satıp
kurtulacaksın.

POYRAZ

Uzatma Karin.

KARIN Ezelden beri
böyle yalancıydın. Bana da
seni
seviyorum demiştin, ben sana bekle
dedim. Sonra al beni
diyecektim sen bana git
dedin. Kaçtın gittin.

(Karin daha fazla Poyraz'la
kalmak istemez ve arkasında
bile bakmadan gider. Poyraz
üstünü başını düzeltmeye devam
ederken, arkasından seslenir.)

(CONTINUED)

CONTINUED:

POYRAZ

Karin nereye dur?
Salak..çocuktuk zaman..Kolay mı
buralara gelmek. Kendim geldim
buralara.Ne anlarsın ki zaten
sen.Sanki ben çok istiyorum
satmayı..Cahil

(Karin uzaktan arkası dönük
eliyle "git işine" yapar.
Karin'in gittiği yön manastır
iken Poyraz elektrik ve baz
istasyon direklerinin
tarafında kalmıştır.
Poyraz arkasını döner sınırdan
agaca bir kere daha çıkmak
ister. Bu sefer ayagı ters
yöne doğru kayar ve tepeden
aşağı yuvarlanır. İlerideki
çukurun içinde düşer.)

Fade out

Fade in

SAHNE 19 İÇ.ÇUKUR.KARANLIK

(Poyraz kendine gelir.
Çukurdan yukarı tırmanmaya
çalışır. Beceremez. Bağırmağa
başlar. Duyan olmaz. Cep
telefonunun çalışıp
çalışmadığına bakar, baz
istasyonları tepededir ama
çekmiyordur. Işığı kullanır
ama sarjı biter. Karanlığa
Gömülür. Ümidini Kaybetmeye
başlar. Bağırmaktan boğazları
acıdır. Yutkunur. Öleceğini
düşünür. Aklamaya başlar.
Sonra kendini tutar, hıçkırır.
Bir daha ağlar..Çukura
yığılır.Bir mucize der gibi
göge bakar. Ve bu sırada beyaz
bir ip gelir önüne. Hemen ipe
tutunur kendini yukarı çeker .
Allah'ım der ve bunu der demez
karsısında Ali Dayıyı görür.
Ali Dayı Poyraz'ı kurtarmıştır.
Poyraz Ali Dayıya sarılır.

(CONTINUED)

CONTINUED:

Kıyafetleri arasında bir fark yoktur. Bu sırada Ali Dayı elini hemen cebine atar. Poyraz bir sey olacak korkusuyla refleksif olarak ç. Ali Dayı cebinden bir anahtar çıkırır. Bunca zamandır Poyraz'ın kendisinden kaçtığı için biraz da kızarak anahtarı Poyraz'a verir. Ali Dayı anahtarı verdikten sonra rahatlamanın sevinciyle kaybolur. Poyraz durumu idrak etmeye çalışır.)

SAHNE 20 IÇ. KULÜBE. GÜNDÜZ

(Poyraz evin yanındaki kulübeyi farkedir. Elindeki anahtara bakar. Ali Dayı evin satılacağını görünce anahtarı teslim etmek istemiştir. Poyraz anahtarın kulübenin kapsını açtığını görür. İçeri bakar. Bir çekyat ve Ekrem amca ile Ali dayının mavi gömlekli bir resmi vardır. Ekrem Ali Dayıya kışları yasaması için bir kulübe yapmıştır. Eve gider satılık yazısını camdan söker çöpe atar. Kıyafetlerini değiştirir. Eski ahsap bir dolabın kapısını açar. Babasının resimdeki mavi gömlegini giyer. Dolabın üst kapagı gene açılır. Bu sefer kafasını çarpmaz. Hatırlar. Ve kapagı kapatır. Sahile yazlıkçı gibi iner.)

SAHNE 21 IÇ. SAHİL KIYISI. GÜNDÜZ

(Poyraz bankta güneşe yüzünü çevirmiş, Kollarını bankın kollarına dayamış dinlenmektedir. Kuşlar, çocuk sesleri, günü birlikçiler adaya gelmektedir. Bankın önünden geçen Seta Teyze onu görür)

(CONTINUED)

CONTINUED:

SETA

TEYZE

Hayırdır yavrum gitmedin mi sen?

POYRAZ

Gitmedim teyzecim, biraz daha duracağım, öyle gideceğim, evi satmaktan vazgeçtim.

SETA TEYZE

Aferim yavrum,
babasının
oglu. Tekrar
hoşgeldin. İyi yazlar.

POYRAZ

İyi yazlar
teyzecğim.

(Poyraz hayatında ilk defa
karsısında duran balıkçıların
ne yaptığını bakmaktadır ..Gün
güzeldir.)

Fade Out

Son