

REFLECTIONS OF URBAN POOR
IN
SOCIAL REALIST FILMS IN TURKEY

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

BY

YILDIRIM UYSAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIOLOGY

OCTOBER 2015

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıođlu
Head of Department

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

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Kurtuluş Kayalı	(AÜ, DTCTF)	_____
Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit	(METU, SOC)	_____
Prof. Dr. Tayfun Atay	(OKAN Ü., SOC)	_____
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Erdoğan Yıldırım	(METU, SOC)	_____
Prof.Dr. Helga Rittersberger Tılıç	(METU, SOC)	_____

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

Name, Last name : Yıldırım Uysal

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE REFLECTIONS OF URBAN POOR IN SOCIAL REALIST FILMS OF TURKEY

Uysal, Yıldırım

Ph.D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit

October 2015, 362 pages

This dissertation is analyzing the reflections of urban poor in social realist films in Turkey, within a perspective that begins at the beginning of 1960s and finishes at the end of 1980s. The study is examining this phase with three different dimensions: the change of urban poor since 1960s to 1980s, the change of social realist films since 1960s to 1980s, and mutual interaction of urban poor and social realist films. Besides, thesis is also focusing on the phase since the end of 1980s to today, to understand why social realist films were finished at the end of 1980s. Thesis realizes the examination of the journey of urban poor and social realist films with sociological, political, economical and artistic dimensions. Along this examination, thesis is taking help from the notions such as migration, gecekondu (slums), class, class struggle, class consciousness; which make easier to understand the concepts that fulfill the poor people's world and are descriptive about the transformation of poor people and Turkish society.

Keywords: Urban Poor, Social Realism, Turkish Cinema, Class Consciousness and Struggle, Transformation of Turkish Society

ÖZ

KENTTEKİ YOKSULLARIN TÜRKİYE'DEKİ

TOPLUMSAL GERÇEKÇİ FİLMLERDE YANSIMASI

Uysal, Yıldırım

Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ecevit

Ekim 2015, 362 sayfa

Bu tez çalışması, Türkiye'deki toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerde kentteki yoksulun yansımalarını, 1960'ların başında başlayıp 1980'lerin sonunda biten bir perspektifle incelemektedir. Çalışma, bu zaman dilimini üç farklı boyutla incelemektedir: 1960'lardan 1980'lere kentteki yoksulun değişimi, 1960'lardan 1980'lere toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin değişimi, ve kentteki yoksulun ve toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin karşılıklı etkileşimi. Bunun yanında, toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin neden 1980'lerin sonunda bittiğini anlamak için, tez 1980'lerin sonundan bugüne kadar olan zaman dilimine de odaklanmaktadır. Tez, toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin ve kentteki yoksulun yolculuğunun incelenmesini sosyolojik, politik, ekonomik ve sanatsal boyutlarla gerçekleştirmektedir. İnceleme boyunca, tez, yoksul insanlar ile Türkiye toplumunun dönüşümü hakkında tanımlayıcı ve yoksul insanların dünyasını dolduran kavramları anlamamızı kolaylaştıracak göç, gecekondu, sınıf, sınıf mücadelesi, sınıf bilinci, toplumsal gerçekçilik, yoksulluk gibi nosyonlardan yardım almaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kentteki Yoksul, Toplumsal Gerçekçilik, Türk Sineması, Sınıf Bilinci ve Mücadelesi, Türkiye Toplumunun Dönüşümü

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my many thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Smita Tewari Jassal, for her precious guidance with her perfect academic experience and helpful personality.

My another thankfulness is for Prof. Dr. Kurtuluş Kayalı, Prof. Dr. Tayfun Atay and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erdoğan Yıldırım; for their valuable advices, moderate criticism and friendly encouragements.

I would like to thank also to Dr. Ali Karadoğan, to share his personal film archive with me bountifully. I wish to underline my thanks to kind research assistants of Cinema-TV department of Ankara University, Bahar Şimşek and Pınar Yıldız, for their polite support about the archive of Cinema-TV department.

Lastly, my deepest gratitude is to all people who have demonstrated their support generously to my intellectual journey. The lovely people in my family who encourage me and are proud of me, and my marvellous friends who fortify my baby steps in academic life; I would like to let you know that my Ph.D degree actually belongs to you, and admittedly, you deserve to be celebrated for this degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	v
ABSTRACT	vi
ÖZ	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
CHAPTER I	1
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Introduction to the Study.....	1
1.2. Outline of the Thesis	12
1.3. Poverty and Urban Poor	13
1.4. The Features of Urban Poor	15
1.5. Gecekondu (Slums).....	18
1.6. Class and Its Definition.....	23
1.7. Class Consciousness and Class Struggle	25
1.8. Class and Politics Relations	30
1.9. Transformation of the Turkish Society	37
1.10. Art, Cinema, Film, Turkish Cinema	49
1.11. Cinema	51
1.12. Social Realism.....	57
1.13. Social Realism in Turkish Cinema.....	63
1.14. The Goal of the Study and Assumptions.....	69
1.15. Method of the Study and Research Techniques	74
CHAPTER 2	87
2. SOCIAL REALISM AND URBAN POOR IN 1960s.....	87
2.1. Introduction	87
2.2. Change in Turkish Cinema, 1960s	88

2.3.	Transition in Production Relations.....	89
2.4.	Societal Conversion in Turkey in 1960s	92
2.5.	Formation of Class Awareness.....	94
2.6.	CHP and TİP	96
2.7.	1960s Films	100
2.7.1.	Weariness from Capitalist Relations	100
2.7.1.1.	Gecelerin Ötesi (Beyond the Nights), 1960	100
2.7.1.2.	Acı Hayat (Bitter Life), 1962.....	104
2.7.2.	On the Way of Class Consciousness.....	111
2.7.2.1.	Otobüs Yolcuları (The Bus Passengers), 1961	111
2.7.2.2.	Karanlıkta Uyananlar (Those Awakening In The Dark), 1964.....	115
2.7.3.	Migration in 1960s.....	123
2.7.3.1.	Gurbet Kuşları (Birds of Exile), 1964.....	123
2.7.3.2.	Bitmeyen Yol (The Unending Road), 1965	132
2.8.	Conclusion.....	139
CHAPTER 3.....		141
3.	SOCIAL REALISM AND URBAN POOR IN 1970s.....	141
3.1.	Introduction	141
3.2.	Cinema in 1970s.....	141
3.3.	Relations of Production and the Transformation of Society	148
3.4.	1970s Films	162
3.4.1.	Individual Struggles Against the System.....	162
3.4.1.1.	Umut (Hope), 1970	162
3.4.1.2.	Düşman (The Enemy), 1979	167
3.4.2.	A View to Gecekondu (Slums) and Migration.....	174
3.4.2.1.	Gelin (The Bride), 1973	175
3.4.2.2.	Düğün (The Wedding), 1973	180
3.4.2.3.	Diyet (The Ransom), 1974.....	184
3.4.2.4.	Yusuf ile Kenan (Yusuf and Kenan), 1979.....	193
3.4.3.	Socialist Seekings	198
3.4.3.1.	Arkadaş (The Friend), 1974.....	198

3.4.3.2.	Maden (The Mine), 1978	207
3.4.3.3.	Demiryol (The Railway), 1979	213
3.5.	Conclusion	219
CHAPTER 4		221
4.	SOCIAL REALISM AND URBAN POOR IN 1980s.....	221
4.1.	Introduction	221
4.2.	The Social Realist Cinema of 1980s	221
4.3.	The Effects of 1980 Military Coup	224
4.4.	80's Politics and the State	236
4.5.	1980s Films	238
4.5.1.	Migration in 1980s	238
4.5.1.1.	At (The Horse), 1982	238
4.5.1.2.	Bir Avuç Cennet (A Handful of Heaven), 1985	244
4.5.2.	The Change of Urban Poor.....	249
4.5.2.1.	Faize Hücum (Rush on Interest), 1982	249
4.5.2.2.	Yoksul (Poor), 1986.....	255
4.5.2.3.	Düştürü Dünya (Skimpy World), 1988	260
4.5.3.	Gecekondu (Slums) in 1980s	266
4.5.3.1.	Bir Yudum Sevgi (A Sip of Love), 1984.....	266
4.5.4.	Hopelessly Political Struggle	272
4.5.4.1.	Çark (The Wheel), 1987	272
4.6.	Conclusion	278
CHAPTER 5		279
5.	TURKISH CINEMA AND URBAN POOR SINCE THE END OF 1980S TO PRESENT	279
5.1.	Introduction	279
5.2.	Turkish Cinema in 1980s	279
5.3.	The Change in Production Relations and Society.....	293
5.4.	Class Struggle and Consciousness	302
5.5.	Conclusion	311
CHAPTER 6		313

6. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION	313
REFERENCES.....	329
APPENDICES.....	344
A. SURVEY.....	344
B. TURKISH SUMMARY	345
C. CURRICULUM VITAE	359
D. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	362

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction to the Study

This study aims to understand the life of urban poor in Turkey in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s and to understand how this group represented by social realism line in Turkish cinema. The thesis claims that the social realism trend which began from the beginning of the 1960s until the end of 1980s reflected and problematized the matters concerning the urban poor directly or indirectly.

This dissertation aims to look at this transformation as it was reflected in the films produced. I am considering social realist films as an ideal instrument to analyze the urban poor of these phases. The reason to choose social realism is that social realism has special tendency and sensitivity to display and to explore the matters of poor people. Along the thesis, I am going to clarify the relation between urban poor and social realist films. I will focus on how urban poor are presented in the films I have chosen.

For our goal, firstly, we need specific films which are considered in social realist trend. I have determined 22 films that exhibit poor people of different cases and scripts which are sourced from the time when films were made. Documentaristic feature of social realist films will make our work easier because the goals were always to reflect life as it actually was. Through these 22 films, the first of which was produced in 1960 and the last in 1988, the change and sociological appearance of urban poor through 1960s, 1970s and 1980s will be followed.

This thesis will examine not only the given films produced during these three time periods but also try to explain the reasons why there have not been any social realist films following the late 1980s. The fact that there have been films –rare as it may be– since the late 2000s that can be once again evaluated under the scope of social realism. This, no doubt, is due to the changes the society and the urban poor have gone through. The reason which this thesis has chosen social realism as a subject and a process, is not solely because it is a trend giving place to problems of the poor people which it wants to prioritize; it is also because of the fact that it is the cinema movement that shows most frequently and clearly, the changes in the society and more importantly in the poor people.

The subject of this thesis has been crystallized in my mind during lecture of Kurtuluş Kayalı, in the 2007 Fall on Turkish cinema. Noticing a veil which goes from 1960s through 1980s and takes a close interest to the matters of poor people is the beginning point of this study. The urban poor were the main subject and actors of the films which are under affect of social realist line. All films aimed social reality.

The concepts of ‘social realism’, ‘class’ and ‘poverty’ concepts provide the thesis with theoretical fluidity. As a first concept, poverty, has different definitions which leans on several concepts: “Most definitions associate poverty with a ‘lack’ or ‘deficiency’ of the necessities required for human survival and welfare. However, there is no consensus about what basic human needs are or how they can be identified (Wratten, 1995:12). Ellen Wratten would like to discuss poverty under the light of two different approaches in her article: “.. conventional economic definitions which use income, consumption, or a range of other social indicators to classify poor groups against a common index of material welfare; and alternative interpretations developed largely by rural anthropologists and social planners working with poor rural communities in the Third World, which allow for local variation in the meaning of poverty, and expand the definition to encompass perceptions of non-material deprivation and social differentiation” (Wratten, 1995:12).

İlhan Tekeli talks about two main sub-categories which have been developed to understand the concept of poverty better; these are ‘absolute’ and ‘relative’ poverty:

“The persons are considered absolute poor who can not realize the nutrition that provides the necessary calories and other food components that humans need to produce themselves as biologically .. The persons are considered as relatively poor who are below the acceptable lowest consumption level in the society in question” (Tekeli, 2000:142).

In international poverty definitions, it is considered two main categories: absolute and relative definitions. “If poverty is defined in absolute terms, needs are considered to be fixed at a level which provides for subsistence, basic household equipment and expenditure on essential services such as water, sanitation, health, education and transport .. the concept of relative poverty is more flexible, and allows for minimum needs to be revised as standards of living in society alter” (Wratten, 1995:14).

Poverty in Turkey can be elaborated due to different indexes. “The per capita income is still low in comparison with EU level”(Adaman – Keyder, 2006:4). Adaman – Keyder’s report specified also that in 2003 data, 26 percent of society has ‘poverty-risk’. Moreover, we also consider two additional indexes: “average income of Eastern regions of Turkey is less than half of average income..” and also, urban – countryside segregation is another important gauge in this issue (Adaman – Keyder, 2006:4).

The concept of ‘class’ is another concept which is one of the main axes of our study. Class as a presupposition or an existing category is a concept that helps us to group people that cluster together in social life. If we are to lend an ear to the words of Marx and Engels, who generally perceive class as a ‘construction of unity of interests, only a struggle which is against another class removes individuals being rival to each other and makes them a ‘class’ (Marx – Engels, 1992:91). English historian Eric Hobsbawm however, associated the forming of class with the consciousness of class: “Class in the full sense only comes into existence at the historical moment when classes begin to acquire consciousness of themselves as such” (Hobsbawm, 1971:6). And the perspective of Adam Przeworski is as follows:”Classes are not given uniquely by any objective positions because they constitute effects of struggles.. “ (Przeworski, 1977:367). Göran Therborn also

emphasizes the ‘unstable’ characters of the classes: “Classes, must be seen, not as veritable geological formations once they have acquired their original shape, but as phenomena in a constant process of formation, reproduction, re-formation and deformation” (Therborn, 1983:39).

In modern times, poor people consists of qualified workers, sellers and farmers whose incomes are barely enough, people who work on minimum wages, farmers who have less than adequate land, people working on jobs without social security and the unemployed ones (Ergil, 1986:85). Poverty has existed both in countryside and urban area. Urban poverty has been emerged mostly due to the migration.

Another axis of our thesis, social realism, is defined such as: “the use of realist art, literature, etc as a medium for social or political comment” (dictionary.reference.com/browse/social+realism). Bondanella is exemplifying the general lines of social realism in Italian neo realism, which is the beginning point of social realism and most known sample: “In its quest for narrative simplicity, true-to-life stories, real locations, everyday language in dialogue, important social and political issues in its content as well as its frequent use of non-professional actors, Italian neorealism established a benchmark for authenticity in the cinema that continues to offer an alternative model to lavishly financed productions, studio work, the star system and cinema conceived of as merely entertainment rather than a ‘slice of life’ “(Bondanella, 2006:39).

The foremost philosopher of cinema, Andre Bazin, is expanding the query in the words of Cook: ”Bazin argued for a sociological approach to film that would take into account the historical moment of production” (Cook, 2007:390). Bazin’s argument is parallel with our study’s argument because the goal of social realism is mostly to take the photo shot of the society at that moment.

Cinema, especially social realism trend, is a reflection of society. From the end of the 80s until the end of 2000s, we cannot encounter a film that centrally focuses on the poor people and makes the problems of the poor people the center of the film. However, since the end of 2000s, there have been, again depending on the

awakening of class awareness in the society, films which display poor characters, and can be considered to be in the scope of social realism (although there are significant differences in the film types).

One of the thesis of this dissertation is that ‘social realist films began at the beginning of 1960s and they are finished at the end of 1980s due to the societal changes. The films which are thought in social realist lines provide the dates as time limits of thesis. I will also explain the reasons of the transformation since the end of 1980s to today: why social realist films were finished and have not been produced since the end of 1980s until the end of 2000s.

It must be considered that a lot of films in social realist line had serious troubles with the political regime because of the issues which they took interest. There are two reasons for that: one is that, social realist films were seen as the extension and the representer of socialist ideology. Social realist films’ scripts which emphasize always the matters of poor people were met by the regime (right parties) as a threat for their government. Right parties were afraid much because of these films produce a class consciousness and a societal standing against their power.

It can not be claimed that social realist films reflect the general tissue and character of Turkish cinema. That is the one of the stimulating reasons of this study: Social realism opened an original channel in Turkish cinema which had not been tried before.

After the definings the main concepts used in the dissertation, we need to enlighten another dimension. This dimension is the ‘time’ dimension. Thesis will travel in three time periods: 1960s, 1970s, 1980s and as it can be expected, all phases have different points which are emphasized in the film scripts. The poor people of different phases faced different problems in urban area. Especially in 1960s, because of the majority of urban poor had included to the city life by migration, poor people had serious economic and cultural problems with city. In 1970s, as it happened generally in society, ‘politics’ and ‘political polarization’ were added to the life of urban poor. In 1980s, urban poor moved away its class standing and got into a

dissolution process under attack of neo-liberalism. Naturally, the reflections of these cases are come into existence in several forms in the films.

In that respect, thesis is open to a triple-dimension interrogation in the issues which I am targeting: the first dimension is the examination of the conversion of urban poor in 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. The standing and the identity of poor people in the films will be interrogated; the transformation of the character of poor which is timid and withdrawn of the 1960s converted in the time to the one which tries to adapt to the city life in 1970s and to play the game with the rules of city life in 1980s.

The second dimension is the change in social realist films in 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. The cinema language and cinematic preferences of films changed in the time to a great extent: being under affect of melodrama in 1960s, the political acrimony in 1970s and individuation by dissecting group stance in 1980s have their own reasons and must be inspected along the thesis.

The third dimension is the transformation of the relation between urban poor and social realism in Turkish cinema for every phase: for 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. While class consciousness was developing among Turkish urban poor in 1960s, that consciousness was also one of the main reasons for the occurrence of social realism in Turkish cinema. That relation and support of poor people encouraged social realist films in 1970s to increase their stiff tone against system but losing the same support was one the foremost reasons of weakening of social realist films in 1980s. So, we can say, first two integrations are based on mostly 'historical analysis' and last interrogation is leaned on intersection point of cinema and sociology.

One of the things I aim to show is that how and in which ways the problems of urban poor are problematized in social realist films. It is accepted that social realist films' main theme and goal are the matters of poor people but as we mentioned above, this is changing due to the time which while films were made, the script of the film and the perceiving of the director of the film.

Exploring the journey of urban poor in social realist films can not be realized by only economic / material criteria. It will be needed to account for the, cultural phenomena which shapes the lives of urban poor. At this point, modernity and class formations along the history of Turkish Republic will be hoped to assist the analysis.

I have determined the films by different directors; in doing this, it is believed that this choice will provide a chance to view the matters of urban poor from a different perspective. Nevertheless, films had different forms and cinema languages changing in every decade, 1960s, 1970s, 1980s: the issues which they discussed and focused were also different.

The subject is important in two aspects. The first aspect is production relations and it is the triggering reason of the changes in the modernity. Turkey had a serious transition in its capitalism process after 2nd World War. The rapid urbanization and the rise of the mass of the urban poor can be explained within ‘the context of this’ rapid development of the capitalist relations of production. As Adaman-Keyder state, the migration in Turkey beginning with 1950s can be understood with the mechanism of by ‘pull-push’ duality. The mechanization in agriculture and insufficient agricultural areas which can not feed the increasing population, form the ‘push’ side of this duality. The developing industry sector which needed the labor power forms the ‘pull’ side. The migrating masses were pushed by countryside and pulled in the same time by urban environment (Adaman-Keyder, 2006:19). Traditional agricultural production relations were broken and changed; the rural economy was not to be able to feed the peasant masses. On the other hand, the newly-structured Turkish industry needed labor force in its factories.

The other aspect is Turkish modernity; Turkish modernity between 1960s and 1980s had undergone important changes, especially in the respect of urban poor phenomenon. During this period, most of the urban poor were added to the city environment by migration, they adapted to the city and produced a different culture and life style in the city.

The transformation of Turkish society since 1960s to 1980s have been realized in two dimensions: one dimension is the transition in production relations. That phase is 'passing to capitalism' and it is related with social organization and classes. This phase should be interpreted by classical Marxist perspective. Other aspect is 'modernization' and it is related with cultural and social practices. That process can be commented by the help of neo Marxist / neo liberal approaches mostly.

We can define the position of migrant people before their migration to city as 'peasant'. Peasants were converted to 'urban poor' as their first social status in the city. Urban poor must be examined by 'relative poverty' concept. Urban poor passed to the next stage and gained a 'working class' status. This means actually the 'material formation of working class'. They are sharing the same position in the working / production relations. After that, 'working class' was on the way that was going to 'class consciousness'. Class consciousness is considered as the peak stage in Marxist understanding for the people who share the same position in production relations.

I am using 'relatively poor' term in my study because almost all poor in the films are not in 'absolute poverty' situation. Relative poverty here refers the people whose spending money level stays under the average of society's spending money level. It is needed to allocate 'modernization' dimension into 'transition in production relations'. There can be two reasons for that: firstly, modernization is the result and the extension of production relations. The import and the settling of capitalist resulted in its sociological structure: modernity. Other reason is that our study is showing tendency to interpret the concepts in a Marxist perspective. Marxism is giving priority to production relations as the first notion to understand the societal conversions.

Before 1960s, production relations were under control of 'tradesman / shopkeeper' logic. This logic is supported in society by two aspects: merchant and small scale industry manufacturer. Domestic economy is the principal way in production relations in countryside. Due to mechanization of agriculture production, product

was being decreased relatively and on the other hand, population was being increased.

The social standing and the status of poor people can be defined in different terms in regards of the positions that they gain. If we use 'lower class', that means we refer its socio-economic status. If we use 'working class', that refers their place in production relations. In 1960s, urban poor extracted two different sub-groups: one of them is working class, other one is 'lumpen proletariat', or reserved army, with Marxist definition.

While we have a look to 1960s, we are facing three main themes in the six films that will be analysed: The notions we encounter in the social realist films of 1960s are elements such as immigration, class awareness, class struggle, and cultural conflicts. For these films from 60s, it is possible to mention 3 different emergent approaches; first of all, 'weariness of capitalism', a concept which spreads into the contents of the films in which the poor characters who are born and raised in the city are suffocated by the gears of the capitalist system; in this context, the struggle of characters to rip apart the system that crushes them will be emphasized (*Gecelerin Ötesi*, *Acı Hayat*). Another trend is the increasing emphasis on class struggle which especially can be traced in the films whose scripts were written by Vedat Türkali. The idea of class struggle arising from socialist ideology and consequently, class awareness is tied to be taught to the poor and to the society in general (*Otobüs Yolcuları*, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*). The main concept and question of the third trend is immigration. The industry was getting more powerful, institutionalized and as in other countries in the world, becoming the prime actor in economy, has provided the need for the transformation of the immigrant rural poor into workers, cheap labor as the potential material basis of a future 'working class'. The city is a place where the means of making a living and consuming are considered to be relatively abundant in relation to the place of origin. City whets rural people's appetite economically, also promises them a living standard and chain of opportunities they cannot obtain in the rural world. The films on immigration also reflect the cultural conflicts which rural people have in modern-urban life, following immigration (*Gurbet Kuşları*, *Bitmeyen Yol*).

When examining the social realist films of 1970s, the first thing we can see is the extent of the politicization of society. We encounter, sometimes, films discussing the paradigms and challenges of the left and sometimes, films trying to convey class awareness based on socialist ideology (Arkadaş, Maden, Demiryol). Apart from these, the concept of immigration did not cease to be an element of discussion and curiosity in the social realist line; from place of origin in usually rural areas to the margins of cities usually, called as ‘gecekondu’ (shanty) areas and passage from production relationships based on agriculture to informal sectors or industry-based production relationships after immigration, became one of the elements which can be observed in 70s. The cultural confusion, a natural result of immigration to the city for the poor people should not be disregarded (Gelin, Düğün, Diyet, Yusuf ile Kenan). In our list, in contrast to class’ stance as a mass in 70s, there are also films that contain persons who cannot make of himself in the system and undertake an individual fight and reckon with the system. These films which are based on Yılmaz Güney’s scripts goal to idealize their lead characters and generate an anti-system stance through them (Umut, Düşman).

Moving on to 80s, the first phenomenon we come up is that, largely due to the military coup of 1980, the dissolution of the political aspects in the films. The films are of a more sociological nature and they leave their lead characters to individuals rather than to talk about the stories of a group. Here too, individual-based texture of liberalism which is a characteristic of the 1980s mainstream ideology can easily be detected. Another aspect that attracts attention in these films is that the urban poor individuals’ being carried off by the ‘consumer society practices’ that were gradually becoming more and more common and feeling themselves in the need to ‘move on to higher class’ in order to be able to consume more. Although the immigration phenomenon had slowed down compared to the 60s and 70s, it can still find a place in 80s social realist films (At, Bir Avuç Cennet). In this connexion, the daily life practices of the ‘gecekondu’ (a word which is used form ‘slums’ in Turkish but it comprises more than ‘slums’ word in a lot of dimensions) in 80s (Bir Yudum Sevgi) and the spread of the free market economy which attacks aggressively to the society and makes itself dominant (Faize Hücum) become important themes. We will also have the opportunity to look into the 80s political class struggle of the poor people

(Çark); additionally, there will be chance to question how consumer society which was packaged by the free market economy as a bright target in which should be involved and the wish to climb up the social ladder, affected the poor people (Yoksul, Düttürü Hayat).

The urban poor mostly dealt with immigration, class struggle and class consciousness concepts in 1960s. Immigration that was accelerated in 1950s, and carried rural poor people into the cities become even stronger in 60s and added two concepts directly related to itself, gecekodu and urbanization which entered the terminology of both society and politics.

As a matter of fact, the influence of the leftist thought on society in general and of course, on the urban poor, increased in 1970s. It is obvious that as the 1970s was the most politicized period of Turkey, it was also the most politicized period of poor people. With the many concepts such as union, strike, political resistance, etc. the urban poor inhaled the air of class consciousness and experienced to have a 'class standing' mostly in this period.

In 1970s, urban poor people who became more and more a part of the city and settled yet who expressed themselves within a hybrid culture somewhere between the rural and urban life were experiencing the class concept with the influence of the now highly empowered left politics. Urban poor was in a tide between the traditional codes of rural and modernist codes of the city on the basis of their natural habitat, gecekodu.

The urban poor people that came to a city for the first time by immigration and settled were not challenged only economically but were also culturally taken aback by their first contact with the city life. The concepts in which urban poor are born and raised in the city were exposed to, were both the consumer society practices brought about by the capitalist production model and the class consciousness the leftist movement wanted to awaken in the lower class, both of which were pretty new for Turkey and Turkish low income people alike.

In 1980s, as the neo-liberal ideology and free market economy took over the system, urban poor experienced greater oppression. Instead of the dynamic, aggressive and 'struggling-to-change-the-system' poor people of 1970s, a new poor type emerged under the ruling of the system, as one of the results of the collapse of the class consciousness of 60s and 70s, trying to practice the ways of consumer society. This situation found its reflection in the cinema as well and the number of films that can be included in social realism decreased and eventually ended by the end of 80s.

In 1980s, the lower class was a part of urban life even more than individuals who lived the modern practices of the cities to the fullest extent. For its cause, we can state that it redesigned the city in accordance with its own culture and life style; as the city altered it, it altered the city. Nevertheless the neo-liberal economic practices which declared their sovereignty rasped urban poor opposition against the system, embracing it more into the system as an extension and a passive element of the system.

1.2. Outline of the Thesis

The thesis is composed of 6 chapters. The first chapter is consisted of different sections which are explaining theoretical and methodological issues of thesis, to help the reader for influencing the scientific road which thesis is going to follow. Introductory section which is providing general information about the reasons, contribution and goals of thesis is the first. Poverty, social realism and class concepts which are the three main notions that form the main axis of thesis together, will be examined exhaustively under the separate titles. Thesis will also give place to the transformation of Turkish society and low income people, sociology of art, cinema, film, Turkish cinema, social realism and social realism in Turkish cinema. By doing so, the theoretical roof will be constructed in the mind of reader and the reader will be informed sufficiently about the chapters which will analyze the films. Thesis is going to speaking of the goal of the study and presumptions, historical analysis and research techniques. These sections are closely related with methodological side of thesis: thesis is realizing a historical analysis along 1960s, 70s and 80s.

The intrinsic chapters of thesis are second, third and fourth chapters. The thesis will use the accumulation of information in first chapter for the analysis and discussion of the films in the following four chapters.

The second chapter is focusing on the life of urban poor and the social realist films of 1960s. Primarily, reflections of both the changes in the production relations in 60s and the progress of the capital class on the society will be studied. The position of concepts such as immigration, class struggle and class consciousness in the 1960s' social realist films will be observed.

In the third chapter, again the economic and sociological changes in the society will be analyzed and the reasons behind rising political tensions will be examined. In the social realist films of the 1970s, class struggle, class consciousness, class and politics relations, immigration and place (gecekondu) concepts will be dealt with.

In the fourth chapter, the domination of changes in the society and neo-liberal ideology exerted on Turkish society will be analyzed; and in the films of the 1980s, we shall try to understand the guidance and effect of consumer society practices, class consciousness and capitalism concepts on society.

Fifth chapter will be looking for the answers of the questions which interrogate the changes that cinema and society have been experiencing since the end of 1980s, when our thesis claims the social realism ended, up to end of 2000s.

The sixth and the last chapter will not only analyze every chapter on its own, but also strive to compare and contrast these four chapters with one another. This is the conclusion and evaluation chapter.

1.3. Poverty and Urban Poor

'Poverty' is a kind of sub-field which joined to social sciences debates lately. Almost all poverty discussions have been improved in 20th century. "In the twentieth century, three main schools of thought developed about urban poverty. The 'ecological approach' put forward several models of the city" (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:321).

Ecological approach has been used mostly for the spatial and the environmental criteria while trying to explain the cases of urban poor.

“The second approach to urban poverty is the culturalist approach that develops in response to the ecological approaches in general. This approach basically develops around Oscar Lewis ideas” (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:322). Oscar Lewis is one of the first persons who realized academic studies on poverty throughout the world. In his famous article which was published in 1966, ‘The Culture of Poverty’, he claims that the poverty is a matter of heritage which passes from one generation to the next one: “Once the culture of poverty has come into existence, it tends to perpetuate itself. By the time slum children are six or seven, they have usually absorbed the basic attitudes and values of their subculture. Thereafter they are psychologically unready to take full advantage of changing conditions or improving opportunities that may develop in their lifetime ” (Lewis, 1966:21). It can be understood from these sentences that culturalist approach accepts a wide and general cultural consensus which is directing the life of poor people. “The culturalist approach tells that social groups of the slums generate their own moral order..” (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:335). ‘Moral order of slums (gecekondu)’ is an extension and a part of this general cultural consensus in gecekondu environment. “The culturalist approach points to the micro-scale dynamics of concentrated urban poverty. It explains primarily the behaviors of individuals and social groups in poverty and their life cycles” (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:336). Culturalist approach tries to understand the ‘daily life practices’ of poor people. We also should consider that culture of gecekondu is a hybrid culture and it has been formed by migrant people largely.

Another approach which can be talked about is the structuralist one (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:322) “.. most geographers have allied structuralist approaches with Marxian theories ..” (Knox – Pinch, 2010:2). In the words of David L. Harvey and Michael Reed, Marx’s approach to poverty is like that: ”Modern poverty .. is a necessary by-product of the social relations of production that capital employs in allocating person, materials and machines in the process of commodity production and distribution” .. “.. poverty, is a structural prerequisite grounded in the sociological contradictions of an historically specific mode of production” (Harvey – Reed, 1992:277). Structuralist

approach is responsible for the poverty of poor people in capitalist frame. Poverty is seen by this approach a concept will continue as far as capitalist system goes on and it is the natural result of the system which goals inequality already. “The structuralist approach shows that concentrated poverty is strongly related to the social polarization among different income groups and also to the process of further impoverishment among the already low income population. This approach basically deals with the macro-scale interventions, which are related to the socio-economic and political restructuring in the country” (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:336)

1.4. The Features of Urban Poor

Poor people have always economic matters and have a disadvantageous position in the system. İlhan Tekeli is juxtaposing the some facts in the life of poor people: “Poor people do not have house places which have enough breadth and quality, they do not have much time to improve societal relation nets, they are not equipped with enough knowledge and skills, they can not reach to the knowledge and financial resources which are appropriate for them. These conditions support to each other, and they lock up the poor in a life style which he can not exit” (Tekeli, 2000:145).

Tekeli interprets the other handicaps of poor people such as: “The experience of poverty is not only fewness of income, destitution from basic urban services; in the same time, living in low social status neighbourhood, marginalization in city environment, surviving his life in unhealthy environment conditions, to be able to benefit from justice, education, health services, to be open to violence more, not to have enough security” (Tekeli, 2000:145).

These kinds of disadvantages turn into exclusions for poor people. Adaman and Keyder determined that poor people is excluded due to different notions: these ones are economic exclusion, spatial exclusion, cultural exclusion and political exclusion (Adaman – Keyder, 2006:9-10). And else these ones, there is social exclusion. Social exclusion due to poverty can contain different type of people:” .. the ones who are excluded belong to many various groups (disabled, lonely old people, street kids etc.)” (Adaman – Keyder, 2006:6) and social exclusion is under affect of one notion

or more than one notion: “education, health, labor market, political rights etc.” (Adaman – Keyder, 2006:6). Adaman – Keyder’s research was done in the environment of 2000s but some facts of 2000s had never changed since 1960s, 1970s.

We must underline that ‘poor’ category is not a distinct social class in non-Western countries. This category contains different kinds of people, it is heterogeneous. It has ‘diversity’ and ‘plurality’ features, so, we should avoid specific class recognition which is used in Marxist theory. ‘Poor’ category is arising from set of distinct production relations which are implied by working class. That ‘diversity and plurality’ is sourced from that low income people are in different occupations and statuses in production relations. Some of them are in informal sector like street vendor etc. Some of them are working in industry sector, some of them are state officer and public worker. Some of them are the owners of the small shops.

Because of diversity, poor are not conscious of themselves as being a cohesive class that share interests. Diversity situation brings the complexity of social identity. Whereas, in Western industrialized countries, almost all low income people are dissolved and integrated to capitalist production relations.

“.. in developing countries, the growth speed of modern section can not provide the employment to whole population of country. It is called generally informal or marginal that the occupations which are formed by the rest of the society to survive their life, besides the patterns which modernity legitimize” (Tekeli, 2000:146-147). This is the result of that formal capitalist production relations do not have enough job positions to meet the demand and the need of poor people. “The urban peasants began to work in unfamiliar jobs, as itinerant vegetable vendors or doormen in apartment buildings, while their spouses cleaned houses (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:6). Urban poor mostly work in informal sector. These can be small scale manufacturing units, street vendors, petty trade and service sectors. They are, with a great proportion, wage laborer but ‘partly self employed’ ones can be seen.

Urban poor people have troublesome relations with economic life. The problems such as ‘off the record unemployment’, irregular income, destitution from social security nets, inadequacy of minimum wage are the common and perpetual cases for urban poor (Adaman-Keyder, 2006:23) Adaman-Keyder specifies some disadvantages of urban poor which are emerged due to the production relations that could not be capitalist %100 and still show some pre-capitalist features.

Lewis defined many features of the concept of poverty that accompanies the poor people: “illicit cohabitation and childbirth, motherhood at an early age, having many children consequently children growing up with insufficient care, lack of work ethics, hopelessness in life therefore lack of struggle to overcome poverty, lack of determination, discipline, idleness, tendencies towards any kinds of pressures including sexuality, alcoholism..” (Lewis’ten aktaran Yılmaz, 2008: 129). Some of the points listed by Lewis such as ‘hopelessness towards life’ or ‘alcoholism’ can be detected in the all the lower classes of the world. The factors such as ‘lack of determination, discipline, idleness’ are not exclusive to lower class though may be more frequently encountered; it may also be real in middle and higher class. Apart from this, a point which lower class conservatism and dominant Turkish norms cannot accept ‘illicit cohabitation and childbirth’ also mentioned above. Lewis, actually, listed these points mostly for Latin American countries.

In the films that we examine, the workers are far from these characteristics. Almost all workers in social realist films are virtuous, hardworking, idealist and proud of their labor. It would be wrong to associate this condition with the films’ excessively idealizing the workers; on the contrary, an important part of the workers desire to earn their livelihood through working and labor, although it might be an informal income.

We may accept that gecekondu cause ‘district discrimination’ from the perspective of the rest of the urban residents: “this also causes labelling by place (territorial stigmatization) by the police, courts, local authorities, and other urban residents. For the average urban residents, these places are a source of urban pathology in terms of

crime and ethnic origins and they cannot integrate into the urban fabric” (Yılmaz, 2008:141).

It is a very common condition that the residents of the city that grew up in the urban culture label the lower class people. Thesis will also focus on the ‘counter imaginary’ of migrants for the urban settlers:

“** The denial of de facto values and rules of the society, dependence on government (if the government provides them with the monetary help such as unemployment aid, they would never work again)

** Denial of work ethics (they sit around in coffee shops all day long and send their children to work on the streets)

** Collapse of ethics (they invade the cities, plundered the lands, they are dirty and clueless about city life)

** Lack of family values (they have 10 children and let them on the streets, they do not care about their whereabouts)

** They are prone to committing crimes (they are the head of seizure by violence, drugs, and pickpocketing, even their children are thieves; they are all terrorists anyway)” (Yılmaz, 2008:142).

There is no reason not to use these labels that were revealed during a field study in Tarlabası in early 2000s in retrospective too. Almost all of the low income people are migrants and they are exposed to the humiliations by many people that belong to the urban culture.

1.5. Slums (Gecekondu)

The conditions of labor or experience in working place did not constitute the entire universe of urban poor. It is needed to see also their living conditions in gecekondu and cultural sphere which is ornamented by their values.

Bediz Yılmaz defines the concept of gecekondu that we frequently encounter in the films that we analyze, a common poor people settlement: “neighborhoods that lack urban services such as planning and infrastructure and are composed of houses usually built by their residents on the lands they do not usually own” (Yılmaz, 2008:131-132). This definition of Yılmaz defines the living places of the masses that uncontrollably poured into the cities. “They tried to safeguard the traditional rural lifestyles in makeshift abodes – gecekondu – they built on the outskirts” (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:6).

Tahire Erman classified the people who live in gecekondu due to the phase which they live in. She thinks the perception for gecekondu people by the rest of society due to the phase: “The representation of the gecekondu people varies in different time periods, namely, the ‘rural other’ in the 1950s and 1960s; the ‘exploited/disadvantaged other’ in the 1970s; the ‘diversified others in terms of ethnicity, religious sect and gender’, and the ‘undeserving rich other’ versus the ‘urban poor other’ in the 1980s and 1990s; and finally the ‘threatening other/varoşlu’ vs. the ‘gecekondu people as agents’ in the late 1990s and 2000s” (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org). The living place of urban poor who are the main axis of our thesis is gecekondu, with a great measure. So, understanding how these people are perceived will be one of the conducive points to enrich our discussions. In the same time, it will enlighten the changing status of urban poor in city life.

The distance which emerged between rural and urban people at first, did not disappear along 1950s and 60s. But in 1960s, as İbrahim Yasa detected in his search, gecekondu family slightly changed and rid out from his strict peasant structure: “The occurrence of the features of urban family and the features of countryside family together, in the structure and the function of this institution made it a unique type”. Yasa thinks also that, gecekondu family “.. sustains the countryside features that it considers as useful, on the other hand, conceded by and by the part of urban features that it approves ..” (Yasa, 1970:10).

“.. slum people have been built always ‘other’. Either they are inadequate as culturally or disadvantageous as economically or poor and need help or become rich

undeservedly. But they stay always as ‘other’ .. It was detected in a research in Ankara in 2002 that the large majority of slum people recognized themselves as ‘slum people’ .. but this identity is emerged mostly as a passive acceptance of a case which can not be denied, can not be refused and it means acceptance of a case which expresses societal and physical disadvantage, which is not wanted usually (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org). In one side, ‘being someone from gecekonu’ gives the one an interesting pride which the rest of the city people can not obtain. May be, gecekonu people try to cover their disadvantageous position in the life to acquire an identity. Like in Ankaragücü example, the name of the biggest fan group of Ankaragücü sport club of Ankara is ‘gecekonu’ (slum).

The moral and social order of urban poor is substantially conservative. Their conservatism is sourced from two dimensions: one is that they are continuing the values which have been inherited from the previous migrant generations, and they keep going on in the values that they have got used to. The second dimension is arisen from their cultural re-action against the city. Especially, migrant-rooted poor got into a cultural protective behavior against the modernist / urban life which migrants are totally unfamiliar and are displaying tenacity for their pre-modern values strictly. The values they had and the place (gecekonu) they lived in provided to their subconscious a ‘safe’ and ‘relax’ feeling; they feel themselves more comfortable psychologically.

“Since the last two decades, the social and economic transformations world-wide have led to serious discussions .. concepts like ‘new poverty’, ‘hyper segregation’ and ‘concentrated poverty’ have become to define socially and economically polarized groups” (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:322). The first reason of these new concepts is the inequality in income distribution which has deepened since the beginning of 1980s. The neo-liberal policies have protected and stimulated only the people who have capital and the ones who earn their lives by their labor, or in another word ‘the dispossed’, have been left vulnerable.

Gecekonu concept and criteria were changed since 1980s. Bediz Yılmaz underlined the change in discourse which is used through the urban poor people. She claims that

there has been a converting from ‘integrative poverty’ to ‘discriminative poverty’. She is defining the integrative poverty as a “traditional situation which poor people are not exposed to labeling” (Yılmaz, 2006:38). Discriminative poverty is based on mostly considering the poor people as a ‘threat’ in city environment. This fear and dislike feelings are against to poor who have been added to city by migration substantially.

Occurrence of a group which has been becoming impoverished continuously since the beginning of 1980s has been depended on unemployment, wage and social service concepts. All these concepts have been converted against the interests of poor people and ‘total development and progress’ discourse which was important after 2nd World War died out (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org).

It can be said that the most important result of the phase since 1980s has been the polarization of social groups. The society has divided two pieces roughly: the ones who have property and the ones who do not have. This polarization and separation cannot be compared with the similar dichotomies in the history because the exploitation and inequality of income distribution have reached the inconceivable numbers.

Zafer Doğan assumes that “firstly, it is needed to separate the poverty in ‘varoş’ and the poverty in collapse areas at city centres” (Doğan, 2004, teorivepolitika.net). Tahire Erman is opening a new term and category for urban poor. This is term is ‘varoş’. Varoş and gecekondu terms can be translated as ‘slums’ to English but varoş, with Ermans using, gains a cultural identity. “It is brought together under the name of ‘varoşlu’ (the one from varoş) violence and societal disorder, political threat against system as Islamist fundamentalism and illegal factious left and being inadequate as culturally” (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org).

Doğan makes this separation based on their struggle and claims that poor in collapse areas have no desire to realize a struggle: ”Poor people here, first of all, are deprived of possibilities to rid of their poverty; moreover, they have lost the belief (to rid of)”. He evaluates the ‘varoş’ poor more active and demanding”: “Varoş poor have a kind

of character which strive to change their societal position that they have, which is open to utilize any kind of opportunities they meet and which is benefiting from all formal or informal initiatives and opportunities for that”. In his opinion, slums in Turkey had a transformation from ‘gecekondu’ to ‘varoş’ concept: “One of the most important fulcrums of commercialization fact in gecekondu is act of grace laws on construction which were released in 1980s one after the other”. The act of grace in 1984 gave a construction right to gecekondu owners to add four flat on their gecekondu. This process opened the way which carried gecekondu houses to the apartments. Of course, this case should not be understood as an urbanizations step; it was just a populist approach to guarantee high vote percentage in gecekondu areas for the political party which realized that. Doğan also is positioning this ‘transformation from gecekondu to varoş’ as the center of the class transformation in Turkey and considers that transformation parallel with the general change of Turkish society (Doğan, 2004, teorivepolitika.net). The transition from gecekondu to varoş terms also proves that the social tissue and structure of where urban poor were living changed. The 60s and 70s phases have gecekondu concept but we have to take into account the change that varoş concept came into prominence during 80s.

“The literature tells that the solidarity relations among urban poor help these residents to survive” (Özbek Sönmez, 2007:335). Solidarity may be the only way that empowers the struggling posture of gecekondu people against system. This standing has both sociological and political faces and in 1970s, that solidarity feeling became easily a supportive platform for leftist movement.

This gecekondu formation, although a source of vote as it is for the rightist line, is politically scary as well. “.. This fear that the workers may become into masses in some places..” again is a potential reflection of “.. the effect of dynamics of place on the class formation” on the political powers (Koçak, 2008:105). These fears have had legitimate reasons and they were to unfold in the years that follow. Gecekondu clustered and bloomed around the factories took the position of providing people to potential strikes and demonstrations. “.. as in the statement of a manager of Arçelik company which settled in Haliç at 1950s in connection with the strikes that became frequent in 1960s, ‘unions were stacking women and children to the place where

strike took place, the factories that were already in the neighborhood found this event always in front of its door' “. (Acar, 1986:151). That is the proof that gecekondu region was the supplier and host of resistance. Nevertheless, this anxiety was not very valid for the Turkish society and this standing had not long breath. Since gecekondu region was composed mostly of conservative people, they usually preferred the right parties in the elections and they had a function as invisible fulcrum for the continuity of the existing regime.

In 1980s and 1990s, gecekondu areas have begun to perceive due to different identities, mostly to political ones. For instance, “slum areas in press are seen as ‘Islamist’ like Sultanbeyli or ‘radical left / terrorist’ like Küçük Armutlu” (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org). This can be one of the answers of urban poor to the system which discriminated and ignored since the beginning of 1980s. In spite of all inculcations of system which tried to make whole society apolitic and succeeded that to a large extent; urban poor, especially young generations, answered this act to head radical political streams. This answer was based on to economic reasons as well as to social exclusion and scornful perspective of system to poor people.

We can interrogate also whether interventionist politics of the state on urban poor has aggravated the social tension and conflict or not. All political parties try to speak on behalf poor people and have a claim that they are representing poor people but in a capitalist society, almost all political parties are natural extension and advocate of capital groups and there is only one exception for this fact in Turkish history; Workers Party of Turkey. Urban poor cannot be counted as social force with their inner dynamics but in Turkey, due to class consciousness which was emerged in 1960s and 1970s, urban poor gained a ‘class’ identity and standing for temporarily period.

1.6. Class and Its Definition

Class as a presupposition or an existing category is a concept that helps us to group people that cluster together in social life. Doğu Ergil defines class as: ”Classes are social sections that have unique economic interests different that other sections and

have an awareness of their position in social order (hierarchy)". This organization composed of the individuals that are gathered around 'we' notion, passes on its privileges and values to the next generation. In modern society, this passage is realized through the smallest unit of the society, the institution of family. It is clear that the feeling of belonging to the same group and sharing same values generates solidarity within the class (Ergil, 1986:118).

The concept of class is mostly examined in Marxist theory. Actually the notion of 'class' is the basis of Marxism because it regards human history to be a whole composed of class conflicts and their consequences. According to Öngen, the most significant advantage of class in Marxist thought is, it is the concept that best resolves the power relations submerged in social transformation, when compared to other social economic, educational and cultural criteria (Öngen, 1999:27). Bertell Ollman also states that the reason behind Marx's employing the class concept as such a fundamental notion is that the phenomena he wants to explain is so closely related to class (Ollman, 2006:101). Ideologies out of/against Marxism carry the lack of class consciousness in the laborers as far as ontological denial of class concept. According to them, class is an imaginary construction without a real foundation (Öngen, 2002:10).

The target mass of our thesis, the lower class (dependent classes), is the class that, in the Marxist understanding of class, does not own either property or control of the means of production. It is economically exploited and socially ruled by the investor class that withholds access to the means of production (Arslan, 2004:129). The most common feature of the lower class is that it does not own the property of any means of production as much as that its monthly income is beneath a certain amount.

It is possible for people from different life styles to share the same working relations position. Although it is seen rare, variations in educational and cultural levels is also possible. Accordingly, considering the class as a homogeneous structure would be a primary mistake to be avoided.

Class in the modernist sense was motivated by the incentives of the capitalist system. Ergil (1986:69), is of the opinion that the stratum system of pre-capitalist era has a social order based on political rights and status, and states that class system is based on economic factors moving on from obtained privileges, not inherited ones. In modern society, social status cannot be passed on but property can be passed on to the next generation.

The continuation of a system based on classes is ensured through institutions. The social consensus controlled by legal institutions and elections held at defined intervals are the main elements of the contract constructed between the classes. A consensus as such remains through the balancing elements between the classes unless there is a forced intervention from either. This balance and consensus is called 'democracy (Ergil, 1986: 78).

İnsel says that "social classes have common symbols, life styles and values" .. "societal relations between social classes are usually limited. This slack or distance of relation shows itself clearly, just as in-class marriages, in sharing the place together, in school, in the entertainment places that are gone, in the cultural activities that are included. Social classes draw a line of habitat" (İnsel, 2008:26). That the classes have such a relationship can be perceived as a modern caste system.

To expand the examples of class distinction, we can add that the neighborhood each class inhabits, is separate from the others and individuals often marry someone of their own class. Other social relations are also similar: they usually befriend people from their own class and spend leisure time together (Ergil, 1986:80). They realize similar social deeds. It can even be understood that two individuals originate from the same class through the similar deeds they do.

1.7. Class Consciousness and Class Struggle

Another Marxist writer Bertell Ollman interprets class conflict as a phenomenon independent of individual's disposition: he claims that people automatically participate in class struggle; this participation does not emerge up to people's

demand and moreover, people prefer mostly the side which is against their interests (Ollman, 2006:44). We find Ollman's approach utterly correct. Nonetheless if we try to apply this definition to Turkish society, we would like to add the explanation that the term 'class structure' is more appropriate than 'class conflict' as our personal opinion is of the idea that, in Turkish society, as in any society, there are classes by definition and by structure yet class conflict is non-existent apart from some exceptional periods.

In the evaluation of differentiation between 'class in itself' and 'class for itself', Marx regards class in itself as a group of people who has developed nothing in common other than a political structure and national relationship between themselves. The cultural stance of a group of people, become distinct and conflicting because of their positions in relations of production, social roles and their interpretations of life. This distinction indicates a creation of a class, yet, this is by no means a 'class for itself' (Marx, 1990:138). The mentioned approach of Marx is correct and valid for us as well. Class exists as a social reality but as long as it is not organized and striving, there is no class consciousness worth mentioning.

Öngen thinks that the way to achieve the concept of 'class for itself' by Marx is the politization of the class: " .. It can be stated that, Marx does not regard the functioning of classes as social powers, meaning the becoming of 'class in itself' to 'class for itself', as a consequence of the economy's operations 'on its own' (as a linear process). It would be better to state that class for Marx is a resort for the separation between economy and politics, and he considers the class conflict as the surpassing of this resort" (Öngen, 2002:23). From the interpretation by Öngen, we see that Marx does not consider class as a passive neutral element under socio-historical conditions: he reviews the class as an agent who should politicize and take action.

Susan Olander states that Charles Wright Mills defines class consciousness by three points: "

(1) An awareness of one's own class interest and identification;

(2) An understanding of the inherent conflict of interest with other classes; and

(3) A willingness to engage in political struggle to realize class interest “ (Ostander, cited from Mills, 1980:81).

It can be claimed that these three points also form mostly the foundation on which the leftist Turkish intellectuals direct their criticisms towards the lower (laborer) economic class. The poor masses in Turkey lack the identity of a class with a great extent, are clueless (or indifferent) about conflict between the classes and most importantly, are far from being in a struggle concerning its own class.

The first reason to emerge when we search for the reasons behind this is that the Industrial Revolution never happened in Turkey. Neither the working class nor the awareness of the working class flourished in Turkish society that does not have a history that generated modernity and capitalism. Just as any other notion related to modernity and capitalism, class awareness too, was imported and constructed from above. Although our personal opinion is in the direction that class awareness developed in a Jacobean coding, it is claimed that class awareness in Turkey also, like in Western countries, formed out of inner dynamics of class and class conflict. Even if we respect this idea and we accept that class consciousness has developed in the time, we insist that at least in the beginning phases, intellectuals and leftist parties pioneered to teach the working class ‘the rules of the game’. We insist because, the laborer class in Turkey may have reached a quantity nevertheless, it does not display as a quality, reflexes of a class. Union, a party to defend the interests of the class, demonstrations, strikes, and protests are non-existent concepts in the history of these people: this is even more relevant for people who had migrated from the village to the cities and become laborers. Nonetheless, we know that the people of leftist thought and cinema/arts society in 1960s put in an effort to teach what actions to take to the laborers who had reached a certain number but still did not know what to do.

We need to accept that awareness of the class happens through strife and the class becomes a tradition, a culture to pass on to the next generations. Since the early 19th century, the time accepted to be the beginning of the modernity, a limited number of

labor awakenings in Turkey, never reached a sizable strength that would oppress the investing class and enforce the investing class to do what it is needed in terms of rights or profits of labor class.

As a consequence of that, we need to underline the ‘needy’ culture of the lower economic class. This culture is a refugee feeling, a blindfolded gratitude towards the employer for employing them. This common perspective in non-Western societies degrades themselves to the position of a gear in the system while reducing the importance of their labor and life.

As Savran states, some contemporary intellectuals hold class conflict in disrespect and regard the ones who mention it to be people tracking a time already left in the past. They also review the notion ‘class conflict’ as an out of date approach (Savran, 2010:23). Judging class conflict or the notion of class in general in terms of fashion, in any case, is far from being a scientific analysis. Opposing to notion of class is a methodological mistake here likely.

On the subject of class’s existence without class awareness, Ayşe Buğra says: “we are aware that the question whether we shall use the concept of class where people do not express their experience and themselves with class terminology, has had a very determinative impact on the discussions about class since then” (Buğra, 2008:9). We can easily expect people who condition the existence of a class to class awareness and class struggle, to state that ‘there are no classes in Turkey.’

Aslihan Aykaç Yanardağ interprets the concepts of ‘class awareness’ and ‘class struggle’ as such: “class awareness is a consequence of the workers’ collectively becoming aware of the structure of capitalist production process based on exploitation and their being excluded from owning the property of the means of production; class awareness also forms the foundation of class struggle formed in various organized structures” (Yanardağ, 2008:152). Yanardağ, with an unusual choice, attaches class struggle to class consciousness instead of the vice versa. Becoming aware of the abuse does not always result in class consciousness. Although class consciousness usually end, in class struggle, the forming of a class

awareness depends on many factors and criteria, not only realization of the abuse. Today also, many laborers are aware of being exploited yet this abuse does not generate a feeling of consciousness and solidarity, naturally not resulting in class struggle as a consequence of awareness.

Yanardağ considers “the forming of a class culture as the social foundations of proleterianization” (Yanardağ, 2008:168). This definition is a valid inference in our opinion: the forming of class consciousness and struggle depends on forming of class culture. The forming of the class culture provides individuals with the feeling and attitude of a proletarian (a laborer).

Yanardağ’s research about tourism workers is significant for showing the consciousness of lower class in Turkey. In her research on tourism workers, she comments: “..When compared to their directors or managers it cannot be said that they are aware of their positions class wise or that they mention anything about it” (Yanardağ, 2008:168-169). It is ascertained that compared to capital owning class or more educated middle class members working on higher salaries, lower economic class is a long way behind in respect of class awareness. This is compatible with Marx’ expectation that socialism phase is following capitalism. For our part, we may add that white collar workers would have to lead such a social transformation from capitalism to socialism.

İlhan Tekeli firstly assumes, to break the cycle of poverty in regards of poor people, “an organized community” (Tekeli, 2000:155). “After emergence of social power such as, it would become easier relatively to transform this to political power and becoming effective in political platform. There is no possibility for poor people who are not organized, look for their own salvation way one by one, to use their political rights efficiently. What these people can only do is to apply clientelistic political practices and hoping help from paternalistic attitudes” (Tekeli, 2000:155).

Capitalism, no doubt about that, considers poverty and poor people as a threat for itself and develops some strategies to handle poverty. Tekeli writes some of them like that: “.. in some cases, to show poverty matter as small and unimportant, to

handle it as an individual disharmony problem more than as a societal problem .. If this fact covers the large masses as can not be concealed, problem is tried to show great and comprehensive at the level which can be solved by a second type exaggeration” .. “In some cases, it is legitimized producing the pressure over these masses by showing these masses also dangerous classes” (Tekeli, 2000:150-151).

Behind the logic of capitalism which would like to leave the masses unconscious in regards of class consciousness, there is its need for wide labor masses:“ Capitalist system which modernity leans need unemployed reserve labor armies to keep profitableness rates high” (Tekeli, 2000:147).

1.8. Class and Politics Relations

One of the goals that dominant class and state share is perpetuating the ignorance of all classes -except dominant class- about their own benefits. Thus, they can prevent them from forming awareness of their class. This is their way to reinforce their domination. However, the classes without class consciousness cannot fully go through a system change: they only strive to enhance their material conditions. The dominant class and the government try to establish their ideological hegemony over the society as much as possible, because they are aware of the fact that the space they occupy and the power they can exercise, is directly proportional to ideological propagation (Ergil, 1986:155-160). It is a well-known fact that, especially in developed countries, system gives a share of the social welfare to the middle and lower classes which actually is a ‘hush money’ and ‘some sort of bribe’. This ensured that the relationship between the system and lower and middle class proceed without any tension. We do not think that the middle and lower class of Western countries passively wait for this charity as claimed above. In contrast, this welfare they have achieved is a fruit of their struggle to raise the value of their labor. It would be accurate to associate the high levels of injustice in income distribution in Turkey and the countries as such, with lack of class struggle to raise awareness and improve their rights.

The political orientation of class/classes and especially the lower class is found mostly in Marxism. Marx believes that the agent to carry the society to the social structure he aims is the worker class. We may accept that Marx, Engels and their successor, Lenin displayed a Jacobean attitude while leading the worker class and in our opinion, this is not the best approach. Socialist thought and society model should be a creation born from its own inner dynamics. Also, not only the working class but all classes in a society should participate in and internalize the transformation. What Marx said was applied in Soviet Union and partially, Turkey. The strife of the intellectuals to spread socialist consciousness to the society and especially to the working class in Turkey did not result in that the worker class would internalize socialism. Of course, the precautions taken by the capital owners and the government which has been controlled by investor class were effective in this, however the major aspect was that socialism is a model of society, not something to be spread or followed through propaganda.

The mission cut out for the lower economic class, does not in the exact sense have a counterpart in Turkey. We cannot claim to have seen the worker class in a framework that aims to put pressure on the decision-making process around organizations such as political parties of unions apart from the effort to some extent between 1960 – 1980. We observe that the worker spheres play a bigger part and have more effect in the forming of the society in Western societies. We guess that classical Marxist discourse regards the benefits of the worker class to be in parallelism with the benefits of the society in general, and believes that the liberation of the working class will bring about the liberation of the society.

It is asserted that the modernist institutions within the class such as chambers, unions, parties are closely related to the representation of the interests of the classes (Arslan, 2006:375). It is however, difficult to say that such a representation exists in Turkish society protecting the interests of the lower economic class. Apart from Workers Party of Turkey having seats in the parliament in 60s, there has not been a party defending the benefits of the worker class throughout the history of the Republic. Moreover, even whether the unions founded to help protect the benefits of the worker class has been able to protect the benefits of the workers against the

capital owning class is open the debate, that is of course, when we put aside the aggressive stance of DİSK in 70s. It was even rumored that the unions were organizations founded as a means to tame the worker class for the capital owner class and were servants for the benefits of the capital owning classes.

We also have to mention the two attitudes that can be observed in the lower class in terms of politics: the individuals in lower income class can be supporters of a radical political trend or they may choose to isolate themselves all together from politics in connection to a religious submission. But a scene as such does not ensure that these groups will always be isolated from politics: as occurred in the religious revolution in Iran, in the right sociological conditions, they may affect the politics considerably (Ergil, 1986:101).

According to Ergil, the latter of the responses of individuals alienated from the system show a hidden danger because the masses who are thought to be pacified may charge back to the social area with high levels of emotional reactions. And these masses are a platform trusted by the organizations and leaders who are plotting great social changes. Ergil is of the opinion that these sorts of tendencies are a threat to open societies. The solution, according to him, is carrying the lower classes up to the intellectual level the system requires, and ensuring that they benefit from the profits of the system (Ergil, 1986:107-108).

The legal and political legitimization of inequality is the mission the state. State as mentioned before, is a result of inequality nonetheless, it is the institution that enables the continuation and regeneration of this inequality. The survival of social fractions with different interests together depends on the mediator role of the state as a superstructure (Ergil, 1986:144). It is expected that state function as an extension of the benefits of bourgeois in a social structure that it is the dominant class, and for the sake of continuity of the society protect the benefits of this class first, this is also the case Marxist tradition acknowledges. Unlike the bourgeoisie in the background, the state when necessary steps forward to gently help the lower class by providing social help to compensate for the unjust treatment through the capitalism: and when

necessary prevents threats to the continuity of the system by force, like police intervention on workers demonstrating for their rights.

State is a form alienated from the individual, a fetishistic institution. It is the isolation of the self-ruling power of the society from itself, giving that power to another dominator and imposing a stranger ruler on the society. This situation is true for all types of states.

Alienation happens when the state becomes more and more complex, complicated and tangled structure. When politics is detached from preferences and will of the people on the streets, the state turns into a superior institution over classes and becomes one and only institution ruling the politics. The state's becoming such a powerful institution independent from the social order pulls the classes into a struggle to take over the government (Ergil, 1986: 150-151). This struggle is realized to control the decision-making mechanisms and composing a social engineering through state to redesign the society with their own values. Undoubtedly, bureaucracy and its friend in the background, bourgeoisie are more advantageous in imposing their own class benefits comparing to other classes.

The most important instrument to soften the relations of the capitalism and capital owning class and working class is social democracy. More 'genial' and 'just' presentations of capitalism compiled with 'leftist' arguments, social democracy and social state, claimed to represent the left within the system. Savran's assertion is even more radical: it is a tool for bourgeois to bring the workers into the system and tame them. He is of the opinion that parties of the left wing are willing to compromise with capitalism and rule it with a leftist perspective (Savran, 2010:206-207). We do not have such an extreme point of view. If we consider from a pragmatist and practical aspect, stance and struggle as a class is possible in the capitalist system as well; social democratic fraction also supported this struggle to protect the rights of the working class. Still, it is doubtful whether social democracy can be a remedy to the problems of today's society as it occurred and developed in the particular conditions of the 2nd World War. The major reasons for the emergence of social democracy are the threat of communism, war, fascism, intense collective capital

regime and class struggles. None of these conditions exist today. The capital owning class would not compromise with capitalism in serious structural crisis; besides, social democracy is not compatible with the new accumulation regime, neoliberalism. In any case, social democracy protects the benefits of the middle class rather than the lower, it would be wrong to claim that it directly targets the lower class.

As Savran has given examples from the Western World, following the 2nd World War, the leftist parties claiming to represent the benefits of the working class, were far from being a threat to the countries' classes that held the capital. They have transformed into being an option for the right parties (Savran, 2010:215). Moving on from here we may have a say on the unions as well. It has always been voiced that the unions are tools to keep the working people of the capitalist society under the control of the dominant class. If we accept this claim, the unions, although may be not from the very beginning, gradually have become to function as a valve to control and soften the reactions of the working classes. Hence, that both leftist parties and unions have gradually become engaged with the system and naturally the capital classes, and they did not display a strong reaction towards those benefits, can be asserted.

Class in Turkish Social Sciences

It is a fact there are different class projections in Turkey due to the social substructures. As Aktas points out, "the basic positions are structural in middle-long term, dependent of economical transformations and more frigid in this sense. Nonetheless, the conjunctural reflexes of these class positions and possible class alliances are flexible and changeable" (Aktaş, 2006:54).

The violent reactions the little bourgeois and craftsmen displayed following the economic crisis of 2001 may be given as examples, moreover that these social groups provide a sociological substructure for various wings of rightist thought such as religiousness, patriotism and conservatism has been observed for multiple times (Aktaş, cited from Ergil, 2006:54).

It may be claimed that these classes are the ones that support the continuity of the system, protection of cultural phenomena, and quarrel with the groups that stand against the system, and this is true too; on the other hand however, the small bourgeoisie fought against the system even harder than the lower class due to that its benefits are damaged during the economic crisis. ‘Temperamental’ tendencies are common also in the classes that are called ‘the white collar’ and that became more visible in the social structure in accordance with the changing relations of production. The people who had been praising the system while it provided them with jobs, money, and various pleasures that money can buy, became system opposers after losing their jobs in the economic crisis and identified more with the lower class (Aktaş:54-55).

It is very rare to discuss the class phenomenon in the academy in Turkey. The two lines that would occupy the research if such research were to take place may be, “whether we can talk about class relations or class attitude in Turkey?” and “how further can we understand the classes in Turkey depending on Western class templates?” and in case the answer is negative “is there not a class structure specific to Turkey?” (Aktaş, 2006:44).

Hatice Kurtuluş and Asuman Türkün explain the reason behind researching so rarely about and using so hesitantly the notion of class in academic circles of Turkey as such: “..it is because the tradition of scientific production in Turkey is not sufficiently independent from the government, real politics and the sponsors of the scientific researches” (Kurtuluş-Türkün, 2006:254). The crossroad between Marxist ideology and government since the beginning of the republic resulted in the class concept’s being acknowledged as a term to stay away from.

Kurtuluş and Türkün do not find it surprising that through the history of social sciences in Turkey, the concept of ‘class’ had never been used in the analysis of Turkish society which had not experienced the social phases the West did: “..It is not strange that the notion of ‘class’ was neglected in the early phases of modern thought in Turkey which ideally imported a society where a similar social transformation had hardly started” (Kurtuluş-Türkün, 2006:241).

This methodological choice to keep a distance from the concept of class was actually compatible with social realities: “.. When it is considered that the industry has hardly developed, the class distinction is not yet reflected on places, life styles and consumption patterns..” (Kurtuluş-Türkün, 2006:244) it is not really possible to analyze the society based on classes. No doubt what we mean by classes should be the classes in capitalism because in Turkish society neither bourgeoisie nor working class can be mentioned in the Western sense; and what is, is quite limited. It is of course possible to make definitions based on class. However, it can be claimed that Turkey has the classes of a pre-modern and non-Western society. Thus, even if a class wise analysis was conducted, we would not find a class structure as in the West.

In any case, “.. for a long period of time the migration, migrants and gecekondu phenomena, being regarded as some sort of development disorder, were dealt only with their visual and cultural aspects separated from the economic and political context..” (Kurtuluş-Türkün, 2006:247) and the problems that lie behind were either not diagnosed right or the right steps were not taken for political interests even if the diagnoses were correct. Further to that, by the end of 1960s, in the academic arena of Turkey, “.. the idea that gecekondu would vanish with the spreading and deepening of the capitalist relations and the laborers will be settled both in industry and agriculture were prevalent expectations” (Kurtuluş-Türkün, 2006:249). These expectations carry within the longing of the laborers for a linear betterment. “The beginning of handling of class between 1960-1980, not only as a theoretical isolation but also as a historical-social phenomena in social sciences, undoubtedly was connected to the pace of industrialization and increase in working class population in Turkey” (Kurtuluş-Türkün, 2006:250). The intelligentsia’s taking the class seriously and studying it developed with parallelism and dependence to social changes just like the forming and developing of the social realism movement in cinema.

The class’s and especially the working class’s becoming visible in the Turkish society tells us that methodological change in the analysis of Turkish society is an obligatory direction. In a time where only ‘center-periphery dichotomy’ is not enough to get a hold on the society, the forming of a capital owning class in the

Western sense and the existence of a working class right in front of it, are the most important criteria to understand a society.

1.9. Transformation of the Turkish Society

Turkish society is like all nation-state societies, a sociological whole ‘constructed by political agenda’. The construction of modernity which officially started in 1923 but unofficially dates back to early 19th century, aimed to carry the individuals to citizen status from religious community status but the slow transformation of social structure did not allow the concepts to find their places as fast as it was aimed.

It is not easy for the Turkish society to single out social actors. The main reason for this is that, in Turkish lands (Ottoman, in the past), an Industrial Revolution had not been experienced and modernity and capitalism are imported from West. As a result of this, a bourgeoisie has never risen from the inner dynamics of society but it was tried to be formed by the state after the Republic. Just like the bourgeoisie, the working class also was created through transformation of a villager population pushed from the countryside to the city into working class under a certain strategy to meet the needs of the bourgeoisie.

The weakness of bourgeoisie in Ottoman and Turkish Republic era forced it to cooperate with bureaucracy. The ‘revolution without masses’ resulted in a political structure which only the dominant classes could have a say (Savran, 2010:187). Due to its weakness, the bourgeoisie had to stay as a social actor in background while the realization of the reforms at the founding of the Republic had to be done with the hand of the bureaucracy. That the bourgeoisie could never become the dominant class in Turkey, may be associated with the fact that there had not been an Industrial Revolution in its history. Thus, the bourgeoisie is not an apparent dominant class today in Turkey either; it has a ‘shadow class’ position, it is an invisible semi-dominant class. It shares half of its dominance with bureaucracy.

Halpern claims that in the societies of the Middle East, the political power groups are stronger and more important than the economic power groups and according to him,

the notion of capitalism has no effect on its own on the defined geography, unless other criteria are considered (Halpern, 1963:62). In our opinion, Halpern's interpretation is very correct. For Eastern societies, political powers in the social flow and transformation are always more in the foreground, compared to the economic powers and they are also more respected and trusted by power groups.

Huntington also underlines the respect towards the army and its role as the leading class in Eastern societies (Huntington, 1969:201). This emphasis is complementary to Halpern's assertion. Army has been the most important wing of bureaucracy, the political power group, always acted on the trust and respect of the society in 4 interventions it had done up until now.

Savran states that the dualism between bureaucracy – bourgeoisie is expressed in different terms from time to time: the dualities such as army – society, state – society, elites – society, bureaucracy – public are used to define these dualisms (Savran, 2010:188). Although the first sides of these dualisms are more concrete and rational class wise, the second part matches bourgeoisie with all of the society which, class wise, is an impossible definition. As Savran cannot accept either, an evaluation such as bourgeoisie being the defender and protector of the people against state and bureaucracy, would be an approach far from the social realities and the benefits of the bourgeoisie.

In Western societies, the bureaucracy has been a class used as a tool functioning to ensure that the bourgeoisie is the dominant class. It has an image protecting and ensuring the continuity of hidden power of the bourgeoisie that is never in the foreground. However, in Turkish society, we do not regard bureaucracy as a class functioning; on the contrary, bureaucracy has always been the dominant class. Since the import of modernity from the West, bureaucracy struggled to manufacture the bourgeoisie in order to construct capitalism which is the economic counterpart of modernity,. In consequence of very limited industry in the Ottoman period, bourgeoisie was also very weak; Especially through the policies in the early periods of the Republic, the power of the bourgeoisie, the space it occupies, the capital it

owns were tried to be increased because bureaucracy acknowledged the fact that it needed a sufficient bourgeoisie for a developed economy.

After all that has been written, it should not be assumed that bureaucracy and bourgeoisie are harmonious classes. Like any other class with clashing interests, they also are in a conflict, but their cooperation comes to life when their shared benefits are in question. Bureaucracy and bourgeoisie, like opposing brothers, are two powerful classes that are mostly in conflict, but sometimes cooperate for common interests.

The evolution of poor people in Turkey is also based on history like its counterparts in the world. Although in pre-modern times when the definition and description of class was not present in modern scientific criteria, and it was expressed in terms of layers and castes, concepts of class and lower class have always been present throughout history. With the start of modern times, and in relations based on industrial production, lower class has come into being, mostly as blue collar workers. Aside from these, farm workers and all low waged workers should be considered in the lower class.

The history of poor people in Turkey is different from its counterparts in the world in some aspects. Throughout 19th century Anatolia where Industrial Revolution did not happen, a means of production based on agriculture was present and as the lower class we may see the agricultural workers working in this vast land. Apart from them, a limited number of craftsmen working in the workshops in the cities can also be mentioned.

Following the declaration of the Republic, in parallel with the fact that the politics was confined to a single party regime, the economy also was under the state's reign until the beginning of 1950s. We observe that in a period of time where both political and economic rights were limited, the poor people could not seek its benefits and rights in the system although they existed as a social group. After the founding of the Republic, for a long time, it was claimed that Turkey was a classless society; the prevalent idea was that, society did not consist of different classes but social groups

which complement and complete one another. In our opinion, the idea that suggests the society is made up of harmonious social groups rather than conflicting classes and furthermore, this is the way things should be, is not a correct interpretation. Not only Turkish society but also no society in the world can be defined as classless. In the period from 1923 until 1960 there was not a sharp class movement in Turkish society and this has made it easy for political entities to define the society as classless. As Atilgan has stated, “When Republic of Turkey was founded in 1923, its population was 13.6 million. 10.3 million of those lived in the villages” (Atilgan, 2012:273).

It is not possible to expect class consciousness to arise in a village environment where a communitarian mentality is at work, the class consciousness in the modern times owes its becoming to Industrial Revolution and modernist social structure. And in any case “..The Independence War was anti-imperialist; but not anti-capitalist.” (Atilgan 2012:274), thus, class consciousness probably was a notion that the bureaucracy and bourgeoisie wanted to delay as long as possible. Due to the natural opposition it has with socialism, the founding ideology of the Republic, Kemalism, is altogether against the class-based representations and the natural instinct of the lower class to seek its rights in the society. “The Law on Associations issued in 1938, prohibited the establishment of any sorts of class based organizations and unions. It even prohibited to mention the existence of social classes in Turkey” (Atilgan, 2012:280). In addition to lack of a traditional class consciousness in the society, political bodies also prevented this tradition from coming into being by precautions as such.

Maybe the most significant element that backs this understanding is, as much as there is a feeling among the workers that does not consider itself as a laborer, also among the state and employers there is the idea of not regarding the workers as laborers, may be even disregarding their being individuals of society. The sentences from the report with the title “Laborer Issue in Turkey” written by Rebi Barkin and submitted to CHP Secretary General Tevfik Fikret Silay in 1948, clearly reveals the way the lower class, laborers were perceived in those days: “Both employers and the government considered the laborers to be a lower and dangerous class. In many

workplaces, the bosses view the workers as people who earn their living thanks to themselves, who find their bread at bosses' door, who are a sort of butler and they consider the action that workers realize to earn their lives as a blessing that is endowed to worker .. in many places, workers were treated as a torment and a servant ..”(Akkaya, 2010:9). These sentences tell us that the workers, let alone being regarded as laborers, were not even held in esteem but treated as second-class people. Apparently, despite the fact that the lower class was ontologically present, in the given time period, neither class consciousness nor class struggle can be accounted for.

This was the situation up until 60s, when the labor power became a part of social force and action as the general direction took a different course following the 2nd World War. The industrial bourgeois, who now sought to be the primary actor in the field of industry which was under government control, had gradually increased its power subsequent to the war, and by the early 60s, it had become the most powerful capitalist group in Turkey, just like the rest of the world. Of course, all production relations based on industry needs a working class to keep the production going. That is how the rural population in Turkey rushed into the cities and got in touch with the industry that promised them a life with higher standards and welfare.

The lower class that had reached a significant number in society, become a sociological force both quantity and quality wise and even if still relatively, sought to come to a certain level of class consciousness by the 960s. This was one of the major reasons why the social realist trend emerged in Turkish cinema. The thesis claims the social realism movement that as its subject deals with lower class problems in Turkish cinema did exist from the early 1960s until late 1980s and ended in late 1980s. The lower class that inspired the social realism movement and served as a source from the beginning of 1960s until the end of 1980s, of course, existed both before 60s and after 80s. However, the thesis is of the opinion that the class consciousness, which came into being in the lower class, inspired and gave reflection to the social realism movement in Turkish cinema; thus, we will be analyzing how the lower class was reflected in the films on its list and how their scripts were inspired by the lower class.

If we want to understand the capitalist relations of production, we have to understand its relations with the geographic conditions and space. Capitalism fictionalizes the place as the platform of exploitation, and the geography as the place to sell produce. When we examine the history of economy in Turkey, we see that the economic structure that was based on agriculture in 1950s transformed into a structure based on industry in 1960s and 70s and from 1980s till now, it depends on an economy based on finance. The change in the relations of production ended the traditional production relations and made the modern production relations dominant in the society (Karaşin, 2012:137).

In the case of Turkey, the composing of bourgeoisie can be dated back to 1950s; however, it was in 1960s that industrial bourgeoisie took the leading position in the bourgeoisie. The importance given to the industry by the state in 1930s wore off, and the benefits of trade and agricultural bourgeoisie took to the front in 1940s and 1950s. During the 2nd World War, the trade bourgeoisie that made large profits through the speculations of the war time, and the agricultural bourgeoisie (land lords) who were not content with the agricultural policies of CHP took an active role in the founding of Democrat Party after the war (Savran, 2010:158-159-160).

The industrial moves that were experienced since the beginning of the Republic and that gained acceleration beginning from late 1940s, changed the society towards the characteristics of a capitalist society which caused the distance between the social classes to expand and paved the way for the deepening of the class differences (Topçu, 2006:119). As the increasing power of the industry and the industrial class forced the economic model of industrial production, capitalism, onto Turkey, different classes and immediately after, the class conflicts became more easily felt as a natural consequence of capitalism.

Koray Yılmaz states that, following the 2nd World War, an important part of the trade bourgeoisie transformed into the industrial bourgeoisie. The Turkish bourgeoisie which spent the time between 1945 and 1960 searching for its luck in international market eager with industry, directed its sales to domestic market when

it failed to find what it was looking for internationally, this time period includes 1960 to 1980 (Yılmaz. 2006:190-191).

While industrial bourgeoisie was moving forward towards its class domination (military intervention of 1960) and it ensured its domination (military interventions of 1971 and 1980), it used the military government for the sake of its own benefits (Savran, 2010:187). Even only these interventions are data which shows the goal of bourgeoisie that in order to keep the rest of the society under its will, it needs bureaucracy and state. Hence, just as in rest of the other societies in the world which adopted capitalism and modernism, Turkish society too, internalized bourgeoisie and bureaucracy as their dominant classes. The difference of Turkey is, reflecting the features of a non-Western society, bureaucracy has a more visible and stronger image.

Because these ‘manufactured’ classes born from the anxiety to catch up with Western civilization, economy and societies do not emerge their own transformations, we should accept that these classes had a problematic stance with the rest of the society in the process of their making. No matter how much the early phases of the Republic supported the spread of capitalist logic and social model, it is impossible for a class to survive forever though state help. As the capitalist production powers strengthen, the classes which the capitalist society requires, start to form as well, for state agents are tools to develop and recreate the bourgeoisie.

With the advantages of being the dominant class in Turkey, it easily came over the disadvantages of being a ‘manufactured’ class, it declared its class identity in 1960s and with TÜSİAD founded 1971, and it formed a structure through which it can express its class interests on an institutional level. We determine that working class indicated institutionalizing before TÜSİAD by Workers’ Party of Turkey founded in 1961 and Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions founded in 1967; however, the first of these has long been closed, and DISK survives with a limited power. I can identify the main reason behind this as class awareness and struggle not gaining continuity. TÜSİAD on the other hand, continues its existence.

It is obvious that the majority of the population is not eager to change the society (Huntington, 1969:224). Neither the capital owning groups based on trade and agriculture that feed on the traditional society have such a desire. The non-governmental organizations that frequently play a part in social transformation of Western countries, are also not a very usual structure in the countries that have imported modernity (Daldal, 2005: 78). In such a social context, it is clear that the only parties working for transformation of the society are intellectuals, civil bureaucracy and military bureaucracy.

In her own modernity steps the pioneering classes in Turkey were the well-educated, intellectual bureaucrats and senior state officials who were adapted to the city life and who embraced the modernist practices. What they had in common was being defined under the 'new middle class' title devised by the Turkish modernization. To these classes we may add the capital owning class based on industry and growing up in urban life however the difference of the previously mentioned classes were that they earned their life through their labor (Daldal, 2005:77).

As pictured here, the part the Turkish lower class played in the transformation of the Turkish society was non-existent before 1960 and after 1990. In the years 1960 – 1988, targeted by this dissertation, however it managed to affect the flow of the society to some extent, form class awareness and attitude, and it harvested the results in all areas of the society, cinema included.

It may be claimed that a class struggle and its predecessor class awareness as such did not originate from own inner dynamics of Turkish society, more precisely, the lower class itself. Although we accept that the Constitution of 1961 was a constitution compatible with the requirements accumulation regime dominating all of the World, for producing masses towards domestic market and paved the way for class movements, we think that there are two determinative factors behind the forming of class awareness in lower class in Turkey. One of them is the intelligentsia in Turkey and the other is the leftists struggle on a social level in the World.

The class awareness in Turkey is an awareness 'brought down' to the society from above just as modernity had been imported from the West. This is a strife of people who are aware that they are a part of a class and this requires a class struggle given in accordance with the conditions of the day. In this respect, it is not surprising that the lower economic class in Turkey indexed its class consciousness to socialist ideology because here the class awareness is not a sociological phenomenon but a wave with an institutional – political character. To sum up, class awareness in Turkey was formed by the reflections of socialist movements in the world and ended the same way when the reflections ceased.

In any case, it would not comply with the principles of the social science to expect the class awareness to rise and fall over such a short period of time. In the West, the class struggle in modernity has a history. This history dates back to early 19th century. It is also known fact that these struggles from time to time, led to bloodshed and violence. Besides, we should also consider that in Western societies the beneficial conflicts from their social and economic structure turned into the classes; in Western societies, the bourgeoisie and the worker class that did not exist in capitalist sense in feudal era were two fundamental and opposing forces in the social beneficial conflicts of 19th and 20th century.

Another reason for such a class awakening was, the socialist line gaining power in the world. The left line getting powerful in the world spread to Turkey as well, paving the way for leftist thought to spread in the society and find support. The movement that took off from the university students was embraced especially by urban and educated middle class. Our thesis too relies on the analysis of the line of cinema in Turkey that developed consequent to such an awakening.

Political class struggle has particular conditions and differs from the class struggle in general. We do not witness the accumulation of the movements starting from the early 1960s, and led by and under control of the university students under the political class struggle. The Workers' Party of Turkey that continued its existence in intervals between 1961 and 1980 can be regarded as the political representation of a class awakening; nonetheless, CHP took the % 33 of the votes in 1973 elections and

% 41 in 1977 elections through the support of a class consciousness from middle and lower income classes.

In the geography of Turkey, where industrial revolution never took place, it is not unusual that there is class awareness and a conflict between employer and employee based on relations of production. Up until the 60s, Turkish society had a social structure where almost all population worked agriculturally and again, mostly lived in rural areas. The bourgeoisie which was encouraged to lead the industrial institutions since the beginning of the Republic, had been formed by 1960s and settled with a class consciousness. Although the somewhat limited construction of industrial institutions in the city generated class awareness in the working class for the first time, this never went beyond superficial nor became permanent.

In the social transformation our society went through in the targeted period from 1960 to 1988, we frequently observe a feeling of submission of the lower class – sometimes somewhat like ‘Eastern shiftiness’ – and a ‘culture of neediness’ that humiliates the lower-class towards the bourgeoisie. In the mentioned time period, the ‘lack of consciousness’ that left the leftist university youth and leftist intellectuals alone in the socialist strife, also turned into hatred towards left fraction depending on whether the laborer is right thought oriented or not. The laborer took a stance against the people who struggled for the benefits of labor even though they were laborers as well.

The major difference of the lower income class in Turkey from its counterparts in the West is, although its short term interest awareness is high, it could not form a class consciousness and awareness in accordance with their class interests. The lower income class in Western world makes choices in accordance with their economical/material interests, supports or establishes a political party. The lower economic class in Turkey makes their social and political choices according to social and cultural values. For a conservative laborer, his conservative lifestyle is more important than his worker identity. He defines himself as a rightist and votes for a right oriented political party. On the other hand, the basic supporters of CHP which

claims itself as a left party are urban, well-educated and have better material standards compared to the rest of the society.

What is common in all three military interventions of 1960, 1971 and 1980 is that they prevented the lower economic class from realizing its benefits and rights. It cannot be claimed that the lower economic class had class awareness during the military coup of 1960 anyway. The 1971 and 1980 interventions that concern 60s and 70s when lower economic class appeared on the scene of social struggle, resulted in that capitalism is recreating itself, clearing the left phenomenon which was conflicting with capitalist thought from system and of course, as in any coup, oppressing the labor class even further.

It cannot be said that Turkish working classes helped to the democratic initiative in Turkish history. In this respect, they are opposites of their counterparts in the developed countries because the working classes in developed countries are determinant social actors for the development of democratic rights and freedoms (Savran, 2010:201)

Hence, as Savran states (2010:204), it would be far from real to claim that Turkish bourgeoisie is democratic. Since the beginning of the Republic, in every coup, bourgeoisie took a stance that affirmed the coup. Sevrans extends his claim and says that only if the working classes put up a fight against bourgeoisie can they repress the oppressing aspect of bourgeoisie and make it comply with democracy (Savran, 2010:205).

At this point, it would be beneficial to examine the relations that the political parties and trends have with the lower class in Turkey. Hakan Koçak mentions three lines about the policies of political lines for the working class: “corporatist strategy’ of CHP, ‘populist strategy’ of DP (and the right in general to some extent), ‘independent- founder policy’ of the socialist left” (Koçak, 2008:98).

The traces of CHP’s perception “of classes as equal groups with different but compatible interests under the common objective of national benefits” that begins

with single party period until the multiple party period can be observed in its following years as well” (Koçak, 2008:101). In spite of this, in its policies by DP concerning the workers, as can also be seen in right wing parties in the years that follow, depended on populist thought. Boratav defines populism thus: “a circumstance that working classes can influence the decision making processes in the subjects concerning their own economic benefits; however cannot organize in a way to offer an alternative or be partner to the political power .. constructs the general political framework of populism” (Boratav, 1983:7). In his own interpretation, Kocak states: “populism is a strategy that dissolves the working class in the process of its making .. covering/denying the class differences that get more and more distinct by the day”; in his line of thinking “the development of class differentiation made populism more essential and functional” (Koçak, 2008:102). The significant growth of the working class leaving behind its weak quality and quantity of 1920s and 1930s, with regard to growing Turkish industry’s needs, brought about the necessity for parties to take them into consideration (Koçak, 2008:102-103).

Populist policies generated a sense of ‘being respected’ (though it may not be real) in working class. Unionist Salahaddin Erkap summarizes the scene in Democrat Party period: “the people not takes seriously in the past experienced being treated as human beings in DP period and thus attached to DP. DP brought many right for to the workers. But more importantly, it was psychological, being properly treated as human beings” (Koç, 1999:140-141).

Koçak states that the working class policies that socialist approach defines as ‘independent-constructing strategy’ changed shape in time: “.. When we move on to 70s, it is observed that the independent constructor strategy oriented towards construction of a hegemonic class in union and political life .. in the years of conflict in 1960s, while workers voted for Party of Justice, the successor of DP, they also embark on battles of tough strikes directing towards DİSK..” (Koçak, 2008:123). According to Koçak, these two opposing reflexes of the workers were due to the conflict between DP’s populist worker policy and worker policy of socialist thought, but we are of the opinion that the different worker groups in the working class are the producers of these two different deeds. In other words, this depends on whether the

worker is right or left oriented rather than the strategies. The guiding of the worker class by independent constructor strategy in 70s had a characteristic that was getting rougher, penetrating more and more into the social life and direct action, and sought a revolution based on working class more than the rights of classes.

1.10. Art, Cinema, Film, Turkish Cinema

It has been seen that art has had a lot of definitions. This is sourced from that art is multidimensional social fact which has the relations with the different sides of the life. “Art is a multifunctional social phenomenon. A creation of arts has to evaluate and criticize history (historical dimension), represent the present (social realist dimension) and design the future (political dimension). Thus, one of the preconditions of artistic creation is knowing the social structure. And after all, the sociology of arts is an area that studies relations between arts and social structure. Only thus, the social function of the arts can be understood” (Tezcan, 2011:35). It is clear in Tezcan’s approach that social realism has the function to reflect contemporary social conditions. His perspective confirms the parallelism we claim to exist between the social realism movement in Turkish cinema and the changes in Turkish society.

“Art is an expression of life style. Accordingly, when we look at the arts of the societies, we sense the way they live; namely, how they perceive the world, the nature, the society and the people” (Soykan, 2009:11).

From Hilmi Maktav’s perspective, arts is a basic measure in the analysis of social concepts, and due to its cooperation with sociology, many sub sociology branches came into being. What encourages this relation is the socially didactic aspect of arts. Arts deals with social issues, diagnoses them, sometimes prescribes, guides and changes society. Seeing arts as only a means for spending pleasant time and personal amusement means that recognizing art with an incorrect and deficient definition (Maktav, 1998:1).

The thought which emerged in aesthetics and philosophy, and in Marxist thought in the first half of 20th century asserts that there is connection between society and art. Art historians whom cannot be allocated in a category easily, embraced the same approach that repeated itself around 2nd World War (Heinich, 2013:22).

According to Heinich, the second trend which can be seen near to 2nd World War is fed from empiricist tradition and it prefers documentary working; it goals to understand how art is concreted in societal arrangement. It tries to comprehend the mutual inclusion between cinema and society. It does not consider the theories, such as art theory or social theory. It finds the roots of intellectual search in the social history of art; it heeds ‘the context which art pieces improved in’ more than ‘art pieces’ (Heinich, 2013:23).

This definition of Heinich has in itself clues as to how Western social realism that preceded Turkish social realism was born. Furthermore, with her definition of the problem of art as ‘studying the doers and creations in the concepts they developed in’, she indexes both the artist and the art piece within the social conditions in which they had developed. When she says ‘the results that made the concrete and permanent historical data fruitful’, we understand her intent, the attitude of social realism that contributes to social sciences’ critical aspect by photographing the problems of society.

Mahmut Tezcan thus explains the connection between arts and sociology: “..Sociological phenomena and findings become more comprehensible via the utilization of arts as a tool. Moreover sociology is needed in order to better appreciate, define and evaluate arts.. Sociology of arts major undertakes this sort of a relationship as its subject. Sociology of arts, taking off from sociological data, analyzes arts, artists, receivers, artistic creations and processes” (Tezcan, 2011: 160). In our dissertation we use the cinema genre to understand the Turkish society in the target time period. But as described here, it should not be disregarded that this relation is bilateral. Social realism movement offers a great opportunity to read the Turkish lower class, nevertheless, in order to analyze social realism in Turkish cinema, we also have to know the changes that occurred in the society of the time.

It can be seen two different Marxist interpretations in art by Georgi Plekhanov and György Lukacs. With the affect of classical / orthodox Marxism, Plekhanov interprets the art as a part of superstructure which is understood as extension and reflection of substructure in classical Marxism. Lukacs has a different interpretation by underlining ‘life style of a phase’ and he seeks that ‘life style’ in the relation between economic conditions and artistic production; his approach to associate the novel types with the stages of Western history can be shown as a proof for his interpretation (Heinich, 2013:27). The fact that Lukacs associates novel types with the stages of Western history is convenient for the coordination between society and arts that we trust on inclusive of this dissertation. As Lukacs employs novel in his example, we employ cinema. It is obvious that there is a subsequent and parallel interaction between the society and cinema. In fact, maybe, we can generalize this for all genres of art out of this dissertation as well, a connection which can be regarded as the reason behind the birth of sociology of arts. What can be stated in our dissertation as well is that the social realism movement that began in the early 1960s was born and became powerful depending upon the developments in the society and again, based on the same relationship it weakened and ended by the end of 1980s. An art cannot be on its own; it has to arise from a social group or depend on one and gain its approval. Otherwise, an artistic trend cannot survive. This proves the reason why subsection of art sociology emerged in the field of sociology.

The social realism trend has a significantly Marxist identity and tradition: “..Expressionism is a basic principle almost all Marxist ideologies share .. Lukacs, although not as sharp as Plekhanov but with undertaking more detailed analyses, agrees with the expressionist view on art piece-society connection, in principle” (Soykan, 2009:11).

1.11. Cinema

The bilateral interaction of cinema and sociology needs to be definitely considered when studying the two disciplines in unison. As Maktav describes: “How cinema becomes a source for evaluating societal events to examine a phase, a society, it is needed the data that is related social life to criticize a movie, to understand changes

which happen in cinema. It is not a realistic approach to evaluate the cinema of a phase or of a society that we don't know its political, economical and cultural structure" (Maktav, 1998:5).

The reason behind the fact that cinema is an area to be enlightened for the sociological theories is that it is intricate with the economic relations, society and politics. In this concept, social criteria and transformation always find themselves a place on the white screen (Daldal, 2005:8)

According to Lotman, the virtual participation and witnessing of audience to film results in the emotional reaction audience. This reaction happens as if the events on screen were real, although the audience already knows that what happens on cinema screen is unreal or imaginary (Lotman, 1999:26)

It is the thought of some critics that Hollywood cinema is in frame which loads ideological notions to the people, which restructures the existing values and institutions in the minds of people, in such a manner which reminds 'the ideological state apparatuses' of Louis Althusser, that legitimizes the interests of the state in people's minds. In that respect, cinema is beyond to be 'just cinema' (Ryan-Kellner, 1997:17). Commercial cinema as well is unexpectedly able to engrave the values and ideas it wishes to insert easily in the subconscious of the audience.

Our dissertation asserts that social realist movement expresses in itself the changes which Turkish society and lower class have gone through. Bordwell and Thompson give an example showing that the interaction between cinema and the society is not only from society to cinema but also from cinema to society: it is interrogated that the films which contain the violence can be the cause that stimulates violence especially in the worlds of young people, after a lot of homicides which happened in the schools (Bordwell-Thompson, 2009:327).

Bordwell-Thompson question the hidden and strong role that genre films and cinema in general, play in America; they are asking themselves that whether there is a connection or not, between increasing in the interest which has been developed to

war films after September 11 and the legitimization of Iraq occupying by USA (Bordwell-Thompson, 2009:328). Apparently cinema is a weapon used for manipulating and orienting the society. On the other hand the social realism trend that we study is far from the shrewdly ways of manipulating and inserting the intentions that do not belong to them into the subconscious of the society and lower class. What it does is to paint a picture of the society and show it to society proving the existence of the problems that have not been spotted until then. Naturally, this may be regarded as a manipulation, however, unlike the ostentatious films of Hollywood, it does this in a direct manner instead of an indirect one. Another aspect is, what it tries to tell is, targeting the lower class especially, the necessities of the society's and the lower class's self-interests. The benefits of state or the dominant class hidden behind ostentatious action or war films are not the goals of social realism; on the contrary it is what it stands and fights against.

“Film is a narrative, a discourse, the way of expressing thoughts. This is valid for all film types and all films of every genre, from the worst one to the most competent one” (Kurtuluş, cinnet.org). “Film covers a broad range, from practical (as a technical invention it is an important scientific tool) through environmental, on through pictorial, dramatic, and narrative to music“(Monaco, 2009:32).

“French theorists are fond of making the differentiation between ‘film’ and ‘cinema’. The ‘filmic’ is that aspect of the art that concerns its relationship with the world around it; the ‘cinematic’ deals with the esthetics and internal structure of the art” (Monaco, 2009:252).

According to Ryan-Kellner, the films are inculcating a ‘chosen’ standing. They are improving some suggestions by targeting to design a specific shape of a ‘case’, rather than the ‘case’ itself (Ryan – Kellner, 1997:18). This is somewhat different in social realism: instead of a fictional scenario social realism strives to express the real life to the audience as much as possible. In that respect, it is the closest cinema line to documentary. Watching a social realist film, you witness that it reflects the society very clearly and is loyal to reality. Another way to define a film that belongs to social realism genre is: you can follow the society the film wants to tell about with one to

one scale. The power of social realist films is the real life itself in their scripts. It does not aim to let the audience spend dreamy time by telling about unreal events, on the contrary it is willing to shock them by making them face mostly negative but pure realities of life.

It has been asserted frequently that there is consistency between the perspectives, descriptions or narratives of an art genre and tendencies of society (Bordwell – Thompson 2009:327). If we regard social realism as a movement in cinema of Turkey, we can see that the values of the Turkish society affected its shape deeply. As we will examine during the dissertation, what is expressed and promoted in *Acı Hayat* film for example are values that belong to lower class. *Gecekondu* in the film *Gelin* are the pure reality in the middle of Istanbul.

The economic infrastructure of Turkish cinema before 1960, in 1940s and 1950s, is an extension of an imported substitute economic modal in cinema. As Tanju Akerson states, Turkish cinema operates mostly on the notion of consumption rather than production and it is, as frequently seen in countries outside the Western World, the realization of economic approach based on consumption. Akerson accepts 1948 as the starting year of Turkish cinema (probably as an economical appearance) and considers this year as the milestone of construction of consumption practices in Turkish society and the emergence of social groups which are acting on these practices (Akerson, 1966:35)

Roughly, the period between late 1950s and 1970s can be called ‘Yeşilçam’ phase. We are aware that the commercial dynamics in this period are high yet not institutionalized and different from commercial structure of Western cinemas.

Our cinema which embraced any genre, melodrama being the primary, with commercial profits, was called Yeşilçam after Yeşilçam Street where film production companies’ offices were commonplace in Beyoğlu. Nezih Erdoğan explains the features of Yeşilçam cinema understanding such as:

“ **domestic

- ** Popular cinema
- ** Model: Hollywood
- ** To produce
- ** Star system
- ** Capitalist mode of production
- ** production – distribution – exhibition” (Erdoğan, 2006:148).

Through 1940s, 50s and even 60s, the genre of melodrama which best described the society in general, was in the foreground of our cinema. Nijat Özön, in his writing that was published in January 1957, reflected the state of Turkish cinema which was far away the societal matters: “There is no black market, no livelihood struggle for Turkish cinema which is at the borderline of 1957 year .. there is no problem that a newly-married couple will face”. According to Özön, our cinema is under control of romantic norms that feed melodrama type; the characters in the films “.. meet in accordance with Mükerrrem Kamil’s novel, make love, betray, are betrayed in accordance with Esat Mahmut’s novel; ‘suffer’ in accordance with Avare film, die by getting tuberculosis in accordance with Kerime Nadir’s novel” (Özön, 1995:211).

“For years, every kind of ‘melodrama’ became a type which touched, affected viewer, which was embraced by the viewer cavalierly, which was the most valid ..” (Scognamillo, 1990:195). According to Scognamillo, Turkish cinema “.. used melodrama, namely ‘musical drama’, in a closest manner to its rules, repeated tirelessly its formulas and cliches that do not change, its themes and dramatic establishments” (Scognamillo, 1990:195-196).

In Turkish cinema we are assured that it is always possible to move up the social ladder through coincidence, working hard or by the love that two people have for each other. Another option is when the evil and rich character softens owing to good deeds of the good character and the film comes to a pleasing end. The experiences in films without a pleasant outcome such as moving up the social ladder, are considered to be individual misfortune (Maktav, 1998:88). Nevertheless come what may, all options are within the system. There are no plots willing to question or change the system in those films.

What Yeşilçam does is to trivialize or fade the formidable gaps between the social classes. And this, it realizes through the argument that moral concepts are more important than material ones (Topçu, 2006:124). In the finale of every film, Yeşilçam displays a united social appearance, which is not realistic. The reality is, classes in different economic levels are always in conflict and struggle for space. This is the reason that social realism disturbed some sections of society, even more so political ones: because it revealed social realities and problems. Yeşilçam's struggle was to serve us a dream society, a society that is the way it should be, and thus console the lower class.

Aslıhan Doğan Topçu states that before 1950, Turkish modernity project, films based on the concept of class were not present since the mentality of a 'society without class' was trying to be established (Topçu, 2006:121). Additionally, in Turkish films between the years 1950 and 1960 – in my personal opinion in all periods of our cinema – the rich characters are pictured as frauds, untrustworthy and evil. Being rich is not a position to envy or achieve. Being rich is very easy anyways; you can move up on the social stratification by lottery or a heirdom which was inherited by a far relative (Topçu, 2006:123).

It can be stated that the difference between 'presentation of poverty' and 'scrutinizing the poverty' in our cinema is the element of difference between Yeşilçam and social realism movement. Hilmi Maktav expressed this in his own words: "literature of poverty has always been relevant, a fruitful material however none had seen it to be problematic .. the ideology of how cinematographers with popular concerns deal with poverty should be looked for in this very context/contextlessness that does not care about the social. This unclear background behind the heroes generally appear as a 'united Turkish society with the rich and the poor' in the finale and this background that fabricated thousands of 'Turkish films' since its beginning and that constructed the golden era of the Turkish cinema now is the social model of Yeşilçam" (Maktav, 2001:162).

The political bodies in Turkey before 1960 had a different approach towards realism in literature and realism in cinema. In a society without a high rate of literacy, the

fact that cinema is easy to understand for people of any educational and intellectual level makes it a rather dangerous art compared to the novel. In this context, while it was permitted to describe rural life real as it is, it was never allowed in cinema (Daldal, 2005:68). By this policy we understand that the right ideology oriented government between 1950 and 1960, was afraid to raise awareness of the masses. It must have regarded the occurrence of class consciousness as a process threatening its balance of power, so that it did not present cinema with the freedom to criticize social problems as it did with literature. In this respect, the melodrama genre was pleasant both for the people and the state.

Public interest in cinema is easy to understand when literacy rates are considered. While the % 67.49 of 17.856.865 people did not know how to read or write in Turkey in 1950, this number was % 60.49 of 22.542.016 in 1960. In 1970, when the population was 29.273.361, the illiteracy rate was down to 43.79; in 1980 it was % 32.52 of 37.523.623 (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, Ataturkiye.com). These statistics prove a social structure in which not reading but watching is popular. Hence for the regime as well, cinema was considered a medium which must be frightened more compared to novels and newspapers.

1.12. Social Realism

Realism trend in art took different shapes along the 20th century. It can be accepted the first version of realism on cinema is German impressionism. After 2nd World War, Italian new realism and French new wave became the conveyer trends of social realism. Another reflection of realism in cinema was socialist realism. State socialism, the official ideology of the newly founded Soviet Union, both displayed what the state aims to do to the society by this line of cinema, and emphasized through which artistic approach and aesthetics the state will analyze the society. Initially, socialist realism was more political / manipulative and under the state's control, compared to later realism versions and interpretations.

Italian New Realism and French New Wave trends in cinema that developed following the 2nd World War, they had non-political and sociological identity. The

break caused by the war greatly influenced social realist interpretations that emerged in European cinema. About the modernity that had continued since the beginning of 19th century, to question the social structure of Western world, focus on the issues that concern society in general and especially the poor people while doing so, were among the goals of social realism.

Turkey's first encounter with social realism in its cinema coincides with the 1960s and usually, Metin Erksan's 'Gecelerin Ötesi' is accepted as the first specimen of this genre in our country. We know the reasons why social realism emerged at this time period. One of the most important of these reasons was the increase of quality and quantity of the working class in the urban areas, reflected in the artistic community. Another reason was that, the leftist movement gradually getting more influential in the world affecting first the Turkish intelligentsia, and then the Turkish lower classes. This case led to the formation of a political party (Workers Party of Turkey) and into a strong union that has its foundations in socialist ideology (Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey).

Cinema has been in constant change since the end of 19th century when it came into being. Among the branches of the arts, it is the fastest and most astonishingly changing one. The changing phases in cinema have allowed it, as in other arts, to diversify and feed other trends. One of the most important, if not in the most foregrounded, of these movements is social realism.

It has to be stressed that the strongest factor is deepening class differentiation between lower and upper classes. The fact that the poor people was disregarded, uncared for and humiliated since the founding of the republic, was in a search of class awareness and its own class interest inspired social realism. The emerging dichotomy between the poor people, the major component of which was the working class and the bourgeois, establishment of whose identity was not very ancient either, is significant in the occurrence and growth of social realism.

We should understand firstly, the first ring of realism which affected the cinema: Socialist Realism. Socialist realism is a Soviet-based art line and defined such as: "a

state-approved artistic or literary style in some socialist countries, as the U.S.S.R., that characteristically celebrates an idealized vision of the life and industriousness of the workers” (dictionary.reference.com/browse/socialist%20realism).

“On April 23, 1932, the Party Central Committee of the USSR adopted socialist realism (SR) as the official artistic mandate for Soviet literature (de facto for art, music, film, and architecture as well), a practice that, theoretically, governed the production of any work of art until the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991” (Ruder, 2004). Soviet Union, with an ideological preference, required to produce films which all Soviet citizens comprehend the content of the film. This preference was crystallized more in 1930s that Soviet state embraced ‘socialist realism’ as the official art policy (Bordwell-Thompson, 2009:455-456) Annette Kuhn is citing from Ephraim Katz the 1928 Congress resolution of Soviet Union:” The basic criterion for evaluating the art qualities of a film is the requirement that it be presented in a form which can be understood by the millions” (Kuhn, cited from Katz, 2007:245). “From the beginning of Bolshevik rule, top officials had viewed art as the tool of the revolution” (Krishnan, 2012:240).

“Originally a work of socialist realism should contain four key elements. The first was ideinost —the work must be anchored in and resonate with Soviet ideology, i.e. Marxism-Leninism. Second, the work must convey klassovost —class-consciousness. The socialist realist heroes and heroines must personify their class heritage .. Third, a socialist realist work must contain partynost —Party-mindedness. This meant that the firm, guiding hand of the Communist Party of the USSR constantly exerted its presence in a work of socialist realism, either in the character of an ideal Party member in a work of literature, or through the visual or aural presentation of a theme or motif that exuded strength, decisiveness, and grandiosity. Finally, works of socialist realism should have narodnost —the content of a work of art should represent the interests and viewpoint of the people (narod) rendered in an intelligible, approachable manner” (Ruder, 2004).

From his own perspective, Mahmut Tezcan defines social (socialist) realism like this: “this point of view does not ask what art is. It states the question as what art should

be. Art is expression. Expressed reality, should be in a revolutionary development, focus on educating the lower class, and to do so, details should be selected and elected touching the core of reality. It should be reflected that some values and theories will wear off while drawing the present situations and characters and a new society and culture will be born” (Tezcan, 2011:22)

The trend that just came after Socialist Realism in realist line was Neo Realism of Italian cinema. The main lines of Neo Realism that emerged in Italy defined the main characteristics of succeeding social realism: “The Neorealists were working for a cinema intimately connected with the experience of living: nonprofessional actors, rough technique, political point, ideas rather than entertainment – all these elements went directly counter to the Hollywood aesthetic of smooth, seamless professionalism” (Monaco, 2009:337).

The realism dimension of films and the persuasiveness were increased by the casting of non-professional actors in films. Vittorio De Sica, the director of *Bicycle Thieves*, explains trusting a laborer in a factory with the leading part with these words: ‘the way he moved and sat, the gestures that belonged to a laborer who has nothing to do with acting .. everything about him was perfect’ (Bordwell- Thompson, 2009:460). Through these words we can see that in Italian New Realism and in other realism trends in the world, the goal was to touch real life with the highest percentage possible. Carrying real life to white screen with the sensitivity of a documentary will result in much better analysis of the problems which that life has.

In the construction of Italian New Realism, the economic conditions of postwar Italy are of the greatest importance. The emergence of Neo Realism in Italy was closely related with technological deficiencies after 2nd World War. Neo Realistic films had to use street environment in the absence of film studios and voice equipments; documentaristic photography understanding became the photography trend of the films (Bordwell- Thompson, 2009:459-460)

The biggest contribution of Neo Realism was the concepts expressed in films. Bordwell - Thompson state that concepts with political and economic bases such as

poverty, unemployment, exploitation mostly decided the way the characters behave in the films (Bordwell – Thompson, 2009:460).

The end of New Realism is similar to the way social realism ended (brought to an end) in Turkish cinema. New Realism in Italy was not wanted by state because it told the societal truths and particularly, negative societal truths. It can be shown as the reasons for the fall of social realism in Italy after 1949 year that Italian films which have important finance support came into prominence, suppression of censor mechanism and the secession of the directors from social realism who made their names through social realism (Bordwell – Thompson, 2009:460-461). Facing social realities is never pleasant for any political regime and state in the world. Furthermore, it is neither useful nor acceptable for any political system when the problems the regime covers and disregards begin to be seen by the people.

“Once it had so visibly split, aesthetically and politically, there was no way that neo-realism was going to be reconstituted. The Italian cinema that followed the neo-realist phase of the late 1940s and early 1950s was very different in character. Neo-realist directors continued to make films, but with very few exceptions these films were not neo-realist” (Nowell-Smith, 2007:237).

“The impact of Italian New Realist Movement in the appearance of realist films and films taking on the social subjects in 40s, had been worth mentioning” (Özden, 2004:26). “This movement “was made up of, the social application of mostly French naturalism, Soviet social cinema, experience of English school of document-film, ‘verissimo’ movements on all social issues of post war Italy” (Özden, cited from Özön, 2004:26)

On the other hand, one of the aspects which made New Realism special was that it had an influence strong enough to impact the French New Wave movement that came after. (Bordwell – Thompson, 2009:461).

The trend that followed Italian Neo Realism was French New Wave. Following the Italian New Realism, French New Wave also expanded new horizons in the art of

cinema especially structurally and it is an accepted opinion that is contributed to the line of social realism: “The reaction to the traditional templates of cinema started to take shape with the New Wave films that started to be produced in France in 1958” (Özden, cited from Betton, 2004:30)

“The Nouvelle Vague (French New Wave) covers a brief period in French cinema history from 1959 to around 1965, when certain historical, technological and economic factors combined to enable some young film-makers to influence French cinema in very diverse ways..” (Cook, 2007:405).

“The French New Wave (Jean-Luc Godard, François Truffaut, Jacques Rivette, Eric Rohmer et al.) embraced neo-realism as proof that filmmaking could be possible without a huge industrial structure behind it..” (Bondanella, 2006:38).

James Monaco, defines the emergence of cinema movement, French New Wave, which was influential in the emergence of social realism in Turkish cinema. In the history of cinema which he divided into eight phases, New Wave is the seventh phase: “The growth of New Wave in France in the early sixties signaled the beginning of the seventh period of film history, 1960-80. Technological innovations, a new approach to the economics of film production, and a new sense of the political and social value of film combined to form numerous ‘new wavelets’ in Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, Asia, and eventually even the United States and Western Europe” (Monaco, 2009:254).

Although the New Wave, influential in the beginning of 1960s also chose its characters and stories right from the middle of real life, from lower and middle class, it is structurally far from social realism, our dissertation’s methodological skeleton, because it does not involve a social problem accelerating its scenario. Bordwell – Thompson exemplify the general characteristic of New Wave in a François Truffaut’s film, one of the films of this genre, ‘Shoot the Piano Player’; the characters in this film spend their time with the daily activities and they do not behave toward a specific goal (Bordwell – Thompson, 2009:463). Social realism refuses to waste a single shoot of sequence: the scenario has a purpose from the

beginning to the end and that is the presentation of one or more social problems to the audience through a story. In this respect, it involves an obvious or subtle didacticism; whether it is visible or not depends on how strong a tie the film has with the ideology.

1.13. Social Realism in Turkish Cinema

We see that Turkish cinema benefitted from the relative freedom provided by the Constitution of 1961. It is not all that surprising that this freedom focused more on the social problems especially of the lower income group with the influence of rising leftist line. Our cinema which so far had regarded the society as a happy whole and devoted all its energy to personal problems, loves, fights, and suffering, stepped on to this new path with young directors beginning their careers.

Halit Refiğ also explains the awakening of the cinema underlining the relative liberal character of 1961 Constitution. According to Refiğ, the social realism movement that emerged in the lively and participant atmosphere after 1960, aimed to examine and reveal the inner structure of Turkish society and the relationships between individuals (Refiğ, 1971:24). Aslı Daldal claims that in critical turning points of society, the people of higher social classes tend to take on an ‘understanding’ approach that is ‘open to improvement’ towards lower classes. She sees the reflection of this in cinema as realism. The artist has a separatist stance in the elite layers of society and undertakes a mission in this ‘realism’ context. However, this realism is not inspired by a realism that aims to tear the system down and rebuild it but a criticizing realism which opens up the aspects of the society it dislikes. (Daldal, 2005:9)

It was a first in our cinema when social realism found itself a place in Turkish cinema which so far had not dealt with social problems and changes but was devoted to melodramas and epic stories. Another reason for the distance the cinema of Turkey had with such issues was that the political regime had not allowed cinema to produce films about ‘social subjects’ and limited it through the concept of censorship, that we no longer encounter these days.

All productions created in this movement direct their camera to the average person on the street. Another point was the attitude of all directors in social realism against capitalist modes of production and social structure. Additionally, the changes that occurred in the form and style of cinema language are very important and progressive. It has a character that changed the direction of Turkish cinema altogether. Another feature, maybe the most important one, was the choice of an event/problem that concerned whole society in all films as the spine (Daldal, 2005:61-62-62). The last feature which is mentioned, in my opinion as well, is the primary feature of the films accepted as social realist and helps it to build a thick wall between itself and the films that are not in this genre.

Şükran Kuyucak Esen, while explaining the features of the cinema movement called ‘third Cinema’ step by step, was describing what is called social realism in this dissertation. To give examples of some points:

“** It sides with the exploited, oppressed, laborer and poor

** It wishes to document and exhibit the deviance, abuse, being underdeveloped, and poverty. Hence to change it

** The existing cinema system is not approved of. Yeşilçam is considered as numbing, like opium and sedatives. It is opposed to.

** Whether a documentary or a fiction, film uses a realist approach and cinema language” (Hakan, cited from Esen, 2012: 221)

Dönmez-Colin underlined the new breath and perspective in cinema which was leaned on the cinema of developing countries and which was emerged in Turkey just after 1960 military coup: “Translations of diverse ideologies, including Marxism-Leninism, became available. With the steady development of industrialization and the growing national awareness in the so-called Third World, of which Turkey was a part, a certain euphoria for the arrival of a socialist revolution was felt, which was reflected in the films of the 1960s-70s, with Yılmaz Güney in Turkey, Ousmane Sembene in Senegal and Fernando Solanas in Argentina, for example, as pioneers” (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:5). It can be seen as a proof that socialist line was considered a salvation way in these countries. Socialism was being used as an anti-capitalist and

anti-imperialist instrument and a way which brings to the masses more welfare, equality and respect.

It is clear that social realism aims to diagnose the social problems that occurred during Turkish modernization. The problems that are consequences of transition of economic activities to industry, the population's concentration and growth in the city, the problems of laborers, had to be analyzed with a cinematographic touch. The problems encountered in this line of cinema are chosen from the everyday lives of people. This analysis has to be realized through not a romantic manner but a rational and coherent one (Daldal, cited from Uçakan, 2005: 58)

We must underline Yön (Direction) journal and movement which was a milestone in leftist-Kemalist line. Aslı Daldal interprets Yön journal such as:”.. It is certain that Yön made great intellectual contribution to urban centred progressive ‘new middle class’ at the beginning of 1960s”. This affect is related closely that Yön’s main worries are the ‘national-democratic front’ and ‘revolutionary leadership of armed forces’ ideas, which speak also to the intellectual world of the people who are raised up in city at that time (Daldal, 2005:85)

An important figure both in CHP and Yön movement Doğan Avcıoğlu gives some clues about the ideology Direction while explaining his line of thought: “..We believe that in the near future, Turkey will move on to the socialist path of development. But the building of socialism requires a lengthy period of time. Therefore, instead of waving socialist slogans, it is necessary to work out a formula of a united front capable of attracting all forces capable of casting aside the obstacles on the way to socialism..” (Lipovsky, cited from Avcıoğlu, 1992:96).

This perception is not realistic. Kemalist leftist line denies the concept of ‘class’ on purpose, and thinks of the society similar to the corporate way of thinking, as classless and furthermore, as made up of social groups that complement each other. When the close relationship between Kemalism and capitalism is considered, the leftist Kemalism was hesitant to take an obvious stance against capitalism. It

presented the occasion as a political struggle against imperialism on the international platform rather than a class based sociological and economic one.

In any interpretation of Kemalism, the wish to stay distant from socialist terminology and concept of class can be observed. I associate this with Kemalism's wish to stay in contact with capitalism which it secretly supported and approved, if not obviously. Hereby we can say that a perspective developed that neither cared about middle and lower economic classes' benefits nor gave them a say as a social actor in the social activism after 1960.

We should also state that leftist Kemalist thought was less concerned with class problems than national problems (Oktay, 2000:27). And this is where social realism of cinema separated from Direction line of thought. Direction movement corresponds to a political line and has the purpose of imposing some political agenda on the society. However social realism is a more sociological construction, its primary purpose is to diagnose the existing social issues and point to class problems while doing so.

The social realism in cinema is somewhat distant from leftist Kemalism, closer to Marxist approach to classes and ready to face the realities of the country. In the films, scripts of which were written by Vedat Türkali, let alone photographing the social problems, even prescriptions were written on the problems and the working class was located in the core of these prescriptions as the social actor. What lies under the wish to awaken consciousness in the lower class is the idea that people's lives can change only by seeking their self-interests by themselves.

Türkali explains the purpose under the wish to manipulate masses, by basing it on the atmosphere after the coup of 1960. He claims that the rights given by the law in that period were not known to the public so they were not applied. He stated that because these rights had not been earned through fight and bloodshed as in the case of working class of the West, they had to be 'taught' to the working class in Turkey (Türkali, 1985:201). Here, it can be said that socialist section was willing to guide

the working class ideologically, i.e to teach their own values to the masses and to expect from them to apply.

The reflection of classes which social realism valued in the films, can be followed through the character presentations. The major supporter of coup of 1960, the middle class working people (state officers, and private business white collar workers), are always pictured as positive characters and located at the center of the scenario. The people pictured with negative attributes are trade and agriculture investors. Of course, these investor groups are seen as Democratic Party supporters and regarded as belonging to the 'right' (Daldal, 2005:95). Moreover, all films give the lead parts to people from lower classes: Kemal from *Otobüs Yolcuları*, Mehmet and Nermin in *Acı Hayat*, 6 poor villagers of *Bitmeyen Yol* are the examples of lower class members playing the leading parts.

In the social realism movement in 1960s too, the directors have different interpretations. Ertem Göreç moved with the influence of Vedat Türkali. Halit Refiğ on the other hand stands closer to Direction line including left Kemalism. Erksan produced films that underline class based separations (Daldal, 2005:60-61). Firstly Turkish cinema was criticized about the cinema patterns it has, people who are closely interested in cinema generated ideas about what a realist cinema may be like. All directors of social realism can be regarded as 'middle class raised within the urban culture'. They all belong to a group with a job, earning their living not through capital but by labor.

All directors, one way or another, had the 'descending rights to people' kind of attitude reminding of the times when Kemalism was being constructed (Daldal, 2005:94). They might have regarded this attitude to be 'taking a responsibility' of the situation. When the low education and intellectual level of the society was considered, they had the purpose to raise class consciousness among middle and low economic classes and show what social issues are to a society, which had so far had only watched melodramas.

Social realism had emerged following the coup of 1960 and temporarily halted after 1965. As the reason for this, Aslı Daldal put forward the Party of Justice taking the government over in 1965. Cinema, moving away from social realism was engaged in a line called national cinema which included elements of Ottoman or national culture. On the other hand, the cinema critics who supported social realism before 1965 now took on an attitude of looking down on social realism as they considered themselves in a universal – Marxist leftist understanding (Daldal, 2005:7). According to me, social realism is closer to Marxist values rather than a nationalist perspective, and has many more films in the framework of these values.

The realism in art was temporarily eliminated from the Turkish cinema because, just like similar versions in the world, the ruling bodies became disturbed about their social benefits and this progressivism that kept development in the foreground. Especially the concern of bureaucracy had about ideas that could mobilize the masses brought social realism to an end in Turkey (Daldal, 2005:9). Probably the bureaucracy and the army thought that the social realism would cause an awakening of the society as a whole, the middle and lower class realize their self-interests and thus threaten their ruling class position. Investor class as well must have been glad that a movement with a discourse and claim against their interests was leaving the Turkish cinema. Since it is mostly composed of workers, an organic tie can be established between the middle class and the social realism movement. However, neither the middle class is socially powerful enough to deal with bourgeoisie and bureaucracy nor did it clearly and powerfully support the social realism, just as the lower class did not either.

When it lost the support of army and bureaucracy in general, social realism could not find a structure to lean on. Existence of an artistic movement in these conditions of Turkey cannot be through the public support alone: there is always need for the approval of bureaucratic and political bodies. Moreover, we cannot say that the public supported social realism either in the box-office or intellectually.

1.14. The Goal of the Study and Assumptions

This study aims to understand the relation between the social realism movement in Turkish cinema and urban poor in the city. The main destination which this thesis would like to sort out is the conversion of urban low class in Turkish society by analyzing the films which this thesis considers in social realist line since 1960s to 1980s. While moving toward this goal, the main objective of the dissertation is the social realism movement, as a means and field of study which will focus on the urban poor of the Turkish society.

The research question of the thesis is ‘how social realism movement in Turkish cinema from the early 1960s to the end of 1980s, expressed the transformation of Turkish urban poor’. The significance of this study is two sided: first, the transformation of the lower income class of Turkish society from the early 1960s to late 1980s has hardly ever been studied in the literature of the social sciences. The second is that social realism line of Turkish cinema is displaying great importance to social sciences; this cinema line with its ‘social content’ is worth looking into, and may reflect the experiences of the lower class, in terms of social sciences.

The dissertation explores the following hypotheses:

1. The urban poor and the problems of the urban poor began to be expressed with the beginning of social realism movement, from the early 1960s.
2. Social realism is merely the methodological name of this ‘expression’.
3. By the end of 1980s, the films that focus on the problems of urban poor had vanished; Turkish cinema no longer make room for the films which focus on social problems and place in its center the characters from urban poor.

We accept right away that the concept of urban poor is questioned in many of the film genres. Our dissertation however, sets some restrictions on films it will analyze and the dissertation itself, with the aim of to be loyal to the social realism genre. Thus, the next issue is the limits of the thesis. ‘How we are to categorize all the films

within the given period of time' and 'according to which criteria we are include or exclude the films'; these issues will be solved by setting these limits.

The primary criterion is the content of the films: it is a criterion that a character or a group of characters from the urban poor is in the center of the film and the film expounds on their experiences as a social problem. One of the features the dissertation expects from the films is to follow a cinema language which places in the center of film one or multiple social phenomena that concerns the urban poor and regards these phenomena as issues to be diagnosed or to be solved.

Regarding the ways the poor characters are pictured in Turkish cinema we may mention three different forms of expression. One of these is the supporting character as a comical element, the other is 'the settling character', more common to the arabesque films; the person who accepts poverty as an unchangeable condition. The third is the poor who struggles against poverty as well as what their position yields. Our target type is the third model: the struggle and problems of an individual who is suppressed by the system.

Actually, when one says 'the reflection of the urban poor' there may be many films to address this. In the melodramas of 1960s, we see that many laborers such as cooks, drivers, servants are placed as the supporting characters. However, they are but figures placed to reinforce the humor elements in the films. They are not the concern and the center of the films. Although family comedies produced in 1970s, such as *Gülen Gözler*, *Neşeli Günler*, etc., tell the stories of poor families, with their aim to make people laugh, this does not belong within the limits of our study. Many films by Kemal Sunal also are not of our concern since their goals to be comedies; except for films in cooperation with Zeki Ökten, such as *Düttürü Dünya* and *Yoksul*. *Yoksul* and *Düttürü Dünya* are films that we deploy in the scope of our study, as they deal with problems of a poor character in contexts far from humorous.

The films analyzed by our study also have spatial boundaries. This boundary is that the script belongs to the 'city', and has to take place within the 'city'. Spatial narrowing was crucial for the volume of the thesis and the tidiness of the topic. We

had to leave out reluctantly many valuable examples within the social realism genre. Among these were, *Yılanların Öcü* (Revenge of the Snakes, 1962) and *Susuz Yaz* (Dry Summer, 1964) by Metin Erksan, *Sürü* (The Herd, 1978) and *Pehlivan* (The Wrestler, 1984) by Zeki Ökten, *Bereketli Topraklar Üzerinde* (On Fertile Lands, 1979) by Erden Kıral, *Yol* (The Road, 1982) and *Kurbağalar* (The Frogs, 1985) by Şerif Gören, precious gems of Turkish Cinema which should certainly be accounted for.

In this context, by leaving these films out, the content and the goals of the films become clear. We want to see how poor people who were born in the city or brought in by migration, were pictured in the social realist films of the early 1960s to the late 1980s and how the social transformation of poor people of the city, was expressed.

Our list of films is as follows:

Gecelerin Ötesi /Beyond the Nights – 1960 / Erksan

Otobüs Yolcuları / The Bus Passengers – 1961 / Göreç

Acı Hayat / Bitter Life – 1962 / Erksan

Gurbet Kuşları / Birds of Exile – 1964 / Refiğ

Karanlıkta Uyananlar / Those Awakening In the Dark – 1964 / Göreç

Bitmeyen Yol / The Unending Road– 1965 / Sağıroğlu

Umut / Hope– 1970 / Güney

Gelin /The Bride– 1973 / Akad

Düğün / The Wedding– 1973 / Akad

Diyet / The Ransom– 1974 / Akad

Arkadaş / The Friend – 1974 / Güney

Maden / The Mine– 1978 / Özkan

Demiryol / The Railroad– 1979 / Özkan

Düşman / The Enemy – 1979 / Ökten

Yusuf ile Kenan / Yusuf and Kenan– 1979 / Kavur

At / The Horse– 1982 / Özgentürk

Faize Hücum / Rush on Interest– 1982 / Ökten

Bir Yudum Sevgi / A Sip Of Love– 1984 / Yılmaz

Bir Avuç Cennet / A Handful of Paradise– 1985 / Özer

Yoksul / Poor– 1986 / Ökten

Çark / The Wheel – 1987 / Hiçdurmaz

Düştürü Dünya / Skimpy World – 1988 / Ökten

As the reader will encounter frequently throughout our study we used ‘lower class’ and ‘urban poor’ terms interchangeably. Although they are not 100% synonymous, each covers the other for the most part, hence our preference. In production relations, especially in Marxist perspective, the occupations which are defined in lower class also belong to the poor people, such as: informal sector worker, factory worker etc. On the other hand, urban poor is composed the important amount of low income class, except the ones who are from rural poor.

There are points where the definition of the lower class differentiates from the definition of urban poor. In Marxist perspective, for individual, ‘class’ term is used to define the economic status of person in production relations. Whereas, ‘urban poor’ concept contains different jobs and status. We may claim that the lower class people work in the jobs which are disliked by the rest of the society, the jobs which are less prestigious and lower status ones.

In the classification of the social groups, it may be thought that the lower class which is targeted in our thesis corresponds to the sum of industrial and agrarian workers. Nevertheless, the laborer status of the people analyzed in our study is of secondary importance. The primary concern is the monthly income of these people. A CEO of a company who makes thousands of dollars monthly is also a laborer theoretically, yet way beyond the concerns of our study. A shop owner who can support barely himself and his family with the income of a little shop is the owner of a means of production and cannot be regarded as a laborer in the Marxist tradition, yet being one of the ‘poor’ (lower class), he is a target of our dissertation.

Marxism naturally is the first ideology that comes to mind when the lower class is studied in cinema or some other discipline. However, regarding Marxism and lower class as equals or substitutes for each other is a serious mistake, to be avoided. Although it is a must that we accept the first to give solutions to the lower economic

class's identified problems and showed a way out came from Marx, and those following his approach, interpreting the lower class, studying its life or protecting its interest, are not indexed by Marxism. Still, we shall state that Marxist criticism had a deep impact on the dissertation, both in its analysis on the cinema and class. I am also examining with a Marxist perspective how urban poor is reflected in the film examples of Turkish social realist line along the three decades.

In Turkey, urban poor experienced an intense change from 1960 to 1980s. Some lower class people in the cities had city origins but the majority of urban poor was from the rural areas and came to the city through migration. Both the transformation due to migration from the countryside to the city and the changes in the relations of production and the life-styles in the time travel from 60s to 80s changed the concepts which urban poor people kept in their life. Of course, the phenomena that social realism is inspired from and expressed within changed as the trend was directly affected by the change. Nonetheless, there were concepts that did not change.

One that stayed is 'poverty'. The lower class by definition is intertwined with poverty and deprivation. In almost every film in our dissertation we encounter poverty which defines and recreates the opportunities and limits of the lower class but the films that underline the fact much more are *Gecelerin Ötesi*, *Bitmeyen Yol*, *Umut*, *Düşman*, *At* and *Bir Yudum Sevgi*.

Another concept is 'migration'. This is a phenomenon which all nation-states goaling to industrialize experience in the modernist period. It is the action of the masses that flow from the country to the city in order to work in the factories established in the cities. While the Western World experienced this in 19th century, the industrialization and migration increased in pace in Turkey, following the 2nd World War. *Gurbet Kuşları* and *Bitmeyen Yol* from 60s, *Gelin*, *Düğün* and *Yusuf ile Kenan* from 70s and *At* and *Bir Avuç Cennet* from 80s period of our study are the films that involve the concept of internal migration.

The urban poor should also be analyzed in terms of its whereabouts in the city and when we follow this criteria in our films, we encounter 'gecekondu'. Gecekondu

which in terms of aura seemed fit for the people of the country accepted to the city, can clearly be seen in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, *Bitmeyen Yol*, *Umut*, *Gelin*, *Düğün*, *Diyet*, *Düşman*, *At*, *Bir Yudum Sevgi*, *Bir Avuç Cennet* and *Düttürü Dünya*.

A point we noticed while analyzing these notions in the films, and that attracted our attention is that when a concept is announced, it introduces some other concepts with itself. For example, the concept of migration was naturally associated with cultural conflict: we could fit it in the same framework of the transformation of the lower class, in its living spaces and relations of production. The desire of an individual from the lower class to move up the social ladder was reinforced by the practices of the consumer society that elevates a life of luxury. Class awareness has always been born as a consequence of class struggle, and the anti-capitalist idea formed the core of the resistance the lower class demonstrated against the regime in the 1970s.

1.15. Method of the Study and Research Techniques

In our study, the research method that forms the spine of the methodology is ‘historical analysis’. The definition and the ways of the historical analysis is demonstrated as follows: “A prominent research tradition in the social sciences, especially in political science and sociology. Works within this research tradition use comparative-historical methods, pursue causal explanations, and analyze units of analysis at the meso or macro-level” (Lange, 2013:19).

“Comparative-historical methods combine comparative and within-case methods, and therefore have affinities with both comparative/nomothetic methods and within-case/ideographic methods. Similar to statistical and experimental methods, comparative- historical methods employ comparison as a means of gaining insight into causal determinants. Similar to ethnographic and historical methods, comparative-historical methods explore the characteristics and causes of particular phenomena” (Lange, 2013:13-14).

There are four approaches critical to historical research and comparative research:

” ** Historical Events Research – focuses on one short historical period (1 case, 1 time period)

** Historical Process Research – traces a sequence of events over a number of years (1 case, many time periods)

** Cross-sectional Comparative Research – comparing data from one time period between two or more nations (many cases, 1 time period)

** Comparative Historical Research – longitudinal comparative research (many cases, many time periods)”

(soc.umn.edu/soc3801w/Lecture%20Slides/Lecture_21_sp06).

The fourth of these methods ‘comparative historical research’ is appropriate for our study. Our cases are ‘the social realism movement and the ‘lower class’; what we mean by ‘many time periods’ is 60s, 70s, and 80s. Our study is a qualitative one, focusing on the contents of 22 films in its list, it will analyze the process the lower class and social realism followed through the 3 decades mentioned above.

“The classic social thinkers in the nineteenth century, such as Émile Durkheim, Karl Marx, and Max Weber, who founded the social sciences, used a historical and comparative method. This method is used extensively in several areas of sociology (e.g., social change, political sociology, social movements, and social stratification) and has been applied in many others, as well (e.g., religion, criminology, gender issues, race relations, and family)” (Kreuger – Lawrance, 2006:419).

“Comparative researchers compare across cultural-geographic units (e.g., urban areas, nations, societies, etc.). Historical researchers investigate past contexts, usually in one culture (e.g., periods, epochs, ages, eras, etc.), for sequence and comparison. Of course, a researcher can combine both to investigate multiple cultural contexts in one or more historical contexts. Yet, each period or society has its unique causal processes, meaning systems, and social relations. This produces a creative tension between the concrete specifics in a context and the abstract ideas a researcher uses to make links across contexts” (Kreuger – Lawrance, 2006:427).

Comparative historical method can be understood as a combined way but with one difference in our study: we will not compare urban areas or different nations with each other. We will compare and examine the journey of the notions (social realism and urban low class) in the time (60s, 70s and 80s). Additionally, the interaction of both of these notions with each other for every era (60s, 70s and 80s) will be another dimension of thesis.

The main line of our study is social realism and the main material is our film list. Than we can claim that film analysis is the main research technique that will lead us in our film analysis.

The film analysis will be based on the analysis of the above 22 films through the above mentioned concepts. We may state that the analysis will emphasize different concepts in each time period, meaning 1960s, 1970s and 1980s as the lower class was exposed to different concepts in the social changes of every time period, and this also affected the structures of the films.

About the types of film analysis Zafer Özden informs us: “in the film criticism field of our day, by semiotic, ideological, sociologic, genre wise, historical, and auteurist approaches, taking assistance from various scientific disciplines, films are more deeply critiqued” (Özden, 2004:104)

Another interpretation classifies film analysis in 5 branches: ”(1) Text-based film analysis (structural approach), (2) topic based analysis (narrative approach), (3) picture and sound approach (iconic analysis), (4) psychoanalytical approach and (5) historical approach” (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Film_analysis). Regarding the types of analyses in this interpretation, we cannot use only single one of them; we need more than one approach in our analysis. Besides, using more than one approach gives depth and resourcefulness to the analysis. The ones that we will employ are ‘text-based film analysis, ‘topic based analysis’ and ‘historical approach’.

Our dissertation will perform film analysis around the concepts that the films focus on (migration, poverty, gecekondü etc.). The concepts that film includes and the

dialogues in the script throughout the film are useful to see the areas which film desires to analyze.

Timothy Corrigan demands an analysis by considering the role which 'realism' concept plays in the films by questioning the space which 'realism' occupies in a film analysis. He thinks the dramatic affect which was produced by realism is the critical point in this questioning and it must be focused also the way which that dramatic affect is employed (Corrigan, 2008:72). Social realism provides a proper and fruitful space concerning this comment. We may also measure the quality and depth of social realist films by checking how the class, people or plot they want to represent complies with its real life counterpart. The 22 films we have chosen for our dissertation satisfies the expectation of cinema from the realism concept adequately by representing the people precisely in their character designs, and by giving place to the social problem or problems, of their times.

The lines that exist in film analysis as subgenres and that we are to employ in our study is historical and sociological film analysis. Zafer Özden brings such definitions to these two film analysis types:

“historical analysis: analysis of films as reflections of their era’s socioeconomic, aesthetic, and industrial conditions

sociological analysis: the analysis of the films as sociologic data in accordance with their relations with the society and social functions” (Özden, 2004:106). Both these film analysis methods are useful and acceptable for this dissertation.

Of these two methods, historical analysis is the one our thesis stands closer to. With the assumption that cinema and films are affected by social changes and reflect them, our study regards films as a reflection of their era and this assumption is the inspiration for the study. Zafer Özden thus deepens his definition of historical film criticism: “..it involves films being evaluated in the context of the time they were produced.. films as a means of cultural expressionism, both reflect the psyche of their times, express their time’s prevailing ideas and world perspectives, represent the

ethics, and also exist in the conditions of the practices in the industrial structure of the cinema of the time, the production mentality and the technological level” (Özden, 2004:119-120).

Corrigan claims that the use and the benefit of historical method are giving opportunity to examine the films, both relatedly with the events of the era in question and the stances of the films in the cinema history. It can be examined directly the relation between film and the time which it is made in historical method (Corrigan, 2008:110 -111).

Giving examples of the questions to be asked in historical film analysis, Lale Kabadayı illuminated the points historical film analysis is curious about: “a few questions to be written about the historical approach may help the writer start the criticism: is the time which film is produced and the time which film reflects same? If not, how does it shape the past? How does the historical background of the film affect the manner of telling (structural etc)? Are there any relations to be established between other types of criticisms such as history-sociology, history genre features? If so, how do these processes affect the film – production, distribution process or meaning-? Is the film a product of its time? Or does it have a manner of telling ahead of / behind its time? .. historical criticism is in close connection with ideological and sociological criticism hence, while conducting historical criticism, these approaches are also to be used in analysis ” (Kabadayı, 2013:64-65).

The other type of criticism is sociological criticism: “Sociological approach mainly approaches the films with characters that provide the themes and role models and with certain class features. These themes and characters are rooted in social life and they appear in the context of the relations of a social environment” (Özden, 2004:161).

“To be able to conduct sociological criticism; there will be need for approaches such as reality, representation, construction, allegory, society, rituals, myths, cultural values, globalization, capitalism, evil, violence, mass, family, daily life, lifestyle, ethics, identity, social roles, culturalization, gender, stereotypes, prejudices, the

other, dualism, class, fascism, orientalism, modernism, postmodernism, and make use of them too” (Kabadayı, 2013:57). Sociological criticism is crucial as the thesis analyzes the lower class and its transformation through time. The connection between social change and cinema is always alive and mutual. Among all other branches of art, cinema is the one that first recognizes and reflects sociological changes. Özden’s comment on this type of criticism is parallel to our statements: “a film critic with sociological criticism handles films as a product of culture, expressing a society’s value judgments, norms, ideals and perspective on life, just like a sociologist” (Özden, 2004:154).

“Sociological approach searches for the answer to the question ‘what is the cultural and national quality of the film?’. What does the film have to say about the culture of the country it is produced in?.. Cultural codes change from country to country and culture to culture” (Kabadayı, cited from Corrigan, 2013:54)

Gülseren Güçhan defines the unbreakable tie between society and cinema as follows: “the change in the contents in the films indicates the change in moral values, beliefs, perspectives of the majority of the society” (Kabadayı, cited from Güçhan, 2013:56) This change takes place in two ways: one is when there is a change in society, the contents of the film attempts to change itself thus catching up with society. The other is that the changes in the contents of the films lead to changes in society and films adapt the society to its contents. Be the effect from society to cinema or cinema to society, sociological criticism is an essential method for our cinema.

In addition to historical and sociological criticism, we also shall consider another method of analysis, ideological film analysis. “Ideological criticism in the later 1970s generally started to modify the inflexible model inherited from Althusserian Marxism, inspired in particular by the rediscovery of the writings of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci in the 1920s” (Langford, 2006:22).

Ideological critics asserts that the films do not reflect and interpret the world without values; the perspectives that films have and the values that films take interest must be scrutinized in the critics (Corrigan, 2008:122).

Not only the film's content but also a lot of factors such as the structure of discourse, the characters, the plot, the scale of shot affect the stance of a film. Ideological critics consider all these components: for instance, showing enemy in large groups or similar to each other in camera angle in a war film, interests the ideological critics (Corrigan, 2008:124). The ideological inducements and hidden manipulations that pervade in the content of the film and that Corrigan underlines in terms of film technique, may be generalized for the discourse and content of the film. Especially in the Hollywood films, although the audience hardly ever notices and the subconscious is affected by this propaganda, the critics easily analyze many attempts to ideologically influence the audience. In the political wing of social realism that we analyze, there are such examples but the difference from Hollywood films is that they do not hide in in the discourse of the film but declare it loud and clear. This method can be regarded as a 'vulgar propaganda'.

On the other hand, the more sociological films of the social realism aim to display the social problems naked as they are, and this choice is one of the main points that differentiate the social realism from the other cinema movements. Of course, this preference is an approach that does not make any prescriptions to the social issue it displays or nor does not guide the audience towards a social / political method.

Our list of films includes samples of 'social realism' and 'political cinema'. *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* from 1960s, *Arkadaş*, *Maden* and *Demiryol* from 1970s, and *Çark* from 1980s served as a platform for an ideology to explain itself or to show how the lower class should take on organized action. According to Corrigan, class studies scrutinize how the power is distributed in the society via social and economic arrangements in the contents of the films (Corrigan, 2008:123).

One of the most important issues in film analysis is that if the film claims to reflect a subject and issue of the time when it is produced, to what extent it has been able to realize it. Nilgün Abisel's comment on this is as follows: "although the claim that one can tell the social, cultural and socio psychological features of an era simply by looking in to popular films, is not altogether abandoned, it is no longer sufficient. Because the films are accepted not to be 'reflection but constructions built on

representations. Thus, it is revealed that trying to understand the society of the time via thematic and structural conventions while analyzing the genres of the films is no longer sufficient. Just as important, the issue that the interaction processes which play a role in establishing the conventions also are to be understood, has been brought in the agenda” (Özden, cited from Abisel, 2004:292). The point underlined by Abisel is very important for popular films because they need an ideological construction rather than being a ‘direct’ reflection and it penetrates what it wants to say indirectly to the subconscious of the audience. This is more visible in Hollywood films. It is observed that in social realism movement that we examine, the questions desired to be asked in the films are done directly and clearly. Concepts such as migration, cultural conflict, relations of class and politics are discussed and questioned in front of the audience, sometimes even with clarity of didacticism and sometimes, connected with a resolution prescription. This preference keeps social realism clear as content. Nevertheless, as a genre, it has the tradition of being very simple and clear in uttering what it wants to say. Social realism, which had a concern to reach ‘as many people as possible’ since the Soviet times when it emerged for the first time, although it sometimes passed to the propaganda line of leftist thought. Usually it was contented with taking a picture of society and showing it again back to the society.

As our thesis analyzes urban poor, interpreting films with a ‘class wise’ perspective may be beneficial for us to develop our thesis. With a definition reminiscent of historical film analysis, Ahmet Tokul, points to the coordination between film and society: “If we decide to analyze a film from Marxist perspective, we cannot do it separately from the background of the director, the place it was produced in and the time of its production, by contradicting with dialectic. All of these are the building blocks of the produced film” (Tokul, filmelestirisi.com).

“Marxist art critics generally agree that arts reflect the outer realism and carry information in this respect. However, after these two common points, which reality is to be reflected (the existing reality or potential reality?) how should it be reflected (the structure issue) caused discussions within revolutionary ideology” (Birikim, 1975:45). The question at the beginning of the statement ‘the existing reality or the

potential reality' reveals the difference between 'social reality' and 'socialist reality'. Whether it should reflect and discuss the existing reality of the society or the model it desires and longs for, is a point Marxist film production and criticism specially emphasizes.

In the interview which we conducted with Tunca Arslan, he states the two category classification of Godard and explains the methodological problem of films: "there Godard sets a very important distinction, right on this 68, something he had written based on the discussions in French New Wave. By saying 'we can produce two types of films, 'one, we can produce political films, two, we can produce films with political methods', he attacks the whole category of films he defines as political films. Vulgar films with slogans, trying to establish ties with the audience right away, and almost trying to convert them at the movie theatres, are films with a vulgar ideology. Saying that political method requires a dialectical approach, dialectical way of thinking and a dialectical line, draws, in my opinion, a delicious line" (Arslan, 3 Kasım 2011). As we have stated in the interview which we did with Tunca Arslan, the concept we stand with and think that the majority of the films we have chosen follow as well is 'producing films with political method'. Actually there are films in our list with obvious didacticism in 60s (Otobüs Yolcuları, Karanlıkta Uyananlar), 70s (Arkadaş, Maden, Demiryol) and 80s (Çark) but of these, Maden, Demiryol and Çark should be regarded as films in which a certain political movement and class stance of the working class are questioned. Otobüs Yolcuları and Karanlıkta Uyananlar films on the other hand, have scenarios that contain an intense didacticism in order to generate class awareness. However, compared to Gelin or Bir Yudum Sevgi, we may accept them to be more political. Closest to the line Godard defines as 'political film' and dislikes is Arkadaş. Still, Arkadaş shall be evaluated as a production of a social environment of the 70s, when everything was political. For example, the terms 'left' or 'socialism' are not used even once throughout the film, still the deep scenario which criticizes the daily practices of the bourgeoisie was suppressed under the arguments of socialism, the dominant ideology of the prevailing conditions of the time. What it criticized was the bourgeoisie life style for which middle and lower class yearned but the prescription it had for the negative aspects of that life was abolishing of the capitalist regime via a socialist

revolution. Such a propaganda, although does not weaken the aesthetic aspect of the film, locates it in the framework of ‘producing political films’ which Godard criticizes.

The content of the art of Bertolt Brecht, an important name in Marxist understanding of art, is defined as such: “.. the importance of Brecht’s art is not only about reflecting this or that outer reality (giving ‘real information’) but also displaying the information process and the social structure. Brecht performs this by the structure of his plays. He places dialectics somewhere between their ideological consciousness and social realism that covers them all. This is what radically snatches him from the hundreds years of bourgeoisie arts and sets him as one of the founders of Marxist arts” (Birikim, 1975:46). If we induce from Brecht’s special example to the Marxist art and criticism in general, we may surmise as follows: maybe the basic quality that distinguishes Marxist understanding of arts from other philosophies of arts is the strife it demonstrates to raise awareness of society. It is clear that this effort of Marxism to raise awareness for all classes of society, except for the class it regards as capitalist class, and the target is an awareness that will begin the struggle against capitalism which is believed to be essential. Marxism was born and developed as a response to the wild character of capitalism that suppressed the lower class; it also produced a way which took responsibility of the situation and established its ideological stance on the basis of preventing class suppression and alienation.

“Marxist film criticism while being concerned with the reproducing of the values of capitalist society in the films, also researches how these values affect the morals of economic relations and the relations between people” (Kurtuluş, cinnet.org). We see here that the cinema of social realism which sometimes draws a picture of a social problems and sometimes creates a method to solve the problem feeds on Marxist understanding. Obviously, finding all the sources and control of social realism in Marxism is groundless in scientific terms yet, it can easily be claimed that Marxist arguments are ideological channels which influenced social realism the most.

Berna Moran thinks that Marxist criticism is different from other types of criticism with regard to relation with sociological criticism: “sociological criticism for the

most part is descriptive; it does not have a judgment on the piece, it only detects the situation. But sometimes it becomes normative and assigns moral values.. the best example of this is Marxist criticism which in many ways merges with sociological criticism and moreover, which is difficult to separate from it” (Özden, cited from Moran, 2004:157). Moran interprets the Marxist criticism and perception of cinema on a point in parallel to the ‘socialist realism’ line; moreover she regards the sociological criticism closely related to the ‘social realism’ concept.

Throughout the literature review books and other published material which examines the urban poor in Turkish cinema and social change of urban poor will be researched. It will be benefited from magazine writings and newspapers which commented on the direction on Turkish cinema and examined class differences in cinema. The other research method which will be used in this dissertation is the partially structured in-depth interview with various cinema experts of Turkey. The below questions will be asked to these film critics and cinema academicians. The study will be tried to enrich with their opinions about social realism:

1 – It is thought that the process in which the social problems are the main direction of the films and named as “social realism” in Turkish cinema is thought to have started in the early 1960s. What is the reason for that in your opinion?

2 – If we are to separate this period from early 1960s to late 1980s in three as decades such as 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, how is social realist trend reflected in our cinema in each time period and which problems it scrutinized?

3 – Which directors used social realism movement, and how did they reflect the social realism in their line of cinema?

4 – If we admit that this line which made social problems the main problem of the cinema language ended by the end of 1980s, what are the facts which may be the underlying reasons?

5 – From the end of 1980s to our day, which lines of cinema were given place in our cinema and have there been any films produced that we may include within the social realism movement?

As opposed to my master dissertation, this study is planned to be performed not with everyone with regards to some criteria but with a limited number of people who have in-depth knowledge of the subject matter. It is crucial that the study to enrich through the ideas of professionals. Apart from what has been written on the subject, there is a need of analysis and interpretation and the people who can do this one best are academicians in cinema field and cinema critics. The analysis of the data I obtain as a result of the interviews will be again carried out by me. The statements in the interviews will be used within the dissertation.

CHAPTER 2

2. SOCIAL REALISM AND URBAN POOR IN 1960s

2.1. Introduction

Our thesis claims that social realism line showed its affect and gave its first examples in 1960s. Cinema but especially social realism line is going parallel with the societal conversions. Naturally, these examples were occurred due to growing class consciousness in low income people. Also, it could be found the clues for the ‘identity search’ of Turkish society and Turkish cinema together in these examples. It must be considered that Turkish society had an important change in 1960s depending on clash of modernity – anti-modernity on urban environment. Huge amount migrant masses joined to the city life by splitting countryside life and that resulted in confrontation for the first time for rural people with the modernist-urban culture and also first time for urban people with the rural customs / life which were carried to city by the migrant people.

This chapter will clear up not only the modernity clash which is mentioned above but also will chase the reasons and the results of the transformation in production relations in Turkey. Actually, the main reason behind this migration is that transformation in production relations. Our films mostly exhibit the results of this economic and social transformation which made Turkish society closer to Western world criteria and dominant economic understanding of world, capitalist economy.

2.2. Change in Turkish Cinema, 1960s

Turkish cinema was in a quest which has worries to construct an identity for itself at the beginning of 1960s. Nilgün Abisel interprets the case that, the critical points in Turkish films after 1960 which display the paradoxes brought about by modernity and social transformation, that has been going on for a while (Abisel, 1994:85-86). According to Aslı Daldal, in this period, Turkish cinema was in search of a line that could both represent itself as well as Turkish society in the process of its national transformation (Daldal, 2005:58).

The directors that produced social realist films in the early 1960s had also aesthetic preoccupations while generating a national cinema language and they tried to convey this in their films” (Kara, 2012, sadibey.com/2012/07/31). Social realist line may be the most important part of this endeavor: “The most important social realist directors of 1960 may be identified as Metin Erksan, Halit Refiğ, Ertem Göreç, Duygu Sağıroğlu and Ömer Lütfi Akad. Of these, Halit Refiğ and Metin Erksan are the directors that could not keep a distance from politics. Metin Erksan supported the Yön movement, was Chairman of Cinema Laborer’s Union of Turkey and also stood close to the Communist Party of Turkey. Halit Refiğ on the other hand, is a supporter of Kemalism and Yön movement in the real sense of the word. The ideology of Erksan and Refiğ was also visible in their films. In the films of both directors, the characters and their features, symbolize their political beliefs. For example Gurbet Kuşları by Halit Refiğ and Yılanların Öcü and Susuz Yaz by Metin Erksan are films in which their political views are most clearly expressed (zamanegezgini.wordpress.com/2011/12/08/).

Refiğ, who collected his articles in a book ‘Ulusal Sinema Kavgası’(National Cinema Dispute) (1971), similar to a ‘Third Cinema’ theoretician, emphasized the role of cinema in the formation of an anti-exploitative culture. According to Refiğ, the cinema that bloomed in 1950s’ Turkey was the ‘cinema of the people’, not dependent on monetary support of either the bourgeois or the state, and was born out of the need of people to watch national cinema. However, national cinema lost its national features due to the star system, stereotypical subjects and the influence of foreign movies. The real problem, according to Refiğ, is that films should be national with regard to general structure and features. For this reason, whether it could be the traditional folk arts or Ottoman Palace arts, it would have to steer towards the past, namely ‘the cultural heritage’ .. Another debate group was formed by the writers around Sinematek, which was founded in İstanbul in 1965. Sinematek started a program composed of projections of ‘auteur’ directors such as Michelangelo Antonini and Jean-Luc Godard of European cinema and the films of Cinema of Soviet Revolution and related debate meetings on these films, as an alternative program to entrenched cinema culture. Aside

from this, Sinematek published a magazine called Yeni Sinema which gave place to cinema movements apart from the mainstream such as French New Wave Cinema, Italian New Realist Cinema and Brazilian 'Cinema Novo'. The Sinematek group and the writers of New Cinema stated that necessity of 'artistic cinema', necessity of a political and realist approach to cinema are needed by criticizing the current conditions of Turkish cinema and the films being produced. Moreover, cinema clubs that became commonplace in 1960s in the urban cities and united under a confederation in the early 1970s, helped a different culture of cinema to blossom (ekitap.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,80306/farkli-sinema-calismalari).

In the sentences by Yağız, 1960s seem to be the years freedom was felt more when compared to earlier years: "60s was a time a freedom trend and a life style were formed not only in Turkey but in all world. It has a unique spirit in terms of clothing, music, entertainment and university youth. The life style and spirit of 60s also permeated Turkish films. This setting was totally visible in the films. For example, in the film there are youngsters – especially the leading actors/actresses- dressed in the trends of the time and dancing to the popular music of the day. Cinema expressed the society with its own culture and changing characteristics. It can be said that the cinema had been a mirror to the society" (Yağız, 2006:26). These words are true for us as well: before cinema had a line that did not reflect the daily practices of life: crime investigation films, historical epic films, romantic films took the audience to a fairy tale world, they were not directly exposed to. Even though the genre of a film is melodrama, if it is based on real life and the script represents the people from real life, it proves that films touch the daily life.

2.3. Transition in Production Relations

"While the industrialization steps taken in the big cities produce new lines of business, they form the projection of 'city paved with gold'. The poor of the rural areas who were enchanted by this magic and who were fed up with poverty, hunger and cruelty of the landlords, began to migrate to the cities where they became the poor of the city, and becoming 'the other' and discriminated one. This migration wave was to cause great turmoil and social transformation" (Kara, 2012, sadibey.com/2012/07/31).

The transformation of relations of production in the rural parts before 1960 determined the contents of social change. The unemployment brought about by mechanization of agriculture forced the agriculture workers to migrate to cities. What lay beneath the start of a depreciation process of traditional relations of agriculture called sharecropping, usufructuary was again the technological developments in farming (Sencer, 1974:363)

The mechanization of the agriculture was against the benefits of the small producer as much as it was for the big producer. The villager who owned a small amount of land either lost his land and became an agricultural worker or became even poorer than before. Still we cannot claim that the changing of the agricultural technology ended the notion of small producer: although the small producer had the opportunity to offer his produce to the market, his production was mostly for self-consumption (Sencer, 1974:398-399). The reason of that villager can not struggle with the market conditions and became even poorer than before is that the profit and the investment are not enough to support the villager's life and re-investment on his land.

“It made it even difficult for the poor villagers without lands to work as agricultural laborers with the use of machinery in agriculture as a result of the easy loan opportunities the big land owners were provided within the framework of Marshall Program. In this order, while the landlords of large holdings became wealthier, a great amount of unskilled labor power emerged due to mechanization of the agriculture. The people of Anatolia, unable to find employment in the towns and villages where they reside turned towards larger cities, especially İstanbul, composing the migration called the first wave” (Topçu, 2006:119). A migration as such was the labor power which the industrial bourgeoisie of the cities needed as the industrial arena that had mostly emerged in Turkish cities, needed the laborers that would feed it. Thus, even if mechanization of agriculture had not left the agricultural workers unemployed, the employment promises of industry and attractive opportunities of city would probably still lure these rural masses.

Another social concept that became a phenomenon in 1960s is migration. Although it accelerated in 50s, it became a phenomenon noticeable by everyone in 60s. Cemal

Yalçın thus defines migration: “Migration is a geographical, social and cultural changing places with a goal to return in short or long term or settling for good because of economic, political, ecological or personal reasons” (Yalçın, 2004:13).

Doğan Bıçk1 thinks that Marxist line finds it right to read migration via social groups: “..in coherence with the Marxist methodology, collectives, social conditions, inequalities between the areas and class analysis should be placed in the core of migration instead of individuals” (Bıçk1, 2011:151-152).

The two basic problems of the new poor of the city were accommodation and unemployment. The informal economy developed for unemployment was different than the formal one and these people who could not afford the houses and buildings which are legal accommodations, formed the phenomenon of gecekondu and the attempts to survive in the city (Şengül, 2012:371).

Another concept we encounter due to the migration in 1960s is “seeing the place as the scene the social relations take place” (Şengül, 2012:353). The migrants experienced a change of places, they came from a village or a town to the city. This is not the same as going or migrating from one village to another; it brings about intense social and cultural change.

The problematic nature of the construction of class concept is one of the elements reinforcing the ‘classlessness’ and ‘being lumpen’. Perceiving as urbanization that thousands of people clustering in the periphery of the cities and converting the cities into big cities is far from providing class awareness to these masses through their economic interests.

These people adding to the city were perceived as threats and problems by some of the previous residents of the city. The examples as reasons why the urban middle class considered the migrants a threat to their life style and the city culture in general can be shown the image which occurred in the minds that the migrant lived in gecekondu which have physically undesirable conditions and the migrants continued

to the habits and behavior styles of the rural culture in the city as well (Şengül, 2012:372).

Sema Erder, while evaluating the results of a research, analyzes how the migrants perceived notion of being 'poor' and 'success'. From the way the people define 'poor' it is understood that people who solved the employment and accommodation problems are accepted as 'successful'; the ones who are not successful and had a place to return would return and the ones who did not have a place to return made up the 'new poor' of the city (Erder, 1995:109).

2.4. Societal Conversion in Turkey in 1960s

“The period between 1960-80 is rather unique for Turkey in terms of social, economic and particularly cultural developments. Between 1960-70, the urban population increased by five million. The 1960s were marked by a rapid increase in urbanization and a relative relaxation when intellectual debate on politics, literature and cinema intensified” (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:5).

“The DP’s policy of modernizing agriculture did not benefit the landless peasants. The city was the utopia of the rural people with limited resources in terms of education, health care and entertainment” (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:6).

It is customary in Turkey to recall the 1960s coup of May 27th. The year 1960 is not only the end of a decade and the start of another one. It is the start of a period when a very serious social transformation took place due to a military coup. Sungur Savran asserts that it is visible that the coalition of the urban classes with the industrial bourgeois in the center was the foundation of the military coup that was the starting point of the 60s. (Savran, 2010:165).

Çağlar Keyder claims that the industrial bourgeoisie considered the economic implementations by Adnan Menderes (the prime minister of 1950s, the note of author) without a real basis and these implementations aimed at pulling the wool over people’s eyes only (Keyder, 1987:142). Ilkay Sunar states that, military

bureaucracy aimed to put an end to the populism of the Democratic Party that had lasted for 10 years with a coup and replace the populist approaches with a modernist-urban mentality that wanted a real and an industrial production (Sunar, 2004:143).

The conflicts within the bourgeoisie peaked. The distance widening between the interests of industrial bourgeoisie and trade bourgeoisie (to which we can add agricultural bourgeoisie as well) can be counted as one of the reasons which formed the way for the coup of 1960. As Sungur Savran also stated, May 27th (1960 military coup, the note of author) may be claimed as the transformation of the realization of interests of agricultural and trade bourgeoisie to the realization of the interests of industrial bourgeoisie on the politics (Savran, 2010:167).

The fact that Democrat Party kept rural population that formed its base in the foreground was disliked by the classes in the cities. However, classes with urban origins were a minority in a society which the major population is formed by rural people (Savran, 2010:164). Actually this is what Şerif Mardin points to as perimeter – center dichotomy. We can define these social actors as the minority of the population, urban, well-educated and controlling the governing mechanisms and majority of the population living in the rural parts, uneducated and far from the governing mechanisms.

Observing Turkey in 1960s shows the formation of industrial bourgeoisie that became dominant in the economy and the natural opponent of this kind of bourgeoisie, the working class. The class struggle and massive demonstrations seen in the capitalist societies became visible in Turkey as well. And this proves that the main lines of modern society are installing into Turkish society slowly. As well as the industrial bourgeoisie became the leader class, taking part of working class for the first time in our social history as distinctive and powerful at that extent is very important in the respect of 1960s (Savran, 2010:168-169).

The enhancements of rights of laborers following 1960, did not present a real problem for the industrial bourgeoisie because it needed the working class in order to increase its volume and influence. However the class awareness that could result in a

detailed questioning of the capitalist system and changing it altogether, was definitely unpleasant for the capital owning class (Daldal, 2005:88-89).

The military interventions of 1971 and 1980 were carried out in order to ensure the continuity of the capitalist relations of production after the working class started to surge the role the system designed for it.

2.5. Formation of Class Awareness

The fast paced social activism that took place among the employed and students in accordance with the class struggle of the modern society after 1960, in our opinion, made the society face with a social transformation that the society was not familiar ever (Savran, 2010:176-177).

We can easily follow the thesis and anti-thesis ideas of Marx in Turkey of 1960s. Muzaffer Sencer stated in his “Social Foundations of Political Parties in Turkey” book that what confronted the trade and industrial bourgeoisie that had grown stronger in 1960, were the agricultural workers in despair, because of the changing structure of the agricultural economy and the industrial workers who tried to survive in the cities and were at the verge of realizing that the labor they owned was entitled to rights. The conflict between bourgeoisie and the proletariat did not remain simply as a sociological class conflict. The Workers Party of Turkey which revealed with a socialist ideology and Republican People's Party that represented modernism when it was founded but in 60s, gradually transformed into a social democratic vision, promised to protect the labor (Sencer, 1974:278-279).

Sencer is of the opinion that the rights of the working class had been neglected in the first period of the Republic, up until the 2nd World War, and the political regime enabled only limited execution of the rights from the aftermath of 2nd World War to the beginning of 1960s. Nevertheless, from 2nd World War to 1960s, the working class took baby steps towards class domination. Sencer mentions three main factors of class awareness of the working class: one of them is the social outlook provided by achievement of industrialization stage, the other is the social structure of Turkey,

exposed to social changes was prone to depressions and another was that intellectuals struggled to bring about laborer awareness (Sencer, 1974:320-321).

Aslı Daldal also emphasizes the ‘labor’ character of this platform formed after 1960. The building blocks of this platform are students and people who earn their living through labor (Daldal, 2005:76). In 1960s, among the people who gathered in various wings, there were civil servants on pay roll and people on low income who could not make the ends meet, apart from the industry and agriculture workers (Sencer, 1974:414). The gathering and resistance of all these groups around the concept of ‘labor’ was a first in the history of our Republic.

İlkay Sunar puts forward that there are two different interpretations for the economic model with the ‘national development’ perspective which one of them is Marxist-inspired and the other one is in social democratic line (Sunar, 1974:143). I am of the opinion that the social democratic one is more accepted by the system with a capitalist core. Marxist line was left out because of its discourse threatening ‘the cornerstones of the system’ and its demands against the interests of capital owners.

Ergun Aydınoglu refers to ‘left’ as an ideology and ‘working class’ as a social group coming closer between the years 1960 – 1980: “the 20 years between 1960 and 1980 is significant not only with the existence of left and a strong laborer movement but also with their becoming a whole” (Aydınoglu, 2006:219). Aydınoglu divides this period into two, 1971 being the threshold, and describes the period between 1960 and 1971 with these three points:

“1. Existence of political party (TİP) founded by unionists, included the largest sections of the left (as the members, trends and generations) and was able to be an attraction to almost all pioneering laborers in the conditions of the time;

2. the ability of Tip to embrace all the intelligentsia of the time and as a result, becoming a branch of left’s intellectual production;

3. founding of DİSK, the second biggest union confederation of Turkey, by the unionists who are members or founders of this party and the presence of a privileged relation between DİSK and TİP” (Aydınoğlu, 2006:219).

The fact that the lower income class follows the dominant ideology of the society can be interpreted as the indication of not ever having internalized class awareness. In fact, a class with class awareness is expected to acknowledge the interests of the class, defend them and do as it should no matter what the social conditions are. In Turkey the class unity of the lower economic class is determined not by their common economic interests but by the common socio-cultural values. In this respect, it is possible to view the support of lower economic class for the rise of the leftist thought in 1960s in Turkey as a ‘superficial attitude of the class’.

In the post-coup environment of 1960 too, we cannot state that the lower economic class took an active part in the social transformations. In the first years of the Republic as well, it is accurate to point to a process led by the elite classes who were scientists, artists, senior government officers and businessmen of the industrial arena (Daldal, 2005:73). I could add to this list, middle class who were raised up in urban culture, supporting the social elite even though it is not elite itself.

2.6. CHP and TİP

Savran thinks that every class has its own layers and fractions. He puts forward that class disintegration or solidarity is in close relation with the way the class struggle develops. That the class is a structure open to change also affects its relations with the political parties. Savran thinks that this relation is of a structure that can get powerful or weak and changeable in time. Party may come out of a class or may gradually integrate in a class although independently formed. In this context, a party, in a social period of time protects the political interests of a class (Savran, 2010:210-211).

It made the change in the arena of political parties when the formation of the working class triggered the socialist ideology. This change can be followed most explicitly in

the case of CHP. Since it is the founder party of the Republic, it is the implementer of modernity and the medium bringing the modernist practices to the society in a Jacobean manner.

Nevertheless, the changing of the conditions in the world and the reflections of this change on Turkey made CHP tend to understand society better by moving away its line which was leaning to the state. As Bülent Ecevit underlines, who was Secretary General of CHP at the time, the implementations in the first years of the Republic had an identity which dislodges the social motivates but an action to result in class wise change in the society could not be developed apart from Ottoman time administrators who were forced to relinquish from the power and the religious men who were purged (Sencer, 1974:287).

With the very words by Ecevit, there was a CHP as such: “After 1961 Republican People's Party undertook reforms and changes that would shake the interests various groups both international and domestic .. it scared the big land owners pointing towards land reforms, by undertaking a tax reform scared the high income people who used to evade tax or not pay taxes at all: and disturbed the ones who regarded it a right to exploit the workers by giving all their democratic rights to the laborers..” (Ecevit, 2009:7-8).

These policy changes in CHP disturbed the capital owners within the CHP as well. The important members of the party such as Orhan Öztrak, Turhan Feyzioğlu stated that CHP was not a defender of a socialist system as in Soviets, but on the contrary, the protector of the system against socialist/Marxist movements. This made it clear that they did not want CHP to be on the same page with Workers Party of Turkey (Sencer, 1974:299). It is quite clear that the real fear was of the change of system. The desire to stay within the system aims to be the left without undermining the capitalist economic system and capital owning class.

Perhaps there was no need for Öztrak and Feyzioğlu to feel disturbed by this shift of axis in CHP as it never actually wanted to be a workers' party. It could hardly realize its desire – ‘so called’ desire- to come closer to the workers. What Savran underlines

is also this, CHP has never been a workers' party. Neither its historical tradition nor its organizational structure is appropriate for this (Savran, 2010:239-240).

When its line is analyzed since its founding day, it can easily be observed that CHP, which is in general accepted as representing the 'left stance', did not have such a concern. As Savran underlines, since its beginning, CHP has been in close relations with the Turkish bourgeoisie which then was newly forming. Nonetheless, CHP growing away from bourgeoisie following the passage to the multi-Party period, returned to its natural supporting class bureaucracy and chose the path to integrate with the government (Savran, 2010:225-226).

This process of CHP beginning in the 1960s, displays the relationship between the political party in need of a crowd of people, and classes in need of a political representation (Savran, 2010:231). When we observe the relation of CHP with the working class, we can see its desire to pull to its side this class whose population had grown by 1950s and became a social actor in 1960s. However CHP had done this not only to obtain the votes of the working class but also for the general direction of the capitalist system. TIP (Workers' Party of Turkey) founded in 1961 and DISK (Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey) founded in 1967 indicated with their presence that working class gradually freed itself from the system in terms of politics, ideology and organization. It was noticed early by CHP that serious and urgent precautions should be taken against the leftist trends which are accepted to be extreme both by CHP and the society in general. The 'left-of-center' and 'social democracy' discourse of CHP were thus formed and settled as the backbone of the party (Savran, 2010:228-229).

The party which recognized the lower class as the main element in its agenda is the Workers' Party of Turkey. The socialist party, Workers' Party of Turkey, clearly declares in its program that "the salvation for Turkey is through a non-capitalist path of development". Sencer salutes the party as "the first party in our history founded directly by the working people". The party desires to realize its claim to protect the class interests of the various groups of people who earn their living by working in the society by gathering them under a political structure (Sencer, 1974:315).

Still it cannot be stated that the Workers' Party could isolate itself from the political discourse and dichotomies in Turkey altogether. In the Öncü newspaper of 19 August 1962, the director general of the party, Mehmet Ali Aybar, states that considering the conditions of the day the party can postpone the problems of the workers to the second plan: “.. our first goal is to gather all progressive elements and socialist intellectuals as a front. Because the main conflict of our society is the conflict between the reactionism and progressiveness. The main conflict of the society the conflict between the employer and the employee can now and then be put back or forth for a short term .. the main controversy of our society today is of reactionism and progressiveness. This will be effective only by the organizing around the leadership of the working class. A socialist intellectual has to consider the issue in this respect. In accordance, one must definitely avoid any actions that would disturb the unity of the front” (Aybar, 1962:5). This statement by Aybar reveals that socialism in Turkey was not totally independent from the ‘nationalist-Kemalist left’ discourse and on the contrary, it was within the national left approach wanting to establish ties with it. The main goal of the progress of the modernity and to ‘fight against the reactionism’ is more important than working class rights even for TİP.

Moreover, in Turkey, the working class has never been politically independent of the capital owning class through its past. This attachment to the capital owning class prevented any resistance from societal ground against military coups (Savran, 2010:249-250). It is easier to see why a socialist party has never been founded in the Western sense in Turkey, the working class does not have an independent class consciousness and organization; it exists within the interests of the capital powers.

It is an important step that TİP did not make a ‘concept mistake’ as ‘the proletariat dictatorship’ which Engels did in his pieces because had that been the case, it would both be a totalitarian regime far from democracy and the lower class people who did not belong to the working class would be left out of the party structure. In the party agenda it was especially stated that the leadership qualities expected of the working class while moving forward towards the planned goals “never meant that the working class was or would be superior to other people, class or strata or had or would have any such privileges”. It is essential in terms of uniting the powers and action of the

working class in the city and the agricultural workers, the working masses in the villages for a sound stance of class (Sencer, 1974:322-323).

With regard to socialist thought in Turkey, it was a first with no other examples in Turkey when the Workers' Party of Turkey gave 15 members to the parliament in the elections of 1965. Even though it did it with %3 percent of the votes and the opportunity given by the election system of the day, the fact that a socialist party had representatives in the government could have meant that there was a class awakening in the general population, however there was no continuance. It can be asserted that there are two reasons for this. The first is as mentioned above; the class awareness was not generated by the classes that were to have it, but taught to the masses by a leading class. And the other is that the class awareness and socialist thought were perceived as a trend. In other words, people perceived the socialism as 'the ideology which should be followed' by spreading of left thought, which was empowering in the world at that time, in Turkey. In 1980s, with the liberalism becoming the dominant mood, socialism lost strength and took a secondary place for the society and the lower classes.

2.7. 1960s Films

2.7.1. Weariness from Capitalist Relations

2.7.1.1. Gecelerin Ötesi (Beyond the Nights), 1960

In our view, Metin Erksan should be acknowledged as the first director of social realism. The first film to be considered both in our study and in social realism is **Gecelerin Ötesi** by Metin Erksan who had his most prolific years in 1960s.

Gecelerin Ötesi takes as its subject 6 young adults from the lower class who live in a humble neighborhood. Of these, Fehmi is a truck driver, Ekrem, a worker in a factory, Cevat is an actor for theater, Yüksel and Sezai are musicians who desire to produce Western style music and Ayhan an artist. They are all friends. The first common element we see in these people is their weariness arising from either being workers or unemployed. As a result of the capitalist relations of production emerging

in Turkey, we see that these people have to work for the capital and be content with limited pay. The moment they realize this is the time, psychological weariness accompanies and surpasses the physical weariness in their lives.

We witness one of the factors that form this weariness in the scene where the manager Mümtaz is scolding Fehmi. Fehmi while carrying a load from Anatolia to Istanbul in his truck, had not driven slower than 70 km/h and went up to 120-130 km/h occasionally. Considering he loaded 16 tons on the truck for 10, 130km/h is no less than suicide. And he gets scolded, though he was expecting to be praised: he cannot gain approval from Mr. Mümtaz for his super human performance. They lower his salary from 600 liras to 450.

We may follow a similar weariness in Ekrem's sentences. While scolding his younger sibling for playing soccer, he was also accounting for his past to his mother: "you know what, I am fed up with my siblings. I wasted myself for years on them. You made me work like a horse.. the kids their age, work and provide for a house. At what age did I start working? Seven, right? You sent me off to work instead of school." His answer to his mother's opposition 'we did what could do, son' is 'it would not have been like this if you had wanted to. (looking at the kids playing on the street) even once I wasn't happy like these kids, all I had seen was terrible misery. Look how old I look, you are my mom, come on tell me.. at least 10 years older than my age. I ask you mother, who made me into this, I ask you mother, who?'

The Marxist hypothesis which claims that 'the hard work alienates people from themselves' is confirmed by Fehmi and Ekrem chatting in the Turkish bath. To Ekrem's question to Fehmi 'how was the trip', he replies 'I don't even notice the trip. It seems like not moving to me since I see the same places over and over. The same me or a part of the truck' Ekrem agrees as 'same here. At some point I feel myself a part of the machine'. Later in the conversation when Ekrem says 'there is no taste in living this life, Fehmi, I am fed up with working' Fehmi confirms: "same here".

As the system does not value the labor and the laborer, this results in an intense weariness towards life especially in lower class people who have to work long hours for an insufficient income. This condition steers our characters towards the feeling of finding money through easy and fast way. The most available ways are to ensure their life and beyond that, to get free of these working conditions that kill their soul, are illegal ones. Yüksel, Sezai, Cevat and Ayhan who are occupied by various artistic endeavors are not brave enough to undertake such an option and this is not a part of their imagination. The one who would have such an attempt is the sturdy truck driver, Fehmi. He puts in to action a gas station robbery he probably had planned before, one night on their way back from a drinking night with his friends. Actually he had stated his thought which is a base to this act on the table that night: “not a single real man grew out from our neighborhood, all of us are worth nothing. We have to do something with this group or we will be in ruins”. After robbing the gas station, Fehmi makes all the 5 people in the car partner to the robbery and explains it with these words: ‘I did this for all of you. Only money can save you from the places you have fallen into. Or else, you will be lost’.

Why this money was needed and how it would be used was different for all 6 of them. Fehmi’s only desire is to provide a future to his assistant in the truck, Tahsin, and his sister who is Tahsin’s fiancée. Cevat wants to start a theatre that is far from the commercial theatre, and embraces an elite understanding and wants to tour Anatolia with it. Sezai and Yüksel want to use the money to go to USA and start a career in music there so they bargain with a ship to be illegal passengers. The painter Ayhan uses the money for the woman he admires; he unconcernedly spends his share of the robbery money with this woman who was indifferent to him when he didn’t have the money: renting flat etc.

After this first robbery, again gas stations are chosen for the second and the third robberies. However, in the third robbery something unexpected happens: Ayhan kills the pumper of the station. This murder scares their tender souls and lives which are not used to illegal things. They stop robberies for a while and return to their private lives.

It is a higher possibility that they would not accept such a way if these people all worked regular hours with a satisfactory pay and were not the ones who are affected the most by the unpleasant aspects of life. Nonetheless, the policy of capitalism that favors the strong only, reinforces the feeling that they are not respected as human beings in their inner worlds. Actually, illegal deeds are the last means that these innocent people of the lower class would consider but their despair in the system leads them in that direction. Ekrem for example, sits, laments and cries by the sea showing remorse after the second robbery. For another example, after the third robbery, Fehmi and Ekrem are driving through Anatolia and the sentence they utter during the conversation reveals that they are not at peace about the choice they made: 'We didn't know the reasons to what we did; if we did, we wouldn't have done them'.

Through passing the door only Fehmi could dare to open (or needed to open), they have the opportunity to achieve what they desire in the capitalist system although for a short while. In any case, apart from Ayhan, they all use the money for a cause, for an ideal. Yüksel and Sezai to become famous musicians, Cevat to start a theatre, Fehmi to provide a future for his sister and Ekrem to start a brand new life free from worries. Although the means may be wrong, all these ideals are worthy of respect, of course we have to set aside the lifestyle of Ayhan envious of the practices of a consumer society. He was dragged into a Bohemian lifestyle behind the woman he loves. After the third robbery that made them take a break from robberies, the money runs dry against the endless wishes of Ayhan's lover. Thus Ayhan attempts a robbery on his own. To the siege of the police, Ayhan replies with a gunshot and the police kill him.

The tragic ending of the film by the deaths of Ayhan, Yüksel, Ekrem and Fehmi shows that no matter how noble the causes are, the film does not let the means dirty. This thought is confirmed by Cevat's sentence to his wife after being caught on a tour: "I did the bad deeds to be able to do the good deeds. But it didn't work, I was wrong, please forgive me Aysel". The script does not let these lower class members to earn their living through illegitimate means but on the other hand, it brings up Tahsin, fiancé of Fehmi's sister, Sema, and his assistant, like a shoot. Throughout the

film he takes a driving license and marries Sema. The script keeps him away from all the robberies and shows him as an exemplary character to take example from. In the last scene of the film, Tahsin and Sema leave the hospital where Fehmi drew his last breath, together, representing the clean and pure future based on the power of labor, thus ending the film. Labor was praised once before in the film with the sentence of the owner of a gas station to Ekrem: “what gives you the right to steal our money? Work and earn it yourself. Get off this road”. The same praise is repeated on the death bed of Fehmi, shot by the police. He asks the police to tell his sister that he had an accident and was wounded. It is understood that he wants his sister to remember him as an honest worker.

Giovanni Scognamillo thinks that the film’s significance is not only in its expression of the psychological problems and anxieties of people right before the coup of May the 27th but also in showing why and how the struggle of characters to ‘break out’ their situations did not make it to a class wise and massive stance. Although their tendencies, cultures, preferences are different, being crushed of these six men under the problems which the system puts on the lower classes pushes them a common crime. The success of Erksan as a director comes from exerting a sociological analysis from the desperate situations of the character: through a crime committed by individuals, he reaches the problems that the entire society should be concerned with (Hakan, cited from Scognamillo, 2012:219-220). He also illustrates that the despair of the individual and the tendency to crime are reflections of a problematic social structure on the individuals.

2.7.1.2. Acı Hayat (Bitter Life), 1962

Acı Hayat another film by Erksan tells us of the love of two laborers from the lower class Nermin and Mehmet who are trying to build within impossibilities. Nermin is a manicurist in a hair salon and Mehmet is a welder in a shipyard. Their first step towards marriage is finding a house which can be a sweet home for this marriage. They attempt many times but these attempts always end in negative results. 150 liras is needed for a gecekodu without electricity and water, while Mehmet’s salary is just 480 liras. A house on an average costs about 1000 liras. In another building they

look at, only a room can be rented with a common toilet and kitchen and the electricity and water bills are shared. This is intensely disappointing for Nermin. Another condo was just rented before them. After another option, they finally find a place they like but the owners want 6 months' rent in advance, 300 for every month, the sort of money they cannot come up with.

I think the benchmark of the film is the changes in Nermin's inner world and mentality. Her courage is broken as the day progresses. Searching for a place drags her to a point which a worker should never come to: kneeling before money. When Nermin says that she would have to keep working after they get married as well or else they could never come to a level of lifestyle they would wish for, Mehmet replies with the usual conservatism of a lower class man: "I would not let you work after we get married Nermin, I cannot let you walk into so many men every day. He is of the opinion that Nermin cares too much about the notion of money about finding a place and providing for a house: 'you resemble the rich consumers by spending so much time with them'. Nermin's answer indicates that she tends to shift from 'resisting against money' as a worker to being on the side of 'money': "all my life I hated money, but now I believe its power. It even turned us against each other; I am fed up with this life".

Mehmet's response to Nermin's wish to work after marriage as 'you resemble the rich consumers by spending so much time with them' is a criticism of Nermin meaning 'you don't have class awareness' as much as it clears his stance in terms of class. Mehmet thus warns Nermin that she should not have the habits of the women who belong to higher income groups. Although this accusation by Mehmet as 'don't be like the rich customers' claims that Nermin is in a betrayal of her class, Nermin's own words as well reveal that she gives in to money, the dominant notion of the system and from now on, any sort of behavior that violates the norms of lower class can be expected of her. The real problem in Nermin's inner world is not rooted in looking for a place to live; anyway, she is sick of the limited opportunities of the life she is living in and the gears of the capitalist wheel that wears the workers off. Nermin who stands up with a sigh when someone asks for a manicure, is feeling suppressed under the rich women's chattering about travelling to Paris, insuring their

jewels for 2 million liras or having a fur coat tailored for 60 thousand liras. Another speech that pushes her away from moral values such as love which she built around Mehmet, comes from her mother. The mother is insistent that Nermin should find the 'rich husband' she could not in her time, may be because of the social environment she had at the time or because she was not as beautiful. The cost of medicine that puts them in a difficult position because of her sister's illness and the sister's weakness due to malnutrition forces the mother to say: "Nermin, I keep saying but I will say once again, you see our situation. At least save yourself. Do whatever it takes, marry one of the rich clients of the saloon, save yourself from this life.. there is no shame in looking for a rich husband, or you will suffer from poverty all your life... you are young and beautiful, of course someone will like you some day. But make sure this someone is rich, marry a rich man".

Nermin's mother's incentives in capitalist direction and all the other troubles she has, drags Nermin to a point at which she encounters Ender. Ender is the son of a wealthy family living in a mansion in Göztepe and he likes Nermin the moment she sets foot in the house for Ender's mother's manicure. Her belief in building a life with Mehmet has fallen to the very bottom and she regards Ender, who approaches her promising marriage, as the way to get rid of her worries and problems.

What attracts Nermin is not only the carefree life; but she also thinks that money represents 'social power'. In one of their conversations her reply to Ender when he says 'girls never get married with the men they love, you will most certainly love me some day' by saying 'I would like to be in your shoes. It great that a person should have such confidence, wealth sure is some power' shows growing admiration inside her. May be what Nermin envies was being 'Ender'. Having the opportunities he has, the self-confidence, the social and psychological advantages that money brings. As she has no hope of achieving that position as a hair salon worker, she took in her vision to become 'an Ender' by marrying him.

Her sexual intercourse with Ender and following pregnancy is a situation that she cut her all ties with her own class. Also, this is a situation which the social norms of 60s' Turkey could not tolerate. As a result, Nermin and Ender start living together without

marriage. Nermin takes money from Ender and gives it to her family. Ender's family wants him to get married to another rich girl and they are strongly against Nermin because of concerns that are sourced from her class.

Nermin and Mehmet have long broken up but later on, Mehmet hits 1 million Liras from lottery. Lottery is one of the common tools, complete coincidence (such as inheritance from a distant relative) for the poor to get rich in melodrama. When Mehmet takes the money, he opens a night club. He undertakes a construction and builds himself a villa with sea view. But as a person coming from the worker class, he is careful about the worker's payment and wants them to be paid overtime. Another side of Mehmet is the importance he gives to intellectuality. He could not finish primary school because his parents could not afford it. Now he wants to make up for that by reading a lot of books. He is a philanthropist; he has a primary school built in the neighborhood he grew in, and plans to give lunch to children free of charge.

It reflects the remorse she feels about her deeds when she come to Mehmet's nightclub and asks for forgiveness; still how much affect it has on the apology of Nermin, that Mehmet is now a rich man is debatable. Had Mehmet been a waiter instead of the owner, whether Nermin still would have gone there or how the film would have unfolded, is open to discussion. Although her attachment to Mehmet and her weakness towards the economic values of the system put her psychology in a dilemma, her weariness and psychological break down keeps her closer to the concept of money rather than Mehmet. To her apology and plea he cries with an attitude praising moral and ethical values: "... you made me this way, none of my good intentions are left. I have become a monster who works only to make money, this is all your doing".

The importance of the notion of 'moral law' is foregrounded once again, when Mehmet gets together with Filiz, Ender's sister. Although Filiz is in love with Mehmet, he is of the opinion that this is the revenge of Nermin. Mehmet gets angry at Filiz and Ender's father, Mr. Burhan like this: "and do not do evil to anyone from now on. The day comes for everyone to take revenge..". The virginity of a woman's

becoming a notion of honor between the men although could be a matter to make fun of in Western understanding, is important when Turkish society's values are considered. Burhan wants to deal with this 'moral law' issue through his business man identity, meaning money. He throws Mehmet a cheque the amount on which shall be defined by Mehmet himself. Mehmet replies with a speech praising himself ethically: "that's right, now you are buying out a rich man, it has to be a sizable amount of money. Is this the only thing you do in life, to buy and to sell? Do you not know of anything else? We neither buy nor sell pudicity... besides I am a very rich man and your money would not suffice to buy me out. Remember you once wanted to buy a poor girl's chastity here? See know the same thing is on you". Here Mehmet refers to Burhan's trying to cover with money the process that started with Ender's sexual intercourse with Nermin.

Probably in the eyes of Burhan, Nermin is yet another of his womanizer and rascal son's adventures involving sexuality; however, not beneficial for Mr. Burhan as Nermin comes from a poor family. He is probably plotting to marry both Filiz and Ender into rich families, turning their marriage into a trade profit. He never accepts what his daughter Filiz is going through; her having an affair without his knowledge and consent, and with a man who used to be a worker once. But actually what he does not see fit for her daughter, he sees fit for other girls such as Nermin and the like.

The melodrama's matching notions and classes is apparent in *Acı Hayat* as well. Mehmet is created as an icon persona. He is always on the side of the right and the moral; this does not change either when he states that he cannot be bought by money to Burhan or when he beats his son Ender. Although he is rich in what extent that cannot be compared with his former situation, he does not sacrifice her personality or principles. This, in a way, results from the rich-poor dichotomy in the nature of the melodramas and results in exaggerated characters most of the time; piling the moral values on one side of this dichotomy is not %100 compatible with real life yet true in a sense: while the higher class on top of the relations of production, learns to be cruel from a young age in order to protect its position, lower class makes it a habit in the

gecekondu they grew in, to protect, share and help (to some extent as a result of the social relations and conditions).

The suicide of Nermin at the end of the film is a person's ridding herself of the system in which she could not locate herself. Like a crow imitating a stork walking, Nermin is neither able to be a stork nor a crow anymore, could answer to the depression revealed by being stuck between the high and low class, with her suicide. It would be the right thing to do to evaluate the tragedy of Nermin being exposed to love of men from each class, Mehmet and Ender, not as the result of her choice but the faulty structure of the system. What if Nermin had chosen Mehmet or a man like him? She would have to be a mom to her kids between four walls for a lifetime and turn in to a working class housewife. What if she had been legally married to Ender against all the opposition of her family? Then she would have to play whole roles of a woman in a bourgeois family. She would have to attend to all the invites, balls, be well groomed always, and as she once did for Ender's mother, a poor girl from the lower class would come for her manicure in some 30 years. Not to mention being humiliated by being reminded of 'which class' she had come from and 'what sort of a family' she comes for hundreds of times by Ender's family and friends. This is the dilemma Nermin and her kind have to go through the system: playing the part the system has planned for them be it middle, lower or higher class. Because, whatever she does to break this, depends on a man and then another man, and because it does not depend on her own honorable stance and labor, Nermin could realize herself neither in her class nor in the class she aims to move up to.

Oğuz Makal claims that the elements rooted in melodrama structure are way more numerous than the elements based on class analysis (Hakan, cited from Makal, 2012:245). May be the definition of the film can be a 'melodrama with occasional class analysis'. While analysing the effect of melodramatic side of the film on the making of the characters Enis Köstepen underlines the lottery that hits Mehmet: "instead of regarding the fact that Ayhan Işık can act a shipyard worker with hair groomed to a side with grease and thin mustache and later a billionaire as a deficiency of realism, we may perceive this smooth transition as an indication that, in those days transition from poverty to wealth in the city could be imagined to be

smooth. From another perspective, in the world created by *Acı Hayat*, being poor or rich depends on luck, a card picked in life. The poor and the rich are gamblers sitting around the same table. Things may change in the next turn and one may be rich as Mehmet does by picking the good card” (Hakan, cited from Köstepen, 2012:246).

As could easily be expected from the year Erksan directed the film, it is structured in the melodrama genre. *Acı Hayat* has a structure recreating the clichés of melodrama such as incomplete love of lovers; rich boy’s spoiling the relationship, getting rich all of a sudden via lottery. One difference it has with other melodramas is the depicting rich and poor class relationship in a more realistic way rather than caricaturizing it.

We may say that the script involves some sort of conservatism, especially for the lower income class, pudicity is a very important subject considering that the film takes place in 60s. For example, a self-respecting person, Nermin, cannot forgive herself for sleeping with Ender after a night of drinking, and ends her relationship with Mehmet. Mehmet also is very preoccupied with the lower class conservatism and the notion of family; it is proven when he buys a flat with 8 rooms for his family.

The group with the lower income considers the capitalist relations of production as a threat to the institution of family and relationships between men and women. It is an important point revealing how morals are regarded when Mehmet forgives Nermin who apologized and asked to get back together, only at her grave because Nermin had given up her relationships in exchange for money. To top that, she committed yet another very important crime by having sexual intercourse before marriage which is allowed to women only after marriage.

It is important for the expression of the victory of lower class values that the script creates Mehmet as an icon-figure. His beating up the rich guy who came to beat him up, refusing Nermin who wants to come back to him, the aggressive attitude against the rich father of Filiz and Ender and being proud of the class he came from. Under Mehmet’s being revolt by the ‘new’ Nermin or not thinking highly of Ender lies the difference between value judgment based on class differences. The modest, confident and unchangeable character of lower class even when they are rich, against Nermin’s

being prone to be bought out, and snobbishness of Ender caused by being high class, is promoted through Mehmet.

Acı Hayat is one of the early films of our cinema in that it shows the dream to become rich starting in the lower class. The greed for money is analyzed in Nermin's person: when her confused character lacking self-confidence, is topped with weariness as a result of poverty and the nagging of her mother, her envy towards upper class is reinforced. In that period of time the lower income group was disintegrating or there was such a possibility, the film take up a clear position on the sweet life promises of capitalism, preaches to the lower income group to hold on to its values and principles.

2.7.2. On the Way of Class Consciousness

2.7.2.1. Otobüs Yolcuları (The Bus Passengers), 1961

Otobüs Yolcuları is a film which was made in 1961. The film tells a story around the construction sector which is a rising trend in Turkey today as well. Laborers, using their savings of many years, decide to free themselves of rent, the highest expense in their monthly expenses by buying a house. However the nets of the foundation and the concrete are weak, one apartment was sold to three different people and there are cracks on the building walls even before being used. There is no water and electricity though there should be and because of an illegal story, habitation permits cannot be taken; in other words, there has been a fraud.

The script is built on the dualism between the working peoples' haste to own a house and the tyrant attitude of the shady company. Of course we should not forget the emotional affair like Romeo and Juliet between the leading roles Kemal the driver and Mahmut Feslioğlu's, owner of the construction, daughter, Nevin. Kemal, a driver, moves to gecekondu neighborhood of another driver, Salih. He is very fond of reading books and also draws pictures. His parents had previously died and probably because of economic reasons he had to drop out of school.

As a tribute to the melodrama films of 60s and the structure of Turkish society, Kemal was composed as an 'icon-figure'. What the film criticizes through Kemal's words is the unconsciousness of the lower class about class and shifting the responsibility of something that even directly concerns them, to another person/group. Kemal's undertaking the representation of an old lady, a victim of the company's practices, and being able to obtain her deed of the house turns him into a phenomenon in gecekondu environment. Kemal on the other hand is a well-grounded person; he expresses that these problems can be solved not alone but by uniting through these words: "what can I do? What do I have? This can be done through law only.. not by my struggle: unite and file a law suit, consult a lawyer". Kemal shows the way to people they should take through organized struggle based on the notion of 'class' which by an induction from the special to general, actually shows the Turkish society the way they should take.

This didactic identity is because the script is written by Vedat Türkali. Türkali through films like 'Şehirdeki Yabancı' (Stranger In The City), 'Karanlıkta Uyananlar' (Those Awakening In The Dark) scripts of which were also written by himself, aims to instill a feeling of class struggle based on socialist ideology. An intense displeasure with capital owning class is also visible. Starting with Nevin's father Mahmut Feslioğlu, the manager of stone quarry, Halim Ağa, his trouble of a brother Selim, representing the power of the mob, İbrahim who is the head of construction are all fraudulent and shady figures. On the other hand, the characters that earn their living through labor such as Kemal the driver, engineer Sahir, and the master builder Bekir, are very positive and trustworthy characters.

In the film, Salih first, then the neighborhood residents travelling with the bus Kemal drives became more than just people of a same neighborhood but like family; they talk to each other and they ask about their well-being. I believe the script imagines the bus to represent the Turkish society; Nevin's choice to travel by bus, refusing his father's wish to go to the school by a private vehicle represents her idea of herself as one of the people. Contrary to her mother and aunt, Nevin refuses the daily practices of higher class and prefers to hang around with Kemal.

They seriously face consequences of class difference in this relationship. While wandering close by Nevin's house they run into Nevin's brother Tayfun and his snob friends. Tayfun tells Nevin to get home in rage. Kemal is aware that he is the reason behind his rage: he says 'that's what you get for hanging with drivers' to Nevin. Although Kemal has read many more books than all these snobs, he is being suppressed by the snobs due to the fact that he could not finish high school and has limited income. The rest of the event is even worse: her mother gets curious about the brother scolding her about the driver and asks 'has the driver something to ask?' but upon learning that she had been hanging around with the driver both her mom and aunt respond with words such as 'such a disgrace', 'scandal'. The words of the mother actually summarize the attitude of the bourgeois towards the lower class: in the mother's eyes, a driver is a person you either ask a question to or a person to ask her a question. He cannot be befriended, to have a direct relationship or to hang around with.

Kemal's other encounter with the bourgeoisie is at a party in Mahmut's house where they play foreign music. As declining some high class women's coming on to him, he also declines some other's offer to be their personal driver. Kemal is always a person of the people, he shows this also when people who had become the victims of the buildings constructed by Mahmut, hold a meeting to defend their rights. He recommends them to give a proxy to lawyer Hamdi and to gather around him. This also paves the way for an article written to have a voice in the media for the voice of these people being unfairly treated be heard. He is a laborer who believes in struggle and standing against injustice. Being together with people, being a part of a collective life he searches for himself and he expresses his character while sitting in the open air with Nevin with these words: "look at this earth we are so comfortably lying on,, look at the ants; their effort, powerful struggle.. how safe do they step on the ground". The characteristics Kemal has and wants to see in other people are hidden in those ants: people who are 'powerful', 'striving' and 'safely taking steps on the ground'.

It is not difficult to guess that the greatest dichotomy in the film will be formed by a laborer with such an identity and Mahmut who built his life by ripping off people,

especially with his daughter Nevin in the matter. Mr. Mahmut wants to marry Kemal to his daughter and send them over to Europe for a year; an idea which he thinks that a cunning one. This way he would be preventing Kemal from backing the victimized people in the neighborhood. Kemal is aware of the hidden agenda so he refuses to marry the way Mr. Mahmut sees appropriate.

In the conclusion of the film, Halim Ağa and Mahmut Feslioğlu's being arrested for the crimes they have committed reveals that the script shows them as the type of people it does not want to see in Turkey. The same way, it should be considered as a display of the people the script wants to see in Turkish society when Kemal, Nevin and the other residents of the neighborhood get on the bus that represents Turkey and move on. Structurally the film follows all the characteristics of the cinema genre it belongs to and the genre of melodrama: the fight between two worker groups at the end of the movie and the love of Kemal and Nevin etc. This is a methodological choice yet the class conflict shall not be forgotten in the film's context.

As we have seen in many melodramas, while the evil characters and intentions are always attributes of people from bourgeoisie, the good, virtuous and moral are the actions by the poor/working people. Mr. Mahmut prevents his son, Tayfun, from giving blood, on the other hand Rahmi, uncle of Tayfun and Nevin who lives in the same neighborhood with Kemal tries to give him the feeling he should have by saying 'we are people as much as we care other people, son'. When Mahmut tells Rahmi not to be distasteful and act out of place, Rahmi answers him with words he could have told to many people from the capital owning class: "what is more important than your taste in this world?". The lifestyle of the working class which is collectively thinking and living and facing the troubles against the individualistic, hedonistic lifestyle of the bourgeoisie which is not caring for the troubles of other people confront a dilemma. What we would oppose here is the attribution of all bad deeds, ill intentions and characteristics to the characters from the capital owning class. This approach is not realistic because being a good or a bad person does not depend on a person's class but on their personality. As much as there may be good people of the high class, there may be bad people in the lower. In the nature of melodrama, there is matching of moral concepts with classes, *Otobüs Yolcuları* as

well, recreates in itself, a prerequisite of the cinema of its time. Considering that most of its audience is from the lower class, we guess that this situation ensures an individual satisfaction and a temporary feeling of victory against the upper class during the film.

2.7.2.2. Karanlıkta Uyananlar (Those Awakening In The Dark), 1964

The next film we analyze **Karanlıkta Uyananlar** should be defined as the first worker and strike film in the real sense, in Turkish cinema. The film is built around the emotional story of two childhood friends Ekrem and Turgut; what is being told to the audience is the precession and the struggle of the working class that has just started blooming in 60s.

Turgut's father owns a paint factory: Mr. Şeref. Ekrem is a worker in this factory. Şeref comes from a working background; he was once the Wright Şeref who carried the cans of paint in construction sites. The workers produce varnish in the factory, a tradable varnish with commercial value. After this success they want a raise in their salary but Mr. Şeref probably regards this demand as a rascality that the workers do not deserve and way over their limits: "the slothfuls and the tramps are my enemy. Be it the closest to me, my son even. I am the friend of those who work. If there is anyone treated unjust, they should come to me. Your union is nothing to me. Those who cause mischief, who want money for nothing, are not welcome in my factory. Anyone who doesn't like it is free to go, that's it."

Turgut is childhood friends with the current workers, he was brought up in the neighborhood where the factory is. Thus Turgut does not have a clear class culture and standing; actually he is far from the bourgeois culture that complies with his economic conditions, he is in the worker culture. He criticizes the workers as 'they couldn't have a single strike in 6 months', but the strike is to be against his own father!! The decision for a strike is discussed in the family. One of the prominent workers, Father Nuri says 'the poor would suffer' for the strike, 'the safe of the union is all empty' and advices them to hold on fast to each other. The reason why the workers are scared of a strike is that they are not being backed up with a strong trade

union. The reason of this is, as stated in the film, not even the half of the workers believes that union is something for their own good. A union not embraced, of course, cannot embrace the workers on the day of their needs. This is also voiced in a discussion between the workers: the sentences such as ‘we don’t drop by the union, we do not pay the revenues, and we say the union when we need it’ reveal that some of the workers are aware of their mistakes. When a worker says ‘there will be a solution Mrs. Hanife, there is the union’ to the wife of a fired employee she answers ‘let that union of yours fall into pieces.. Whatever happened came because of that union’. For another fraction of the workers too, the union is a problematic, trouble maker institution, actions of which always result against the worker.

Still the strike is decided on. The very first day of the strike, some people come to the factory doors to replace the striking workers. Mr. Şeref on the other hand is worried about something else: he complains that their best product’s foreign counterpart’s import has not yet been ceased. He also says that the work is loose and the workers who are left behind are enough for him and this will save him the daily wages of the workers on strike. The news which arrives from the capital making Şeref Yetimoğlu a happy man: the paint import has been forbidden. Immediately after this, the businessmen came to Şeref’s office. These businessmen do not produce paint by the opportunities of the country; they have comprador bourgeoisie identity and they are working through connection with foreign bourgeoisie and importing paint.

Mr. Şeref gets carried away in dreams with the good news: thinks about increasing the number of workers from 200 to 2000, 10000 even. He wants to become the biggest paint factory of Balkans and Middle East, export paints and earn foreign currency for his country. To top that, he wants to establish the chemistry industry. Nevertheless, the moment the regulation to prohibit the paint import is issued, it also becomes difficult to import the side material used in paint production. Probably the domestic wholesalers are in black-market because their imports are forbidden. And when local products are used, the quality of the paint degrades. For a 3rd world country with the goal of development, this scene is a double-edged sword. On one side, the development to be made by its own capital cannot proceed due to lack of material and infrastructure and on the other, a better produce can only be made

through foreign capital and material support and as a result, the foreign capital carries the profit to its own country.

With the import of paint stopped and the order for paint from the domestic market, Mr. Şeref has to accept the demands of the workers on strike but dies when he is just about to sign the agreement contract! Now the property and management of the factory is all on Turgut. The class impositions start right at Mr. Şeref's funeral, because of the very rich people coming to the funeral, Ekrem and his friends cannot offer Turgut their condolences. In spite of this situation, Turgut comes to the pub where he always goes with Ekrem and other friends. All through the night, Turgut tries to underline the fact that he is one of them: "Am I not the same with you.. you are my everything.. The raise. The factory. They don't mean a thing. It is all yours.. the factory and everything are all yours. Come on, say it.. say, it is ours". Turgut worries because he is afraid that he becoming the owner of the factory can affect his relationship with his friends negatively. His effort is to convey that 'nothing has changed and will change about him'. The words by Turgut above are not said under the affect of the booze, they are his sincere thoughts. When his friend oppose as 'no boy, it is your factory alright', 'of course it is your factory', he insists 'it is yours brothers, can't you understand when I say, it is yours', and he forces his friends to say 'this is our factory'.

The dilemma Turgut will fall into will be the beginning of the end for him. The discourse of the family friends reveal to the audience how they expect 'a bourgeois factory owner' to behave, a family friend says: "he is not the Turgut he was before, he has responsibilities.. he has to come around, he is the head of a huge factory" and the family physician says "old friends and old life cannot go forever.. now they all work for you and your factory" warning Turgut.

His first day at the factory brings about his encounter with the realities of the bourgeois. Despite his orders that the demands of the workers be accepted and the fired workers be employed again, Mr. Fahri, the director, says none of these are possible. And he tops that by his offer of %5 raise which makes the workers feel humiliated. Turgut, from day one, is lost.

Later he meets the director Fahri's artist niece Nevin who would carry Turgut to bourgeois practices. Nevin has an intellectual group of artist friends whom can be said about 'eccentric' in social norms and she takes Turgut to the night club where she meets with her friends. Turgut is a stranger to all these people and their life-style.

The first event that points to the distance growing between Ekrem and Turgut is when Ekrem wants to talk to Turgut about the 3 workers who were fired; they make him wait saying he is busy. And when he is finally able to speak, Turgut tells him that the 2 workers were put in another factory and the other found a job. Ekrem is aware that he will not be the same person again; when he goes home, he throws their photo on the wall to the floor. He cries and cries.

Ekrem is not the only one aware of this 'change'. That Turgut is also aware of the situation is revealed in his conversation with Nevin. When Nevin says 'live as you used to' he replies 'I can't. Even the way they look at me has changed. It is impossible to tell them things. I couldn't even speak to Ekrem today, he walked off. I called and he didn't even answer me'. It is when Ekrem is arrested in the police station and Turgut saves him, the gap gets bigger. Even after this good deed, Ekrem does not look Turgut in the eye. When Turgut tries to speak to him, Ekrem spits in his face twice; and Turgut takes the first by pushing him, and the second, with a punch. When they return to Turgut's car Nevin scolds him: "once you were a pitiful man living drunk and a rascal living with a bug's instincts, I pitied you. I was blaming your vulgar father. What are you now? Keeping the oldest friend waiting at the door, ditching them, and beating when drunk and then cursing every one, a..." although Nevin does not utter the last word, the rest of the accusations are heavy enough for Turgut. Even though from a bourgeois woman, his description as neither a bourgeois nor a worker is too much for him and he leaves Nevin there on the street and leaves.

On the other hand, Father Nuri and his granddaughter Fatma take Ekrem to their home the terrible night of his arrest. Father Nuri is not pleased with the way Ekrem took to drinking. He wants him to lead a life proper to the working class and his worker father: "I lost two strong sons. I never separated your father from them. Your

turning a rascal and turning us your back hurt me as much as their loss. I suffered when this became of the son of that brave honest man burned in iron casting. We already are in a hypocritical, dirty world. I am an old man I wanted to be proud of you, son. With your bravery, goodness.. I am not strong enough anymore. You get it right? There is a lot of work to do”.

Ekrem’s coming to his senses and becoming aware of his responsibilities of course could not happen with a single conversation. That consciousness is rooted deep down in Ekrem’s subconscious and it is needed that Father Nuri lends a hand to surface it. Ekrem tries to make the most of his awakened consciousness by a speech to the union workers: “can we prevent the employer from firing us when he likes, that is what we should consider..” and to a worker who opposes ‘shall we join the union so that they can fire us’ he says ‘you are the union.. you, me, them.. all of us. Can this emerge (pointing to a can of paint) without us? Who will give us what our labor that produces this deserves if not us? What in the heck do we have to lose? You were given a right by the law. Instead of shivering like dogs, hold on fast to one another, and then see if anyone can rip you off from your bread, your humanity”.

The most important part of Ekrem’s words is ‘you are the union’. This states that the union is not a beginning; it is an end, the material phase of labor awareness. This is an important point; to realize that union is a tool only, what really matters is having the awareness of labor in mind and expressing this in social life as ‘class awareness’, that is the point of importance.

The fact that there are people from the minorities among the workers such as Moiz, Hristo, the other worker’s having migrated to Istanbul and still using the accent of their hometowns asserts that the film, without using an ethnic and regional identity discrimination, desires to include all workers under ‘class’ title. Ekrem keeps on inserting the class awareness, ‘we shall face the employer altogether instead of one by one, so that we may be strong’. To a worker opposing with words, ‘Is my nakedness not enough, do I have to think about strangers too? Ekrem replies ‘if you do not think about other naked too, you will stay naked forever.. if we don’t fight this war today, we will chain not only us but also our children to poverty’. What is made

out from Ekrem's words is in addition to his wish to make this a collective struggle: he also wants it to take on an institutional identity to be passed on from one generation to another. Although the 'labor awareness and class culture' that has not been formed so far is not something to happen over such a short period of time, as we will later see in the film *Maden*, the people who believe in this awareness try to bring it on the society and working class in very short periods of time. This belief in awareness reached such a point that in 70s, it was thought that a class awareness finding its counterpart in the society could even go as far as changing the regime. This no doubt is not realistic; thinking that the transformation that came into being in a 200 years period in the West to happen in 20 years shows above all that those who believe that are not educated in social sciences.

In any case, even building only the class awareness is not that easy because a fight breaks out between Ekrem and the worker he speaks these words to. Father Nuri pulls him aside in a manner to show that class awareness is not so easy to achieve: "you have to be patient, son, and things as such do not just happen. Look how long it took you to realize the truth".

On the other hand, Turgut is still not satisfied with his position about class, and he complains to Nevin: "You should see how they look at me. Ekrem wants to burn me with a welder. What have I done to them? We horsed around together, could we not work together?" Nevin visits Ekrem following these words, I guess she is scared that they should harm Turgut and wants to prevent them from making a mistake. When it comes to the painting she made for the office of the factory, a worker says 'is she talking about painting our walls' and Nevin corrects him: 'that is not painting the walls, it is a painting'. The painting she did is painting the walls for the worker. However, she had stopped the painting to protect the workers. At the end of the conversation, Ekrem kicks her out of the house.

It gets difficult for Turgut by the day. His life and body which are not used to running a factory is squeezed more and more. His factory keep being protested and warned. The workers have not been paid for months. They go on a strike again and ruin Nevin's painting with black paint. Nevin attacks some workers because of this

and thinking their friends are being attacked the workers pour into the office part of the factory. They run into Turgut, they are led by Ekrem. The once inseparable friends are now rivals representing two different classes. Workers ensured by Turgut that things are going to be alright, decide to give him another try. Turgut then goes to Nevin to apologize for what happened to her painting but Nevin cries and exclaims in his face the fact that he does not belong either to the bourgeois or the working class by these words: ‘what is it to you, what does my painting, arts matter to you.. Your factory is all that matters.. As long as your workers work.. Beg to your workers, beg so that they can spoil my paintings even more.. Who are you? Look kids, do you know who this is? Turgut Yetimoğlu. He had me, it is his right of course, he takes me if he likes, shuts me by two blows on my mouth.. I am a piece of furniture to you, even a slave. You may ask for my hand from my uncle. As your wedded wife you may forbid me to paint if you need to. Rip it and your workers may step on it. As long as they work, right? As long as they work.. Get out, get out of here’.

With the painting she created with so much effort, her belief in the working class and Turgut is also gone. Nevin’s refusal of Turgut shows the bourgeoisie’s burning the bridges with the working class. Following, by the refusal of a 3 million liras worth of order, the factory bankrupts. This is the point the comprador bourgeois comes to the scene and takes over the factory. They immediately change the production way of the factory: they took up an organization that instead of production, only blends the imported paints and packages them. They had stated their ideas not believing in national production in another scene before: “Hasan from Sivas and Mehmet from Çemişgezek will learn chemistry and we will establish the paint industry. Why is it not enough to mix the important paints and package them..” they sign contract where he accepts %40 partnership with a foreign businessman. But what they did not consider was the determination of Ekrem and his friends to protect the factory.

Although the owner of the factory changed, Ekrem and his friends decided not to let anyone into the factory. To the workers who come to demolish the factory, they say if they prevent them to be labor, the same would happen to them someday and the workers who had come to demolish the factory agree with them. The resistance of

Ekrem and his friends, and the decision to go on a strike forms a joyful wave in the gecekondu close by. Still, in the lower class it is possible to sense fear, especially of the government. An old woman's concern with her words as 'what about the government' Fatma resist with all that she has got: 'what do they have to say? We are not doing something illegal, we defend our rights'. All people in gecekondu back them up.

Turgut's tragedy starting when he takes over the factory again ends in front of the factory. The man who belongs nowhere comes to his confiscated factory, according to the law; he has the factory for another 20 days. He makes his choice on the labor's side; he leaves the factory to the workers to run it in whichever way they want for 20 days.

The script sends Nevin to Paris at the end of the film, does not let the comprador bourgeoisie take over the factory and the whereabouts of sad Turgut after leaving the factory is a mystery. Thus, the bourgeois characters are all out of the film's finale. The film declares that it will not give either national or foreign capital will own the factory. The factory now is where it shall be, in the hands of the workers. The way the workers are the breath and blood of the factory, they are also the only ones with rights to the productions of the factory. The scenario does not tolerate the comprador bourgeoisie even for a second; at the end of the film, it calls them through the words of a journalist: 'these are the leeches with roots abroad that exploit the country'. It is more tolerant towards national bourgeois; it lets them go silently if they are to leave the factory to the workers. It sends the liberal/elite/bohemian mass to Paris, in Nevin's person, it does not regard them culturally as parts of this land and this society. To the comprador businessmen coming to take over the factory, Ekrem says 'we are here against the robbers, slavers of this nation'. And the film closes with the images of the strikers yelling 'we are against them.'

The film expects the working class to be aware of their rights, to obtain and to protect those rights, striving to obtain those rights, not hesitating to go on a strike and joining a union, and being a working class with a working class consciousness. The beginning of Turgut and Ekrem which is growing in this culture and providing

companionship to each other at their ‘bull session’ is different as night and day at the end. While Ekrem transforms into a worker leader with class awareness, Turgut, from the same starting point, transforms into a defeated bourgeois who lost his factory. The script declares its stand on this dichotomy by defeating Turgut and making Ekrem victorious. Although it has a rough and aggressive cinema language, we deem the *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* to be the one most touching and emotional films among the others in the dissertation. The reason for this is, the friendship between Turgut and Ekrem dissolves independent by their desires and their class positions. They turn them into enemies, more in the case of Ekrem.

Ilhan Selçuk embraces *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* as a film he had been longing for in Turkish cinema: “..Can our cinema world stay deaf to the awakening of Turkey? Those who teach our girls to be vamp in Hollywood ribbons and our boys being playboys, should remember that cinema has another mission. Stories with machine guns, American cars, women legs, alcohol glasses and sex with a hint of alaturca sound, strings and belly dancing will not be satisfying anymore.. as in novel and theatre, the cinema audience as well, cannot wait to see the light of awakening on white screen. The first green light to this wait is *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*..” (Selçuk, 1965, *Cumhuriyet*).

2.7.3. Migration in 1960s

2.7.3.1. Gurbet Kuşları (Birds of Exile), 1964

Gurbet Kuşları of 1964, which is also sociologically deep film such as *Gecelerin Ötesi* and it differs from the other films we analyzed in that it revolves around not a group of people or a certain group but a family. That the film talks over the phenomenon of migration with sensitivity of a social scientist, makes it one of the first films on the migration theme. The conservative large family with 4 kids, the addition of the experiences of each and every child one on top of the other make the film multi-layered and interesting to follow.

As we can interpret *Gurbet Kuşları* to be the story of a family migrating from Maraş to Istanbul with a dream to start a new life in the micro scale, in a macro scale we

may interpret it as the encounter of the rural conservative mentality with the modern lifestyle of the city with its Western features. The initial desire of the family was to rule and own Istanbul. Their sentences such as ‘once we unite as so many people, it will be easy’, ‘we will turn mountains into marketplaces’ prove that they did not come to make a living, produce a life only, but also to prove themselves to the scary nature of the city and get accepted. Haybeci, a figure they meet on the boat shares the same dream: ‘O, Istanbul, the city of abundance.. you bitch of a city brace yourself, Haybeci is coming to be your king’.

The family settles in a flat near Yavuz Sultan Selim Mosque in Balat. But to rule this big city was not as easy as the family had expected. Hence, when they arrive at the work place the father of the family, Tahir, supposedly had made a deal to take over, they understand that they had been swindled. People who have nothing to do with the workplace had taken the family’s money and run off. This first blow to the rural family is the real meeting of the family members who later would be dragged into a tragic end with the city. The family later on opens a small repair shop. The oldest son, Selim starts working in the shop with his father, the son number 2, Murat starts working as a taxi driver; number 3, Kemal enrolls in the medical school and the youngest, daughter Fatma stays home with her mother.

How the four children of the family evolve in the city environment are the building blocks of the future of the family in the city. While Selim helps his father in the shop, he starts a relationship with the wife of a Greek car repair shop owner. What he is clueless of is that the woman wants to seduce him just so that the shop of her own husband earns more than Selim’s family shop. The times he spent with the wife of the Greek man causes his father to be alone in the shop for long hours and results in the bankruptcy of the shop. Murat starts as a driver and from that moment on, adapts to free market rules. Meeting a woman of night clubs, Seval, causes deep changes in his life, since as a conservative man, it is not easy for him to accept such a woman but he keeps it going. Kemal starts getting emotionally closer with his classmate, Ayla. A more decent and elite looking man than the looks of his family, Kemal has to conceal his origins due to the prejudice Ayla has towards migrants and to new

comes to the city. And Fatma becomes friends with a wanton woman, Mualla, their neighbor.

We have reasons to believe that *Gurbet Kuşları* is a film that analyses sociocultural notions rather than socioeconomic ones. I.e. Murat, as he proceeds with his relationship with Seval, understands that she is not the ‘lover from Istanbul’ he had always dreamt of; just like himself, Seval is really from Maraş and her real name is Naciye!! The Naciye of the Erengil’s that was mentioned as a bad role model Fatma should avoid being. She was a run away from home in Maraş and went bad. Murat says “I wish we had never left Maraş, may be we would have found the happiness we search for in Istanbul, there” but Seval’s answer complies more with the realities: “I don’t think so. We didn’t even run into each other although our homes were so close. Besides my father was about to marry me off to a man I have not met and I cannot love. I was gonna leave one cage for another. And even if we could have met later, it would have been too late with children on our laps and all”.

On the other hand, Fatma is invited to a party with Mualla. For the first time in her life, she drinks alcohol in this party from Mualla. Everybody was dancing twist in the party but at some point they switch to çiftetelli; Fatma and Mualla belly dance together. The men around them are very obtrusive and insincere except for Orhan. Orhan, the man she meets at the party leaves a different impression on her with his fatherly and moderate attitude. Again Orhan saves her from a drunken man. While Orhan leaves Fatma to her home by his car, her brother Murat sees her in ‘the car of a stranger’ and that is the harbinger of the commotion which will be happened at home at the evening.

Murat beats Fatma in a terrible way and cuts her hair, the symbol of her womanhood. Although the other brother Selim backs Murat, their father Tahir insists that no one but himself is to be concerned with the honor of the family when it comes to Fatma: “I am not dead yet, Selim. It is my business to think about the honor of the family. Not you, I provide for Fatma. Instead of your gibberish, look at yourselves for once. Selim could not hold his belt on, bankrupted the shop. Murat on the other hand

became a punk, not dropping by home once in a while. You are no good for home but when it comes to big words, there is no one better than you!!”.

Later on, her younger brother Kemal makes Fatma repeat his words like an oath and the event ‘getting on a stranger man’s car’ is closed: “from now on I will be a good girl, I will not do anything wrong, I won’t hurt my brothers who love me”. Kemal’s verbal training is in a way relocation of Fatma in the line that can be accepted by a conservative family with rural origins. This is the only way the family can get over Fatma’s unacceptable behavior: to accept that this mistake was exceptional and is to stay that way.

Nevertheless, Fatma does not let this be an exception. She meets Orhan again. Like many girls from lower or middle class backgrounds, she is more in love with his fortune than his fatherly image. She dreams that this process starting as an affair probably leads to marriage and she becomes the wife of such a man. The sentence in a later scene that appears as an inner thought ‘we meant no harm, we were to get married anyway” proves this dream of hers. Orhan takes her to their summer place that is on the shore of Bosphorus and play with her emotions by constantly talking about the concept of marriage which is an element of attraction for Fatma, as would be for many other young girls. And the sexual intercourse that follows is a first for Fatma. In this aspect, she was on a road with no return: either she has to marry Orhan or she has to torn from her family. She makes her bag, leaves a letter which is saying that she is leaving home and goes to the mansion she slept with Orhan but in a letter that Orhan left to the watchman, Orhan wrote that he wanted to break up with her.

I believe it is obvious for all characters of the film and the audience that Orhan considers Fatma as an adventure, except for Fatma. Fatma, as Nermin did in *Acı Hayat*, thought that she could have all that wealth by offering her womanhood. However, Orhan has no intentions of sharing his wealth with her for a lifetime. Fatma, who gradually experienced notions that are not approved for a women in the conservative culture such as: having a boyfriend, going to party, drinking, premarital intercourse, is deserved to be punished by her family norms.

Dialogues of Ayla and Kemal are the scenes the didactic nature of the film is in the foreground. The film inserts its political and sociological discourse in their discussions because they are both medical students; they are the best educated amongst the rest of the characters of the film. In the early days of their relationship Ayla criticizes Kemal for giving money to a beggar woman: “I think what you did is not right.. she is a healthy woman, she shall work. Besides why would she even leave her hometown and come here? Begging is easy; leave your village, come and rob Istanbul people”. Kemal is worrying that this would come to his own origins asks: “does everyone that comes from outside come to rob the city residents?”. “I don’t know for what they come but in any case they ruin Istanbul rip it of itself, they are everywhere”. Ayla adds “besides what is it to you, are you one of them”, and Kemal strongly refuses her argument: “God forbids, my family has pure İstanbul origins. The only village I know is Kadıköy”. In another conversation of theirs, Kemal criticizes Ayla’s doctor brother’s leaving for USA: “Why does he leave? Is this country too small for him”. In another instance, Ayla talks about leaving for USA but the nationalist side of Kemal refuses this: “It probably is a good thing to go and see it but as long as work is waiting for us here, it is not right to stay there”.

All reflexes of Kemal has are in line with the ‘national left’ understanding of Yön journal, then a dominant fraction in social realism. We may witness the same feeling in the social analysis by Ayla and Kemal looking at gecekondu: living and working together, in brotherhood instead of violent rivalry and serving the development of the country, etc. These discourses are influenced by the corporatist economic model which desires the classes to work in a harmony but does not desire the conflict between classes. We can also see the interpretation of capitalism that protects the rights of the middle and the lower class by social democracy which is the left in capitalism.

This is an understanding of economy that is moderate, considerate of the development of the economy of the country as much as own economic development, paying taxes, responsible, living by the rules and expecting others to do so. Who is the exact opposite of this perception and mentality is Haybeci, the character we meet in the beginning of the film. He was a porter in the beginning of the film, and when

he runs into Tahir around the middle of the film he says that he ‘promoted’ to being a ‘parking lot butler’, in his words. On top of that he makes fun of Tahir because he fell back from a car repairman to a driver, again in his words!! Haybeci runs into Selim later and he had become an auctioneer, he even offers then unemployed Selim to come work with him. By the end of the film, Haybeci has a whole gecekondu district to himself. He wants to open an agency in his hometown, Kayseri, which will find housing for his fellow townsmen who want to migrate and then return back to Istanbul to start building of an apartment block. This uncontrolled and beyond measure development of property gives us an idea of the structure of the dominant capitalist idea in Turkey. An important capitalist accumulation in Turkey was a result of uneducated people having fortunes by finding gaps in the laws, not paying taxes, and committing all kind of frauds. The worst part of this is that it sets a bad example for society, a majority of the society envies this fortune be it made by fraud! At the end of the film, Haybeci explains that the logic behind his fortune to the family taking of back to Maraş: “no food for the one who does not have his eyes open and mind open in this world”.

In the countries that imported capitalism like Turkey, that capitalism it is not as in the western sense ‘inventing something and developing and releasing it to the market’ but ‘obtaining money by hustle’ explains why in countries like Turkey, the industrial and agricultural production are nonexistent. In countries like Turkey, there cannot be an industrial bourgeoisie but always trade bourgeoisie. It is cleverer to buy an existing product, put profits over it and sell than to develop a product and export to the world markets. The film also subtly advices young generations to leave this ‘Eastearn shiftiness’ and take Western style production and hard work as role models.

Actually, the characters in the film desire to live the ‘pleasures’ of life that the capitalist world offers them. For example, the goal of Father Tahir when they first came to Istanbul was to return to Maraş with the money he earned and pass by Yakup Usta character ‘brand new’. When we enter the dream world of Tahir, we see such a portrait: “British navy on my back, Serkisoff chain watch from here to there, yellow shoes, I will order raki for the people like pashas..”. We witness the same

situation in Seval to whom Murat wanted to marry and move to another city. She answers to the proposal of Murat made around the idea of a piece of bread as: “hunger and love does not go together, my boy.. I can’t marry for a piece of bread. I want a carefree life, good clothes. Besides we got used living in Istanbul now, nowhere would suffice after here”. The standards set by consumer society as goals to be achieved, and people desiring them, and if owned wanting to protect them are results of artificial standards configured by people being forced on the society.

Fatma’s cutting her ties with her family leads her to prostitution. She comes together with Seval for prostitution and Murat figures it out. He asks her brother Selim to the building they are in but Fatma runs to the roof from the flat. They catch her there. Fatma commits suicide because of fear. Her tragic end is also a finale for the family. Death of a family member forces them to return to their hometown Maraş. The educated member of Kemal explains the analysis of the situation both for us and for the family: “Death of Fatma should be a lesson to us all. It is time to think everything over. I think moving to Istanbul from Maraş, getting carried away in the dreams of taking over Istanbul is where our mistake started. As a family that should live in defense and by our own means, we undertook offence. Instead of working back to back we got distracted, each of us. We tried to suck on the opportunities of the city without giving anything from ourselves. Thus we could not succeed”.

To Selim’s question as to ‘what do we do now’ Kemal replies “I think the only solution is to sell and give whatever we have, go back to Maraş, and start all over”. When Murat asks ‘what do we do there after this’ Kemal says ‘we best open a repair shop and make it work effectively’. As in his conversations with Ayla previously, in these answers too we can find the traces of a corporatist economic understanding working collectively, caring for the nation and the society, based on the economy in the countryside, hardworking and productive. This model is loyal to the ideas of National Democratic Revolution (Yön journal). It also cares about family institution, shows the city environment as shady and claims that happiness is in the countryside.

Where is the lower class in such a scene? What the lower class does or is, does not matter so much, as no social fractions are regarded with ‘class logic’ in Kemalist left,

none of the groups are in more foreground than the others. Two notions are very important in Kemalist Left: one is that the bourgeoisie should be nationalistic, comprador bourgeoisie is not allowed and the other is, resistance against imperialism, not ever letting a foreign country to dominate over Turkey and profit from it. As seen in this scene, lower class is not given more importance and regarded as yet another social group striving for the future and wellbeing of the country with the rest of the classes. As many intellectuals from the Marxist fraction opposes to, Kemalism proceeds in a very different area from the line and concepts valued by socialism / Marxism. In the films we analyze, we think that only *Gurbet Kuşları* is in the same line with Kemalist left. *Otobüs Yolcuları* and *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* are films with a hint of left Kemalism but mostly closer to Marxism with their goals to analyze lower classes.

Of course, it is not inevitable that every girl ceasing ties with her family should be a prostitute but as in many examples of Turkish cinema, it is frequently repeated that nothing good happens to women left out of the notion of family. This is partially related to social reality: the number of women who are economically independent and living alone are very few, additionally; it is not approved by the society of the time for a woman to live without a husband. Still, it can be claimed that, the expectation of conforming to social norms can be a characteristic of 60s cinema. As with Nermin in *Acı Hayat*, Fatma was also punished by suicide by the script for her betrayal of family and moral norms.

At the end of the film, through the words of Ayla and Kemal, once again we hear distrust of urban capitalist economy, and the desire to get away from the city. Kemal says to his family about to get on a train to return to Maraş: “You need to consider this return not as a defeat but a new life starting”. Ayla supports Kemal with the words that believe educated intellectuals should serve in even the hardest places of the home country: “we will come join you once the university is over. I believe those places need educated people more than Istanbul”. Kemal’s influence on Ayla’s transformation from a woman with dreams of moving to the USA to an idealist believing in national goals is of course huge, and the message given by the film

through Ayla from upper income group is that bourgeoisie too should work for the high goals chosen for the society and the country.

As in many films of social realism genre, *Gurbet Kuşları* has the obvious didactic within its contents. Unlike the film *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* that we will analyze later on, its discourse is directed not only to lower class but the whole society. And the lower class occupies as big a place as cut for it in this discourse. Another point is that the sociocultural conflicts resulting from migration occupy a larger place in the film than concerns about class. The basic criticism of the film is spatial; and the focus is the city. The city is described as a sinister, eerie place. Fatma became a prostitute and committed suicide in the city, the family was ripped off with skullduggery when they were going to take over the repair shop in the city, they lost everything they owned in the city and had to return to Maraş without a gain. The script assumes that none of this would happen had they stayed in Maraş. All the people with negative attributes are left in the city; the married Greek woman, Despina, with whom Selim had an affair, Murat's lover Seval and Orhan whom Fatma wanted to marry. The dead body of Fatma who wanted to be a part of that city life via marrying Orhan. The film rips the family from Istanbul and sends them back to Maraş, this changing places virtually cleans the family from its mistakes. As only Ayla and Kemal's relationship ends happily, this suggests that the film does not approve of the other forms of relationships. The Greek woman cannot be a wife to Selim because of her ethnic origins, the hostess girl cannot be a wife to Murat because of her job and Orhan is not formed to become a husband to Fatma because he belongs to the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, Ayla and Kemal are on a high spot by the scenario: they have contemporary images, they are bright, students of university and soon graduates of the university, they are wanting to work for their society and aware of their responsibilities towards their country; in other words, the young Turkish prototype which film would like to see.

In its core, the film criticizes modern life from two aspects: from the economic aspect it regards the capitalist economy as an economic model with no morals in trade. It sees capitalism as the economy of people who make a fortune without labor, without an honest and honorable work and by subterfuge. On the other hand, it sums

up the social structure in the city regarding the social values and moral stance as an extension of these characters. As it reflects the rural life, the place of good intended honest people, it pictures the city as the devil's place, place of the trickery and ambition.

Especially in its finale, *Gurbet Kuşları* advises the lower income groups to stay away from the city, it claims that city is a place of 'collapse and perish' both in economic terms and social norms for the poor masses from the rural areas. This romantic perspective of the lower income group, especially the poor people of the rural areas has an idealist identity, with its attribution of a positive homogeneity to the lower income groups, although that perspective is not compatible with the low income people in real life.

2.7.3.2. Bitmeyen Yol (The Unending Road), 1965

The last film on our film list for 1960s is **Bitmeyen Yol** by Duygu Sağıroğlu. *Bitmeyen Yol* recounts the story of 6 innocent villagers who migrated to Istanbul. It is a migration film and a film about *gecekondu*. It focuses on a group composed completely of men as *Gecelerin Ötesi*.

This 6 people arrive in Istanbul on a train entering the station, this is probably their first time in a city. They go to *gecekondu* district where their fellow villagers who migrated before are living in. Their fellow villager runs a coffee shop in this district. Ahmet's answer from the group who just came from the village to the question of this man as 'how is the crop, are beets maggoty again' gives us an idea why this group of men migrated: "soil becomes worse by the day, it can no longer feed the villagers". Here in this district again, sister Güllü from their village lives with her daughters Fatma, Cemile and her grandson, Ali. Fatma's husband is in prison, Cemile's husband is in Germany. Ahmet starts living with them as a guest. Fatma works as a cleaning lady, Cemile works in a textile factory.

The script composed Fatma and Cemile as exactly opposing characters of the lower class. Cemile is closer to the village, more innocent and emotional; she speaks

Turkish in a village accent. Fatma is a kind of person who desires the city. For example, she carefully tries the accessories of the lady of the house where she goes to clean, puts on makeup, tries the clothes of the owner. Her being so fond of the landlady's comment which proves how much she envies city life and how this comment honors her: "my lady says you are nothing like a villager anymore.. she says 'comb your hair like this, it suits you' ".

The first days of these 6 people group in the city is worth seeing. The 6 of them move together in the traffic. Cars coming from everywhere, for a moment they are separated from each other and scared to lose each other. Eating the loaves of bread they bought from a bakery, they share their first impressions about the big city. Hasan likes the bread they bought; he thinks it is better than the bread in the village: "this really is not bread but cream. You don't need to put anything in it. Eat Mehmet, eat". Mehmet is more cautious towards the city: "I wonder if we will always be able to find this bread. No job, no work around. We listened to that crazy Hasan to come here, we have not a trace of brain.' Hasan is the person who believes in the city the most: "Was it better to be slaves to a cruel man like Kırık Ağa. You have reached this age and seen what? Have you eaten a bread like this.. (By showing her friends) there look at those breads for once.. (By meaning the cars) just look at those machines. The pavements are golden here my boy, you just need to know how to earn it". The objections are quick to come from the group, one of his friends says 'yeah right, from what job are we going to earn the money' and the other says, 'who lost a job for us to find'.

Hasan turns and asks Ahmet what he thinks: "Ahmet, what do you say to that, shall we get up and go back to the village?". Ahmet's reply implies that he is also willing to be a permanent in the city: "once we have come, we cannot just go back, we will endure". If we may remember, this dilemma whether to stay in the city or go back was also discussed in Gurbet Kuşları. The migrants swing like a pendulum between the mood of being scared of the overwhelming structure of the city and the possibility of having opportunities incomparable to the village, once they succeed. The most active in the group and the closer name to the notion of 'city' Hasan declares that the communitarian, collective mentality of the village does not work in

the city where they now are, states the strategy of the group from then on: “of course we will endure but we cannot look for a job as an army like this. Everyone should look for his own job and food”. Hasan’s underlining this ‘individualism’ shows that he is aware of the individualist structure of the city and the one most ready to comply with it from the group. Still they cannot be separated from one another just like that: in a scene, one from the group is walking alone, then another of his villagers join him, then another one and another one, Hasan is the last one who joins and the six men are together again.

One of the most important and pleasant aspect of the *Bitmeyen Yol* is that it shows us how the people who came from the rural to the city encounter the city’s various economic and cultural faces, a trip we mostly take through Ahmet. For example Ahmet peeks into a night club he encounters and sees people dancing to slow music. While walking, he sees the writing by Türk-İş (Türkiye İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu, Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions), he reads ‘gas will be nationalized’ and while he is reading this in the middle of the road, the name of ‘Mobil’ company is visible in the background and a truck owned by Mobil company almost runs him over while. Then he comes to an agency sending workers abroad. He meets a person who says he can deal with the procedure in two days and hand him his passport in exchange of 500 liras.

All these elements make *Bitmeyen Yol* a sociologically important film. The reaction of a villager witnesses dance and music for the first time. The attitude set against the Mobil Company depending on the idea that prevailed in 60s in the intellectual community stating the national resources should be controlled by the national centers. His meeting with a person that claims he can send him abroad in a period of time when workers were sent to Germany. All these prove that the film filtered the social phenomena of the 60s very good and added them in its context.

Ahmet continues his tour of the city; the amusement around him entertains and excites him. He joins his friends, the friends eating are not yet in the atomized individuals’ mode as demanded by the city: “the property of a Muslim is common, come eat a couple of loafs”. Where he meets his friends actually is the worker

market. There comes a truck to take the workers away, a commotion breaks out, when all the workers attack the truck. Police come in the end, the police forces workers out of the truck and the workers are handpicked but this time 19 are chosen, while 20 were needed. One last person is needed and a voice from behind proves that class consciousness is not present in the owner of the voice: “take me too, I’ll work for 5 lira”. This person who violates workers labor that is normally 7.5 lira and downsizes the price is giving one of the biggest blows possible on already non-existent class awareness. They also suffer from the lack of class awareness in the sand quarry they work in. Their reason to be here is because the crane had broken. But even the workers carried there are not enough, the boss wants more workers. Bailiff warns the boss that this would be expensive. But the boss is sure of himself: “son, these are the villagers. They have neither unions nor insurance”. The bailiff implements this ‘supposedly cunning’ idea and makes the payments over 5 liras. When Hasan states that they have come for 7.5, he threatens the workers by firing.

The cultural cacophony in Ahmet’s mind due to the city life goes on in his dream. He and Cemile are at a night club wearing stylish clothes. The other men of the migrated group also are in the night club in suits. All of a sudden, folk music starts in the night club: this time Ahmet, Cemile and the other men are wearing folk costumes and they start folk dancing. The scene changes again, this time rock and roll starts playing and one of the dancers is Fatma. During this music, they push and drag Ahmet to the floor and he gets stepped on by the crowd. In the whole of this dream, it is possible to follow first an urban, then villager, then urban process. The feeling of being in the middle experienced by Ahmet and the similar ones with Ahmet who came to the city through migration is summarized through dance in the dream.

The basic impulse of modern life, industrialization, pushed the lower economic class in Turkey into a sociological hollowness. May be the prime reason for this is the criteria of social relations in pre-modern environments, such as living in the same neighborhood, being a part of the same family, having the origins of the same city is left aside: and criteria such as the job, money earned, the region, habits of consumption became definitive (Berber, 2003:228). For Doğu Ergil, it is normal to feel one’s self to be in a psychological loneliness in the distanced and formal social

relationships of the city life. This condition occurs more frequently in people migrated from a village to a city is due to the fact that the migrants cannot find in the city the emotional intensity and solidarity offered in the countryside. Moreover, the lifestyle and social and cultural institutional demands of the city life are very difficult for people with rural origins (Ergil, 1986:98-99). The change of criteria, obligatory adaptation to these new criteria means an exact anomie especially for lower income class people who migrated to a big city. One cannot say that the Turkish society and the political powers in Turkey managed this anomie appropriately or prevented it before it happened. In the foundation of problems such as unplanned urbanization, informal business sector, gecekondu, etc. lies improper guidance to the pouring rural mass into the city.

As we have discussed before in *Acı Hayat*, Nermin's alienation of her work and weariness can also be observed in *Fatma*. Sister Güllü is scared that she may be fired for waking up late. Fatma is tired of washing underwear in the houses she goes to, and yells at her mother and Cemile because of that, later she starts crying. But still she leaves for work, but actually she goes to Ahmet. They question the sexual intercourse they previously had. Ahmet regrets it and fears being disgraced by people, most of his heart and mind is still set on the village. Fatma reminds him that he lives in the city now: "to whom will we be disgraced? This place is called Istanbul; no one cares what others do". Ahmet on the other hand is uncomfortable with seeing the things he dislikes about the city in Fatma's life: "to hell with your Istanbul. Were you a girl to become this? Look at yourself, your face is like a painted glass. What is the meaning of envying the city women and disgracing yourself".

The crane is fixed at the work place but probably because it was not properly repaired; it falls on one of the workers. The working of the crane means a lot for the workers because it means the temporary employed workers will be unemployed. They must be fully aware of that as they gaze the machine with hatred. What they actually are experiencing is facing the cruel face of capitalism as people transported from a land dominated by agriculture, mechanization of which is felt, to a city which is trying to be mechanized the same way. The workers in the West experienced this

in 19th century and tore the industrial machines then may be considered to be a new invention into pieces as it prevented them from labor and employment.

It is clear that 1960s Turkish lower class has a long way which they should take when only it is considered being tardy 100 years to this 'facing with machine' case.

Hasan is very happy to be in the city no matter what the conditions are. When the wages are given in the sand quarry he says 'so wise of us we didn't stay in the village. See we have some capital, with God's blessing. The future is bright, even Vehbi Koç started off as a convenience store, and became a big man. It is our term boys, if god allows us. The desires of Hasan are the same brought down to the masses by capitalism because in pure capitalism there are no grey areas; you are either white or black. If you are a boss you exploit your workers or shout at them or someone crashed against the system making just enough money to survive. What Hasan desires is not having enough money to live on, but a glitter and show beyond that.

Cemile's girlfriends are to meet with men and they want to introduce her to a man. They dress her up, she does not have a dress to wear but they borrow one from their factory without permission to put it back after they are done. The same day Ahmet and his friends are also at the same place, they carry on getting to know the city, visit the zoo. At that instant a man appears who gambles with cards. Hasan wants to play like a person of monetary weakness and ambition. Seeing a man constantly winning (probably the gambler's man) he gets encouraged to win as well and actually wins in his first game (probably to keep him playing). And later as expected, he loses all that he had but he wants to win it back. He is so ambitious that he forces his friend to lend him money. His being captive to gambling can be interpreted on a macro scale as the relationship between the lower class and the system. The system too, first makes the poor believe through some means that they can move up the social ladder and then exploits them to the extreme, uses their savings, treating them like objects.

Meanwhile, the man whom was considered appropriate for Cemile by her friends, attempted to harass her but she breaks free and starts running. During this chase,

Ahmet sees them and starts running after them, catches the guy and beats him up. The Museum of Archeology of Istanbul where they go together afterward happens to be the place they reunite; we learn that Ahmet and Cemile used to love each other in the village but did not have the opportunity to get married. Later on, they go to county together, running from city to nature. This is what Cemile used to do alone and Ahmet shares the same feeling. Their pure and innocent souls cannot take the gears of the city and the moment they have the opportunity, they let themselves into the peaceful arms of nature. Nature is also where they come from; it is the home for people who live in the city only to earn their living but who are villagers in terms of lifestyle and feeling.

Fatma's noticing their relationship while watching them from the window ends up Fatma's denouncing of Cemile to the factory with a feminine jealousy which considers Cemile 'the woman who stole Ahmet from her'. The factory considers seriously denouncing about Cemile's borrowing the dress without permission and terminates her job. Against this case, Ahmet rebels against the 'city that fires Cemile' and adopts a masculine protectiveness: "I am healthy and powerful, thanks to God. I'll work, fight whatever it takes and earn our living. Once we buy a sewing machine, no one will be our competition. Watch and see how I will own this bitch of a world.. Wait.. Wait and you will see. Your Ahmet is worth what". His process of looking for a job after this speech turns into a frenzy. The insults he hears due to being a poor and uneducated villager result in him murdering a businessman who he requests job lastly.

After the murder, when many people are chasing him, his running away on the city's streets almost like leaving his identity behind is the climax of the film. The city that ripped Cemile of her job made Ahmet commit a murder and threw them out of the system. And Ahmet is not even like Hasan, he has no desire for luxury and proving himself to the city. He is like Cemile, he just wants to live under the shadow of a modest job, just enough to make a living but the city does not tolerate his kind. The city wants to see in its body ambitious and greedy people like Hasan and Fatma. It grows with them, gets her appetite with them and sustains its existence and future with them.

With a very sincere observation, *Bitmeyen Yol* is the best film we analyzed in 60s. Its power comes from its ability to perfectly display the economic suppression and cultural confusion of the migrants to the city. The 6 people in the film are just a small sample of the migrants; even if we raised the number up to 60, 600 or 6000, the result would not change. The life of a migrant is their eyes looking with astonishment at the statues from Antique Greece and Antique Roman for the first time in the Archeology Museum of Istanbul; it is being poked by the bailiff of the sand quarry to wake up like animals while dreaming about sitting in a night club with his lover; it is killing the employer who insults and does not give a job him right after finding his lover who he could not marry in his village in the city.

2.8. Conclusion

We can witness in this chapter that there is parallel search for identity both in Turkish society and Turkish cinema. The main reason can be shown that 1960s is an important breaking point in Turkish societal conversion. We are seeing also both the poor people who are born and raised up in city and the poor people who come to the city by migration are in a process about converting themselves from ‘being poor’ to ‘class standing’.

Moreover, this societal conversion had reflection on political platform. TİP founded its party strategy on the interests and behaviors of poor and CHP tried to embrace the conversion in poor people’s life generally into its party structure. All these happenings could be evaluated as the triggering reason for the birth of social realist line in Turkish cinema. Due to the social and political awakening in urban poor people, social realist line became the conveyor and the representer of this awakening in cinema field.

In the examples that we have examined, the poor people who are raised up in the city environment are complaining the devastating working conditions; the poor people who joined the city by migration are facing modern and different face of the city, they are in a situation culturally which they do not know to do. Also, the class consciousness and organized societal act were tried to teach to the poor people, this

side was happened by the affect of socialist ideology but the socialist ideology is not located in the films directly.

CHAPTER 3

3. SOCIAL REALISM AND URBAN POOR IN 1970s

3.1. Introduction

1970s had the decline of Yeşilçam understanding but the ascension of social realist trend in Turkey. The discussions which continued since the second half of 1960s were about in which way Turkish cinema should continue.

The societal structure of 1970s is more chaotic than 1960s. Political tension fed the violence in a lot of cases. Politic trends were controlling the societal conversion. Social realism, by the effects of societal changes, split up two ways: sociological and political. Political side can be called as ‘socialist realism’ because its didactic and severe cinema language was controlled by socialist ideology.

The goal which we should focus on in this chapter will be to find out parallel points again between the nine films in our list for 1970s and societal conversion of Turkish society in 1970s.

3.2. Cinema in 1970s

In terms of the social realism that we analyze, Turkish cinema produced both ‘sociological’ and ‘political’ examples of cinema in this period. Here, it would be wrong to consider the cinema language only as an issue of structure: structure is coherent with the content which the film attempts to narrate and it is already chosen to illustrate the contents. While the films we analyze such as Umut, Gelin, Dügün,

Diyet, aim to scrutinize the social problems sociologically, films such as Arkadaş, Maden, Demiryol are prescriptive for lower classes and undertake guidance for lower class to rid of its problems. It may be guessed that the helping point in this obvious orientation here is socialist line.

Nigar Pösteki evaluates our cinema based on time periods as such: “up until 70s Yeşilçam was influenced by 3 major trends: commercial films, nationalism and realism. While social realism was influential in 70s, the civil opposition was silent after September 12th; inner conflicts, individualism and fantasy came to foreground..” (Pösteki, 2005:30). From a remark such as thus, we can gather that the time period when our cinema was most concerned, aggressive and critical was 70s, when the approach of cinema was moving parallel to political tensions. That we have 6 films from the 60s, 7 from 80s but 9 from the 70s, proves the lunge of our cinema.

“The political upheavals of the 1970s were not advantageous for cinema. The populist Yeşilçam film industry, which was lacked the necessary infrastructure, was not prepared for the social, political and economic transformations, globally and locally” (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:5).

Eylem Atakav mentions that in the cinema environment of 1970s, there are two approaches to be considered; the films with social content questioning social problems and cheap comedy productions on sexuality. Atakav claims that audiences moved away from cinema in 70s: one of the reasons was the hot political climate of 70s. The other was that the popularity of TV was getting more in 70s. As the unsafe and anarchic environment of the street pushed families, women and children into their homes, the TV waiting there promised free entertainment and fun. While families withdrew from cinema, it was left to male audience; men were the target audience of sex films employing women’s body as commodities (Atakav, 2013:44). Oğuz Makal also supports Atakav’s statement: “when the year 1979 was reached 131 out of 195 films were on sex (19 of them were arabesque) .. The most common audience of the sex films that reached an important sectorial success were the lumpen fraction, child-youth” (Makal, 1987:22).

Thus the cinema withdrew from the family habitat of 60s. The remark by Turan Gürkan in 1974 explains why our cinema of 1970s was not as prolific as the 1960s and reveals that the problem is not limited to sex films. The foreign films screened in our country without control and TV became common not only in the city but now in little towns as well, were the basic causes for cinema's economic problems (Scognamillo, cited from Gürkan, 2010:178).

Theoretical discussions over social realism were fairly limited in 1970s compared to 60s. However, this does not mean that the trend is over. Following the limited number of social realist film examples between the years 1965 – 1970, first People's Cinema then National Cinema discussions took place. 'Turkish nation is a classless society' argument was stated by directors Halit Refiğ and Metin Erksan and other participants agreed upon in the session of MTTB (Milli Türk Talebe Birliđi, The National Union of Turkish Students) in 1973 (Karadođan, 1999:5). The social realism interpretation by Refiğ, Erksan and probably involving Akad as well, claiming society to be 'classless' and staying within the national framework, reveals that it wants to draw a firm line between itself and Sinematek group which was formed after 1965 and led by Onat Kutlar, and loyal to the Marxist-international values.

"The period which Nijat Özön claims have started by Yılmaz Güney and named as Young / New Cinema period (1970-1984) started in 1970 and is a period of time when the anonymous structure of Turkish cinema started to individualize and the directors emerged with their personal cinema. The major feature of the phase is that it grew away from Yeşilçam and 'director's cinema' appeared" (Karadođan, 1999:3).

When Yeşilçam was looked down upon by the Turkish intelligentsia, intellectuals were inclined towards foreign films. The disconnection between intellectuals and cinema is an obvious reason of the lack of cultural foundation of Turkish cinema (Karadođan, 1999:6). The goal of the intellectuals was more like "... more 'artistic' and 'out of commercial concerns', 'progressive' search for cinema, cinema that is not Yeşilçam" (Karadođan, 1999:17). The reason that intellectuals stopped supporting

Turkish cinema was that they looked down upon at to some extent and also their being prevented by Yesilçam's commercial cycle from participating in cinema. We may exclude social realism: social realism concerns a mission which considers artistic and scientific sides that are questioning social problems at foreground and letting the commercial aspect of the cinema left in the background. The trends such as 'people's cinema', 'national cinema' and 'revolutionary cinema' occurred with certain goals to produce films by the effect of social realism but unfortunately, their efficiency had a short life span.

“Be it called revolutionary, materialist or socialist, for years we have been occupied with the problems of an art that is new and towards the future structure of the society.. of course in scale with the development of revolutionary practices, it is our inevitable mission to determine and develop the theoretical basis of the problems of revolutionary aesthetics , cinema and other forms of art in Turkey” (Kutlar, 1975:10). In his writing published in March 1975, Onat Kutlar thus described in a sentence that the revolutionary trend of the 1970s had to institutionalize in arts as well, and establish a direction. The road paved by Vedat Türkali in 1960s to 'build class awareness in the working people' had evolved in such a way that Kutlar was talking about a 'revolutionary aesthetics' and 'revolutionary practices in arts. In 1970s cinema, we encountered more the socialist realist examples than social realist ones.

In the following lines Kutlar thus describes how the socialist realist understanding should be: “For a socialist realist cinema understanding, concept of 'nationalism' can have positive results in a country set back and under the heavy pressure of imperialism. In our day in which bourgeois culture takes up more and more cosmopolitan qualities, the economic independence completed under cultural pressures, the revolutionary director should hold on to the nationalist line, keep the local colors vivid and be cautious against economic and cultural imperialism” (Kutlar, 1975:13). The kind of socialism Kutlar defended was accepted in Turkey in the 70s. If we recall a previous interview of Mehmet Ali Aybar in the newspaper in the one of the previous chapters, Aybar also wanted to distance from nationalist thoughts and dynamics. Kutlar, like Aybar, defended socialism, leaning on nationalist thought and under Kemalism's influence. However, perhaps, the most

important reason why during the middle 1960s Sinematek community with the leadership of Kutlar moved away from directors such as Erksan, Akad and Refiğ who deemed national cultural dynamics more important than the international cultural dynamics, was that people of Sinematek felt loyal to Marxism. Through the words of Kutlar –if we accept that he did not go through a change in his ideas- we may claim that where they separated was not nationalism but their level of relations with socialism. Sinematek community was of the idea that these three directors regarded the social realism understanding passive, and although they may determine and display social problems, they did not try to change them. On the other hand, it must have noticed the importance of nationalist values for the social groups that socialism is based on in Turkey; it established its political framework never to contradict the folkloric elements. Moreover, it established its national understanding against imperialism, imperial states and imperial culture in a way reminiscent of Kemalism. As stated in Kutlar’s remarks, ‘cosmopolitan’ culture was regarded as an extension of imperialism and a threat. The goal is to go back to the roots of the nation, and build a socialism based on the values of our nation. Hereby, it is possible to recall Ibrahim Kaypakkaya’s Maoist socialism based on rural life; apart from this in the films of Yılmaz Güney masculine and conservative values of Anatolia are frequently repeated.

“After TIP (Türkiye İşçi Partisi, Workers Party of Turkey) / MDD (Milli Demokratik Devrim, National Democratic Revolution) separation, New Cinema stood closer to the socialist revolution thesis defended by TIP” (Karadoğan, cited from Görücü, 1999:18). That Kutlar and socialism in general, kept their distance from the universal identity of Marxism targeting internationalism is also related to the fact that universal values were very unfamiliar to Turkish society. In the 70s, when globalism had not yet started, the ‘passage of capital from imperialist phase to globalist phase’ predefined by Lenin had not yet occurred. In Turkey, one of the developing countries under the economic control of Western world, hatred towards Western hegemony was not limited to economics but was also felt in the cultural arena. Hence, it may be claimed that the socialism of the 70s did not only aim at economic independence but also cultural independence and grounded this on nation state, the political model that continues today as well.

Kutlar says important things about political cinema: “Political cinema cannot be the offering of a single political core determined single-mindedly by a cinema artist. Because, we cannot regard political cinema apart from the whole of revolutionary movement in our country. Whatever the line the socialist and democratic strife is on in our country, is the first line the revolutionary cinema should care about” (Kutlar, 1975:14). This cinema line prescribed by Onat Kutlar can be easily followed in Arkadaş, Maden and Demiryol among the films we analyze in 70s. It is possible to mention a rather indirect political discourse in Yusuf ile Kenan and Düşman films but the three films we mentioned above are as clear as hand-picked examples of Kutlar’s definition.

The directors Kazım Öz and Emin Alper also shared their interpretation of political cinema in a session they participated in: “Emin Alper opened the session with a discussion as to the limits of the political cinema. He said that what we mean by social realism, class issues such as poverty are all handled politically and all are open to discussion. ‘Is Yol, Bereketli Topraklar a political film? On the other hand could there be a cinema that is not social realist in Turkey? Emin Alper, who started the session with such questions, stated that although criticisms of September 12th have become commonplace in mainstream cinema in the 2000s, when it comes to political cinema, what first comes to mind is Kurdish cinema. Kazım Öz took his turn by a similar question ‘is there an apolitical cinema?’ and went on, ‘the society is forced to live an apolitical life by governments. However, I believe that no matter how hard one tries to keep away from this reality that defines all areas of life, there are not any films that are not political. Hollywood films can be more political and ideological than Kurdish cinema” (Milliyet, 2014, 7 April).

Although the first half of the 60s is fruitful regarding the films we focus on, due to the pressure of political bodies and the change of social conjuncture, we do not have any films from the second half of the 60s. Yılmaz Güney is the person who changed this direction and stood against it with only one film (Umut). With regard to directing, Güney showed that he was after what is ‘different’ from the moment he stood on his own feet. As much as the leftist awareness he had was influential in this, the social infrastructure of 70s also which tended to give rise to the left was also very

supportive. What made him different, made him a school, made even the films he did not direct such as *Sürü*, *Düşman*, *Yol* referred to as ‘Güney films’ is that he gave people a sense of security with his determination to display the problems of the lower class.

As Nijat Özön underlines, Güney is a cinema person who “continues and develops Akad’s line in cinema, who can be considered as his only legitimate successor, who serves as a link between Directors period and Young / New Cinema period and who also started the latter..” (Scognamillo, cited from Özön, 2010:317). The reason behind Güney’s being referred to as people’s person is because he knew the Turkish people very well and the main element in his scripts is ‘people’ (Özgüç, 2005:20).

“According to Yılmaz Güney, class is one of the most important tools of class struggle and the function of revolutionary cinema is to direct people into thinking about social and political matters .. Led by Yılmaz Güney, conforming to the conditions of the day, a ‘social-political’ cinema trend was influential in Turkish cinema in 1970s. But it should also be stated that in the same years, directors from older and newer generations also helped social realism that started in 1960s, to continue with their films. The trilogy by Lütfi Ö. Akad, *Gelin* (1973), *Düğün*(1974) and *Diyet* (1975), dealing with issues such as migration to big city, longing to move up the social ladder, suppression of women, the concepts of labor and unions should also be considered in this framework“ (ekitap.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,80306/farkli-sinema-calismalari).

“Although throughout his filmography Güney fictionalizes his films over various places and characters, his main concern is to tell about the problems of the poor people. Güney accounted for a cabbie in *Umut*, smugglers in *Ağıt*, an agricultural worker in *Endişe*, 3 people whose paths pass through prison in *Zavallılar*, a nomadic family living on husbandry in *Sürü*, a worker working in jobs with low wages in *Düşman*, 5 poor people again released from prison in *Yol* and the poor in prison in *Duvar*” (Uysal, 2011:74).

“What is common to all characters is they are in economic despair and poverty. Moreover, they are also in despair socially, the results of which are worse than economic suppression. It is not clear whether negative economic conditions result in suppression in terms of social status or being suppressed in terms of social roles is the reason for not being able to break the poverty cycle. The characters seen in Güney’s films are suppressed and alienated in terms of both aspects” (Uysal, 2011:74)

3.3. Relations of Production and the Transformation of Society

The social structure of 70s inherited from 60s, displays a disorganized, imbalanced view. What Turkey had was cities, the structure of which was disturbed and now more cacophonous than before because of migration and rural areas that lost most of their population due to migrations and the difficulties in providing for the ones that stayed. Turkey of 1970s is a time more chaotic than the history of Republic ever witnessed. I believe the reason why this decade was experienced as such, was that the cooperation between social change and institutional structure was broken and while the social change took place independent from all rules and structural contents, the system’s institutional structure did not have the capacity to neither take change nor to direct it into a positive direction. As a result of the fact that these changes were not realized in a sociologically healthy way, the social groups and classes challenged each other. The tension formed by aggressive change gradually transformed into social conflicts. The transformations of social conflicts to the political arena as ‘left’ and ‘right’ political trends, the political tensions into armed struggles were the processes to be witnessed throughout 1970s.

The economic model of 70s which is inherited from 60s was an ‘import substitution’ understanding; this is a structure that desired to protect the national bourgeoisie and favored the domestic market rather than the foreign market. And the acceleration of the economy is clear from the number of holding companies: while only 19 holdings were founded from 1963 to 1970, 106 holdings were founded from 1971 to 1976. This number reaches up to 142 in 1979 and 30 of these were the companies with sizeable capitals (Atılgan, 2012:290-291).

TÜSİAD (Türk Sanayicileri ve İşadamları Derneği, Turkish Industrialists' and Businessmen's Association) was founded on 12 March 1971, should by no means be accepted as a coincidence (Atılgan, 2012:291), but regarded as a proof of the close relation of bourgeoisie and bureaucracy based on interest. Indeed, bourgeoisie always used two military coups (1960 and 1980) and two military memorandums (1971 and 1997) as ladders. In other words, it knew how to get out of the undesirable social conditions for its interests with the help of the military bureaucracy.

It is very clear that the memorandum of March 12th served the interests of the bourgeoisie of big numbers, industrial bourgeoisie. The damaging of the interests of the bourgeoisie by the organizing of lower and middle classes due to their legal rights was the main reason for the freedoms and rights given in Constitution of 1961 were scythed for the most part, after 1971. The reason behind Milli Nizam Partisi (National Order Party) undertaking the representation of the rural bourgeoisie was closed in May 1971 and Türkiye İşçi Partisi (Workers Party of Turkey) which followed the right of the working masses was closed July 1971, was again that these classes threatening the interests of large capital. Moreover, although Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People's Party) which passed to a social democratic line now was not closed, it was under pressure having difficulty implementing its policies (Sencer, 1974:434).

The interests of the industrial bourgeoisie, the strongest economic class of the society throughout 70s were threatened in two different ways: one of them was the working class which became powerful by numbers and class awareness, this was a threat from out of bourgeoisie class. The other was a conflict of interests within the capital owning class; the interests of the trade bourgeoisie and the agrarian bourgeoisie were in direct conflict with the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. At this point the Adalet Partisi (Justice Party) and Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi (Republican People's Party) were trying to lure the industrial bourgeoisie to their side with promises. AP, with its attitude siding with capital, promised to suppress the workers' movements. CHP, on the other hand, offered the industrial bourgeoisie to set back the other capital classes (Savran, 2010:230). Other bourgeoisie groups are based on conservative values; this is an important ruling out reason behind CHP's goal. The

modernist character of CHP facing towards the West is closer to the industrial bourgeoisie, representative of liberal ideas and far from the agrarian and trade bourgeoisie which have a conservative/rural mentality.

CHP, since the beginning of 60s, had a line trying to walk up and win the lower and middle class. It took the first fruits of this policy change in the elections of 1973 and 1977 (Savran, 2010:235). CHP with the vote rates of 33.29 in 1973 and 41.38 in 1977 was raised to the position of the leading party as it leaned towards left because the leftist thought gained power in the world and in Turkey and the interest in the lower class for the leftist thought. But we can see in the elections which followed that this interest did not turn into a permanent class feature or get institutionalized, but depended on people (The person of Ecevit, then the director general of the party) and political trends of the time.

As employers formed institutions within, the workers also evolved institutional and organized structures via the union. When we come to 1971 with the union rates of % 29.6, we see that in 1963 it was only % 11. The working class also took up protecting their rights through occupation of the factories and 42 factory occupations between years 1968 and 1971 prove to what extent the desire to protect their rights reached. (Atılğan, 2012, 292-293).

The reaction of the working class was not limited to factory occupations; “.. strikes, go slows, decreasing efficiency, sit-in protests, demonstrations, meeting, letting beards grow, food boycotts, refusing overtime, going on visits, resistance, occupying, hunger strikes, death fasts..” (Atılğan, 2012:293-294) are among the many methods in 1973 and after. Moreover, the ideological influence of different political fractions and the unions founded under their lights were also effective. Additionally, Milliyetçi İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu (MİSK, Confederation of Turkish Nationalist Workers' Unions) was founded in 1970, displayed a patriotic unionism accompanied by Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (Nationalist Movement Party). Türkiye Hak İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu (Hak İş, Confederation of Turkish Real Trade Unions) that was founded in 1976 showed a unionism based on religious patterns as accompanied by Millî Selamet Partisi (National Salvation Party). This unionism line

was also in socialist thought axis and wanted to be alternatives to Türkiye Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu (DISK, Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey) which was established way before, but it was far from uniting (Atılgan, 2012:295).

The power of the working class on the system showed itself in strikes. While a work loss of 4.506 days occurred in 1963-1971 period, this number was recorded as up to 21.182 in 1973-1980 (Güzel, 1983:1872). The workers wanted to dominate the management mechanisms of work places as well and in this direction, self-management examples were begun in some places of work. This was a serious threat for businessmen who by owning the workplace owned the management as well; then-director of TİSK (Türkiye İşveren Sendikaları Konfederasyonu, Turkish Confederation of Employer Associations) Halit Narin says: “the desire of the employees to participate in the profit and capital is concerning for the future of the regime” reflects the feeling of displeasure formed in the bourgeoisie about the possibility of working class harassing the management that was under bourgeoisie’s control (Ozan, 2012:139).

If the concept of class is the main concept examined by social realism in our study, this concept was felt to the fullest in the history of our Republic in the 1970s. Ömer Turan also underlines this reality: “.. the first point to emphasize is that 70s is a time when the class conflict got sharper and all fractions of the society realized that they are not a non-contradictory and organic whole” (Turan, 2013:5).

Also when Ömer Turan says that “the time was politic enough to be able to turn the apolitical one to political” (Turan, 2013:14) he is stating that 1970s were the most political years of the Republic’s history. We may claim that siding as classes also brought about politization: achieving class awareness also brings about the political or social movements and organizations as a result.

“At the second half of 1970s, the wide-based reconciliations between classes which left its mark on Turkey’s urbanization processes with almost 25 years were shaken” (Doğan, 2004, teorivepolitika.net).

The first signs of sharpening of class structures and alignments were the laborer demonstrations on 15-16 June of 1970. According to the data given by Atilla Özsever, the number of participants in 15th was seventy thousand people which went up to one hundred fifty thousand on the 16th (Özsever, 1998:452-453). According to Murat Belge in the demonstrations of 15-16 June, “.. the massive support which was provided by the demonstration showed that the working class movement began to ripen ..” (Belge, 1992b:173). Ömer Turan also states that such a social action indicates a new phase in terms of social struggle in Turkey: “from now on, it was not possible to separate the strife of socialism from the working class and the union. With June 15-16 the motto as ‘army and youth together’ and the brought down from up above socialism imagination to be established by intellectual class became archaic “ (Turan, 2013:6).

According to the information given by Ünüvar, “.. as Türk İş (Türkiye İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu, Confederation of Turkish Trade Unions) could increase its member number by 1.5 during 1962-1976 (14 years), DISK (Türkiye Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu, Confederation of Progressive Trade Unions of Turkey) increased its by 9 times during 1967-1980 (13 years). We may say that this is one of the effects of left and leftist political mass movement” (Ünüvar, 2013:43). If it is accepted that left movement aimed at a revolution ultimately, although it is did not achieve to, we should give credit that it managed to provide a certain political awareness to the masses.

For the majority of Turkish society, the leftist movement of 70 painted a shady, insecure and bizarre picture. The terminological counterpart for the public is ‘anarchy’. It keeps demonstrating and walking, battles with the police, demonstrates violence and kills people. For the state and people who have their back against the state, left is a confusing and threatening line. To the majority of the public, it looked like a deviant road embraced by university students and a handful of urban intellectuals.

While Ünüvar paints the social transformation of 70s, he also reveals the positive effects the leftist movement had on people:

“..Party and unionist organizations, as was never seen in Turkey before, defended the rights of the class, set back the interests of the dominant political classes or created that perception:

** This being accepted by the ‘man on the street’ as a social reality; establishing the organization as a legitimate right;

** by embracing the social state emphasis of the Constitution and persistence to implement it, the order stating everyone has equal rights instead of all should know their place could be openly stated;

**ensuring the rights of freedom to have union and to organize for the civil servants including the police, the logic to work for the public good not for the state was established;

**making it obligatory to have mutual consensus through the unions on wages in public offices and private sector for the sake of the employee-employer relationships etc” (Ünüvar, 2013:44)

It can be observed that like other ideologies shaped in modernity, leftist thought in 70s, also grounded in pure dualism. With the detection of Necmi Erdoğan, “populism is a discourse that defines the social-political area around the axis antagonist relations between popular fractions and dominant fractions, public and the government blocks, and tries to dominate it” (Erdoğan, 1998:25). The rationale of the politics here is to fictionalize the society which is made up of many different classes as whole, instead of protecting the interests of the people, serving it to the people like that and taking the control over by taking power not of people’s reason, but emotions.

Necmi Erdoğan states both the politically and sociologically dispersed view of the society as such: “The 70s social-political topography of Turkey was formed around an organic depression where ‘the old died but new has not been born yet’” (Erdoğan, 1998:33). In his book written in the first half of 1970s, Muzaffer Sencer supports

Erdoğan's deduction with the following foresight which was proved after 70s: “.. the political ideology today is far from being its final and stable form and will be the scene for important developments in the short term..” (Sencer, 1974:435). The chaotic and unstable social structure of the 70s extended as far as the violent battles between right and left ideas and the military coup of 1980s afterwards.

Thompson's perception of the class based on the notion of 'experience' may help us understand the class formation in 70s' Turkey. According to Thompson, class is the definition and the total of people's life experiences which have been continuing from past to today. Class concept depends history concept, and indirectly experience concept: if history and time concepts are destroyed suddenly, the class concept would disappear. What we can see at that time are the persons who have different pasts and experiences (Thompson, 2004:41-42). It is one of the principles of Marxist understanding of classes that the classes should be analyzed through their social conditions. That the present class structure has a historical past and continuity is also a Marxist thesis by about classes.

”.. people find themselves in a society structured in determined ways (crucially, but not exclusively, in productive relations), they experience exploitation (or the need to maintain power over those whom they exploit), they identify points of antagonistic interest, they commence to struggle around these issues and in the process of struggling they discover themselves as classes, they come to know this discovery as class-consciousness. Class and class-consciousness are always the last, not the first, stage in the real historical process” (Thompson, 1995:136). Should we follow what Thompson suggested, class awareness depends on class struggle and this is what our personal opinion is. Class awareness is a process which develops and forms in class struggle.

The righteous claim of their rights by the lower economic class for the most part, dissolved in this political cacophony. The fact that claiming rights was fictionalized as a sociological phenomenon dragged behind a political ideology instead of a sociological demand resulted in the lower class drowning in that ideological framework. There are two reasons that lower class could not express clearly their

demands: Socialist ideology could not be perceived by the majority of the society and ideological polarizations got lost in a spiral of violence.

Although it was essential for their interest we cannot say that the lower class as a whole, and all throughout 70s, supported the socialist movement. As stated above, a negative perspective on socialist thought in the majority of the society was shared by many people from the lower class as well. In this context, it is for sure that the socialist movement was disappointed not finding the support it expected from the masses. Another reason for this is the majority of the society led a conservative life style. For this mass, to sway towards right thought was way easier and it happened on this way.

Savran considers the struggles of lower economic class for socially claiming their rights did not reach the goals as not being able to ensure its independence from the bourgeois parties. Another point he underlines, the groups in strife for the leftist thought could not build a united front (Savran, 2010:185). In our society, where the class awareness is not present, especially in the lower economic class, it is not surprising that the working class could not break free from the current system and parties. It is also a reflex one can expect with the non-existence of class awareness that different social groups with the same interests at the same time can not come together and build collective action.

Many fractions within the left did not allow a proper representation of the lower class either in political or social arena: “it is not difficult to claim that unison of the left and the workers’ movement was impossible in a country where fifty something organizations and movements were in an aggressive competition” (Aydınoğlu, 2006:221).

It could be expected that such a situation would disconnect the leftist movement and the lower class, both in terms of quality and quantity, and that was what happened: “the overwhelming majority of current left organizations and movements and their supporters(the fractions they address) are composed of students, the youth not yet in

the production process (unemployed), and the laborers at the periphery of the working class” (Aydinoğlu, 2006:221-222).

From all these sentences by Aydinoğlu, we can see that the lower class had a representation problem. It may be possible to roughly associate it with two reasons: one is that the class awareness did not exactly rise from within the class and as in early 1960s, it was taught by the intellectual class to the lower class. Such an effort cannot be expected to be fruitful in such a short period of time. Besides, I believe that class awareness is not something to be taught but something that rises from the inner dynamics of a class. The second reason which is indexed on the first is, a group without class awareness cannot generate its organization. As stated above, this resulted in activities being run only by students, unemployed young people and a limited number of laborers.

It is expected that politics can get even more radical in such a chaotic climate and the radical groups of people to pull it to extremes and that was what happened in the Turkey of 1970s. The armed leftist groups even perceived the armed movements as attractive: Mahir Çayan, one of the well-known leftist student leaders explains the mentality underlying this with such words: “armed propaganda agitates discontent of the public towards the system, saves them from the rising influence of imperialist brainwashing. It first shakes the masses and raises awareness.. armed propaganda above all distracts the sedated and pacified masses lost in the concerns such as livelihood, conditioned by the imperialist media, with hopes tied to this or that party of the system and move them” (Çayan, 1976:342). It is understood that violence is perceived by the leftist group as a way to quickly pull the masses which are sociologically indifferent to left and its promise of revolution, towards the goal of revolution and motivate and trigger the society for revolution. Such a method of action will bring them to their goals neither politically nor sociologically. The words by Ömer Turan are also parallel to our criticism: “..in a climate dominated by violence, only superficial readings prone to dogmatism are possible” (Turan, 2013:17). It is certain that a political trend dominated by violence would have a problematic stance with the rest of the society and the exerted violence will satisfy only the ones who already support the trend or participate in it. No other people

would be content by violence, support it, or believe in the goal at violence is to direct them. It is obvious that a political path based on violence would be fractional and would polarize people instead of uniting them. Notwithstanding thus, it may be said that a strategy based on violence emerged not as a result of deep intellectual discussions but followed a shallow social science criticism as Turan stated because none of the intellectuals -thinkers- educated people approved of or supported violent ways.

Gün Zileli, in an interview by Korhan Atay evaluates 1975- 1980 as the period dominated by violence: “I think the time between 1975 and 80 was an unnamed civil war. An average of 10-12 people died every day. Over 5 thousand people died in 5 years.. What is this called if not a civil war?” (Zileli, 2013:83). Artunkal also supports Zileli’s statement saying in June of the summer of 1980, 10 people on daily average, in July, 15 people and in August, 20 people died in daily average (Schick-Tonak, cited from Artunkal, 1992:393). General Kenan Evren paints the picture of those days of bloodshed: “5241 people died of terror in the last two years and 14.512 were wounded. The number of martyrs in the Battle of Sakarya were 5713 and 18.480 people were wounded. Even this simple comparison shows us that there is a war which was going on regardless of humane feelings” (Schick-Tonak, 1992:394). It is clear that the main reason for the military coup was, in a modern society which is expected to be free and safe, these concepts were highly worn out and threatened but of course, none of these legitimize a military coup.

In his work published in 1981, William Hale explains the consequences of the student movements in 70s on the academic community: “During 1969-71 academic life was already severely disrupted by demonstrations, boycotts and violent clashes between police and students, or students of rival political persuasions. The military-directed governments of 1971-1973 imposed an uneasy calm, but at the cost of a draconian restriction of academic freedoms. Violence returned to the campuses, however, on an increasingly bloody scale, during 1973-1976. Since then, political terrorism has spread outwards to the streets and factories, leaving its academic birthplace in a calmer, but not necessarily happier, state. By 1979, classes were proceeding in a reasonably orderly fashion, but this was achieved only by armed

policemen, patrolling the corridors and searching all those entering the campuses. From this viewpoint, the problems faced by higher education could be seen as part of the social, political and cultural tensions in society at large” (Hale, 1981:226)

“In 1970s, the polarization and the conflict atmosphere which was seen in society generally reflected to the slum areas strongly, leftist and rightist groups used violence to each other to exert dominance in slum areas” (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org).

This increasing political tension provided a new perspective about gecekondu areas: ”It showed that slum people were not a homogenous unit which village culture had united, slum people contained different cultures and political views which conflicted each other” (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org).

The actions which are based on violence implemented by the extreme leftist groups in 70s were of no use in terms of the rights of the poor class. The radical organizations the young people who came to the big city from the rural and poor regions to enroll to universities, tended to join when confronted by economic and cultural differences were nothing but political toys, which are void of generating class awareness.

Ömer Turan defines the years between 1977 and 1980 as an ‘economic crisis’ and states that “the crisis was about that the framework of production and distribution defined by the imported substituting model was no longer valid”. Moreover according to him, “.. the organized struggle of the working class deepened the crisis” (Turan, 2013:18). It is known that the real beginning of the process from 1977 to the coup of 1980 was the worldwide petrol crisis that broke out in 1973. The reason why countries like Turkey that do not produce petrol and are dependent on other countries in terms of energy that cannot preserve the imported substitution model, is the import of energy. This is similar to working mill with buckets of water, and it paved the way for the bankruptcy of the imported substitution model and surrender to international economic powers.

“.. the foreign investments stopped from 1977 on. The big shareholders were aware that the way out was to increase the scale of production and labor efficiency and in this framework wanted the imported substitutionism to give way to international competition climate” (Turan, 2013:18). All economies of the developing nation state countries must have been experiencing a similar problem. In addition, the great capital powers of the West wanted to use the underdeveloped and developing countries they exploited in terms of raw material from early 19th century to the middle of the 20th century as potential consumers now. These two points are the main reasons of globalizing economy and globalization that became a worldwide phenomenon from the 80s. Turan wants to emphasize a similar extension: “.. the crisis towards the end of 1970s should be considered as not only the end of import substitution and related to liberalization in 1980s but also over its connection with the financial liberalization in 1990s” (Turan, 2013:19).

Why this uncontrollable move did not turn into a revolution is again a question to be answered by sociological realities. Yıldırım Koç’s opinion “.. Small bourgeoisie was still the majority of Turkey. Also the relations of some wageworkers with property of the means of production continued to some extent” (Koç, 2010:49). This statement may tell us why class awareness to be formed over the concept of ‘labor’ did not form in those years. In addition to the people who owned small scale means of production such as convenience stores, restaurants, small farmlands, patisserie etc. were the majority of the population, the people who earn their living through their labor also had direct or indirect relations with the means of production and even the means of property. The presence of such a relation kept them from a desire for revolution that can extend as far as change of the system, because more or less they also were the parts of that system. And people who had nothing to lose other than their labor lacked the level of education or awareness of labor, or courage. Thus the socialist movement willing to transform the system remained a trend followed only by university students and urban secular middle classes but could never reach the necessary majority in quantity.

If we look to the position of urban poor sociologically, it settled in the peripheries of the city widely, unlike 1960s. There was now a rooted migrant mass in city. As Lütfi

Akad sensitively examined in his trilogy that we will analyze in the rest of the thesis, the incoming mass was a part of the city and had no intentions of going back.

The phenomenon of migration took place in Turkey without a professional guidance and out of control resulted in the urbanization occurring in a larger scale than industrialization. Atılğan exemplifies that the urbanization rate between 1970 - 1975 was % 4.2 while the industrialization rate was % 2.3. Because the formal employment opportunities were limited, the migrants were directed in to informal and maybe materially more profitable jobs such as street vending, housekeeping, stall holding, minibas assisting (Atılğan, 2012:296). When Kerem Ünüvar said that “.. there was a population that could not adapt to the demand about being urban-modern but had come to the city nevertheless” (Ünüvar, 2013:31) he underlined that modernity was not embraced by the migrants from the rural places to the city.

Observing the time between 1950-1975, Nebihat Yağız in her perspective of the city in the aftermath of the migration, states: “the culture of gecekondü and arabesque emerged of its own accord.. a human type who has not money, has not a job, is rambler, desperate, wretched has emerged. Besides gecekondü, the concrete buildings and apartment blocks also became the part of the life of Turkish people then..” (Yağız, 2006:24-25). “This new urban population formed their own tastes, music, dressing style, entertainment style, ways of talking, moral norms, communication structures..” (Karadoğan, 1999:17). The cultural codes of the migrants in gecekondü were as new to themselves as they were to the urban residents.

Oğuz Makal helps us understand the psychological state of the migrants by examining their state of mind socio psychologically: “when the migrants come in the city environment that is totally unfamiliar to them, they encounter personal problems they cannot get out of, they become disappointed, the norms and beliefs of their previous world collapse (anomic); as they cannot connect to the environment easily they become alienated: their inner world also was unsettled as their unsuccessful outer world and they fall into despair (frustration gap)” (Makal, 1987:29).

Perhaps the lower class wanted to compensate for its being challenged psychologically by the elements of consumption. It could also be observed that the masses that came to the city via migration frequently got in touch with the opportunities that they cannot achieve in the rural, their life standards were rising: “the TV antennas which were covering the roofs in gecekondu neighborhoods by the middle of 1970s, was the symbolic proof of this development. Similar observations could be made on the transistor radios, cassette players, refrigerators, even the use of cars which were being permeated in worker and villager families” (Boratav, 1995:96).

In context of the given conditions we see how culture of gecekondu and arabesque as its natural extension were formed: “arabesque taking its power and hegemony from the social and political dilemma; also as the sociologist Emre Kongar detected; having cultural elements such as ‘enterprising, courage and aggression’ in its body, was to become the shelter of the villagers in the city who regressed, got confused and discouraged with their psychology in a mess due to the realities they encountered” (Makal, 1987:24). It is obvious that arabesque emerged with a function of healing as a ‘semantic world’ for the hurt souls of the rough city conditions.

“For them there is no more satisfying the desire of superiority, no more success or defeat. Desire for death for them is diminishing the self and dimensions so that getting rid of the anxieties caused by being, and also wish to get help from others, and being protected” (Ersöz, 1985:35). The concept of ‘death’ is very important in arabesque which covers a deep space in their intellectual perspective. Although arabesque culture is quite far from social realist films that our dissertation concentrates on, in order to resolve the psychological dynamics of the lower class that our films analyze, it is not a culture to go past by.

3.4. 1970s Films

3.4.1. Individual Struggles Against the System

3.4.1.1. Umut (Hope), 1970

Our first film in 1970s is **Umut** by Yılmaz Güney. It is one of the most important films in the history of Turkish cinema. By the polls conducted by the film critics, it is constantly chosen one of the best 10 films of Turkish cinema. Umut is also a milestone in the personal career of Yılmaz Güney; Scognamillo states that with this film Güney gave his first exam with regard to cinema and brought the concept of ‘poetic realism’ to Turkish cinema. Umut was also the first film where he searched for his own cinema language in terms of form and content (Scognamillo, 2010:323). Güney fictionalized a display of poverty in the center of which was Cabbar the cabbie, in a scenario in which he chose to depict then-Adana as location. Cabbar is a poor cabbie who lives in a hut, which is worse than an average *gecekondu*, with his wife and 5 children. His income is not sufficient to provide for his family’s livelihood and to pay his debts. This deadlock would force him into various directions and make him run around like a crazy person in an ambiguous finale.

The strongest aspect of Umut is its depressive scenario which exposes how the exit points are closed to Cabbar one by one. Although there is not a single positive aspect to Cabbar’s life, the audience never expresses disbelief such as ‘oh, come on now, this is too much’. On the contrary, with a realism that is surpassing its predecessors in social realism genre, it makes the audience believe that the chain of events that cannot be believe unless seen, is real somewhere in Turkey, such in an atmosphere which is reminiscent of a documentary.

Cabbar’s problems in the film start with his old and worn out coach and the weakness of his horses. Because he has a bad car, none of the customers want to ride his coach. His hope in the beginning of the film is winning a lottery. When his friend Hasan says ‘you are fond of tickets’, he replies: “mine is not being fond of it, it is a hope, maybe I hit a 3-4 thousand and get rid of my debts. I am in a red with debt. I earn 15 liras a day at most, do I pay the debts or feed the population at home, I am all

messed up”. From these words, we see that Cabbar is not greedy for riches but only wants the money for his family’s livelihood.

Hasan tries to persuade Cabbar that he can make a bundle metaphysically. He keeps offering Cabbar to find a treasure through prayers etc. Another man advises Cabbar to seize by force or robbery. Cabbar refuses these in very clear manner. Of his children, Cumali is unsuccessful in car repair and Cemile in being a student; thFis shows him that he cannot build a future leaning on his children, either.

The event that disturbs the life cycle he had been going in one way or another, was that one of his horses was hit by a car and horse is dead. Moreover, the treatment he faced in the police station where he went to claim his right, was as bad as the death of his horse. The police commissioner does not even let him speak and looks down on him. To top that, the commissioner blames him for parking where he should not have and trying to strangle the person who hit his horse with a car. His suffering persists: in order to be able to buy a horse he visits all acquaintances he remembered to be well off, including his old boss for whom he worked for 9 years. None helps him or takes notice of him. Besides, the people whom Cabbar has debt are all aware of the fact that Cabbar is in debt and in no condition to pay his debts and they discuss among themselves how they are going to retrieve their money back. A man Cabbar owes 180 liras says ‘180 liras, I am such a donkey brain, what can I take from this bloke’ and another replies ‘you can take his daughter’.

The way Cabbar is suppressed is not different from the other laborers. The same way he is suppressed by ‘ağa’ (feudal lord, rural bourgeoisie), the people on top of the feudal relations of production in the city of Adana, he is also suppressed and not treated properly in his relations with the police (bureaucracy). In spite of all these, his only desire it to be able to provide for his family and despite all the negative events, he counts on his own labor. As he tells his wife; “only if we could buy a horse, we could have been able to feed ourselves and not depend on other people”. His wife is of the opinion that the coach is over for them: “the coach is old, no one rides it. Municipality wants to remove the coaches anyway”. Cabbar is determined not to leave his job and labor; he wants to sell the entire commodities in the house to

buy a new horse. Another example of Cabbar's protecting the notion of labor and that he is against earning without working is seen when a pickpocket tries to rob him. Cabbar catches the pickpocket and beats him up. This action underlines the fact that only income tolerated is the earned one.

Despite Cabbar's good intent and strife, debtors take his horse and coach when he is not around. Cabbar is getting exhausted gradually, as if reminding the saying 'no predicament happens on its own'. This time Hasan sneaking in, persuades him to carry out a robbery. Although they are in very bad economic conditions, Cabbar almost begs Hasan to call the robbery off. An American man comes and beats Hasan up while he is supposedly trying to rob him and persuades Cabbar to run off.

From another perspective, Cabbar draws the picture of a laborer with class awareness. He attends a meeting held by cabbies against the idea of the municipality to remove the coaches. He no longer has a car or a horse but still attends the meeting with a Turkish flag at hand. Perhaps, with this choice, he conveys the idea that being a Turkish citizen is the only thing he is left with.

His absolute poverty forces Cabbar to accept the preacher idea Hasan advises. Hasan is very sure of the benefits the preacher would bring to them, meaning the treasure he says 'the preacher has gnomes, fairies and angels, once he prays for you that's it he will tell you its place right away'. Hasan and Cabbar initially bring the preacher to Cabbar's home. The preacher makes Cabbar's children sit before a bowl of water one by one and asks them to tell the place of the treasure. From the words of Hatice, daughter of Cabbar, they get the idea that the treasure is in their front yard and start digging their yard.

The dialog between Cabbar and his wife the next day is like a translation of the revolt against the class position of a very poor family. To his wife's complaint as 'not one day have you given me a peaceful, comfortable life. It has been 16 years without a single good day' Cabbar replies: "I know you haven't. But you shall from now on. This is a very talented preacher, we will definitely find the treasure. And woman, then you will see a good day and life. You will forget all your suffering. We

will eat good food, meat, baklava, wear nice clothes, we will have nice carts, nice horses”. These sentences of Cabbar show us that the longing he has for his family sometimes surpasses needs and reaches the level of ‘luxury and pleasure’. He is willing to compensate the middle class life he could not provide for his wife and 5 kids with the opportunities of the high class.

The preacher tells Cabbar that they almost found the treasure in theory. Such hope mongering mingles with his feelings and he speaks to his wife: “gather the kids too, this is our last day anyway. We’ll go out and buy equipment and stuff, and also eat a good kebab. We shall get rich in short time”. Cabbar, the preacher and Hasan buy two horses and set off. The preacher told them that the treasure is under a dried tree between Misis Bridge and Ceylan Bridge. By coincidence, they see a dry tree at the target but cannot find the treasure around it. To keep on with his plot, that he captures them in, the preacher now finds another excuse: “the treasure can run away in any disguise; an ant, an insect, a snake, a bird. If you notice the treasure on the run and touch it, it becomes gold, turns in to its real self”. Cabbar stays awake all night lest the treasure run away. He sees the treasure as the livelihood of his wife and kids; he says ‘we shouldn’t let anyone else get it’. He even finds a stone and thinks that it is the treasure. Because of his extreme behavior, the preacher starts to get scared of Cabbar, and thinks that he is losing it, Hasan also shares these concerns.

Although Cabbar is lost in his consciousness, in his subconscious he is still under command of his responsibilities towards his family. ‘I had left 40 liras before leaving. They must be hungry now’, he says. He sees a snake and when he holds it, he understands that it is only a snake, not the treasure. After a short nervous breakdown, he starts to cry. In this period of time when he is not conscious, the feeling of responsibility towards his family resurfaces; he keeps saying he had left 40 liras at home; the kids are hungry and looking forward to his return. At last, they tie his eyes, the preacher prays for him to find the treasure and the film closes with Cabbar running at the shore of the river crazily.

The most important phenomenon we follow throughout the film is that Cabbar travels from rational to irrational. Underlying this is the desire to have a place for

himself in the system. His inability to reach a life he wishes for himself and his family with basic needs of a person rips Cabbar from the rational and real life and carries him to running after an unreal and irrational dream. As we will see later on in the films, *At* and *Faize Hücüm*, the stories of the lead characters as ‘alienation from the system and losing hold on the system’ was experienced in exactly the same way by Cabbar. His inability to break the vicious circle leads him to follow a man he would not actually have taken seriously, a preacher abusing Islam for his earthly desires and dominating over poor people with limited intellectual abilities.

If we look at the solutions Cabbar tried throughout the film, these are lottery, robbery, personal labor and finding a treasure by a preacher’s ways. The only one of these options Cabbar really desires is labor, but the system does not allow the income of a lower class laborer to be at a level sufficient to provide for himself and his family. This level is obtainable only for the middle class. Throughout the film, despite all the predicaments he encounters, Cabbar never ceases being a brave, honest laborer, not thinking anything other than his work, not having eyes on anyone’s work, putting his family before himself, supporting his fellow laborers by attending their meeting, not having a coach, considering the treasure he is looking for as food for his family, responsible and fearless. This is the portrait the scenario wants to observe in the lower class of a worker who never ceases to struggle even for a moment.

Critics also praise the realist line of *Umut* and appreciate it. Nezih Coş is of the opinion that *Umut* is a new ring within the social realism movement that is pulling the movement to a level higher by observing the environment out of the main story as a documentary. In the name of capital and labor conflict, Cabbar who is not the exact definition of a worker by Western standards, but still trying to handle poverty is positioned in opposition to local bourgeoisie and land owners who also do not exactly fit into the Western bourgeoisie criteria. Another point is that the leading part is not of a character with incredible features as the audience is used to expect of a film. It makes the film sympathetic since it is furnished with characters from the real people as a man on the street, a poor person has the leading role, and to top it, there are people like kebab sellers, lottery sellers or the cab drivers holding a meeting, just

as we are used to and enjoy seeing in social realism (Coş'tan aktaran Hakan, 2012:317).

Engin Ayça also underlines that cinema language is as in a documentary, which is one of the characteristics of social realism: “As if early one morning they went and pictured the real coachmen waiting for customers, lahmacun sellers, children selling newspapers and taxis just as they are. This work here is the harbinger of describing, showing documentarian approach that prevails in the film” (Ayça, 1974:6).

“According to Kırıl, with this film, Güney broke off from the dramatic structure, handled events in a dialectic way and did via a style grounded in documentary. Umut broke through the rigid phrasing of Turkish cinema” (Karadoğan, cited from Kırıl, 1999:12).

3.4.1.2. Düşman (The Enemy), 1979

Another film of our dissertation **Düşman** is a film directed by Zeki Ökten with a script by Yılmaz Güney. As its setting the scenario choses the rural town Çanakkale. We start the film with scenes from the workers' market place. İsmail is a laborer from the Eceabat town of Çanakkale. There are two market places of workers in Çanakkale; one is where the town's workers go and the other is populated by workers from all over the country. İsmail's difference is that it is his first time in the marketplace. A man whom he meets from Diyarbakır defines his situation: ‘We all were like to on our first time. You look around shyly; you think that every man with a good dress is an employer. As if, you are a commodity that is waiting for a customer’. That expression reminds Marx's commodification idea. Although the worker himself is a person, he is commoditized like a thing.

There are lesser number of jobs compared to the number of workers, so there is competition between workers. This competition sometimes causes fights. Workers pour into a truck for a job that requires 15 workers. Abdullah and Rıfat, two workers from Black Sea region have not eaten a bite for days. Abdullah can make it to the

truck but Rifat cannot. Rifat holds Abdullah's hand to get on the truck but Abdullah bites his hand. Rifat falls down, hits his head and dies. Only this composition alone shows us the competition the workers are in.

In another scene Ismail is in, a person is choosing workers and afterwards asks 'does anyone have an education degree'. Thinking that this question will yield a good result, he eagerly answers 'I do, I dropped out from high school first grade' and the person choosing says 'ok, so you may find a better job anyway, you stay here'. Ismail stays 'over qualified' for a job that requires manual strength.

Meanwhile, the scenario introduces the other characters around Ismail. For example a man called Feyyat is a porter but his wife and daughter are prostitutes in secret. His wife puts a broom at the door when there is a customer inside. A friend of Ismail, Nuri is a peddler selling souvenir but his real goal is to expand his capital. Ismail and Nuri go to a pub where the lower income people hang out. Nuri had bought a typewriter and they talk about a man called Topal Bahtiyar who made a lot of money by typewriting. Bahtiyar is almost a legend in the area for being very wealthy, having from scratch. Ismail says that he is a worker loyal to moral values: "but many poor people have rights to every penny that Bahtiyar made, can a fortune built by other's right be of any good?". Nuri reveals that for him any means of making money is acceptable: "cut this speech about the rights of other people". The people in the pub support his idea but also, make fun of his goal to be the next Bahtiyar. Nuri however is seduced by Bahtiyar's life story from scratch to incredible riches: "not very long, in 2-3 years I will buy out all of you, you will come at my door". Nuri actually is aware that this desire to climb up the social ladder is not to result in being the new Bahtiyar: "perhaps we cannot be a Bahtiyar but we sure can save ourselves".

As a worker who believes in honesty, Ismail warns Nuri, compares being Bahtiyar to winning the lottery. In any case, wanting to become a Bahtiyar is not a model Ismail would envy, but Nuri may. According to what Ismail says, Bahtiyar had done everything from smuggling to women trade, he did not hesitate to steal or taking by force the belongings of other people and did not feel any guilt either. He is the kind of man who took by force or by persuasion people's things. When Nuri's personality

is considered it is not surprising that he envies such a person: “we can do the same thing, whatever he did, we can as well” Nuri says. The humble and honorable life perspective of Ismail cannot digest such actions: “this is so wrong for me.. having the stove going, bringing home bread is enough for me. Even that is so hard”. By these words, he states that an honest worker starts life a step behind.

Ismail goes home. The quality of their home is bad. His wife Naciye is always worrisome and contempt the economic level of her life. She is after a richer, more colorful life. She is always sarcastic to Ismail; the reason behind this is clearly the economic problems. Ismail thinks that there are vultures around him and around his family. The people he calls vultures are immoral opportunists who follow and detect homes with economic problems, poverty, and try to turn this into their income. There is one of those opportunists in the market place too, abusers who buy the belongings of people on low prices. Ismail also mentions a swindler called ‘Bohçacı Hatice’ (Hatice The Peddler, a woman peddler type who visits home and selling rugs, tissues etc. to housewives). She is a person who constantly comes in and out of Ismail’s home. Her method is to first make the housewife owe her and then drag her to prostitution. Ismail is scared that Hatice will ruin their home. He really is fond of his wife and loves her. He even considered robbery for her sake, but could not bring himself to do it. And Naciye keeps reminding him that they do not have coal though the winter is coming and the roof leaks and they have not bought clothes for the winter yet.

A person called Muharrem finds him a job to poison dogs. Although Ismail is a merciful and sensitive person, he has to accept the job because he is unemployed. He is as sensitive as to try to stop a dog from eating the poisonous meat he had given it. But he is too late, the dog dies in agony. At night, Ismail dreams of the dogs he poisoned, it is obvious that he does not take the job very well. He supposedly tries to justify what he does in his speeches; he talks about the children who were recently bitten by dogs. He criticizes people who are sorry for the death of animals but who do not care about people; it is obvious that this is all an effort to calm his conscience down.

Ismail has a share from his father's farmland. He goes to his village nearby to protect this share but his father is angry at him for not helping with the work before he left. His father and his brother also dislike his wife Naciye; they think that Naciye is not a hard worker but rather a person who spends time looking in the mirror, which is not all that wrong. During the conversation we understand that Ismail and Naciye's marriage was a love marriage. Naciye loved Ismail and ran to him. When his father brings up that Naciye is a woman without a father and she had no dowry, Ismail says that she was not greedy when they were getting married: "did she want bracelets like other people, or money from the fathers, what did she want?"

Ismail reminds his father the effort he had made on the farmland: "I labored on every piece of rubbish, every handful of land you have". His father humiliates his speech on 'labor': 'hah.. labor' he says. 'Don't get me started on your labor, or your anything. Everybody has labor talk in their mouth. What labor? Are you a communist too now?'. Finally Ismail begs his father to help him. When his brother teases him about his wife's not working, they get in a fight and the father becomes involved as well. Later on, when Ismail comes back to the city he complains about them to Nuri: "we live in such a time that even his own father is no good to a person, we don't know whom we trust anymore". Nuri replies like: "you'll trust yourself, yourself only".

Meanwhile, the person called 'Rooster Şevket' has guests from Germany. One of these people is German, the other two are Turks who are living in Germany. They have come to Çanakkale to buy roosters. Later on, Şevket and his people take them around for a historical tour of Çanakkale. They set up a picnic for them and Şevket belly dances with the German. After the picnic, poor kids come to the picnic table to eat the leftovers. The film brings an irony at this scene: poor Turkish children eating leftovers of a man who is from the Western world that we destroyed as an army, in 1910s, in Çanakkale. The penalty for the military and political victory not being complemented economical, is suffered by the lower class people of the society again.

Naciye has hung the pictures of models, singers and actors on their walls. She mimics nose surgery on the mirror and envies it. Her mother's advice while she is

doing all these is clear: “feed yourselves first”. That night although it is quite late, when Ismail comes home, Naciye has not come back yet. She comes late wearing a lot of makeup. Naciye claims that she was at the circumcision feast of Bahtiyar and she regrets going, ‘I won’t step my feet outside without asking again’. Ismail is of the opinion that he and his family is surrounded. While his wife dreams other dreams, maybe of being an artist and having fame, he is only after their bread and livelihood. He declares his mental distance to his wife with a long speech which will bring about their physical separation as well: “we are poor people, we need our bread Naciye. Can these (by meaning the pictures on the walls) feed us? Can these cure our problems? Have you never considered that these dreams you have in your mind will take us to an abyss, ruin our home? Who will make you an artist, who are you? What do you have to trust? There are millions like you. Millions of women, young girls are poisoned by such dreams. Some leave their homes, some leave their families. Do you know what becomes of them?”. He must be fed up with his wife’s ungrounded perception of life as opposed to his devotion to his labor that he keeps on: “I cannot poison dogs for a woman with such ideas. I cannot play games for a woman thinking like this, I cannot grin and bear it. As long as Naciye carries such a mindset, she cannot be my wife anymore”. Ismail throws her out that night, yet cannot resist his little daughter’s request and let her in.

Feyyat’s wife and daughter who are prostitutes want to go to Istanbul. Although at first Naciye’s intention also was to go with them, the words of Ismail touch her and she changes her mind. The unbelievable reality revealed as Naciye is talking to Feyyat’s wife and daughter is that she also had been involved in prostitution. She even had intercourse with the German who came to buy a rooster and paid her with German marks. Naciye wants her money from Feyyat’s wife and to stay in Çanakkale.

The same night, Naciye accepts her fault and wants to talk to Ismail. The next day, the day Feyyat’s wife and daughter will run off to Istanbul, Naciye asks Ismail to stay home all day long; however, Ismail has to be among the ones to see the Germans off as they are returning to Germany. The day they sent the Germans off, on his way

back home he learns in front of Feyyat's door that his wife and daughter have run off to Istanbul and runs to his home. Just as he expected, Naciye has run as well.

His sitting and thinking things through is like a critic of the Turkish society and a manifesto summarizing the whole content of the film: "we are to blame right. We have watched it all like a film. Everything, all the evil, corruption, immorality.. as if it was far from us and would not plague us. We are to blame. Whereas, all that was so close to us indeed, so related. If there is a contagious disease, it concerns everyone because it is contagious. And what have we done? Keep our distance. We did not stop it. We did not ask what is going on. We just let everything be, didn't get our hands dirty". He regards Feyyat's wife's prostitution, as immorality, challenging all moral people. He thinks that the microbe will infect everyone someday and the silence shown to immorality will ruin everyone.

The film defends concepts such as 'honor' and 'family' is a result of the fact that Yılmaz Güney the project owner of the film comes from the Anatolian culture and it is fictionalized against the 'liberal' and 'modern' woman relationships. We see that the conservative/macho/patriarchal concepts are frequently repeated in his scenarios; Güney elevates the perception of family and morals in the village as he finds them 'pure' compared to the bourgeois family and morals he dislikes and regards as corrupted. When we consider in terms of social realism movement, we see that there is a parallelism with social reality because in the low income environment, obedience to conservative norms is expected. In the visible aspect of life, the conformism is %100 ensured but, what is claimed for not so 'public' aspects of life is that events are more excessive and more extreme than the upper class, which is considered to be more 'liberal' and 'open', are lived. Indeed the prostitution carried out by Feyyat's wife and daughter and Naciye who we considered to be loyal to her husband is a proof of the claim. It is shown that conservative moral structure is not realistic and not internalized that these women who seem like 'housewives' from outside easily passed the morality barrier which society has set, in order to overcome economic difficulties they have.

The same moral residue also reveals examples of hypocrisy in the majority of lower class men: a man of this moral who gets disturbed even if his wife or daughter only goes out of the house, does not hesitate to go to a brothel or look at the body of a woman with a decollete dress. Moreover what these examples tell us is that a moral code that is not voluntarily participated in, and forced to conform to, tends to cause hypocrisy and dishonesty.

The wish that emerged in Ismail's inner world to kill Naciye is stopped by Selim. Selim is the son of Muharrem, who lives in Istanbul, works in a factory and is left-oriented. Selim, who is hidden by the scenario until the end of the movie, is a sane, level headed, persevering person who is to keep Ismail from a mistake. "As long as this order goes on there will be thousands of Naciyes. One Naciye will die and another will be born. Killing Naciye will give you sorrow. Funeral house, problems, hardships.. you will be ruined. This time Zeynep (Ismail's daughter) might face the same problem". Selim's advice is accurate and pulls Ismail to his senses. Selim tells Ismail to start to a new life instead of doing all this. He wants to help Ismail find a job in the factory.

Ismail's wish, which is to cut all his ties with the environment he is in, can be seen when he sells back to Nuri the cassette player he bought from Nuri for Naciye. Nuri buys the player but pays 100 liras less than its worth. After this, Ismail tells him that he truly believes that Nuri will be the next Bahtiyar but there is no future for Bahtiyars.

When he sees Şevket and Nuri from the bus on the way to Istanbul, he feels that he is leaving them behind. He is going to the city where he thinks he can reflect his honesty better than the town where the Eastern shiftiness prevails. They are travelling towards Istanbul with Selim and his wife. Selim says 'hello brother, hello to the new life Ismail brother. From now on, you should focus on the future. Not the past, future'. What is common both in Arkadaş and Düşman is they both fictionalize their characters to the future. The motivation Azem gave to Cemil now is given to Ismail by Selim. This direction forward shall take place in the city, not the rural environment. The individuals get their motivation for the future with the help of

socialist ideology. Then, the expectation that Güney has of the lower class and expresses in his scenarios is that individuals who work for the future based on socialist ideology in city life.

3.4.2. A View to Slums (Gecekondu) and Migration

We have to set it as a presupposition that the lower economic class that migrated to the city had settled by 70s. The phenomenon of migration that started to be felt in 50s, and the effect of which become undeniable in 60s continued into the 70s. But what set the 70s in a different place is that it was the time period when gecekondu around the city begun producing their own structure and culture. Gecekondu was not formed by the already existing poor people moving from one district to another. It was formed by the clustering of masses coming from the countryside, their migration to the periphery of the city, a mid-cultural form carrying the features of both city and the county. In the Turkish cinema of the 70s, the most important sight on lives of these people who migrated to the city because of economic obligations but were concerned with hanging on to the rural values they own, was **Gelin-Düğün-Diyet** trilogy by Lütfi Akad.

In all three of his films, Akad places the phenomenon of migration at the core of the film, directly or indirectly. In the center of all families there is a woman: Meryem in Gelin, Zelha in Düğün and Hacer in Diyet. The same actress plays all three women (Hülya Koçyiğit). We can interpret this fiction as the displeasure of the scenarios with the patriarchal-conservative mentality dominating the women and rising against it by referring to the woman the leader status. Actually, it is rare to see a woman in the leading status in a rural family but, the film gave these three women the mission of a leader in terms of the values the rural family should give up and take on. All three woman characters undertake the mission of being teachers against the social values the films look down, representing urban, new and modern values.

In Akad's observation while talking about the migrants, defines them as ladies and gentlemen also regarding them as hardworking and loyal people. He is of the opinion that they adopt the aggression given by the city only after they realize the conditions

of the city, when they realized that they had jumped head first into a jungle of building blocks and crowds of people. They cannot return either; one way or the other they have to live in the city (Hakan, cited from Akad, 2012:351).

Lütfi Akad, whose trilogy of *Gelin – Düğün – Diyet* we analyze in our study, explains his line of cinema thus: “In the films I produced, I tried to bring about some questions. But I never considered answering these questions. I wanted to show a disease but thought that it was none of my business to give the prescription for that disease. For me it was enough to make the audience think about the problems. This was my purpose. I mean to open the wound, to diagnose it, but not the prescription” (Yağız, cited from Şekeroğlu, 2006:25)

“In 1970s, the paradigm change in social sciences happened, political-economy dominated theories empowered instead of evolutionist-modernization theory to explain societal events .. As a result of that, *gecekondu* were considered as a permanent product of urbanization fact which periphery countries have in capitalist system instead of a temporarily fact which happened in transition period from tradition to modern” .. “Correspondingly, there were differences in ‘construction of slum people’, slum people were considered as victim of circumstances instead of the resource of problems, they were begun to constructed as ‘the exploited / the disadvantaged other’ ” (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org).

‘Not to be able to coalesced’ problem of slum areas with city is depended on different reasons in different phases. In 1950s and 1960s, countryside culture which was repeated itself in urban environment and in 1970s, the unequal core of capitalist understanding were the main effects to prevent the integration of slum people to the city (Erman, 2004, ejts.revues.org).

3.4.2.1. Gelin (The Bride), 1973

Gelin is a film directed by Lütfi Akad in 1973. The opening scene is a family migrating from Yozgat to İstanbul, getting off a train. The family consists of Veli, Meryem and their little child Osman. Veli’s father Hacı İlyas and brother Hıdır had

migrated to İstanbul before them. The family is relatively better off compared to the people who migrated in other films. They have their own convenience store and are planning to expand the enterprise through a bigger market to be opened in a richer neighborhood. Nevertheless, while they still live in *gecekondu*, it can be said that this choice also is cultural as much as it is economic.

We encounter the thick barriers driven by the family between its own conservative culture and urban culture when Veli and Hıdır run into İsmail, their acquaintance from Yozgat. In spite of the warm conversation between Veli and İsmail, Hıdır does not really want to acknowledge İsmail's presence and talk to him. The reason to his attitude he offers that İsmail lets his wife work in the factory. The woman working in an environment that does not belong to the family and other than home, is a concept that the rural culture cannot accept.

The migration of the lower class from its familiar habitat to a place which it is not familiar produces the result that the socio-cultural values of their life are foregrounded. Buğra defines this process by saying: "it can be stated that the cultural connections do not lose importance by changing places, on the contrary, they become more important" (Buğra, 2008:15) but she adds immediately that, ".. here, it can be mentioned a situation which the culture and the culture-based relations are instrumentalized" (Buğra, 2008:15).

Hacı İlyas wanted Veli to sell all their property in Yozgat. This deed makes it clear that they regard İstanbul as a permanent and ultimate place to live. An important part of the population that arrives through migration is aware of the fact that the doors of the rural life they grew in and are familiar with, are closed to them; they have no future left there. But the city for them is a place they can only have economic relations in due to its unfamiliar structure and its being a huge organism.

One of the sentences to understand this cultural alienation is said by Veli to Meryem: "it's the same sky as long as you stay home". In fact *gecekondu* region is really built similar to a village: almost all of them have a garden they could sit around and have their meals. Again, most of them are single storied. As was the case in many villages

of Turkey at the time, they did not have water and electricity. Thus home and in a macro sense, gecekondu region functions as a cultural castle for migrants who protect themselves 'from the city'.

Moreover, an aura as such also presents a character ensuring the conservative / patriarchal oppression on women in a spatial sense. When we consider a woman who does not leave the yard of her house, she experiences no difference in the city she migrated, from her life style in the village/town as is stated in Veli's sentence to Meryem. The family regards the yard of the house as Yozgat and the rest as Istanbul. 'This neighborhood is the same without hometown' expression reveals how the family regards gecekondu region.

The representation and protection of the communitarian mentality in big cities and towns are provided by 'neighborhood'. Nebihat Yağız thinks that this was very dominant in the years between 1950 and 1975: "the smallest unit of the society in 1950-1975 is the neighborhood. It is in the center of individual's lives. The neighborhood which is a family resembling to a big family is the defining and effectual factor. The element of neighborhood is so dominant that it is almost impossible to act independently from it. Otherwise, there is the danger of out casting" (Yağız, 2006:93). This reality Yağız emphasizes is felt more in the lower class. Although she detects it between the years 1950 and 1975, we can easily say that the same condition lasts in the districts of low class in the cities today. In the neighborhoods where the upper and partially, the middle class lives, the individual behavior and choices brought about by modernist life are more frequently observed; however in the neighborhoods regarded as the gecekondu / outskirts that are built by force in the formation of gecekondu, the 'neighborhood pressure and culture' is an indispensable quality. A man wearing his hair long or a woman violating a certain dress code is not approved of. Although there is not punishment by law, the social norms as invisible criteria define what a person shall obey.

From another perspective, the neighborhood functions as a harbor that protects the people of lower class born in the city or migrated from the vulturous capitalist relations as a shelter. The person, wrestling and battling with many people and events

in daily work life, experiences the comfort of being with the people he knows in the neighborhood coffee shop in the evening.

The approach to Osman's illness – the reason for the tragic finale of the film – displays how far the family is from the modern and 'scientific' life. When Meryem complains about her son Osman's illness to Veli, she gets the following answer: "tell my mother, she has a strong breath. She would treat us that way". The family thinks it is the common cold; a disease which later is diagnosed as heart disease and expect him to get well by wearing an amulet. This situation proves that the family lives a long way from the mentality of the modern life; it does not care about treatment methods of modern medicine. For Meryem's mother in law, for example, the doctor is a strange and shady character. Not a part of their life but an element of the city and modern life. She also describes Güler, the wife of İbrahim, who befriended Meryem and had arrived in the city before them, as "they have become corrupt coming to town".

In contrast to the distance Meryem's family is keeping from the city, İbrahim and Güler lead a life using the opportunities of the modern life and under the influence of the city culture. They both have insurance. Through the loan provided by the insurance company, they are trying to buy their own house. Although it is very common in country life to have kids, they still do not have any, waiting to move in to their new home (this can also be regarded as an influence of the urban culture). They are an example of migrants who desire to adopt to the city. They are aware of the necessities and opportunities of their new environment. They are trying to fulfill those prerequisites and also benefit from the opportunities.

Meryem whose mother in law thinks that she is a self-ordained person, is closer to the city culture with her persevering, independent, and open-to-change character. She stands closer to the line of İbrahim and Güler. She is rational, wanting to interpret city life in the correct sense. Her father in law Hacı İlyas and brother in law Hıdır, on the other hand, are pragmatists to the fullest and target oriented: the modern and central districts of the city attracts both of them both in economic aspect, yet they exert on themselves and the family absolute cultural protectiveness. They want

maximum profit of what city offers economic but do not wish even slightly change culturally. This attitude is not realistic. Every economic and material production is in some relation with a cultural structure. As an economic structure produces a cultural structure, the same cultural structure also produces the same economic structure; this condition is mutual. This attitude of Hacı İlyas and Hıdır reminds the discourse once popular in the right “we shall take the science and technology of the West but conserve our culture”. But as stated before this is not a realistic approach. Whoever wants to be a part of those economic relations also has to embrace or at least be affected by the culture produced by those relations.

Actually, the distance the family has between the health institutions is rooted mostly in its economic pragmatism rather than the unfamiliarity of the institution. For example, Hacı İlyas who does not go to a doctor for Osman, buys medicine from a pharmacy for his own knees. The family is trying to avoid giving the 6-7 thousand liras necessary for Osman’s surgery, not believing in the benefits of a health institutions, want to transfer the money to their new store to be opened. Instead, the mother in law prefers to bring home a woman to rid Osman of the evil eye by ‘pouring lead over his head’.

The family who is enough greedy in the economic sense and caring about religious practices, tends to turn a blind eye when it comes to Osman’s illness. After the market is opened in the rich neighborhood, the elder son of the family, Hıdır, started plotting for a white appliances store. The family fasts together on holy month Ramadan and buys ram for the ‘Feast of the Sacrifice’. There is a parallel between Osman and the ram, because Osman dies on the first day of ‘Feast of the Sacrifice’.

Meryem’s breaking off from the family (and the traditional life represented by the family) takes place after the death of her son. She leaves home and as Güler, starts working in a factory. But Hacı İlyas and Hıdır do not like this situation; Hıdır learns where she is working and Hacı İlyas leaves a gun for Veli to kill Meryem. Then, one of the breaking points of the film comes at the end: Veli goes to the factory that Meryem works but not to kill her. What he asks is, ‘is there a job here for me, too’. This question clearly points that he also wants to switch sides as his wife, as Güler

and İbrahim. His starting to work as a worker in the factory is the evidence that he takes the side of the labor, and leaving the side of capital. Moreover, it can also be interpreted as proof of his wish to embrace the city culture like Meryem.

With regards to economic relations, there are two paths to take for people who integrated to the city via migration: one is the development of labor awareness in the individual who survives in the relations of production only by labor. The other is, the development of capital awareness for the individual who is to take part in the economy by capital. The transformation of Meryem in *Gelin* is an example of the first. To her, development in urban life, her fellow town's people provide the guidance who are now both workers as a family. Meryem becomes aware of the suppression of traditions on individuals and especially on women; she reaches awareness about the norms of city life. She learns that working and personally taking care of her child is an obligation, a mission (Karaşin, 2012:135).

3.4.2.2. Düğün (The Wedding), 1973

The next film by Akad, **Düğün**, takes from where *Gelin* leaves and reaches out to the problems of migration and *gecekondu*. The family in the center of *Düğün* has migrated from Urfa to Istanbul. In this family without parents and made up of 6 people, the leader is the oldest sister Zelha, oldest brother Halil and the uncle Bekir. After a month on arriving in Istanbul, as for any newly migrated family, there are economic problems.

One of the subjects *Düğün* concentrated throughout the film is the perception of women by the conservative – rural mentality. This perception which gives second place to women is appeared obviously the first time on Uncle Bekir talks about marrying Cemile off for dowry. The amount of money to be obtained by marrying (selling) Cemile is to be used for buying a 3 wheeled motorcycle for her brother İbrahim who sells 'lahmacun'(a kind of Turkish food). Uncle Bekir's nephew when describing Cemile to her suitor Yasar, says: 'she is chaste, one of us, understands the way we speak, cooks the meals like in your town, like your mother'. The most sensitive word here is 'one of us'. In the chaotic and stray environment of the city,

building a home with someone from the same cultural background, being supported by that person is very important for the people who migrated.

The three wheeled motorcycle bought by the money obtained from marrying Cemile off, is not important only in the economic sense; in the symbolic sense it means that the technological developments produced by modernism are in a way superior to the manual labor which was dominant at these times in the rural area.

Zelha's undertaking the role of a mother reminds us of the woman sacrifice that is very common place in the countryside. The fact which it is always women who have to sacrifice prove that this is actually suppression but not sacrifice. As Meryem of Gelin gives her gold for her brother in law's commercial needs instead of using them for her child's treatment, Zelha of Dügün gave up her fiancé Ferhat with the instinct of being a mother to her sisters and brothers came to İstanbul. It is the extension of this ascetic mentality that Zelha forgets her womanhood and her life, to position herself in a 'unisex' identity and a responsible older sister status.

What is criticized in the film is both Cemile getting married at a young age, taking dowry, and a woman falling into a marriage she does not agree to. As the lower economic class analyzed by our study is under absolute domination in the countryside, all three of the notions above are normalized. Getting power from migration to the city and the change of land and place, Zelha resists this situation and although she cannot prevent the traditional conservatism in Cemile's case, she manages to stop it in Habibe's.

The words by İbrahim after the three wheeled motorcycle is bought "I will be the emperor to this land" reminds us of the words in Gurbet Kuşları, "we will rule this İstanbul". All six members of the family are working; even Yusuf, who is the youngest one and still a student, works at the hours that are left after school. It is a common condition that all members of a lower class family work, especially in the lower class migrated from a village to city. The underlying reason is not taking seriously the institution of education and the passion for earning more in a shorter time to join to upper class, rather than the insufficient income.

The work done by manual labor is given to women in *Düğün*. While the two sisters work in the factory, the older sister Zelha prepares food with domestic manual labor for the peddler food sale. What is attributed to men is a mentality that aims to get rich the easy way which is a consequence of wrong interpretation of capitalism in the Eastern method (Karaşin, 2012:135). A way of thinking which desires to get rich without a certain investment, background information or hard work and regarding cheap shiftiness as business mind is common in our society. This is a wrong translation of capitalism based on industrial relations which in the West includes long term research and development, a reflection of intellectual development on production rather than commercial relations based on buying and selling.

A typical example to this greedy charlatan greed for Turkish society is shown by the elder brother of the family, Halil. For commercial interests, the brother Halil does whatever he wants on his brothers and sisters: he does not allow Zelha's marriage, marries off his other sisters to get money from dowry. In order to keep the work on schedule he thinks the youngest brother Yusuf should take the blame for the crime İbrahim committed and upon jumping to another job he sells the three-wheeled motorcycle İbrahim struggled to get without even asking him (Karaşin, 2012:135).

Zelha objects to the idea that Cemile who is married Yaşar look after the children of a rich family. This according to her is a way of abuse. Still, by giving the money she earns to her husband, refusing her sister's call to come back home, Cemile shows her devotion to traditional relations of men and women. According to Orhan Ünsel, the reason why Yaşar wants Cemile to work is to get back the dowry money he paid for Cemile (Ünsel, 2006, sadibey.com). The man who becomes Habibe's lover advises her that she does not need to take permission from her brothers. He wants to break the chain of traditional family relations in her mind.

The ways Halil and İbrahim work are important with regards to the working profiles of people who came to the city via migration. They sell the food Zelha prepares at home wandering around with their three-wheeled motorcycle. This is one of the informal jobs. It does not require training, much capital and is done without records or taxes. Anyone who gets used to, can do the job. The film established a dichotomy

on Zelha's previous fiancé Ferhat and her brother Halil. Ferhat is a laborer working as a driver in a construction and Halil 'a village foxy' desirous of getting rich in a short time. As Ferhat with his honest and determined character is identified with the working class, the shrewd and selfish character of Halil is identified with the capital-owning class.

Although Habibe wants to marry someone, her brother Halil wants her to marry Cabbar Ağa, a merchant he has business relations with. In Halil's perspective, Habibe's getting married to Cabbar is reinforcing the economic partnership with family ties, which is a very commonplace situation in the rural culture, transforming economic relations to family relations. And in the finale of the film, against the capital power of Cabbar, Zelha says: "We are enough for each other with our strength and labor.." . With this sentence the importance of labor is once more emphasized against capital.

The finale of the film is also important for the identity of the woman and woman resistance which were alien concepts then in Turkey. Especially for a woman from the lower class with rural backgrounds, such as Aygül in *Bir Yudum Sevgi* that we are to analyze later on, to fight against a patriarchal world with her two sisters is an anomalous struggle that can be taken as a role model by people like her. Through an uprising with a feminist aim, Zelha finds in herself the courage and strength to rebel against the suppression of women by the conservative/patriarchal culture uniting with capitalist incentives. In this sense, the film can be defined as a pioneer in terms of feminism before feminism emerged as an intellectual movement in the 80s.

Zelha in the film is quite a dominant character. With the pressure rooted in her mission to be a mother to her sisters and brothers, Zelha is a lot more dominant compared to Meryem in *Gelin*. Actually, this tough stance of Zelha in a way seems like a 'unisex' identity to us. Zelha, who although engaged to Ferhat once, chose not to marry and stayed single and devoted herself to her family. She grew away from the characteristics of her kind in her struggle to claim her rights even though she belongs in with females too. She gave her battle for her social rights not by being

more ‘feminine’ as the Turkish society requires but by ‘abandoning’ her feminine side.

In *Düğün*, also we encounter one of the very positive points of social realism movement in terms of cinematography, and that is the camera in the opening scene, wandering around on the streets filming the peddlers, small business owners and the workers working on daily wages. Such a display of these people of the lower class, who had so far been disregarded in films, indicates a shift of mentality which should not be left unnoticed. Presenting to the audience the people who earn their livelihood through labor is important in terms of letting it be known that they also exist in and are also making the audience take notice of a life built upon labor (Karaşin, 2012:135).

3.4.2.3. Diyet (The Ransom), 1974

Chronologically, the following film by the same director is **Diyet**. This time the director filmed the scenario in a factory setting and setting off with an occupational accident makes an impact in the beginning. The factory in question produces in very unhealthy and unsafe conditions. Salim, who is the son of the factory owner and the manager of the factory and Master Bilal, who is the instrument that Salim uses to control the workers, are people who put the production above everything else and careless about the lives of the workers. Salim lets the condition of Mustafa who became paralyzed under the waistline because of the accident slide over saying, ‘so an accident happened, the compensation will be paid and that’s it’. When the workers demand the changing of the machine which caused accident, Salim replies: “the new machine costs 450 thousand liras without the custom taxes. This is a small business, it cannot take such a burden, it would bankrupt by leaving you unemployed”.

Hereby we can see that mechanization, essential for industrialization which is the prime actor of capitalism occupies a more important space than human life. Although Mustafa’s losing his legs was one more addition to accidents, the people in charge have no intention to renew the machine. The ‘preference of the machine instead of

the people' is intolerable for the workers and that case becomes clear when Mevlüt, one of the workers, asks Salim: "how many machines can add up to one person?"

Diyet is one of the best examples of Turkish cinema that presents the dance between the concepts of boss – worker – union. The first advice that Salim offers to Hasan, Mustafa's replacement after the accident, is to keep away from the union. There are two reasons why most workers keep a distance from the union: the first is that majority of them have rural backgrounds. When a woman laborer invites Hacer to the union, she says that she came by migration, she has no idea about the unions, so she does not want to participate. Union does not belong to rural lands; it is a mystery for the people who were born and raised there. It is a structure formed in order to protect the interests and rights of the workers in the industry sector which was created after the Industrial Revolution.

The other reason is that they have been employed on the condition that they do not join the union. The fear of unemployment or losing their job prevented many people, especially the ones who joined the work force in the city via migration, from joining the union. Although the workers have come from different regions and work in the same place, they show different ways of protecting their rights of class. For example Hacer is from Afyon, Muhsin Usta from Niğde and Mevlüt has the East Black Sea region's accent. But their relations with the union are not defined by their origins but by the time they spent in the city and the labor awareness they obtained through their work lives.

In a scene where the situation of the workers who keep their distance from the union is being discussed, the director of the union says "once they come to terms, they will surpass us all" and advises patience. By these words, we understand that many people including the director of the union, are aware that the labor power that gathered in the city is only a cluster of people who are not yet aware of 'class consciousness'.

In our opinion, the idea that this awareness depends on time and experience is accurate. In our country where the rights of the workers were not obtained through

battles, but handed to the lower economic class by the system, the stabilization of labor and class awareness can only develop through some experiences. When he gets his weekly wage, Hasan experiences his first disappointment with the system that he felt grateful himself because he thinks that the system provides him his food: they had cut off the taxes from his weekly wage.

We again observe in *Diyet* that the concept of migration and informal jobs such as peddler do not have positive results on every migrant. While Meryem's father is trying to sell balloons, he complains to his friend who sells pastry 'if my fellow townsmen see me with balloons in my hand, I'd rather die'. The man selling pastry also complains that he started the job as his son-in-law insisted and that not even in his daughter's home, there is no daily bread for someone who does not work. They both define Istanbul as a 'perfidious'.

Yunus cannot or will not develop plan or hope about the future in the city. When he recalls the respect he had in his hometown, he gets psychologically suffocated in his current condition. In contrast to some characters in the previous films, we analyzed who hold on to the city and have hopes about their future in the city. Yunus (also due to his old age) has no vision of future and is being crushed by the city. Another important point is that the man selling pastry is an elder man who is nevertheless forced to work. This certainly is not a situation that rural people are used to since making the elders work is disrespectful in countryside. On the contrary, they are respected elders sitting in the best corner of the house. That the pastry man works and worse than that, he is forced by his son-in-law to work is a reflection of capitalist mentality which is dominating the city on the family institution, rather than insufficient economic conditions. As every member of the family is expected to contribute to the family budget, all members are expected to work regardless of the economic conditions of the family. Of course, the need is more obvious in the lower economic class.

Hasan draws a workaholic profile but the power which forces him to work is his ambition. As a result of his ambitions which are pushing him to work and work which is pushing him to attribute to work a value almost like worship, he responds to

concepts like union and strike as “should one curse a given blessing”. When notices are distributed in the factory about worker resistance he says “ while working is so pleasant, all this is idleness”. All these reflexes can be defined as ‘submission about labor’. For Hasan and people like Hasan, who do not define themselves as individuals and are unaware of their individual rights, a job is a gift and the employer is a person to be grateful to as the employer has chosen them out of many people. They are not aware that business life is all about mutual interests and the employer needs the person’s labor as much as the employee needs the job, maybe even more. This mentality model encountered in the non-Western societies and the life based on community in the rural, when added by the conservative perception and misuse of religious philosophy, the environment desired to prevent the labor from claiming its right is generated.

The same mentality but read from the other side can also be observed in Salim’s father, who is the real owner of the factory. His response to the demonstration of workers to claim their rights is “what is the sense in having an agreement with someone working at your door”. From the perspective of capital too, we observe that this old factory owner also could not adapt to a modernist way of thinking in economic relations and he regards the laborers as ‘people working at my door’; not as ‘laborers’ or ‘workers’.

For the lower class people, ‘production’ and ‘life’ take place in the same district. As a result, private life and business life intertwine. The people whom are known from the workplace are also neighbors. In Diyet, only when the landlord tells them to evacuate the house because a building is to be built on the land their house is on, Hacer perceives the aspect of the system that easily gives up from them. Hasan, on the other hand, has already undertaken the construction of his own gecekondu; going slightly above his regular income gave him the inspiration and ambition to build his own house. But Hacer is far from such ambitions; she is aware of the opportunities and options she is living in (Karaşin, 2012:139).

Actually Hasan is aware of what Marx defines a ‘alienation’, the situation which is a worker cannot makes sense of himself and the work that he does and this also was

experienced by Hasan: “after a while, you work without knowing what you do, it is almost like you have become a part of the machine”. Hacer also walks in the same direction with her words in another scene: “work, work and work, how much longer will it be like this, we are not like human anymore”. Still it can be said that Hasan is more eager to work compared to Hacer, who is crushed under the conditions she is working in. Hasan, who gazes with love at the machine that he himself is responsible and struggles against Master Muhsin who wants workers to work in shifts for the machine by saying that he can handle it alone, gives an example of the ‘conflict within the class’ by this act, which we are used to seeing in Turkey.

Hasan calls the supporters of the union as ‘chest people’. He defines them as ‘people who united in evil’. The initial attitude of Hacer also is submission to the ‘hand that feeds them’ as in the countryside: “you cannot rise against that which feeds you”. Mevlüt however replies by stating that in modernism, every worker is an individual and has to claim his rights from the employer: “what you have learned is out of date. This is the city, this is factory, this is Istanbul”.

Hacer’s shifting from her stance against the union to stance with the union is related closely with her concerns about the future of Hasan whom she had feelings for and eventually married to. Another factor is that Mustafa who cannot use his legs anymore is her next door neighbor. Hacer’s transformation is the wakeup call for ‘class awareness’ subtly presented by the film. Also with the help of personal conditions resulted from her relationship with Hasan, Hacer transformed from a rural woman scared of the idea of the union to a woman from gecekondu who is aware of the cruel working conditions in the factory. This transformation ultimately leads her to joining the union.

At the end of the movie, Salim’s response to Master Mahir, who believed that they had reached the essential number and gives to Salim the paper that contains their conditions and demands, is the separation of the union workers and non-union workers right before in front of them. Meantime, Salim interferes by saying when Hasan tries to pull Hacer to his side by force, ‘let her be, no one can force another’. Later on, Hacer wants to switch her side to the workers who are not the members of

the union but when she sees Mustafa in the wheel-chair, she prefers to stay with the workers who are on the side of union.

Hasan's arm ripped off by the machine at the end of the film perhaps is the punishment the film gives for his unawareness of the notion of labor. And Hacer looking for someone who blames like a judge with verdict can be seen an example for the working class' despair within the system. She first wants to hit the machine with a hammer (which Master Muhsin with a hand gesture that wants her not to do), then to Master Bilal, who is the accomplice of the employer, she says 'it is not your fault' and finally to the workers one by one, she says 'it is our fault' and these shall be interpreted as the film underlining the Turkish lower class's lack of class awareness, once again.

We may perceive *Diyet* as the prospect of the life of the lower class migrants to the city from the perspective of industrial labor. The scenarios that focused on informal jobs and trade in the first two films inspect the factory environment and life of the workers in *Diyet*. *Diyet* looks into the relation of machine – person which is examined in more detail in *Modern Times* by Charlie Chaplin. It states that the system will crush and destroy the workers who are reluctant to claim their rights and who cannot reach the class awareness as the machine rips off Hasan's arm (Karaşin, 2012:136-137).

According to Orhan Ünser, although the chronologic order of this trilogy is as *Gelin – Düğün – Diyet*, the real order should be as *Düğün – Gelin – Diyet*. He claims that this is the right order with regard to their sociological content and development. In *Düğün* the struggle of the family to move upwards from the lowest level of trade, peddling, is a deed expected from a family with little or no income or a family migrated to the city. The family by adding nights to its working schedule, and increasing the variety of their products, try to increase their capital. The threshold in *Düğün* which the family wants to pass with a livelihood by domestic production and informal trade was passed in *Gelin*. The family in *Gelin* has a convenience store in *gecekondu* region and they made a move toward the city center via a bigger and nicer store. To pass on to the relations of production based on industry is not possible for

them at this point in terms of their capital and the lack of knowledge that is required for industrial production (Ünser, 2006, sadibey.com).

The interesting part is that the family avoids the work based on labor in the direction of the work requiring capital. The city version of the family uniting for economic deeds as commonly seen in the rural area is the businesses founded on small capital. This is the preference of the classic Anatolian family but the films reach important results by fictionalizing Meryem as a worker in the end of *Gelin*, making Ferhat work as a worker in the construction site in *Düğün* and choosing the factory as the setting for *Diyet*. The results are various: one of them is that the worker characters are pictured as straight, virtuous characters to be taken as role models, and people of capital as immoral, dishonest people prone to unethical deeds in commerce. Another result is that working in a factory is one of the inevitable options of city life for people from the lower income class. It is quite different from farm work and rural life. The films interpret the participation in the work force as a personal uprising and manifesto. By being employed as a worker in the factory in the end of *Gelin*, Meryem both earns her personal economic independence and breaks off from the traditional domestic relations.

In *Düğün*, this uprising has more feminist grounds and it is against the traditional bigotry that buys and sells women like commodities. At the end of the film *Zelha*, having saved her sister from Cabbar Ağa, walks out of the wedding area in an attitude of victory and self-confidence. In *Diyet* the enlightenment of Hacer develops in parallelism with worker rights: while she was clueless about the union movement at the onset of the film. In the end, she is at a level that she can shout about who must be blamed that the workers cannot claim their rights.

On every film of the trilogy, the leading woman evolves throughout the film and experiences a maturation realizing the potential she always had within. It is very important that Akad fictionalizes this evolution with woman characters and his placing the woman as the ‘subject’ can be regarded in contrast with traditional civilization – nature dichotomy. Generally, in mythological fictions, man represents the civilization and / or culture and their productions. Mechanization etc. are

attributed to male gender. Women represent nature, purity and chastity; the concept such as innocence is referred to woman. Akad takes the matriarchal woman of the prehistoric times before this dichotomy as a reference. Leading women roles of the films, like the woman of prehistoric times, are the active ones and they lead the change and the development in the films.

Hamdi Karaşin also supports our idea saying that throughout the trilogy, Akad wants to show us a strong, grounded rural woman through Meryem, Hacer and Zelha. This woman model migrating from the country to the city should also be considered as a subject who embraces and practices the necessary changes in the changing society. In Akad' vision, when compared to men, women draw a profile more predisposed to new conditions and more easily internalizing them. At some point, she has a leader's quality which reforms the relations of her group with the society out of it, with the changing relations of production and with the social values (Karaşin, 2012:139). Akad hereby attributes the mental and social transformation to woman, and to top that to women who are totally unfamiliar with the city life in a way, thus giving them a mission to fulfill. Through the personas of Meryem, Zelha and Hacer, the director perhaps shows us the direction in general the lower income class and in particular a woman from the poor class shall take.

“When the woman stereotypes are examined in the Turkish cinema up until 1980s, mainly two types are found. The women are chaste, domestic, mother to her children, without sexuality (with no personal preferences), affectionate, always forgiving, even when they know that they are being suppressed they cry unseen and do not refuse the happiness of her home. Or they are the sort who have nothing but their sexuality, evil, against all happy homes, vamp women who lure men into devilish directions” (Esen, 2000:29). Neşe Kaplan states that social realist films like the *Gelin-Düğün-Diyet* trilogy surpass such stereotypes: “.. in some films that are emerged as the products of social realism in this period, it is seen that women are represented out of these stereotypes and there are comments offered as to their problems and social positions” (Kaplan, 2003:159). In addition to diagnosing the problems of the lower class, the social realist films also concentrated on the problems of the women of lower class and Turkey in general, revealing once again its didactic function.

The trilogy shows us that in the struggle of the lower economic class to move higher in the social ladder, the elements that need to be subtracted are actually subtracted. The family in Gelin, disregarding the illness that carries Osman to death (Ünser, 2006, sadibey.com), can easily give Cemile away for a three wheeled motorcycle in Dügün.

Another notion Gelin – Dügün – Diyet trilogy presents the role that the religion as a phenomenon plays in the lower economic class's vision of the world. As Ünser emphasizes, with the concept of 'sacrifice' in the story of Prophet Abraham is referred to in Gelin, in Dügün there is a parallelism with Prophet Joseph's story, and in Diyet, a hadith of Prophet Muhammad through leading character Hacer is used to provide theoretical grounds for union organization (Ünser, 2006, sadibey.com). As the role religion plays have been present for hundreds of years in the rural area it is understandable and expectable. Nonetheless in modernity, religion is not a significant notion. However, the migrants carried with them a religious mentality to the city where they migrated. Even more, religion became the element that brings the migrated masses together and unites them. In the unfamiliar chaotic setting of the city, religion became the focal point for insecure people to take shelter in and unite. This later on formed a great potential of votes in gecekondü environment for political Islam that emerged later.

That labor is attributed to women, and desires based on capital are attributed to man can be read as reference of genders to both concepts. Another point is that labor is identified with honesty, exonerated of negativities, while those who work over capital are mostly pictured to be deceitful and untrustworthy. Thus if we define the sides, we see at one side labor – woman – virtue and on the other capital – man – deceit clusters.

What challenged the people who have migrated is their experience of the irrelevant sociological conditions all at once and having more than one identity and play more than one role. Having an urban identity in economic life but in social relations and private life having to be loyal to the norms of the rural people, maintaining a conservative line of thought that dominates rural life despite having a place in

modern life are the phenomena one can observe in the life of a migrant (Karaşin, 2012:137).

Akad gave place to this transformation in his trilogy. In *Gelin*, the front yard of the house is an extension of the life in the village; it is the platform for the family's freedom and hierarchy against the city life. Whereas in *Düğün*, the family has deeply rooted ties with the neighborhood through their front yard, a strong but loose relationship with the people around them. The static hierarchy and the family structure which are based on control in *Gelin* will start on a transformation process as family opens itself through social life in *Düğün*, it will feel itself that it has to (Karaşin, 2012:138). The variety of relations between home and the neighborhood increase in *Diyet* more. In the context of relations, the common point of all three films is that the relation is confined to the district they live in and the people who are living in *gecekondu* are intimidated by the middle and higher class people of the city. Because they have low level education and an even lower economic education, they are scared of an attitude that will cause them to feel inferior.

The reason why the majority of migrants disdained working in certain jobs for specific pay is mainly the desire to move up socially and this goal requires a serious amount of capital. Another reason for this desire to move up is that the people arriving via migration want to own the city, as much as the former residents of the city feel that the city belongs to them (Karaşin, 2012:139).

3.4.2.4. Yusuf ile Kenan (Yusuf and Kenan), 1979

The last film chronologically of 1970s is a film that is based on the innocent worlds of children as *Bir Avuç Cennet*, a film we will examine later, does too. Although children are employed as auxiliary elements in *Bir Avuç Cennet*, *Yusuf ile Kenan* has given both its leading and supporting roles to children. It starts with two village kids with nothing but their dads come to Istanbul after their father's murder. Yusuf and Kenan arrive to *Beyoğlu* in order to find the Uncle Ali by the address given by their father but they cannot find him. They have nowhere to stay so they sleep on the streets embracing each other. The next day they go to a cafe, watch TV and attempt

to drink tea but a glass of tea is 2.5 liras and they only have 18 liras left. The cafe owner also rents beds in a dorm and rents them a single bed for 15 liras. Many single men sleep in this lounge, most of which are probably workers on low wages.

Yusuf and Kenan keep on walking the streets. A street urchin they meet show them friendship. His real name is Cenk but he is called Böcek (Bug) by everyone. Böcek's mother is a prostitute. Meanwhile they also meet two other kids called Çarpık (twisted) and Falconelli. Another kid by the name Mustafa advises them not to have anything to do with Çarpık, the other thing he says is: "you have to earn by your labor". Although Mustafa too is around adolescence like the other kids, he is a political activist writing slogans on the walls.

To his brother Kenan, Yusuf says 'we are villagers, we are no craftsman' and chooses to join in the business with Çarpık. The underlying reason that Mustafa advised them to stay away from Çarpık is the fact that he is a man of illegal business. Çarpık's brother also is a trouble maker who raped a child before. Stealing a radio player from a car Çarpık shows Yusuf what kind of business he does. Yusuf calls Çarpık as 'Çarpık Ağa' (ağa, a respect compellation in rural Turkey) and he aspires having new shoes and pants he says: "not so good to go on boots in a city". Kenan accuses Yusuf of being a thief, he thinks that hanging around with Çarpık will make a thief out of him. Yusuf replies this outrage of Kenan by a blow. Yusuf is a boy who had stolen in the village too, he is prone to illegal deeds.

Meanwhile Böcek takes Kenan to his home. And he teaches Böcek to catch a partridge. They become good friends as they go bird hunting together. Another homeless boy they meet on the train tells them that he rides the train all day long to keep warm. A police officer catches them all and takes them to the police station, a section for orphans. A boy from Diyarbakir they meet there says he makes 800-900 liras a day by smuggled cigarettes; he claims that the underpass in Karaköy is under the control of people from Diyarbakır. According to what he says even in the hotel, the people from Diyarbakir stay together.

On the other side, as Çarpık needs Yusuf in business, he keeps him from getting his brother out of jail. There is a man Çarpık reports to, they go to him together. He asks if Yusuf is Kurdish and is relieved to hear otherwise. This man is to teach Çarpık using guns but he does not hand the gun before the training is complete. The scenario implies that the person is nationalist as he teaches how to use guns and is relieved to hear that Yusuf is not Kurdish.

After the training period, Çarpık encourages Yusuf to auto theft. Yusuf also steals a stereo of a car. In the night club, they go to following the theft, they are caught by the police but their nationalist brother saves Çarpık with ease, Yusuf is left in. They cage him with the leftist militants singing the Austrian laborer anthem. It is clear that Çarpık is being trained for 'the idealist cause', besides, Çarpık, by saying Mustafa is an 'anarchist' revealed that he takes him for an enemy.

Meanwhile they release Kenan from the station. The machinery apprentice Mustafa looks out for him and take him home as a guest. Mustafa's father on the dinner table tells him to 'eat my boy, strong men are needed for the working class'. The film ends with the scene Kenan eagerly and determinedly works on the workbench.

The scenario of Yusuf and Kenan started sociological but towards to the end, it becomes political. At first, it showed us the world of the children on the streets and lower class children, towards the end it fictionalizes Mustafa and Çarpık as two ends of a political dichotomy by separating them from the rest of the children. It also shows us how the generations who do not go through a formal education and vocational education are 'estranged from the system' and pushed to the very core of crime. This situation is encountered in many of the films we study: the generations who lack a steady family life, who do not pass through an educational institution, and who do not acquire a proper occupation.. the 'lost' youth are highly probable to become the trouble makers of the society as Çarpık and Yusuf.

On the other hand, the film presents Mustafa and later on Kenan as the 'first stage' of the worker type as it should be. A laborer who is serious and mature almost as if he has been an adult before, never getting in any illegal deeds, always with positive

input for his society and family, honest and honorable. What Yusuf and Çarpık desire, in contrast, is ‘gain without pain’: make a killing with illegal business, living rich and be respected. As the deeds done to gain respect are wrong and bad, the respect earned is ungrounded and in vain.

Hereby the script, attributing the virtuous concepts to the members of left ideology and associating the illegal life to members of rightist ideology signs under a partial mistake. We may confirm this detection sociologically as in the right fraction there are a sizeable number of people feeding on illegal structures and even gathering and organizing for illegal business. However, we cannot generalize this for all people who claim to be on the right ideology. Besides, the right ideology does not have statements to encourage its members for illegal deeds; as much as the tendencies of Çarpık, Yusuf and the man that guides them are towards crime in accordance with their characters, it is also a consequence of the social conditions that force them.

We may also interpret Yusuf ile Kenan as a migration movie just like *Gurbet Kuşları* or *Gelin*. Throughout the film we witness the scenes from the big city the boys walk around in, following the arrival of the two adolescent village boys in the city before being majors and still in need of care. By carrying them to the backstreets of Beyoğlu, the script takes a look at a neighborhood that withholds more ‘anomalistic’ and more ‘extreme’ people compared to the other districts of Istanbul. By doing so it gives the audience the opportunity to make a ‘subcultural’ reading. The people living in the backstreets of Beyoğlu push and violate the limits of the social norms as prostitutes, homosexuals, women traders, dealers who cannot live in any other district. To concentrate on this district which many other films are to become fond of examining later in Turkish cinema actually is choosing the easy road for the cinematographers. As cinematographers mostly reside in Cihangir / Beyoğlu areas, they know the social life of the area very well and as also seen in this film, they present this life in many of the films.

While analyzing Yusuf, Kenan and other figures in the neighborhood, the term ‘underclass’ by Erik Olin Wright may help us expand our analysis. By saying “..underclass’ can be defined as a category of social agents who are economically

oppressed but not consistently exploited within a given class system” (Wright, 1994:48) Wright defines the underclass people. Additionally he also says, “.. the underclass consists of human beings who are largely expendable from the point of view of rationality of capitalism .. Capitalism does not need the labor-power of the unemployed inner-city youth” (Wright, 1994:49). We can see that Yusuf, Kenan and almost all other characters of the film in the category of underclass.

We may only state that Mustafa and Kenan who started to work in the same place with him belong to the lower class by working on a wage with insurance by their own labor but especially in countries like Turkey which added later on the capitalist relations of production, the proletariat which Marx calls as ‘lumpen proletariat’ who does not have a certain occupation, or taken a vocational training are common place. One probable outcome that awaits these people is participation in labor force that is called ‘informal’; the other is making money over the businesses that laws define to be illegal.

Wright points to the answer capitalism offers to such a situation: “The alternative, then, is to build prisons, to cordon off the zones of cities in which the lower class live. In such a situation, the main potential power of the lower class against their oppressors comes from their capacity to disrupt the sphere of consumption, especially through crime and other forms of violence, not their capacity to disrupt production through their control over labor“(Wright, 1994:49). For these people located even lower than the lower class, although crime may not be the only option, it is the most probable one and it is the reflex against the system in their subconscious. These people do not have a legal and ethical response to offer against capitalism as the workers on walk-outs; crime and violence for them is the strongest option on the table. Again as Wright suggests, the fraction of these people who are used to crime are in prisons, and the ones who keep their distance from crime are supposed to live in the areas of the city which are cut for them with low standards and do whatever job they can find.

Perhaps we can alter Wright’s underclass term as out of class, being inspired by the conditions of Turkey because not having a job in the formal sense and not belonging

to lower class is not always the equivalent of being poor. It is a known fact that informal jobs such as selling bagels or kokoreç (grilled sheep intestines) make more money than many of the formal jobs such as being a doctor, teacher, lawyer or banker. These people are not regarded to be in well-known class definition as high, middle and low class of capitalism, this must be the reason why Wright came up with a new class category for this social class. The jobs out of tax system, which are not really existent in Western countries, are common place in the developing economies like Turkey, thus, probably regarding these people to be out of class based on not participating in formal jobs would be more accurate.

3.4.3. Socialist Seekings

3.4.3.1. Arkadaş (The Friend), 1974

Yılmaz Güney's film of 1974 **Arkadaş** carried him to a very different point in Turkish cinema because **Arkadaş**, as a film itself, does not fit into any film genre. The scenario tells us the story of Azem and Cemil, two civil engineers who shared a house in the university. The main setting of the film is a holiday resort that Cemil's summer place is in. During his annual vacation, Azem calls Cemil and they meet after many years. Although the department they studied at the university and the flat they lived in were the same, which means they started off from the same point, the points they now stand at are completely different.

The reflection of their changing philosophy of life becomes obvious at the night that Cemil takes Azem to a cabaret managed by Romanies in Sulukule region of Istanbul. Cemil has a great time in the place while Azem is dismal. Cemil has sexual intercourse with the prostitute who stays with him but Cemil does not have sexual intercourse with the one who is taken for him: he talks with her all night long, listens to a poem that the woman wrote and took the first place in a poem competition.

Cemil takes Azem to their summer house in a holiday resort. The sentences he uttered to Azem are repetitions of 'proving one's self' and 'getting somewhere' notions that have an important place in bourgeoisie mentality: "but in spite of all my beliefs, I proved myself, I achieved everything I planned. Today I have fortune,

fame, everything. If I had listened to you, now I would have been wasting my life in a road construction of General Directorate of Highways”.

At this point, Melike joins the story. Melike is an 18-year-old young girl who continues her education in Switzerland. She is extremely bored with life in the resort and open to learning. Azem is a socialist. He notices her open-to-learning personality and feels that he can mold her in accordance with his ideology. Azem tries to get to know Melike; asks her what she does, what she enjoys reading. Azem presents himself to Melike as a ‘friend’.

It is crucial that we offer some supplementary information here: the strife of Azem conforms with the goals of ‘ideological propaganda’ and ‘winning people over to the cause’ that were observed in sociological movement of 70s. As a matter of fact, these deeds were not particular to left movements but were also common for idealist national/right movement and religious communities. Affecting the mentality of a person via propaganda and indoctrination, pulling the person towards an ideological world, had become one of the basic goals of these movements.

Azem takes Cemil and Melike out for a picnic. The people are Azem’s acquaintances who Cemil is familiar with from their university years together. Azem shows Melike the room he and Cemil shared in university. Apparently Cemil had been dreaming of being wealthy since their years together, which show that the current position of Cemil had its ideational history rooted in his years as a young man. Cemil goes through Semra’s, who is an acquaintance of Azem, socialist books and asks with a concern that they may cause legal troubles: ‘ is this not dangerous? ’. The dialog between them comes such as: ‘yes, it may be very dangerous for you / for us, why? / because you are no longer elder brother Cemil of 10 years ago, now you are Mr. Cemil’.

Beyond doubt, what Semra emphasized is a transformation in terms of class rather than social status. Because Azem had also become an engineer and went through a change of status yet he kept his ties intact with the class structure which he was from. In the case of Cemil, the room he shared with Azem in the university and the people

he encounters in the picnic who belong to his past are only a phase of his life. His desires have been different since his years in the university and eventually, he transformed in terms of class and achieved his goals.

This alienation and the feeling of break off consciously in terms of class appear on surface when Cemil warns Azem not to keep in touch with Semra and the young people like her. Cemil regards Semra as quite dangerous due to the books she reads; he has actually been thinking that young people have been getting dangerous in these times (in the 1970s). The impressions of Semra on Cemil on the other hand, are equally unpleasant compared to Cemil's impressions of her. According to Semra, Cemil is experiencing the worst kind of corruption. Semra thinks that it is impossible to save Cemil. Although Azem says that he is a friend and he does not want to leave Cemil in that everglade, Semra is determined in what she is thinking. She makes a speech to Azem which is leaned on one of the principal mottos of Marxism that 'all the things which happened realized on its way because they had to happen only in this way': "Do we know that it is an everglade for him too? He must be happy with his life. Besides, why would he change? Change for what? I think your point of view is wrong, friend. I think you should let him be because you cannot think of a man out of his conditions. Cemil today is made by his conditions and only through altering them he can be changed. But it would be wrong to expect a change as you expect from Cemil; Cemil will not be saved. What is more, it is none of our business to work on Cemil. Who is he today? A man who changed his class, is corrupted and spoiled. Be a little realistic; rid yourself of your old habits. Look at the things in terms of class".

To Azem's words 'but he is a countryman in his core, isn't he', Sema objects again: "not now. If we cannot well define who we should deal with, fallacy and defeat are inevitable. We cannot drag everyone to the right direction; it is not in our power". Later Semra defines Azem's next ideological target Melike as a 'nightingale without a clue' and says that she could not have been any other way, probably by meaning the conditions she grew in.

Jolting Cemil, whom Azem regards in a meaningless emptiness in regards of life and thinking style, by talking to him.. The point that separates Azem from Semra about Cemil, he likes Cemil as a person and believes that he will return to his origins due to the fact that they are friends. If we consider that Azem's trust in Cemil on a macro scale, we would encounter the feeling of belief that in consequence of transfusion of an ideological structure to the individuals and transformation of these individuals, ultimately, the political regime also would convert.

In the holiday resort, another young person attracts Azem's attention: Halil. Halil has a rural background and works in the resort. He is a middle school graduate working for 4 years and because he is sick in the lungs, he cannot do heavy labor anymore. Another aspect of Halil is that he punctures the tires of the cars and breaks house windows in the dark. One day Azem's eyes which are staring in the darkness catch that fact. In one of the following days, Azem asks Halil why he is doing this. Halil explains his acts as grudge and says that once he does such an act, he relaxes for a week-10 days. Azem tells Halil that he cannot change anything by puncturing tyres or breaking windows.

Azem asks Halil the reason why he wears his hair long. He addresses him as 'friend' as he does to Melike. When Halil replies as 'sir', he corrects it to 'friend' again. Having a difference from the rest of the society by salutation sorts is common for nationalist and religious communities as well as the socialists. Another point is that the gender of a person does not matter; whether you are addressing a male or female does not matter; everyone is a 'friend'. Age differences, educational difference, economic differences do not matter either; everyone is a 'friend'. This similarization although seems like a strife in favor of the lower class, it is actually a reaction towards the negative consequences of stratification within the capitalist system and is valid for all three of the trends above.

Azem tells Halil that he is going to give him a book and he has to read a lot. In addition, he starts talking to poor people working in the resort. Azem probably regards himself as the missionary of the socialist movement in that resort. Melike witnesses many of those conversations and asks Azem the contents of socialist

terminology. Azem's ideological struggle starts causing unrest increasing among the residents of the resort. They start saying 'what does this man talk to the workers and the servants?' And a friend of Cemil even does so to Cemil: he says 'what does this man keep talking to the workers, watchmen and the servants'. Cemil, with an aggressive manner, replies as 'why, should not be talked with workers' and his friend says 'one can talk to workers but your friend seems like a suspicious person'. Cemil's wife Necibe as well wants Azem to leave the house, she is scared that he may bring trouble. She must have understood that he is a political person as she says 'they say this and that for him' to Cemil. She is afraid to even utter the word of 'socialist'. The people of the resort who embraced the bourgeoisie culture are scared for 2 probably reasons: first is; they think that their life spent in comfort and pleasure is threatened by ideology, the other is, by virtue of the attitude of the state that does not approve of radical left or radical right they are scared that they can get in trouble by the law.

The direct contact of Azem with bourgeoisie takes place through a dinner. In a dinner Cemil, Melike, Necibe and Ahu also are present, Azem and Melike get tired of the conversations based on sexuality. The breaking point comes when Cemil's wife Necibe asks Azem 'And you Azem, sir, how do you solve your sexual problems'. The woman – male relations network in the city can be regarded as 'open' even for the norms of modernist – liberal – bourgeoisie. Necibe had cheated on Cemil with a man from the resort and is on the verge of cheating again with another man. No one respects to the family institution in resort.

During a later conversation, Azem criticizes Cemil. According to Azem, Cemil's friends call that sort of morals 'being civilized' and Cemil calls it 'open-mindedness' but for Azem, it is nothing more than 'degeneration' and 'corruption'. Azem criticizes Cemil's words on that dinner as 'a person with a wife can kiss my wife, a person who has a beautiful sister-in-law can kiss my sister-in-law' saying: "you used to get disturbed even if someone stared at the woman with you from 500 mts, remember?". Even though Azem's criticism here is to the relative latitude of the morals of the bourgeoisie, we are not of the opinion that he took inspiration only from the 'principled' morals with some rules and social structure confirmed by the

socialist ideology. What influences him is the conservative idea in the texture of Anatolian culture; concepts such as loyalty to family institution, rules of male – female relationships, cult of manhood and so on are notions we frequently encounter in other films under Güney's lead. It may be regarded as an interpretation of socialism under the influence of the values of the Turkish society. Although he wanted to teach a lesson to Cemil in this discourse, Azem also got close with a bourgeois woman, Ahu. He went to her house, drank luxurious alcohol and had sexual intercourse with her. This choice is his only fallacy throughout the film when he is taken off-guard in terms of his social stance and ideology.

Azem reveals later that he did not change his mind about Cemil, whom he had an argument with Semra about. He drags Cemil to Cemil's own village. Cemil's brother Muhittin Ağa lives in the village. He is presented as a role model villager by the script, and also the type of a villager the socialist ideology dominating the film wants to see. Muhittin managed to find water from a barren land. At the end of 10 days' work he managed to find water in 32 mts and he is growing fruits and vegetables with it. Azem had given the 7000 liras Cemil had given him to Muhittin Ağa to finance this work.

Perhaps after seeing Muhittin, Cemil starts questioning his life in terms of class. He expresses this awakening in him with these words: "I would like to be in Muhittin's shoes so much Azem. How happy he is, how fast he holds on to life. How a handful of green lands, a bucket of water, a piece of land makes him happy whereas there is no meaning in life for me. You also, have a thought, a cause that you believe in. Nothing left for me to believe, I am done for". Azem is happy to see this 'coming to his senses' and he encourages him: "a person is never done for Cemil, a content person only gets exhausted. That's what you did; you were satisfied with what you earned. / I am not satisfied, I am tired. / You wanted to get rich, you achieved it and everything was over for you. From that moment on your corruption started / corruption.. yes, corruption. I am corrupted. But I'll get better.

This existential query continues at their stopover on the way back to Istanbul. Cemil looks at the earth for a while, cries, and experiences a drawback to his inner self.

Azem asks him: “What are you looking for? / Cemil, I am looking for myself / Why do you search for yourself here? Did you lose yourself here?” During on the way to Istanbul, Cemil talks about leaving his wife; he defines her as ‘his arm with gangrene’. He even says that he could go back to the village if Azem wants so. Azem’s answer is in a manner of proving that he wants to build the socialist structure in the city. He tells him to leave aside the urban romance and asks while everyone upon coming to the city what Cemil would do in a village. ‘There is no going back’ says Azem, ‘we always look ahead’ and Cemil confirms these words in excitement: ‘yes, we are gonna make it Azem, we will’.

It would be wrong to associate Necibe’s slap to Azem as he is leaving Cemil’s house, with the idea that Azem caused Cemil to break up with Necibe. This slap mostly has class content. As if underlining this, Azem says ‘you will have to pay back some day for this slap, someday you definitely will, we will make you’. Throughout the film, Azem and Necibe are like the two ends of a line: how much one is political, other one is apolitical at that extent; one is so much loyal to his goal, the other one is buried in pleasures; the one is as societal one who cares the problems of other people as much individualistic / selfish the other one is.

At the final, as Azem is leaving Cemil’s house, a gunshot is heard. But it is a mystery whether this gunshot is for Cemil or Necibe. Film is ending so ambiguously and takes us back to the argument between Azem and Semra. If it would have ended on the way that Azem expects, it must be Cemil who kills Necibe and cleans his life of the last bourgeois remnants. If Cemil would have killed himself and managed to get rid of the life which he cannot free himself from while he is alive, this sort of final confirms Semra’s words. The film does not clarify how it ends and leaves the interpretation of the final of the movie to the audience.

The sociological projections of the film are perfect; however, the film aims the declaration of a political engagement and the manipulation the audience to this given cause. It is obvious that this expectation is mostly about the lower class. Just like Azem’s struggle to raise awareness in the workers of the resort, the film also through its duration, tries to bring socialist awareness to its audience. Other target of the film

is the youth; it cares more about Halil and Melike than Cemil. It is never important that Melike belongs to the upper and Halil to the lower class; this choice tells us that which class a person belongs does not matter but which ideological stance that one takes up and the causes which a person works for do matter.

Although the film was looked down on as a ‘propaganda film’ and its ideological manipulation regarded as too fictional, when we look beyond the film’s surface, the upper class criticism is quite realistic and a product of a thorough examination the society. The main setting of the film, the holiday resort expresses the crowds in a hedonistic mood getting lost in pursuit of notions such as ‘living life to the fullest’ and ‘enjoying life’. The message that film gives to the poor people who usually envies such a life is that, the life they envy is not actually a ‘life’. Degraded to physical desires only, the ‘emptiness’ of the lives of these people not reading books, not thinking anything other than having fun, swimming in the sea and dancing, is the point the leftist thought is concentrated the most and this concentration is a righteous one. It is a strong critique of consumer society gradually increasing after 60s in Turkey but the prescription which the script suggests is ‘revolution’. With the trust it takes from the left movement that is getting stronger by the day, in fact at its peak since the beginning of the Republic, the film Arkadaş, aims to make its audience believe, as itself does, in the ‘sounds of the footsteps of the revolution’ which is closing up.

Although Arkadaş can be evaluated as a propaganda film, and it has evaluated on this way mostly by the people who have examined it, there is no ‘open’ and ‘visible’ propaganda of socialism in anywhere of the script. Even, the words like ‘socialism’, ‘revolution’ are never pronounced during the movie.

Taylan Altuğ who wrote a very critical piece about the film states that the film remains at a very personal level and does not concern itself with ‘classes’: “.. indeed Arkadaş, is not a study that scoops out a holistic image from social realism and the class conflicts that compose the content of this realism; it is a film that reflects the populist, ungrounded and revolutionary characteristics of a personal myth that has deep ties and interactions before the masses .. staying on the surface of reality and

wanting to present conflicts between the social strata in a very vulgar and over perception; showing intellectual confusions and envy as it could not handle the consciousness issue; a work that became negative especially by the concern to realize a Western wannabe cinema language” (Hakan, cited from Altuğ, 2012:357). The criticism of Altay on ‘keeping on the personal level and not reaching the class level’ is correct to some extent. Azem, just like the Christian missionaries going to South American jungles and to convert people to Christianity, is a socialist missionary in a holiday resort. In the film, socialism works on Azem’s strife only. Although this individuality does not conform to the nature of socialism, and contradicts its ‘organized identity’ more visible at the time, we have to accept it as a situation rooted in the scenario because the scenario does not include an action by a group or crowd. The film says what it wants to convey through a line on which Azem and Cemil’s friendship is based.

Arkadaş is also a film that did not experience the distance between the box office and art films. In Istanbul, it stayed on the big screen for 5 weeks with a sizeable box office gross, a serious achievement for a film of its genre in the Turkey of 70s (Hakan, cited from Milliyet Sanat, 2012:378).

Canbazoğlu is of the opinion that many of the social realist films of the 1960s and 1970s were extreme on didacticism and this harms the artistic aspect of the films. Canbazoğlu claims that cinema languages have populist tendencies (Canbazoğlu, Appendix). This is an interpretation we agree on one aspect and reject on another. We agree because it really is so to some extent. However this didacticism at the time was a way one had to choose in order to raise social awareness on social matters. Nevertheless, we observed in the films which we analyzed that at least the films did not fall into the well of didacticism to the extent that Cabbazoğlu claims and forgot that cinema is an art.

The two films which belong to Yavuz Özkan built themselves on the socialist language of 70s, ambitious and seeking political authority. It is possible to regard the films by Özkan as a political manifesto, a sincere examination of working class and

also a louder cry of reality of revolution which Arkadaş had subtly whispered into our ears.

3.4.3.2. Maden (The Mine), 1978

Maden, a film directed in 1978, provides a sequence from the lives of mine workers and hold within a subtle didacticism. The two workers in the center of the films are İlyas and Nurettin. The composition of İlyas with his every move and speech is designed to set a role model for the working class. He displays this dominance from the beginning of the film. Following a worker's death in the mine, İlyas tries to talk the workers into gaining consciousness while the other workers consider this accident as fate. İlyas's complaint is grounded on the statistics, "our turn will come anyway, today them, tomorrow you and I. We lost countless men to mine gas, collapses, and flood". In İlyas's strife, there is a mentality surfacing as 'for the people in spite of the people' because as İlyas speaks, the workers in the cafe chose to watch the TV although his words affect their interests and their rights directly. A concert commotion takes place outside the cafe and all workers run out; İlyas is left alone in the cafe. Actually the strife of İlyas is very important because they make workers work in a place with gas, it is seen gas poisonings. And the union called 'yellow' is working not for, but against the interests of the worker. Yellow union is a name given to a union that follows the words of the employer and under its dominance, functions as a control tool on workers. What İlyas tries to do is to explain that the accidents workers suffer are not caused by fate but conditions the employer wants, and they serve the interests of the employer.

The film explains the socio-cultural stance of the working class with an example. In a company like a fair that comes to town, a woman who works in the company takes stage as singer. That woman is not a singer, in fact. The workers do not even listen to her sing, they want her to undress. As long as she does not undress, they boo, until a moment when the woman starts to cry, while singing. The painted picture is a form that does not trust the working class in terms of cultural criteria. What I gather is that there is a message given as a critique of morals: 'are these workers to make a revolution, who cannot even listen to a singer without sexual motivation? '. The

same mass prefer to watch TV rather than listening to Ilyas at the beginning of the film. So, as much as the film shows these people are clueless about class struggle. It also shows that they even lack of culture to listen a singer, thus revealing that there is a long road ahead for the working class.

Regardless, Ilyas believes in his struggle and the obstacles do not restrain him. He offers Nurettin to ask an inspector to inspect the mine and collect signatures from the workers. Nurettin starts getting signatures from the miners. However the miners still do not take Ilyas seriously. On the other hand, the employer and the directors of the union called Yellow Union are closely following the deeds of Ilyas and Nurettin. Here we should not ignore the conversation between the employer and unionists. The employer says 'I am making things easy for you because you are patriotic' and asks the unionists, 'who is behind all this? '. They answer 'Russia, sir'. The employer says 'that is for sure, but who else?' The unionists give away the names of Ilyas, Nurettin and Ömer. The bizarre point is that, the employer supposedly sides with the union because they are patriotic, and the unionists claim that Soviet Union is behind the deeds of the workers. This claim is obviously comical yet, it is also important as it displays the fear of the Soviets at the time by associating every leftist act with Soviets, as a foreign power. Moreover, alienating the workers movement regarded as 'leftist' and finding the union closer himself as he regards it 'rightist' also expresses how important political labels were, at the time.

Employer's idea that to fire the three given names is objected to by the directors of the union; the advice is to be moderate. They state that the workers are depressed because of the collapse in the mine and that they may react if the union stays inactive when workers are fired. The union representative claims that he can manage things by talking.

Consequently, the yellow union gathers the workers. In this meeting, it is obvious that workers do not regard the union as their representative. While the workers talk about the fact that there are not enough safety precautions in the quarry, the yellow union adds the articles in collective agreements such as: 'the workers should not to urinate openly and should not to spit the ground'. It is obvious from this approach,

that they regard workers as ‘critters’ who are clueless about how to behave and should be controlled by ‘written’ rules.

Nurettin and İlyas criticize that workers claim rights only in terms of ‘pay raise’. Nurettin who speaks in the meeting say that the rights which concern the workers’ children more than the workers: he must be saying this in order for the right to be institutionalized. He continues his speech that as long as they do not unite in unions where political struggle can be formed in addition to the economic struggle, their efforts will bear no fruits. ‘We should not live like veggies my friends. We were worth nothing, at least our children shall’ and İlyas continues the speech from the point where he left: “Actually, we are all worth a lot but we are not aware of this. That is the point where things go wrong, we keep the world going in our hands and we are now aware of it, we must”.

The point Nurettin underlines is compatible with Marxist political economy. For the protection of rights achieved by the struggle and for passing them on to the next generation, it is crucial not to leave the struggle at an economic level, but to reinforce it on the political level. Actually, I do not think that the expectation is limited to a union that is merely to become the social-political face. The expectation is a society in which the left movement institutionalizes, socializes and spreads and starts controlling the political decision making mechanisms and ultimately, builds a socialist regime. Here we are encounter a belief that starts the process again with the working class as appropriate to Marxist dialectic, but ends with the declaration of an absolute political authority.

The more Nurettin underlines that political struggle is crucial for their struggle, the more İlyas underlines the importance of workers in economic life and ‘class awareness’ that has to form accordingly. The building stones of the understanding that İlyas tries to reach are ‘we are all worth a lot but we are not aware of it’ followed by ‘what matters is our uniting together’. His words prove how much he believes in the cause, when a worker says ‘no one will sign now brother, and they would fire the ones collecting signatures’ following the meeting, İlyas says, ‘if anyone hesitates to

sign, we will talk him in to signing and explain the situation, there is no turning back now, the fight has begun’.

The letter written to Ilyas by a university student friend of his, adds a different perspective to the film. This letter is a bridge symbolizing the bridge between the ‘educated’ and the ‘uneducated’ sides of the left ideology. Friend of Ilyas complains the violence in the university and associates it with imperialism. She mentions the revolutionary powers and fascism, she claims that imperialism divides the revolutionary powers through games and disturbs their unity. The following words by the student prove that she hands the leadership of the ‘approaching revolution’ to the working class: “we trust in you, brother, I trust you, you workers. Write me bright news from your simple, modest but right, sound development”. In a previous letter to his friend Ilyas wrote: “we have to work against union tyrants as well while we are fighting against fascism and we will succeed, there is no other way’.

Only 2 years after when the film had been directed in 1978, in 1980, there was a military coup. So, what happened and then these crowd who is enamored of a revolution and working for a revolution, scattered suddenly like a tower which is composed of playing cards when the military coup took place? If the result occurred in the way that left wing wanted, there would have been a revolution in two years, not a military coup. Both in Turkey and in other examples in the world, this may be attributed to insufficient social support for socialist thought to change the regime as a whole. The breaking off of a section of the leftists and becoming capitalists after the 1980, is a consequence of the weariness based on the idea that ‘we could not win the support of the majority and we never will’. The best example of this can be Ilyas. Had Ilyas not died at the end of the film and lived to see the 80s, his choice to leave the workers who prefer to watch TV instead of listening to him and return to non-political life would not be surprising.

At this point of the script, an unexpected event takes place in Nurettin’s life. A relationship develops between Nurettin and the woman in the fair’s ring stand, the woman who was singing at the stage in the beginning of the film. Ilyas is furious at this relationship, blames Nurettin for not being able to keep his pants on: “You saw a

broad, you forgot your family and children. What we deal with here and what you are doing”. When Nurettin says ‘hold on Ilyas brother’, İlyas replies ‘it is not the day to stop, you are still telling me to hold on’.

There are two possible ways to interpret İlyas’s attitude towards Nurettin: the first and previous one is that in the present, in the ‘tough’ political movements of the 70s, the concepts like ‘emotional relations’ and ‘falling in love’, were looked down upon. This way of thinking that was based on disregarding or postponing basic human notions such as love and sexuality, considers these notion as harmful for idealism; the options that push people to personal desires and hinders the communitarian structure of the political movement. This situation is similar for idealist nationalism, religious communities or Kemalist groups. All these ideological structures expect their followers to leave aside their personal desires and devote themselves to the ideology itself. This perception is one of the weird aspects of the political movements within Turkey; it is neither natural nor rational to expect an individual to give up on human needs and to behave like a robot, a machine. In fact, we had seen a similar situation in Arkadaş between Azem and Melike. Melike and Azem conceal their feelings for each other all through the scenario, they address each other as ‘friend’ a word without gender and they cannot even express their feelings at the end of the film, and they separate as friends. It is not difficult to guess that the underlying reason is the ideological obstacle, rather than the huge age difference.

The other interpretation is, İlyas wants Nurettin to be loyal to his family. İlyas’s finding it appropriate to be loyal to ‘his family, kids and home’, involves loyalty to the notion of ‘family’ in conservative thought that upheld by the majority of the low income people. Nurettin’s venturing into an emotional relationship at this level is both the violation of socialist ideology and the family institution for İlyas.

İlyas at this point in the scenario gets attacked which happens via his speech to the workers. İlyas and other wounded workers are taken to a hospital. The only good outcome of this attack is that it makes Nurettin’s labor awareness, which so far was somewhat unsettled, more fixed and stable. Nurettin and his fellow workers say, ‘we no longer need tents or anything of the sort, lets mind our business’ when the fair

crew, the tenters in their words, are leaving. Nurettin goes home and shows affection to his wife and children. He starts the demonstration called 'first gear' what I understand as slowing down the work, but the participation is not as high as desired. Ilyas's idea is that slowing down the work should be done, no matter how hard it is against the hopelessness of Nurettin results in their shouting at each other. Nurettin walks out of the hospital but other workers stop him by saying that it is time to unite. Meanwhile, the employer comes to visit Ilyas trying to realize what Yellow Union could not, to 'stop the workers' movement' by talking to Ilyas.

The positive development of Nurettin's 'class awareness' is obvious in the dialogue of his wife and his wife's friend, Ayşe. When Ayşe talks about the possibility of the workers being fired, Nurettin's wife says, 'there are always people to whip you if you are a donkey' and here Nurettin replies as: "Are we donkeys? We are workers. We have produced the damn world, whatever there is our production". Nurettin is aware of the benefits of uniting; he says of the boss, 'he came right to our feet when we united'. He also says that they will keep on slowing down the work until all the wounded are released from hospital.

Water was found in the quarries 17 and 18 of the mine, so it is very dangerous to work. But those two quarries are the best ones and the coal is found in these more than any other, so the employer wants his responsible manager to keep them at work as if nothing has happened. Actually he asks for more, he plots an evil plan to put Ilyas and his friends to work on the 18th quarry. He is planning to realize what his gunmen could not in the quarry; an indirect execution.

As expected, the 18th quarry collapses due to a flood. Ilyas, Nurettin and Ömer are trapped in the mine. Because of the planks that fell on his head, Ilyas gets stuck under water and does not come out. The workers take out his dead body together in sorrow. All workers unite hand in hand and arm in arm. This is the finale of the film.

In my opinion, Maden is the most serious film about organized worker struggle since Karanlıkta Uyananlar. The workers' struggle indirectly presented in Arkadaş and Diyet is directly and clearly told in Maden.

3.4.3.3. Demiryol (The Railway), 1979

The next film by Özkan **Demiryol**, shifts the setting from the mine in the countryside to Haydarpaşa train station in Istanbul. The social actors now are railway workers. The film opens with scenes from Haydarpaşa. A strike starts in the railways, the trains stop working. Focusing on conversations among railway passengers, the camera tries to show the impression of the people on the streets of the left movement. A man on the train says ‘these men have gone too far. They are paid more than anyone on this country, they are still not satisfied’. A woman backs him up: ‘we are the ones being suppressed, we the civil servants, but we have no rights’. At the rest of same conversation they say the factories are closed because of the strikes and it is continued to blame the workers. In one side the passengers complain that the country is in distress because of the strikes and on the other, a passenger complains about retirement mansions is not increased. Finally, someone says that their arguments are irrelevant: ‘you put the blame on workers almost for every problem in your lives’.

I think there may be two reasons why lower and middle class people from different layers of life are complaining about the laborers: one is, there is no labor awareness and solidarity between people from different positions in the working class. The other is the repulsive impression socialist movement has about individuals and the perception that socialism is not a good thing. This idea of the majority of the society which matches up the working class and its societal acquisitions with socialist ideology, turn into hate that towards the working class.

A teacher (woman) on the same train takes a private car with a driver and arrives in a rich house. Her purpose is to tutor the child of the house in English. The owner of the house is Mete, he is a business man and he has foreign guests at the house. He tells his guests that they are struggling against the unions. The reply of his guest is quite interesting: “the situation is the same in all underdeveloped countries. Unless an authoritarian regime comes, it is not possible to stop the opposing movement”. This was a very interesting answer for us. Considering that the film was made in 1979, it is describing the coup of September the 12th of 1980, a whole year before it happened. This sentence also shows just how much the capital owning class needs

the oppressing force of the state (bureaucracy) in societies like Turkey which 'imported' modernity. The capital owning class is weak to suppress any social power or movement that threatens its interests; it needs the power of the army in the bureaucracy.

In the same meeting it is said that the strike to take place in the railway does not concern the capital owning class economically, but does in the political aspect. The labor movement is no longer only an issue of 'raising wages' and 'expanding the rights of laborers'; the probability that the system would change as a whole and bourgeoisie class will lose their hold of the system emerged as a fear and a reality that bourgeoisie class felt strongly. In this context, the political aspect of the labor movement has surpassed its economic aspect.

The businessman owns the newspaper with the highest circulation. As this is the case, one of the subjects discussed in the meeting is presenting the striking workers as 'anarchists' in the media. The idea is that this way the other worker movements also can lose power. The foreign businessman advises them, 'use the strike if it cannot be prevented'. He proceeds with his advice, 'all grown up establishment should be stopped and until the new take their place, you may take radical precautions'. Here again, he is describing the aftermath of the coup of 80. The action part of the social movement in a way was stopped through execution, torture, imprisonment and various violations of human rights all through 80s, but mostly in the 3 year period until the elected government started in 1983. The dissection of the crowd brought up with the leftist consciousness and ready to fight while preventing the new generations' reaching the awareness of struggle, also made those generations into a toy for the neo-liberal ideology that dominated 80s and the following years. Now, a young person from a lower class is concerned about getting rich individually and climbing up the upper social class rather than being a part of social struggle. The teacher, Sibel, represents the bodies and souls surrendered to hedonism: she easily accepts businessman Mete's invitation to a hotel room and having sexual intercourse with him.

At this point the film introduces us to Bülent, a militant character. With his other militant friends, Bülent seizes a truck carrying food. To the driver of the truck he explains the grounds the action stands on ‘we are robbing the one who steals from you, who exploits the marrow and bone of the people’. He sees the capital class as ‘enemies of the people’. They take the ‘Migros’ (a big store chain in Turkey) truck they seized to gecekondu region and distribute all the goods. Despite all this effort, despite Bülent’s call to ‘join the fight’, the residents of gecekondu do not seem to understand the call. Later on, the police come and the militants start to run, the chase begins. A militant is killed; Bülent and another take shelter in a house while on the run and take the woman in the house as hostage. This hostage woman is Semra and the sister of Sibel, the teacher mentioned above. I think, this hostage scene is added to the film inspired from the event Mahir Çayan and Hüseyin Cevahir, prominent names of the student movement in 1971, who took Sibel Erkan, daughter of an army major, for 51 hours. While taking Erkan hostage, Çayan’s friend Cevahir had been killed and Çayan himself was saved. He was killed at another place later on.

In the climate of strikes, there are workers apart from the ones on strike who want to work, and their leader says that their numbers are close to the ones on strike. The workers dance ‘halay’ (a traditional folk dance) during the strike, and meanwhile, another worker group (the rightists perhaps) chant against the strike. The director of the train stations says: ‘let the ones who want to work, work and the others, not’ supposedly asking for democracy. When this offer is not taken positively, the representative of the workers not on strike, comes up with another offer: ‘one cannot talk to these people, sir. I told you we should ask the government and let them show their power’. This mentality which seeks refuge in violence of the state when it cannot deal with the united power of the labor, probably did not consider workers’ basic rights such as striking as a right, at all.

After that, the police come. Two worker groups are chanting against each other. Actually, the numbers of the workers who are on strike and the ones who are not on strike, are different than how the leader of the workers who are not on strike claim. 15-20 thousand workers are on strike while 1000 are not. One of the strike breakers say ‘isn’t there democracy, the one who wants to work is free to work’, the leader of

the strikers, Hasan, replies ‘when you work here you do not only betray us but the whole working class’.

Hasan, introduced by the scenario, is Bülent’s older brother. In contrast, to Bülent’s illegal and violent acts, Hasan is of the opinion that the process of claiming rights should be moderate, non-violent, and within the system. Hasan tries to talk the strikebreakers into the cause. Meanwhile, the imprisonment of Bülent in Sema’s house continues. Immediately after his friend Selim leaves the house, he is killed by the police siege. Following this, the sister of Hasan and Bülent is given the news and they too come to Sema’s. Sema defines herself as a follower and gives Bülent a coat. Besides, she prevents her sister Sibel from calling the police and denounces Bülent. She says ‘I will not let you rat him out’.

In the house where Hasan brought Bülent to, they start arguing. Within this argument, we find the intense methodological dilemmas of the left in 70s. Hasan is against the method chosen by Bülent as it is violent, and regards it as ‘individual terror’. Bülent dislikes Hasan’s opposition within the system; he defines ‘economism’ as quicksand, he defines the real fight as a political-ideological one. He thinks that the battles being fought ‘should not be on bourgeoisie’s grounds’. If we try to define the position of these two people through their own words; Hasan’s position seems to be on the side of the struggle for class and rights based on economic interests and he is determined that this should stay within the limits of the system. He is probably not plotting for a change of regime at the end of the battle. Bülent on the other hand, sees the struggle as a political one, not economic. And he prefers to use illegal methods that involve violence and arms, not legal methods. His definition ‘not fighting on the grounds of bourgeoisie’ is interesting, and we can guess that he wants to achieve the change of regime through armed violence.

The same discussion about attitude and method takes place between Hasan and Bülent’s friends in the solidarity night organized by Hasan and his friends. When Hasan objected as ‘so you are saying you are the ones to define the working class, is that so?’ a friend of Bülent replies that their methods pioneer the working class to have class awareness. Hasan points to the chaotic, messy and not institutionalized

nature of the movement of Bülent and his friends by saying ‘are you a party, a union do you produce anything’. Hasan probably regards the friends of Hasan as people who only chant slogans and cause commotion. The answer to his presumption by Hasan’s friends is that what he calls a commotion will work better than a strike. Bülent’s friends also look down on the solidarity night that was organized and the slide show presented. Another argument of Hasan against these young people is, that fractionalizing in the left movement will divide the power of the left and weaken it against the enemy. During these conversations police raids the solidarity gathering. It is obvious that the official institutions are fearsome of any leftist gatherings in the climate of 70s.

Bülent is actually a student. His sister wants him to finish school and work in the factory. She thinks such behavior is more useful for his ‘fight’. The reason why his sister and probably his brother, Hasan, want him to move from a militant life to a normal life ‘within the system’ is, while they are scared for his safety, they also regard his path as useless for the cause. Their worries are proved become right. The house where his brother and sister secretly take him to is under surveillance. The police surround the house and Bülent dies a terrible death.

Meanwhile, in a party where Mete also participates, high society has gathered in a villa watching a pornographic film. They are making fun of the film with economic terms. For them, money and other concepts are just the terms of economy science, this is simple like that. Other people work long hours to earn a little amount of ‘money’. For them, money is an element of humor, simple and insignificant as they have a lot of it.

Sema is aware of the fact that the attraction of this lifestyle wrapped in consumption practices and hedonism is confusing her sister, Sibel. She shouts the realities to her sister directly by describing her feelings that she had in the rich house and that led her into sexual intercourse with the businessman: ‘you thought that you had all that wealth to yourself, that is your delusion’. She notices and defines well her sister’s hunger towards the businessman’s wealth. She also concludes that the ‘reification’ concept became real on her body, as she resembles her to a vase or a car and adds

that she has become a commodity. She calls her sister to be something ‘to renew when it gets old or when a newer version emerges’ or a ‘belonging to use and throw away’.

The sympathy Sema had for leftist political line results in going to the strike to extend her support but she faces the possibility of arrestment. Sibel goes to the strike leader Hasan for help but dislikes his attitude; she accuses him of being too comfortable, ‘after all it is not your sister getting arrested’. Whereas, this accusation is ungrounded, as Hasan despite not being indifferent to such a situation, also he lost his own brother to political conflict. Her next stop is the businessman, Mete, with whom she had a sexual intercourse. The moment which Mete hears that Sibel’s sister is in trouble because of a political issue, he orders his secretary that sending Sibel and she never comes to tutoring again.

The analysis of Sema about Mete and his thought about Sibel is accurate. Sibel or any women like her is not different from a watch or a wallet for Mete. As capitalism taught Mete, people have a value as long as ‘they are useful’ or ‘they have a function’. The moment when they threaten his interests or they lose their function, they must be left out such goods like in a game; this is exactly what Mete does to Sibel.

This blow which Mete hits Sibel, caused Sibel to come to her senses and feel class consciousness much more as a worker from middle class and a teacher earning her living through her labor. Sibel makes tracks for strike again and says ‘let me do something for you, let me help you in a way’ to Hasan. Prior to Sibel’s arrival, Hasan had been telling the others that the strike and the support to the strike are growing; Sibel’s support to strike is a proof which endorses his thought. She came to herself with the sudden and cruel slam while she was being lured to the opportunities which the ‘upper class’ has and she turned her direction to the ‘lower class’. Actually, we cannot regard Sibel and Sema in lower class; both the neighborhood and the flat they reside and their lifestyle, opportunities are not like the life of low income people in gecekondu in the 70s. Nevertheless, the awakening of Sibel that depends on Mete’s discrimination to her and that happens in a very short time; in other words, going to

bed at the evening with a different mentality and getting up from the bed at the next morning with a different mentality, does not comply with well the facts of psychology science, we do not dwell on that foible of the script. In consequence, Mete's behavior ended with a positive result and inclined Sibel to the labor movement. Of course, her discourse and attitude do not change one hundred percent and do not have to anyway. For instance, she thanks with 'merci', French expression for 'thank you' which is used by Turkish high classes frequently, to a worker who offers food to her.

Unidentified people bomb Haydarpaşa Station with the aim to sabotage the strike but this takes place in the newspapers as 'communists bombed Haydarpaşa'. The workers carry water from the sea working together and extinguish the fire. The leaders of the walk-out interpret this sabotage as 'the pressure climbs as the end of the system of exploitation comes to an end'. The film closes with scenes from real strikes.

In addition to being a propaganda film with a well-built script, Demiryol also is a film that has successful sociologic analyses. Demiryol, just like Arkadaş, is a film that honestly believes in the socialist revolution on the way. We understand this presumption of the film as it closes with the real images of strikes. Where should we locate the lower class in the stream of the film? The lower class has been located and examined within a political context. In this regard, the low income people who support the socialist political movement is on the foreground, but there are also the workers against the socialist move and strike. Moreover, it successfully presents a many-layered society analysis by adding into the scenario Mete from upper class and Sibel and Sema from middle class. Because it has a profound script, Demiryol successfully examines the relations between the classes and helps us to see the effects of the consumer society practices that are to expand in 1980s.

3.5. Conclusion

It is seen a new discussion concept in this chapter: gecekondü. Gecekondü was discovered, discussed and presented as the life aura of urban poor. We are observing

also that poor people are the part of the city and they are producing their own life aura and culture.

It can be seen that the system which was locked by degrees turned on dilemma and this dilemma became a platform which feeds the violence. Military coup was used as an instrument that destroyed this dilemma and the interests of bourgeoisie were constructed over again. It should be underlined that 1970s is the most chaotic period of Turkish society in regards of societal dynamics and engrossingly, it is the most powerful time of social realist films and also, socialist ideology. In my opinion, the chaotic structure of society in that period fed and provided courage to cinema world in Turkey for producing the social realist films. The power that people found in themselves showing struggle against the system became one of the incentive points for interrogative films of Turkey.

CHAPTER 4

4. SOCIAL REALISM AND URBAN POOR IN 1980s

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter, the most important point which should be examined is the reasons of collapse in class consciousness of low income people. That means ‘low class’ converted to ‘poor people’ again. Low income people lost their class stance; moreover, they could not even protect their traditional community aspect. Poor people were atomized fastly and harshly.

Turkish cinema in 1980s was carrying the effects and the crumbs of 1970s Turkish cinema. Social realist line of 1980s made the social realist notions which had stayed from 1970s as possible as it could do. Mostly, the individual narrations remain in the forefront in the social realist films of 1980s and in this chapter, we are examining the parallelism between the individuals who are the results of neo-liberal waves and individual characters of the films who struggle against the system without the support of class solidarity.

4.2. The Social Realist Cinema of 1980s

The difference of 80’s from 60’s and 70’s in terms of social realism is that we do not see accurate and profound discussions on cinema. The intellectual segment of our cinema inspired by social realism in 60’s and 70’s, had undersigned movies that are from time to time even based on socialist realism. The same intellectual segment caused in 1980s the decline in the number of the films which take the societal matters

as their subject, by heading towards the films that are called ‘art movies’, that are inclined more to festivals and that are disconnected from the general cinema tend of the society.

When we look at the movies that belong to the line which we analyze in 1980’s, it is possible to see that these movies are not in the political cinema line whose examples can be seen along 1970’s, they were more inclined towards a sociological cinema understanding. In this context, the first half of 80’s is an abundant phase for our thesis. It is easily noticed that the divergence from political language is related to the September 12 coup d’etat. The pressure that the junta administration put on political movements and the ban of junta on ‘radical’ movements which junta perceives as dangerous, was reflected itself in cinema. Surely, there were exceptions as well: For example, Çark aims to express organized labor resistance. However, we usually see movies that are from real life and they are distant from political expression.

The neo-liberalist and neo-conservative movements that our society was exposed to in 1980’s, have bruised the leftist accumulation of until then and the value which it had formed in socialist respect. It was possible to follow its proof through cinema: It was quite difficult to find the family that occupied the lead role in ‘Gurbet Kuşları’ of 60’s or the group of friends of 6 people in ‘Gecelerin Ötesi’, the family that again played the lead role in the movie ‘Gelin’ of 70’s. In 80’s, we witnessed movies where the collective consciousness fell apart and in harmony with the period’s liberalist-individualist tone, ‘individuals’ battled against the system. Yoksul of ‘Yoksul’, Kamil of ‘Faize Hücum’, Hüseyin of ‘At’ or Mehmet of ‘Düttürü Dünya’ were all people who fought against the system on their own as lead characters of the films.

Even if we immediately accept that the characters from the lower class had a fight against the system, no matter how these movies end, how the true choices are made that the movies are not connecting their endings to concepts like ‘moving up the social ladder’, ‘becoming rich’ or ‘success’. Faize Hücum and At ends tragically as far as the lead characters are concerned. Bir Yudum Sevgi and Bir Avuç Cennet

leaves the characters alone with a hopeful beginning and *Düttürü Dünya* ends with an ambiguous ending just like the movie *Umut* of 1970's.

As per Yağız's establishment, "After 1980 arabesque movies dominated cinema. The squatting that occurred as a result of migration from rural to urban areas and arabesque music and movies as a product of squatter culture increased in this period." (Yağız, 2006:99). That the squatter become a permanent factor in city life and even a dominant factor in city life, is obvious from arabesque music becoming dominant in society. However, why the social representation of lower class goes through arabesque music is another point that should not be unnoticed. Social realism, having left its glorious and powerful days far behind, settled with one or two examples per year in the 80's , whereas the arabesque movies that are telling the pain of the lower class in a different cinema language, were in a frame that made their producers happy with their artistically weak, but commercially powerful stance.

".. especially in 1980s, both on one hand bourgeoisie provoked consumption tendencies and on the other hand, became the marketer and the buyer of art by entering the 'culture' area. Another point that gained importance is here that increasing of writers and the artists who are jointed to culture industry in this period" (Karadoğan, 1999:107). Another underlying reason for the subject preference of the cinema/art circles, whose guard was lowered throughout 80s, and who became more and more distant to social realism, was because they became more integrated into capital. The art world that became more and more integrated with capital and capital class, were inclined to movies that reflected the depressions and contradictions of the upper class and upper-middle class. These were called 'art movies'.

"Following the bloody coup d'etat of 12 September 1980, parties and unions (including the union of cinema workers, Sine-Sen (Sinema Emekçileri Sendikası, Film Laborers Union) founded in 1978) were closed; both Gören and Özgentürk were imprisoned for one year without trial and tortured; books and films were burned and politics banned" (Dönmez-Colin, 2014:7) The directors, Şerif Gören and Ali Özgentürk (whose *At* film is participating in our study) were considered by the state in 'leftist' tradition. This perspective of state resulted in a lot of detentions, tortures

and human rights violations during 1980s, especially first three years of 80s. Cinema laborers also got their shares from this wild process.

4.3. The Effects of 1980 Military Coup

Turkish society began the 1980's with the September 12 military coup d'état. Even though it was claimed that, the military coup was done in order to put an end to the chaotic state of the society in during the 70's and to destroy the violent political culture that had spread to every segment of the society; this military coup d'état was actually made to guarantee by force, the interests of the domestic and foreign capital circles that were under threat. Actually, before September 12 just like January 24, 1980 decisions, there were political steps taken to get out of the atmosphere of left-axis of 70's but we can accept September 12 as the official beginning of neo-liberal politics in Turkey, which showed a significant rise around the world, throughout 80's.

In the year 1980, not only did industrial bourgeoisie come across the opposition of lower economic classes led by the labor class, but it also had to deal with the moves of the agricultural and commercial bourgeoisie that threatened their own interests. These two bourgeoisie channels that had mainly rural origins had a value system that was fed by Anatolian conservatism in the face of the urban industrial bourgeoisie that represented modernism (Savran, 2010: 182).

1980 coup d'état had in this respect updated the interests of industrial bourgeoisie in many ways. As Savran suggests (2010:184), the 1980 coup d'état is important in respect of cancelling out the combatting power of the labor movement that was raised throughout 60's and reached its peak during 70's. At the same time, the guidance of industrial bourgeoisie is the reason behind abandoning 1961 Constitution which recognized and cared for labor rights and passing to 1982 Constitution.

The underlying reason for economic globalization during and after 1980's is the locking of the world economy that was happened 1970's. Gaining an international identity of capital by getting rid of the nation state obstacle and the self-adaptation of

nation states to this capital model, provided to capital a freedom, power and legitimacy that it can move to anywhere on the world (Maktav, 1998:42).

Korkut Boratav claims that the capital movement in Turkey during 80's had two stages. In the first stage, the aim was to eliminate the rights of labor by changing the equilibrium of capital – labor dichotomy in favor of capital and thus, to maintain a sovereign space to capital to realize its objectives. Another objective in this period was to maintain the nation state economies to find themselves a place in globalization that was announced to have begun. Boratav takes this first period between the years 1980-88. He initiates the second stage with the year 1989, extending today, and views this stage as the adaptation period to the laws of international capital and hegemony (Atilgan, 2012:297).

During 80's, the target of the capital class in Turkey shifted from domestic market to foreign market. A production intended for the foreign market required not only a great amount of capital but also a labor class big enough to produce the amounts targeted for the subject foreign market. The reason behind the increase in the exploitation on workers and the enormous damage to labor rights that were based on being a laborer was because of this big exports move (Atilgan, 2012:298 -299).

Another point was that the humankind which was actually 'homo sapiens' was forced to become 'homo economicus'. Based on the concept 'economism', this mentality that valued people based on space that person covered in economic life, made an effort to make the middle classes especially as part of the system throughout 1980's. To cut the relationship of middle class with the lower economic class, to distance it from the lower class and to approach it to the upper class was the target and it was maintained with much success. The main incentives of consumer society 'individualism', 'consumption' and 'entrepreneurship' distanced the middle class from the political affirmations of 70's that kept it together with the lower class. The middle class was bourgeoisied (Atilgan, 2012:299).

Hayri Kozanoğlu shows the result of the fictionalization of market economy as a system without an alternative and as a system that an alternative is not allowed:

“Before 80, when even the number of people who knew the difference between equity and bond were really limited, now you can hear a terminology extending until terms like capital market, price-earnings ratio, dividend, investment fund etc. everywhere from buses to match lines” (Kozanoğlu, 1993:66).

According to Murat Belge, the fictionalization of the individual as ‘an economic being’ led to the emergence of a model that is ‘not embarrassed by earning money’. Depending on the changing production relationships, earning money and entrepreneurship became notions that are more related to abstract lunges than concrete economic investments, and at the same time, an aggressive entrepreneurship was accepted. The qualifications of bourgeoisie such as production and generating employment that had been glorified in the past, were not appreciated anymore (Maktav, cited from Belge, 1998:33).

Maktav claims that the reason for Turkish society’s dense productivity in other fields of life during 80’s is that the people were subjected to inhibition and obstruction in political life. He puts the new societal structure across as follows: “.. ‘the explosion encountered in 80’s where it was accepted that the market had no alternative, where consuming and becoming wealthier became the only meaning of life is the ‘announcement of individualism’, ‘it is a general approval of the idea that the secret way to success is through competition’, ‘that even the private spaces of life becoming subjected to the market..’” (Maktav, 1998:3).

1980s Turkish society was pathological; it did not have a societal structure that could be idealized. The inequity distribution of income that grew day by day among economic classes, dependent on this that the economic struggles of the lower and the middle class especially in big cities, the extremity of cultural worthlessness, the ambition that the lettered-intellectual segment demonstrated to become engaged in neo-liberal economic life; money’s seizing control of social relationships in all the remaining segments of the society are all items that could be presented as examples (Maktav, 1998:8).

Murathan Mungan too, suggests that a miniature version size of American society that was put in front of us as ‘modal society’ was being produced in Turkey. Everyone was made a singer no matter whether or not they had a good voice; fake stars were produced from construction workers; godfathers were selected from old waiters, people who had no artistic experience or training were put before us as ‘artists’. The American dream that was pictured in American movies was fictionalized on our soil after September 12, again as a Turkish-American production and under its light (Maktav, cited from Mungan, 1998:4).

Nigar Pösteki, is of the opinion that the societal type that was formed during 80’s is a copy of the American lifestyle and values on a local scale. The growing advertisement sector and entertainment centers made consumption the principle goal. Especially, the poor people who migrate to the city were unable to reach this life which they witness and envy and this led them to developing an intense reaction towards life style. One of the results of this reaction was the transformation of the society into a more conservative state, which was already fairly conservative (Hakan, cited from Pösteki, 2012:404). Another form of reaction usually came into existence in the form of turning towards radical political movements. Political movements such as ‘political fundamentalism’ and ‘Kurdish nationalism’ that were more felt in the societal scale in Turkish society during 80’s were promising to those people, who could not find themselves a place or an opportunity in the existing system, a system that they could have ‘a nice place’.

“ ‘laissez faire, laissez passer’ philosophy’s formation of a significant relief and lethargy is both in economic and cultural space. The hazy, gloomy and depressing ambience of before 1980 period had lifted; the intimidation that dominated the society after September 12 coup d’etat had disappeared also” (Bali, 2002:56).

After the ‘unable to consume’ society of the 1970’s, the ‘society that learnt to consume’ during the 80’s, became like a cure and an exit, for all segments of society that were overwhelmed by political violence during 70’s. We know that after a societal structure that “.. permitted to go abroad once in three years, keeping one dollar in the wallet to be sufficient proof to be a foreign exchange smuggler..” (Bali,

2002:25), while the society is getting used to and being made used to consume, the lower economic class was dying to become a part of it – even if it lacked financial resources.

The sweet promises that the system made to individuals, increased the belief of the individuals in the system and their expectations from the system. Hayri Kozanoğlu says that “.. the belief was instilled that the welfare of all individuals will rise, their happiness and dynamism will increase” (Kozanoğlu, 1997:110) which underlines this fact. The message ‘if you participate in the system, you will also benefit from its favors’, that the upper layers formed in order to keep calm the lower class which they thought in 60’s and 70’s were a problem for them, drew the lower class to aims that they could never own. The hedonistic sweet side of capitalism, motivated the lower class to aims such as ‘enjoying life’, ‘diving in pleasure and joy’ more than ‘earning a living’ and the desire to ‘maintain a family’. It can be seen that let alone the lower class, even the middle class could not possess the financial resources necessary to lead such a lifestyle, but the success of the system, made people believe that such an economic infrastructure actually existed. Rifat Bali uses the credit card from 1991 to 2001 as a parameter and gives the following information: “Credit cards that used to be a status symbol of the privileged and wealthy people of the seventies became ordinary in a very short period of time and entered everybody’s wallet. The total credit card number of 766.085 in 1991, increased to 13.996.806 in 2001 by increasing eighteen times during the period in between” (Bali, 2002:307). The mentality that capitalism wanted to see especially in the lower and middle class, is to measure a persons’ own humanity, societal stance and respectability by how much that person consumes. This would increase production as much as it increases consumption, and maintain the continuity of capitalism.

Singer Maria Rita Epik reflects the change that occurred by money as capitalism’s dominant and determinant factor as follows: “After I came back (to Turkey) in 1984, I found everything changed. Özal period had begun. Before I went to America people never talked about money, when I came back I found everybody talking about money. However, money was a private thing. If you did not have money, you would pull your husband or boyfriend to the side and talk about money issues privately.

Money was not a subject that was talked publicly in Turkey..” (Göktürk-Bengi, 2000:41) Money’s coming out of being the conversation and the problem of a specific segment and becoming generalized to an entire society, shows that Turkey is entirely interiorizing capitalism as a philosophy and lifestyle. The change in daily life practices, more than the change in system proves that the idea was penetrating into the society.

The economic policies that were implemented after 1980, politically erased the search for class consciousness that was already non-existent, sociologically. As much as the governmental politics, the disappearance of the belief of individuals in societal actions and everybody’s turning to their individual targets had an effect on this. Individualism that had become stronger during the period from 1980 to our day instead of easing, brought with itself the destruction of the public side of human beings. It is no longer possible to come across people that used to march, shout slogans and have a societal stance as in the 70’s. For people, societal causes became insignificant.

Throughout the 80’s the silencing of the working class in societal space in legal terms, led to two types of conclusions: one of is the radicalization and shift to illegal channels, when the search for justice demands of the lower income group were not legally permitted. This option brought about the evolution of radical left organizations, especially with the support of university students. Another conclusion is the shift of opposition to the system, towards apolitical channels. The legal impossibility of political and organizational opposition led to the realization of opposition via, for example, music or literature.

Surely, the passive, recessive stance of the labor class should not be ignored. The non-existence of resistance from the lower class, the lack of display of any opposition from the labor class while the rules of economic life were being redefined, the non-existence of any effort to strike when the right to strike, which is a fundamental in every modern society, was banned, are surely points that require further examination. This loser stance must have encouraged the capital class more so that, between 1980-88 the total percentage of fees and wages regressed from 32.79

percent to 13 percent; on the contrary, the profit, interest and rentier incomes increased from 42.88 percent to 73 percent was proving that how much the working and earning understanding in the society had deteriorated. Turkey became the sixth country in the world in the list of deteriorated distribution of income (Atılğan, 2012:300).

A sizable segment in the lower class, had noticed very fast the incline toward liberalism in the 80's. This could already be expected of poor people who did not have a leftist orientation. However, the giving up of most of the lower class people, who had supported the leftist struggle throughout the 70's, from left thought and movement, and 'seizing the atmosphere of the day' is the interesting point actually. This situation can be explained in two ways: one of is that these people who supported the leftist struggle never interiorized leftist thinking and perceived it as 'trend'. Just as people followed the left because the dominant line of thought of 70's was socialism, people started to follow liberal thought as soon as liberalism became the dominant line in the 80's. The second point is the end of people's belief in a massive leftist struggle. The role of September 12 coup d'etat is undeniable in this process and it came into reality in two ways: one led to resort to violence through official channels. The individuals who still desired resistance were tortured or put in jail. The other way depoliticized the next generation successfully by encouraging apoliticism during the 80's. Another reason for the next generation is becoming distanced to politics is the occupation of the whole society with consumption society practices.

It is seen that the bourgeoisie was also changing tactics towards the lower class during the 80's. While the message given was "... towards the labor class 'we are all on the same ship, we also sympathize with you' .." (Bali, 2002:77) "rather than standing at enemy positions with the labor class and officialdom, they chose top leasing their conscious and placate them" (Bali, 2002:77). This kind of a strategy led to the further softening of the lower class which had already lowered its guard. The image before them was no longer the cruel and disgusting businessman whom is seen in the Turkish movies of 70's, he was a benign, fatherly, sympathize to the laborer, helpful character as Hulusi Kentmen portrayed in the movies. So, he was a person

that it was unnecessary to struggle with, like a laborer who had more money than the rest and who helped them.

Populism that the rightist government constantly appealed to would also help another rightist government in the 80's. Certain social welfare steps taken, targeting the lower class together, with the opportunities the municipalities provide to the squatter residents such as reconstruction permits, reconstruction amnesties, delivery of title deeds, etc. have become sufficient for them to tie the lower class to themselves (Atılgan, 2012:300-301).

Korkut Boratav says that the lower and the middle classes were seduced by the populist implementations of ANAP (Anavatan Partisi, Motherland Party): “.. this sub-period, is the time when a ‘degenerate’ populism was implemented towards public classes. The main target which is especially towards urban poor masses was to form crowded groups who are unaware of class consciousness in these masses and who are able to surrender to the program and the ideology of the capital (of ANAP) “ (Boratav, 1996:680).

In an interview, Korkut Boratav mentions processes of “tightening of mechanisms of moving up the social ladder” and “the deepening of disintegration” during the period after 1980 (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:184). The weakening of the phenomenon of moving up the social ladder and the disappearance of opportunities means the widening of the gap between societal classes; to find something that would be more dangerous than this one to a society would be very difficult.

As per Boratav's claim, the implementations after 1980, with their full power “.. targeted the corrosion of class consciousness of the laborers ..” (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:184). If we make an effort to interpret all of Boratav's words, rather than saying that the class struggle disappeared because a gap between the classes occurred, we would say just the opposite: that the gap between the classes grew wider than how it should be in a healthy societal structure because the class struggle became inactive. Therefore, it is possible to say that class struggle is a must to ensure that the societal layers do not fall apart from each other. In societies where the class

struggle is repressed through fraud or force, it is possible to see increase in notions such as the unfairness in distribution of income ranking the first, poverty, unemployment because the thing that decreases these notions' percentages is again the class struggle itself. On top of this, two ways are possible for the lower class' inability to express its interests in the frame of class struggle: either the state pronounces such struggle as illegal, or even if it is not illegal, the state represses it; the other point is that the lower class is already unwilling or exasperated for such struggle. It is supported by examples from Turkey and from the world that both of these conditions prevent the evolution of a healthy societal structure.

Alain Touraine underlines that the problems which interests society lose their importance and the problems which can not be accepted as sociological come into prominence. A societal construct which political and ideological worries disappear is nothing but a stage where only economic targets exist for individual (Touraine, 1994:204). 'The transition from the societal to non-societal' is a tendency that showed itself since the 80's all over the world; it is the reflection of new production relationships based on globalization and free market. Public side of the individual of our day has deteriorated and that individual has become atomized day by day.

In 1980's, migration reached a much stable and full state. We can mention a state where we can discuss the results of migration that occurred until 80's, more than the migration itself. In the specific of Turkey, we comprehend that the state of 'confrontation of different classes' and 'the realization of classes the life of other classes' are both related to the 'migration' concept.

The 1980's revealed the class paradox among people who were already residing in the city and who had internalized the city culture and those 'new residents' who were reluctant to internalize city culture. The older residents of the city were complaining that the cultural structure of the city changed with the arrival of new residents (Maktav, 1998:44).

The segmentations in modern individuality can be accepted as the reflection of class separations in modern city (Berman, 1994:194). We should perceive these words of

Marshall Berman as more towards the urbanized individuals that grew up within the modernist culture. The people who grew up in the urban culture in our country met with the people who migrated to the city and with their lifestyles, in the city environment for the first time. Meeting with a different lifestyle brought the urban individual the obligation of interpreting through a different perspective the space that he shared only with urban people.

As mentioned above, modernity brought different classes together and composed common spaces which they would use together but Murat Belge is of the opinion that, after the migration in Turkey, different cultures deepen the gap between separated districts of city by stimulating spatial differentiation (Maktav, cited from Belge, 1998:40).

Maktav thinks that by 1980's the culture that migrated from the rural areas and the poor segment reached dominant state in the city (Maktav, 1998:40). Another reason for the poor to get stuck in their own ghettos is that the values of the emerging system undermined poor people. A social structure was formed where even the middle class avoided having connection with poor people (Maktav, 1998:41).

Ömer Laçiner explains the inability to build an urbanized consciousness of this poor mass that came to the city from outside in these words: “.. the masses that started to ‘use’ larger spaces of the city with their even growing population, were unable to maintain an owner state that required a specific responsibility and conscious” (Laçiner, 1996:12). We can expect that “.. a specifying majority living in the city to have an urbanized consciousness , to have a behavioral norm colored by the specific living culture that was formed in the city throughout history..”(Laçiner, 1996:12) but the articulation to the city of the mass that migrated to the city is brand new; the time they have for such integration is really limited.

The family structure that changes form in the Turkish society during and after 1980's in another parameter that affected the society and thus, the general situation of the lower class. Türker Alkan implicitly mentions the role of the family in the changing societal structure as follows: “As a means of socialization, family, by its value

judgments, can not only contribute to the societal change; but also can have a retentive quality with a slowdown effect over change as a primary group” (Alkan, 1981:101). In which Alkan underlines that the second issue he emphasizes was seen more in our society. Most of time, family has a restraining and inhibiting effect, especially on the individuality of the young. It is mostly a carrier of conservative thought and this situation is more evident in the lower class.

According to Aslı Ekici, “With the evolution of capitalism in 1980’s the isolation of economic functions from the family unit decreased the external functions of the family and made it easier to become an organization based on emotional satisfaction and understanding” (Ekici, 2007:31). This situation already exists in capitalism’s nature; meaning the separation of business life and personal life from each other. Because the capitalist production relationships took deeper root in our country after 80’s, it smoothed the traditional side of the family based on economic function and the nuclear family model became more evident. Because the traditional family is seen mostly in the lower class, the lower class that migrated to the city was affected by this change the most and was left in chaos.

Despite this change, Ekici’s interpretation is that “The contemporary nucleus family in Turkey still carries the traces of a traditional structure” (Ekici, 2007:32). In an investigation which was carried out by the state institutions in 2006 Summer concluded that “.. house works are the duty of woman, the activity which families realize most is to visit neighbors and relatives” (Radikal, 2006:6). Same investigation also exposed the result that home staff such as cooking, ironing etc. is realized by women with a great percent (Radikal, 2006:6). Whereas Alan Duben makes the following comment: “.. the processes of rural transformation, urbanization and industrialization in Turkey have not greatly affected household structure, except possibly in relation to shifts in household type among long-time urban families” (Duben, 1982:82). The idea that modernity and capitalism leads to different reactions and conclusions in different geographies is thus once again proved. First of all, capitalism is not a model that societies except Western societies produced through internal dynamics. Capitalism, with the way it was introduced from outside, surely

leads to different conclusions in a society that had until then lived under different societal dynamics and a different economic model than in Western societies.

The levels completed in capitalism did not further decentralize individuals as is the case with Western societies, on the contrary it made them emotionally and socially closer. But we cannot say this for the whole Turkish society, this is valid for lower class and surely, we can guess that the reason behind this is economic. Limited income encourages people to build families, two salaries are always better than one salary. When a working woman and man have a child, usually a grandmother is necessary to take care of the child until the working parents come home. This kind of moral and material obligations brought with it the continuity of the extended family structure; it helped the lower class in Turkey to resist capitalisms' oppressive nature, which is more grinding in Turkey than its Western equivalents.

Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı argues, based on researches, that in the modern city life the emotional dependency in the relationship between individuals and their families increases in direct proportion to being urban and the level of education and that financial independence also increases both in respect of the individual and the family (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007:122). It is possible to think that normally economic independence would bring emotional distance. It is obvious that individuals that are depressed by the character of capitalism that asks individuals to deal with each other only for business purposes, feel an emotional hunger in their private lives and feel an insufficiency of the protective nature of cultural values. The nuclear family in the West and extended family in Turkey is effective in functioning as a safe haven where the individual psychologically shelters against capitalism. The reason especially for migrating men bringing along their wives and children, or if they did not bring their families with them, their effort to bring them to city as soon as possible is for the purpose of feeling emotionally comfortable against the overwhelming economic and cultural alienation. If we think about this choice on a larger scale, if the individual's mother, father, brothers, sisters, cousins or none of them are in the city, his production of a community in the city by communicating with his fellow countrymen, his formation of a sub-group in the city are subconscious reactions to the loneliness capitalism produces. Kağıtçıbaşı supports our line of thought with the

following words: “.. both historical and contemporary findings show us that despite changes in social and economic structure, there is a certain continuity in culture” (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2007:121)

Doğan interprets the change in production relations 1980s with these words: “the main dynamo of economy slid from production capital to finance capital. Its meaning is clear: the heart of economy was beating from then on at banks but not at factories .. it began a rapid class polarization in Turkey, where the difference between classes had been more conceivable before” .. Doğan shows as reasons that “industry production lost its feature of being principal” and “service sector had rapid growth” for the big decline in real wages of workers in 1980s. The other reason is that “the closure of a lot of organizations such workers union, political parties and democratic mass organizations as the result of September 12 military coup and in this context, erosion in the political consciousness and syndicate organization of workers” .. in 1980s, “.. wealthy classes improved an attitude which is more aggressive and more discriminative against to urban poor” (Doğan, 2004, teorivepolitika.net).

Another reason for the erosion in the class / politic consciousness of the urban poor can be said that, “.. the strategy of ANAP / Özal (Turgut Özal) was targeting to corrode the consciousness of ‘salariedness / belonging to working class’ by feeding the small property obsessions and ‘loot’ expectations which are depended on property on urban laborers” (Doğan, cited from Boratav, 2004, teorivepolitika.net).

4.4. 80’s Politics and the State

Even though at first sight it looks weird to see that following the significant politicism of 70’s, the 80’s kept itself distanced from politics as much as possible, there are sociological reasons for it. Olivier Fillieule, explains the weakening of political bonds and beliefs of individuals under in three items: “the extinction of ‘prizes’ (becoming unemployed, transition to family life, etc.), the disappearance of ideological meaning (because of change in political climate, meeting the demends, the disappearance of the consensus within the movement, the appearance of separations and fractions, etc.), the transformation of social relationships within the

group (relationships among the generations, exclusion from friendships, etc.)” (Uysal, cited from Fillieule, 2013:181).

Bostancıoğlu analyzes the categorical definition of Fillieule through Devrimci Yol (DEV-YOL, Revolutionary Path) organization in Turkey specifics. Oğuzhan Müftüoğlu one of the significant names of Revolutionary Path in 70's, in interview Metin Bostancıoğlu made with him, underlines the Turkish society he witnessed after his imprisonment which was ended in 1991 and the four points that he identifies in the societal transformation from 70's to 90's: “The entire lives of people were made up of economic and individual pragmatism. Money being ahead of everything else, severely affected human relationships, societal life .. there were also significant differentiations view to Turkey, to the world, to the politics within our own community. The most common problem that raised questions in people's minds was the collapse of the Soviet Union and socialism. The fuss of the media about socialism coming to an end, spilled all over the place”. We can write the four points Müftüoğlu identified as follows:

** In the society that was grasped by the neo-liberal politics after 1980, money and economic interest being the main axis,

** Following the collapse of the national socialism model of the Soviet Union, the misbelief towards socialist ideology by even the people who were once leftist,

** The lethargy and anxiety of the organization members that developed by the torture phenomenon following September 12; the fear of organizing based of Revolutionary Path's being illegal in front of the laws,

** The inability to get used to the organization's and thus oneself becoming insignificant despite the fact that it had a significant role in 70's in leftist movement and in social life, (Bostancıoğlu, 2011: 296-297-298). These circumstances Müftüoğlu conveys, clearly shows us why the lower class in 80's disheartened from the political soul it had in 70's.

Murat Belge says that the average Turkish individual that was already passive and coward before September 12, became more suppressed by the iron fist of September 12: “The ideal Turkish Republic citizen, is a human type that, above all, lacks the

feature of asking questions .. it is a human type that got into the habit of subservience to authority .. ideal Turkish Republic citizen is a human type which does not know the things that the people, who are authorized to know, know” (Belge, 1992a:322-324).

ANAP, the leading party of the 80’s overly carried out the mission of ‘apoliticizing the society and especially the youth’ which was a mission given to them by the state (Maktav, 1998:14). The ideological structure that both the ‘appointed’ bureaucracy and the ‘chosen’ Motherland Party fictionalized hand in hand as Kemalism plus capitalism, asked for capitalism to invisibly get hold of people’s subconscious, while visibly presenting Kemalism as the single political perception.

The only ideology that was provided by the state to the depoliticized society was Kemalism. Kemalism, which was the official ideology of the state and especially was for army, was representing a standing which is above all political movements, like virtually above politics. The presentation of Kemalism as a ‘single ideology’ and ‘single politics’ was a situation that was formed to keep the society away from all political movements except Kemalism.

4.5. 1980s Films

4.5.1. Migration in 1980s

4.5.1.1. At (The Horse), 1982

The 1982 production *At*, that is the first movie that catches the eye from 1980’s, stands close to the ‘poetical realism’ movement that *Umut (Hope)* movie previously followed. The modest scrip of *At* tells us about Hüseyin who leads a tranquil life in his village and whose only issue is to educate his son. Hüseyin, who wants to go to Istanbul to work, has the desire to buy a car and peddle, but he is poor. With the advice of his uncle’s son, he borrows from the landlord of the region and leaves the house as collateral. His target is to peddle in the big city first, and then to start a business in a town close to his village. At the end of these economic purposes lies his son’s education.

One of the ideas that shapes Hüseyin's mind is the attitude of his lieutenant towards him and his friend while he was doing military service: "you are not man, at least make your child a man. He would not be overwhelmed, live in misery like you..". The dream to move up the social ladder of this kind, is the natural result of 'overwhelmed psychology' that is often seen in the lower class. The situation seen in Hüseyin is more based on reasons related to social status than economic reasons. The feeling of 'not being perceived to be a man' that stems from being in the lower class, is something that Hüseyin would not like to see in his son Ferhat. The literacy level of his son makes him proud: for example he prides himself on his son's reading speed towards the people he shares the same compartment in the train on his way to Istanbul.

When Hüseyin comes to Istanbul, he cannot even find a house. He stays in an open air yard together with the other peddlers. Another peddler called Remzi, with whom he meets there, starts to tell him the rules of Istanbul: "Here you will focus on saving your ship, keep your nose clean". The same Remzi is fed up with the puss-in-the-corner game of the peddlers with the police, he is complaining and is aspiring to own a shop: "You will have a shop; nothing happens like, run-hide, walk back and forth. They would not leave you anywhere".

The first time Hüseyin meets the big city and the oppression of his own class, is when he hits the car of a businessman with his peddle car. As soon as the businessman gets off the car, he insults him; as if that was not enough, he also pushes him around. He yells at him saying: "Even if you sell your entire family, you cannot afford this car". To the reproach of a younger man who was passing by, "isn't it a shame? Do you have the right to yell at this man so much", he responds with all crudity as follows "have we asked you what the shame is? Are you their butler?" The wife of the businessman who gets off the car doubles the level of crudity and continues insolence with the following response: "100 men like you work under my husband's command, we will not learn what the shame is from you".

The city environment provides the individual with more opportunity to come to a higher level within society (Ergil, 1986:111). This specifically makes the city a

center of attraction for individuals of the lower class who are aware of this and living in the rural areas. In contrast to the limitedness and monotony of economic life in the rural segment, the city at least theoretically, provides a spectrum where moving up the social ladder is much and possible. Hüseyin, while he is thinking about the businessman assaulting him, puts his son in the shoes of the businessman and realizes that moving up the social ladder might lead not only to positive results but also to negative outcomes. However, while he was living in the rural segment where there is no social class movement, while he was living in a stable social fiction, he never thought this way. With his inexperienced feelings, this incident in Istanbul where he came for his son's upward mobility showed him that such movement is both not that easy, nor 'clean' and 'meretricious' as he had imagined.

In the yard where Hüseyin and his son Ferhat lived with the other peddlers, there is another character named Dead Hunter. This person is gathering income from the bodies of dead people. Another peddler named Hamuş is against Dead Hunter, and believes that his earnings are illicit. One day when Dead Hunter brings 'baklava' (a sort of well-known Turkish dessert) to the people of the yard, he warns them not to eat it. The movie's stance regarding 'true labor' and 'false labor' differentiation is clear. Just the way the businessman character was reflected negatively and the movie showed its distanced stance towards the notion of 'capital', a labor that is 'not true' is found wrong to the same degree.

There is a dialog between Hamuş and a mystical character called Poet, who lives in the same yard and does not peddle, about the people who are forming monopolies by becoming mafia in the peddler's trade business. When Hamuş makes a statement like: "whoever has built his gang, he built it. You can only run. If we had not been brothers, we would have no bread from each other" Poet responds: "so you will also build a gang and take the bread of the others. There is something wrong with this business. If you are to eat bread, eat it together". Despite Hamuş's underlining of class-based cooperation, Poet believes that he is also envying those trying to build monopolies and for him the right way is to share the economic cake in a fair way. The movie, through the Poet character, criticizes people who used to earn their money with their labor, switching to the side of the capital in an immoral way and

blocking the way of the others who are earning their money through the same business. This situation is frequently seen within the labor class.

Hüseyin's meeting with the 'bureaucracy' class occurs when he converses into a man whom he comes across in a park. The man advises him to educate Ferhat through the exam of public boarding school. However, the officer in the public office where they apply says that for Ferhat to be able to enter in this exam, his father must have been dead. To Hüseyin's statement of "today I will register Ferhat to the public school" Remzi responds: "this guy does not have a brain". In the same way Hamuş and another kid from the neighborhood underestimate Hüseyin's desire to educate Ferhat. It is obvious that the desire to educate Ferhat, who does not even have a shoe, does not have an economic base but the point that makes one sorry is that the people from lower economic class underestimate the educational establishment. In a societal structure where money is more important than diploma, it is the thinking of the lower class that education is for the upper and middle class who are more materially under guarantee and keeping of the idea of 'what will happen when you get education' in mind. Even if the education event becomes real, what is expected is not a diploma or intellectuality, but the economic opportunities that diploma could bring. It is understandable to some extent that they prioritize economy to education in the 'absolute deprivation' state that they are in but I think that this level of extenuation and disregard of education is a situation that can only be explained through ignorance. This point of view does go no further than an endeavor to substitute a value that they do not have with another 'so to say' value, perhaps by putting 'money' as a target and value against the institute of education that they have never gone through and will never be able to go through.

Hüseyin exhibits an extremely responsible father composition. Ferhat gets caught by the police while he was trying to sell something with other kids in the neighborhood and is brought to the police station; Hüseyin gets him out of the police station. He feeds him in a restaurant and washes him in the Turkish bath. The character Poet advises Hüseyin 'not to waste this kid at the whereabouts'. The strike that knocks out Hüseyin comes from the municipal police: they come all of a sudden and pour all his goods into the sea, worse than that, they seize his peddle car. At this, Remzi's advice

is to bribe the municipal police. However, Hüseyin is too ingenuous not to know how to bribe properly; they throw him out of the municipality by beating him up.

Hüseyin is determined not to lose this fight to the city. He has now come to the state of 'make it or break it'. At the end, he gets the peddle car of another peddler and goes and stands by the marketplace. His stance is a clear manifesto towards the city and the system in the city. Hüseyin is saying 'You got my car from me, you put me in several difficulties, you did not consider me a man but here I am and here I stand'. His stubbornness does not last long; the owner of the peddle car comes to the marketplace, they have a fight, the man stabs him and kills him.

Hüseyin's 'making himself disappear' can be perceived as an indirect suicide. Hüseyin has been suppressed, despised, manhandled in social relationships, business life, in front of the state. Hüseyin, who realizes that he is already unnecessary for this 'system', makes both himself and the system happy by making himself disappear. Also from another angle, he has paved the way for his son by leaving his son without a father so that he could go to the public boarding school.

In this movie, the character that comes after Hüseyin and strengthens the scenario is Remzi. Remzi is the most negative laborer composition in the movie. Remzi warns Hüseyin about the illegal return in the marketplace. It is also Remzi who advised Hüseyin that nobody would be of any good to him except himself. At a fight that occurs in the place they stay, it is also Remzi who says: "had they given me this country for a couple days, you would have hanged 5-10 people, you should have seen it then". Again it is Remzi who gave the least while they were collecting money among themselves to give to Ferhat after Hüseyin's death. Although he is a laborer, he is someone who makes rationalist and materialist notions, which are permeated in the essences of liberalism, live in his own constitution, and he is one of the two closest persons together with Dead Hunter 'to move up the social ladder and escalate' among all the lower class people who share the same yard.

Remzi is perhaps a character that was fictionalized as the opposite of Hüseyin within the labor class. It is a possibility that while the movie attracts the attention to the

heterogeneity of the labor class through such dichotomies, it claims that Remzi is a hidden bourgeois in the laborer status. It becomes clear that Hüseyin is not a character like that when he approaches to Dead Hunter at a point when all his hopes run dry, and praises his son's reading: "you should see Ferhat reading, he reads like a motor". Dead Hunter says that Hüseyin does not have the opportunity to educate Ferhat but that an old couple is willing to adopt a son and that Ferhat is perfect suit this wish. Hüseyin, Ferhat and Dead Hunter go to the mansion of the old couple and the couple offers Hüseyin money for Ferhat. Grabbing Ferhat and run out of the place is not resourced only his concern that his son would turn into an 'object for sale', it is also his unwillingness to see his son whom he could not educate through his 'labor', to get the subject education through the power of 'capital'. In this way, it is shown that Hüseyin had a 'class consciousness' being aware or unaware of it, and makes his choice on the side of labor.

Ali Özgentürk, the director of the movie, expresses his thoughts while he was building the movie: "I wanted to heroize a 'father' that could never be a movie hero, to turn a deserted death, a deserted joy, a deserted passion to a movie .. I wanted to put an ordinary death, the texture of a lot of ordinary things in the movie and make them extraordinary". (Özgentürk, 1983:79). This understanding of cinema is appropriate to the character of societal realism movement because it is telling us about the lives of people that society does not attach importance to. As a matter of fact, it is the people of the lower class that live right in the middle of societal problems; it is the poor people you will face as long as you take notice of those societal problems and your way has to be through those societal problems if you are to shoot a movie about poor people. On the other hand, the people of the upper class have nothing to do with the societal problems; they are unaware of the societal problems, in the safe lap of money. Unemployment is not an issue for them because they were never unemployed or they never felt the necessity to look for jobs. They do not know what it means to starve because they never experienced such a thing.

The system also prepared a way full of sweet promises for the middle and lower class; its expectation from them is to forget about societal problems. This, in many ways, serves the purpose of the people of middle and lower class: the 'sweet' movies

the system prepared for them, the TV series, holiday villages, holiday packages, shopping malls, cafes, restaurants, etc. all types of consumption in abstract or concrete form, disables them to think about the problems of society and other people by keeping their minds and lives busy. This is what the system already asks for: get busy only with your own pleasure and keep your mind away from every kind of problem including your own. The people of the lower class are carried away to the luxurious life that is shown to them in the TV series and become happy by coming out of their own problems and lives, while watching the 2-3 hours TV series. This people who are eager to get away from even their individual problems are surely not expected to show tendency towards societal issues that have or have not anything to do with their class based interests.

4.5.1.2. Bir Avuç Cennet (A Handful of Heaven), 1985

In the movie **A Handful of Heaven** which was produced in 1985, we see a migrating family. In 1980's, the waves of migration were to a large extent completed and decreased, the city was now accommodating the amount of laborer it could absorb within itself. To build a squatter was no longer a task which that easy and effortless is; not only the inspections of official bodies increased but also the production of squatters had turned into an 'unearned income' phenomenon controlled by the mafia. This sociological outlook also had reflections in cinema: cinema now began to produce the movies of people who are 'now in the city' and who migrated one generation before themselves.

A Handful of Heaven, place the Emine-Kamil couple who migrated from Demirköy village of Bilecik not to a squatter, but to an old black maria that no one else but the vagabonds use. This bus would become the place where Emine and Kamil would lean on in their struggle with the city. At first, Kamil is reluctant towards the city and is more prone to go back to the village but Emine and their children Cevat and Sedef want to stay in the city. Kamil continues with his hopeless attitude toward the education of his son Cevat. To Emine's wish to register Cevat to secondary school he responds: 'what will happen if we register him'. The reply to Emine's 'he would become a man' sentence is 'nobody would become a man out of us, at the utmost he

would become a redneck'. Kamil wants to find a job for Cevat but Emine thinks that the appropriate response to the 'let us find him a job' offer is 'sit down where you are'. Kamil can no longer resist the intense desire of his wife and his son to stay in the city but when his wife bring her working to the agenda again, he scolds her again saying 'we could not even make our wife listen to us'.

The movie, in respect of cinema language from time to time throughout the movie makes a choice on the side of 'poetical realism': it gets support from the children's world. As we previously witnessed in the movie 'Yusuf and Kenan', bringing children in front of the camera softens the hard facts of the movie, brings the movie a little to the ground of a fairy tale, and the movie mauls the inner world of the audience less. Right at the opposite of the bus where the family lives in there is a neighborhood that people from the middle or upper class live. Cevat sheds light with a mirror to a girl at the balcony of one of these houses and the girl who is about the same age with him likes it. However, the girl's mother becomes uncomfortable by a family living in an abandoned bus right at the foot of the neighborhood and complains about the situation to a person on the telephone: "the boy sheds light to the house with a mirror, the woman stifled the neighborhood with smoke by washing the clothes". The woman's expression of her discomfort from the family by labeling them as 'gipsy' is actually a manifestation of her class based discomfort existing in her subconscious by using a word of ethnic humiliation. For the middle and upper class to share the same living space with the lower class is a distressful and unwelcome situation. Kamil's pumping water by buying a water pump and their turning the surrounding of the bus into a garden by fencing it, is for me should be evaluated as a praise to labor rather than the continuity of their habits from the village life. Different from the city people who has no contribution to the earth they are living on, these people coming to the city through migration put forward a concrete production for the sake of sticking with the city by planting things in the city. In the city where is the place for industry and service sector, the putting forward of things via agricultural production which is the production method of the rural segment, can be seen as a resistance to city life via the production method.

Kamil soon comes over the cowardice he feels for the city. He buys a radio, aims to buy a television too. He thinks of selling the product growing in their garden. His wife Emine tries to bring him to a milder and 'down-to-earth' point: "let us first eat our fill, then we will see". Emine continues with her restrained stance and mentions to Kamil about the necessity to find a normal and decent house before they buy a television. Despite Kamil's enthusiasm for the city, just like in *Bitmeyen Yol*, we think that he has a hesitation swinging between the village and the city. To the sentence of Enver, the cabbie that brought them to the city, 'the village lost its charm', Kamil responds 'this place has no taste either Enver' and with this sentence shows his hearts still beats for the village. Despite that, he also makes it clear that he is aiming to be permanent in this abandoned bus and aiming to spend the winter there by buying a stove.

The major concern and aim of the people migrating to the city is the establishment of a place of their own. A migration without the maintenance of a place is considered to be half and incomplete in their perspective; the migrants cannot integrate in the city (Maktav, cited from Şenol-Cantek, 1998:97). The desire of Emine to build a future for herself in the city, becomes clearer when the watcher comes and tells them that the land they live on belongs to the municipality and that the scrap that they live in also had an owner: "there is not a handful of land left without an owner, everywhere is conquered, what are we to do? Are we also not the children of this country, it is also our right". The fact that the entire city was hired by either the city people or by the migrants makes Emine who has neither capital nor a labor she could use at a job, revolt this way.

The movie also shows us that the haphazard urbanization and misguided migration will lead to very risky and problematic results for the next generations. This is also clearly seen at a fight that rose among the poor children and the rich children living in the houses at the shore for a kite. The rich children that the poor children call 'shore children', complain to the police about the poor children and the police arrives at the house of a fat boy among them. The kid that his father stands up from the dining table and walk up to him, spends the night outside. The kid steals a bike from one of the rich houses in the following days but they put the blame on Cevat. The

police arrive and bring Cevat to the police station. In the meantime, the fat boy that stole the bike brings the bike back to the rich boy but a fight arises and the fat boy stabs the boy whose bike he took.

This is also an example of how the children coming from the lower class and who lack options in front of them were pushed to crime step by step. The combination of being the son of a butcher that is short-tempered and irresponsible and the impossibilities of the lower class can leave a person who is not yet an adolescent face to face with the crime of injuring people. We can accept that both his family and his own character played a role in Cevat's not getting involved in crime. His father Kamil is already very respectful to authority and the powers of the system: when Cevat gets scared and runs away from the police when they arrive to take him, he reprimands him saying 'would one ever run away from the police'. He asks the police to 'scare him a little so that he won't do it again'. However, he does not even know if his son is actually guilty or not and indeed Cevat really did not get involved in a crime.

The watchers that say that the bus will be taken away at a time when Kamil is not home will knock their dream of 'building a life' in the city up for six. After Emine who gets on the bus just as the crane lifts the bus from where it is, Kamil this time attacks the crane operator and brings the bus back down but it does no good then to get arrested by the police. Emine, Kamil and the children build a tent exactly where the bus was and continue their 'struggle' from there.

As far as I am concerned, it is true to interpret *A Handful of Heaven* as a movie that questions the individuals relationship with the system and wants to display the overwhelmed state of the individual in front of the system. Even though it sometimes moves to the epic and utopic cinema language, we should accept this as a stylistic choice and we should approve that the questioning of the system through a family that has recently migrated to the city makes the movie more interesting. On top of this, there are other characters in the movie that can question the 'system', besides the leading characters of the movie: for example the man who entered the bus Kamil and his family lived in in the beginning of the movie as a burgler, is at the end of the

movie, one of the workers that came to lift the bus. While he was against the system and a person outside of it, he becomes involved in the 'system' as a worker. Another interesting character is the elderly woman that lives alone in a scrappy cottage in the dumping ground where the children sometimes spend their time and who continues her life with the things she gathers from the dumping ground. This elderly woman is the one who hid the fat boy in her cottage when he got involved in the stabbing issue. The taking of an elderly person staying outside the 'system' the kid that gets in trouble with the 'system' under her wing is also a choice that crystallizes the stance of the movie that is against the system. The scenario by giving space to kinds as much as it can also feeds itself from the innocent worlds of the kids that has not yet been involved in the working life, life and the system and that is not yet corrupted

The scenario also has a sex discourse running through Emine and Kamil. Emine is a woman who wants to struggle with the city and stay in the city; she wants he son to get education and she wants to work. Whereas Kamil shows more pre-modern / traditional characteristics; neither does he want Cevat to get educated, nor does he want Emine to work. He humiliates his wife saying 'why would you listen to the wife's word', even when his friend that he says he wanted to move to a normal house tells him that 'maybe if your wife works too' he is not convinced about his wife working. In this sense, we see that the movie attaches the modernist life and values to woman just as it was the case with the trio of Gelin – Dügün – Diyet. The woman defends these values, follows them, represents them and she even helps the transformation of his man. Actually Kamil also goes through a transformation with the effect of Emine from the beginning of the movie to its end. Kamil that regretted to have come to the city and wanted to go back to the village at the beginning of the movie, and Kamil that attacked the crane operator at the end of the movie is not the same person. In Marxist terms, even though there was not much change in the superstructure, meaning cultural values (it cannot be thought of expecting a 100% change from a man of this age in such a short period of time), in terms of the economic struggle in the substructure Kamil became a person who believes in his own struggle and strength.

Oğuz Makal's interpretation of the movie is “.. the family members perceive what is negative and bad for them as a natural result of the facts of life, and interiorizing the lifestyles. However, their reaction will occur when the ‘shelter’ that is the only possibility to make themselves exist, the old bus that is a heaven for them is taken from them” meaning as far as we are concerned, he claims that the characters do not have class consciousness and they are not aware that the situation they are in resulted from the class they belong to” (Makal, 1987:53). Atilla Dorsay describes his perspective about the director: “Indeed Özer, sees his persons always with an optimistic perspective. Nobody is bad in real terms, everyone has goodness, humanity, even if there is a bit. The problem, is resourced from the hard, rough self-conditions of life” (Dorsay, 1985, Cumhuriyet). Hilmi Maktav thinks that the director is following a line that makes class based differentiation and struggle trivial. He estimates that the real class struggle is missed by becoming distant from the ‘harsh’ spectacle of life by involving the children to the scenario. On top of this, he thinks that the director advocates in the movie the thought of being able to resist the system with an individual struggle (Maktav, 1998:98). ‘An individual struggle’, is what is conceptually expected of the societal structure of the 80’s. In a world where everything becomes individualized, it is natural for the struggle of a person of the lower class to become individualized but what should be criticized is that it is not the case. It is important and good that there is struggle and not giving up against the system but what is better it to have this struggle collectively. Maybe, the people that were unable to find that collective feeling and support from the people at equal state, but who is still eager to continue their struggle, was becoming obliged to such an individual struggle and they were left alone in such struggle. This situation is one of the worst results of the mentality of ‘saving oneself’ that became dominant after 80’; to be left alone in the struggle.

4.5.2. The Change of Urban Poor

4.5.2.1. Faize Hücüm (Rush on Interest), 1982

The laborer character comes in front of us in the form of a retired officer in our next movie Attack to Interest. Kamil is a person who spent his years working for the state,

nevertheless, could only buy a house in a neighborhood that can be called a squatter just like most of the officers. Saniye is his wife, Nesrin and Tülin are his daughters. Nesrin's husband Ömer is in jail for political reasons, Tülin is engaged to Murat who does pedlar's trade.

The societal phenomenon that the movie brings Kamil come across with is the issue of 'brokerage'. At the beginning of the 1980's the brokerage phenomenon, which benefited from the inexistence of a chosen government and that penetrated to the societal life through the legal gap it found, was promising the masses a sweet life. Within the capitalist system, the most important factor is that to keep the lower and the middle classes as connected and motivated to the system and for doing that, giving them such a belief that they can become a member of the higher income group one day. Even though it is not the case, the fairy tale the system tells to the lower and middle class is that the system is a sea of opportunities and if they make use of the possibilities well and if they work hard enough, it is a matter of time to find themselves in the higher class.

The repetition of this fairy tale through brokerage madly mobilized the masses of Turkey at that time. Nevertheless Kamil, the hero of our movie, remained deliberate in depositing to the broker at the beginning. Towards his wife's tendency, he put his foot down by saying 'I do not sell my house'. The case which convinced Kamil in the time and made him lower his guard was the interest of the people around him, towards the brokerage process. His neighbors' selling their Mercedes' and depositing to the bank, almost all of his colleagues' becoming a part of this surrounding and more than that, it is the entire society's being carried by the desire for 'hot money'. Learning that the Ministry of Finance officially approved these institutions means the completion of the puzzle in Kamil Bey's mind. For a person who has retired from the state, for a person who recognizes state as the highest authority, the approval of the ministry which is an institution of the state is the most important piece of this puzzle.

He deposits the 1 million he receives by selling his house to the broker and the company pays him 82 thousand liras monthly!! Even if this interest rate that exceeds 8% is not a rate that any financial organization can pay in the long-run, the people

depositing to the broker do not think hard on this point. It can be understood that Kamil Bey's prioritized target is the desire to provide welfare to his family that he could not provide before. Kamil Bey's feeling of merely 'taking it as his duty' of such desire can be attributed to his status of official duty for long years; besides, despite the fact that he has worked for long years and received so many letters of appreciation, we can evaluate it as another reason that he did not receive the material equivalent of his labor and service. At the bottom of this manipulation of the society and his family as an extension of the society lies the accessibility of the middle and lower class to the practices that has been coming down the society level by level since 1960's and which is no longer the practices specifically of the rich class.

For example, his wife Saniye, washes the clothes in her hand; she does not have a washing machine at home. Their daughter Tülin mentions about the color TV that recently came out. Envy to a luxurious life with high standards is seen in his wife Saniye as well, probably by the effect of her female friends and the general tendency of the society. One of the first things that Kamil Bey did after he deposited his money to the broker is to buy his wife a washing machine. They move to a proper apartment flat after the squatter style houses. Despite the fact that the status of 'officer' is generally accepted as middle class in the society, Kamil Bey could only move up to the middle class from the lower class with this move in his life.

The psychological effects of Kamil Bey's depositing his money to the broker are almost more than its economic benefits. The way Kamil walks in the street was even changed. He thinks that he has got rid of the feeling of guilt because of the welfare he could not build in long years, with one move in his life. This desire to 'prove himself' that he lives in his subconscious recurs again one evening while they are sitting at home: Kamil says he had been working to provide his wife a comfortable life. He also adds to his words that at the time the ministry inspector praised him and that he had received 22 certificates of appreciation in 30 years. In the meantime he is aware that these do not worth any money, he attempts to measure his own manhood with the 1 million liras he deposited to the broker.

At this point it would be wise to bracket Kamil's daughters Nesrin and Tülin. Nesrin and Tülin are designed as the representative of two lines where one is praised by the scenario and the other is criticized. Nesrin is a person who reads, has interest to politics, who enters into employment agency and who earns her life through 'labor'. Whereas Tülin is a woman who envies consumption goods and the rich life, became addicted to TV with her mother. Even the men of Nesrin and Tülin are in builds that complement their personalities: Nesrin's husband Ömer is in jail and most probably this imprisonment stems from political reasons. However, Tülin's fiancé Murat is doing peddler's trade and is a person who has full confidence in his commercial capability. Murat, who is constantly dreaming of expanding his business, expresses his objectives to Tülin in an evening when he visits Tülin's in his following words: "If I can rent a shop bazaar, I would fill it with goods. Peddler's trade is not a suitable business for me, the installment of the car gets hardly paid. Only if I could buy a land..". Kamil's candidate son in law Murat, fully adopts the competition based mentality and rules of the free market order, to the extent that even while he is driving he implements them by driving fast: "If you cannot go someone one better you are done. You should see whom I will go one better once I hire the shop. I will go everybody one better then, I won't listen".

The scenario aims to produce a dichotomy between labor and capital through these two women. Contrary to Nesrin's labor based life that has a certain economic limit but is respectful, the world of thought of Tülin was deployed that is based on capital (her fiancé), who aims to become a housewife instead of working, that shares with her fiancé the dream of a life that asks for luxury, and a life without an economic top limit. The movie, not only uses contrast modeling in economic foundations, but also carries it to the ideological-cultural superstructure: Contrary to Nesrin who has a political stance, who constantly reads books and who has a critical mind towards life, Tülin, who does not have any interest towards politics, who constantly watches TV, was lost in the spirals of life.

Even though Kamil Bey thinks that Nesrin has done wrong by marrying Ömer, in some respects, he is just like his daughter. He turns off the TV while Saniye and Tülin is watching and says: "since we bought this demon thing, we could not spend a

couple sentences to each other". We can see this sentence as the early finding of media obstructing communication within the family. This group that received the individuals to themselves started with the TV and became more severe in our day with the internet, was at the time recently becoming involved in Turkey. Besides that, the results of the trend of brokerage have penetrated so deeply in the society that it could even find a place for itself in children's world. When the friend of the family's child Yılmaz asks for 20 liras, he offers to pay it back the day after as 30 liras including interest.

It is again media that woke Kamil Bey and the lower and middle class who deposited money to the broker from the sweet dream they lived for a short while. It is again the media itself who made these people come back to 'real' life, just the same way media made all this mass eager to live a rich life, turn to the brokers via its commercials. The 'brokers are running' news that Yılmaz read to his father is the messenger to the approaching inevitable ending. Kamil Bey goes to the brokerage company that he deposited his money. The mass that convened in the brokerage company is curious about the consequence of their money. The show the broker performed in his own office is the most influential scene of the movie and the breaking point. The broker has spread over on his table an amount of money that those people have never seen in their life and welcomes his customers in this way. This show of strength gives the messages of 'I am very rich', 'this company is very strong' and 'your money is in safe hands' at the same time. The banker carries his one man show one step further and says: 'whoever wants to withdraw his money, can take it back'. The show of strength had served the purpose, the concerned lower class applauds this show of 'richness', even an elderly man tries to kiss the hand of the broker despite the fact that the broker is younger.

Despite what he has seen, Kamil is still concerned and angry. Indeed, the next time he goes to the company he learns that the payments are seized. The company officers claim that the payments will be effected within 1-2 days but Kamil, slowly starts to realize the ending that is approaching to him.

Maybe Kamil, get involved in a game that he should not have played as a laborer. Especially in societies like Turkey where capitalism is adopted afterwards and by import, meaning in an environment where the individuals are not legally protected enough against the economic organizations, where the free market understanding is perceived to be 'wild capitalism' and even as a 'system where everybody rip the other off when the opportunity arises', Kamil Bey and similar people are very vulnerable and weak against the strong actors of the market. We can observe the size of the brokerage phenomenon with the dreams it sold to people when we think about a sum of 200 billion money that concerns half a million people. The only response of the victims from the lower class could give to the 'system' was to plunder the company. The only thing left to Kamil Bey from this plunder, is the door.

At the end of the movie, the family in a way comes back to where they started by moving out of the nice apartment flat they lived in to a poor house in Tarlabası. The biggest result remaining from this adventure is Kamil Bey who lost his physical and mental health. This 'destruction' of Kamil Bey within the societal life reminds us of Hüseyin at The Horse who merely made himself disappear by making himself killed. Had this movie continued, we would most probably see Kamil Bey's son in law Murat to turn into a 'successful' and 'earning well' businessman. Just as Murat is the person the system wanted to see, Kamil was the one it could not stand, that it threw out of itself.

If we look from the view of capitalist mentality, Kamil would be disregarded and humiliated. This mentality can perceive Kamil as 'passive', 'unsuccessful' and 'clumsy' but in our perspective Kamil is a person that continued his life through labor and never shifted to the side of 'capital', not even once. The reason for him not being able to reach the outcome he wanted is not his clumsiness but his honesty. This situation he got in, is the expected outcome of him denying his existence and following the enthusiasm the society imposes on him. Kamil tried to play in a space where he does not belong to, a game that is unknown to him, with its rules he is a complete stranger of.

4.5.2.2. Yoksul (Poor), 1986

Another movie that catches the eye in the 80's, **Poor**, happens in an inn in Istanbul's Eminönü neighborhood. The character Yoksul that gave his name to the movie is a laborer that works in the tea house of the inn, he looks after the tea service. Everybody in the inn undermines him, and most of the time they call him 'bud'. Leyla who works at a textile workshop in the inn is his fiancée. Almost all people in the inn have Anatolian origin. The inn has a cacophonical order within itself with factors such as the businessmen who constantly try to collect their debts from each other or from the others, workshops that produces non-stop day to night etc.

The offer that would change Yoksul's poverty and his way as a laborer comes from Kerim Bey. Kerim Bey is aware that Süleyman, the boss of Yoksul is rubbing the property owners of the inn blind through knavery. Kerim Bey's suggestion to Yoksul in this context is to report Süleyman to the property owners and to run the tea house with Yoksul. Süleyman is a person who interiorized all the negative, dirty and illegal sides of free market. He tells Yoksul 'now the market is free tiger, no bread without getting tired'. He is trying to sell even the tea left at the bottom of the pot, looking for ways to decrease the number of sugars put by the side of the tea. He keeps delaying his wage dues to Yoksul. Thinking that nobody is calculating, he keeps drawing lines to the debts of the clients whenever he is free. His advice to Yoksul is as follows: "In Istanbul, you will rob blind whoever comes in front of you, buddy".

The scenario actually built this inn as a little Turkey because it is possible to find in the inn most of the daily life practices and ways of thought that developed in Turkey with the 80's. The girls working in the textile workshop keep talking about marriage whereas the boys keep talking about football pools and pick six. In most of these worker girls, there are the desires brought about by the consumer society. A merchant in the inn does fictitious export which became merely a trend in the 80's. The kids play Atari in the white appliances store, disco music is heard in the background. The workers at the textile workshop imitate the Lee Cooper commercial. All these are a chain of initials for Turkey as well as factors encouraging people of the day to capitalist mentality.

Yoksul is so to say a partner to the tea house with a share of zero point something. However, this situation is not an obstacle for him to receive a threat of lay off from Süleyman mentioning about the unemployed population in the country when he says long in the bathroom. Yoksul heroically defends his labor: “none of them can do it like I do”. In the next service Süleyman sets the clock for Yoksul but surely at a tempo he cannot accomplish, so Yoksul drops the glasses and breaks them. The point that the ways of Yoksul and Süleyman separates is when Süleyman hits him because of the teapot he burns: this point is also when Yoksul says goodbye to his laborer character. He scolds Süleyman with rage: “you cannot hit me, I am not the servant of your father. I cannot work under these circumstances. I do not have insurance, we always inculcate to minimum wages, it is not clear if we are an errand boy or a night watchman”. After this fight Yoksul who goes directly to Kerim Bey informs him that he accepts his offer but Kerim Bey disappoints him to some extent. Kerim Bey suggested him 20% of the shares and he leaves it with 25% at last. He explains this again with the free market rules: “this is the way these businesses go, whoever inserts capital wins”.

Yoksul must have understood upon this experience that the capitalist mentality is applicable to everyone exploiting it so he starts to evolve towards Süleyman’s line himself. He does not give the glasses outside because they do not come back, he makes the teas he sell lighter and decreases the number of sugars he puts by them. Yoksul who has not yet taken over the tea house is in a way doing a traineeship of the free market implementations before he takes over the property of the tea house.

When Yoksul mentions to a worker woman about their engagement plans with Leyla, the woman teases him saying ‘we listened so much’, ‘obviously, you hit the money from somewhere’. Yoksul’s response is: ‘eee, surely we won’t stay like this forever’. There is a hidden desire to ‘move up the social ladder’ in this response of Yoksul as well. If one reason for this is his awareness that he needs money to maintain the things he desired, the possible other reason is the targets towards consumption that the society of the day puts forward.

When an official notification arrives to Süleyman to empty the tea house, Yoksul goes and informs Kerim Bey of the situation. When he responds to a sentence of Kerim Bey as ‘with pleasure’, Kerim Bey tells him: ‘there is no more with pleasure son, you are the boss’. What Kerim Bey tries to do is to give him a sense and attitude of a boss. He is trying to ‘bourgeois’ a laborer character and try to transform him into the concept of ‘petit bourgeoisie’. Yoksul also likes the state of transition from being a laborer to becoming an owner of a production mean. What he likes is more than having larger material possibilities, is to become higher in terms of social status and that people would now not be able to call him humiliating names.

Despite all these developments that could be considered to be positive for Yoksul, his desire to marry Leyla would not lead to the result he wanted because Leyla runs away with a contractor. Leyla had already shown that Yoksul is not the one she was looking for by remaining distant to the engagement issue but extorting money from Yoksul. Leyla, who is under the control of the consumer society feeling just like many women from the lower class, is probably thinking that by choosing a contractor who has money that Yoksul can never earn in his life, she has not only reached at things that are appealing to her taste, but also has taken her future life (so to say) under guarantee.

The movie ends with Yoksul elevating to the level of a ‘boss’ and with arabesque songs that presents the chaotic sociological structure of the period. The most important lesson we derive from the movie is that the system repeats itself. Even if Süleyman goes away from the tea house Yoksul replaces him by becoming a Süleyman. Scenario in that respect shows that it does not believe in the lower economic class. In Turkey of the 80’s, the poor people became by far distanced from the conscious and target of ‘changing the system’, which began to develop among the lower class in 60’s and reached to its peak in 70’s. The poor person that keeps becoming individualized and losing his capacity and will to act collectively, views his state of poverty ‘as a temporary state that needs to be endured’ and seeking the way to move to higher classes by maintaining spare money. The story of Yoksul is like a summary of the change the lower class went through from the beginning of the 80’s until its middle.

As far as I am concerned the give up of the lower class from the ‘class struggle’ that easily can either be explained by the nonexistence of class consciousness throughout our societal history or by the quick assimilation and adaptation to the societal change that occurred. This type of vigilance that is known as ‘peasant craftiness’ or ‘East craftiness’ within the society aims at a chameleon like adaption to each trend the society gets in or to each circumstance it has and the exploitation of the opportunities within the system to its maximum. These kinds of people acting with a Machiavellian reflex can climb up the social ladder very fast because there is no moral norm they remain attached to and they make use of all gaps in the legal system formally. We have seen the example of this prototype in *Gurbet Kuşları*, with Haybeci character.

The transition that Yoksul went through is parallel to the transition the society of Turkey went through. The laborer character that at the beginning scolded Süleyman with rage by saying: ‘I cannot work under these circumstances. I do not have insurance, we always inculcate to minimum wages’, has turned into a person that gives order to the person working by him to decrease the amount of sugar put by the tea at the end of the movie. We cannot explain this with concepts like ‘learning entrepreneurship’, ‘learning to be a boss’ because Yoksul’s entrepreneurship lacks any kind of moral content, just like most of the entrepreneurs in Turkey. In my own perspective the reason for this is the perception of entrepreneurship in Turkey as ‘swindling’ meaning instead of the capital owner’s to put something ‘forth’, ‘produce’ and reach its material-emotional benefits, it is the thought of reaching to the maximum profit by taking the money of as much as possible people, by robbing as much as people blind. There is no presentation of production or difference as it is the case with Western capitalism. Besides, an employer model that complies with the legal necessities of economic life, pays his taxes, pays the insurance of his employee is very rare and is an example you cannot face with especially in this inn. Yoksul is also aware that he needs to be like Süleyman in order not to disappear in the system and to be able to play the game by its rule.

The movie claims that the laborer people are now an ‘individual’ and it will not give a reflex of ‘class’ within the neo-liberal suggestions. This claim is absolutely true.

The breaking of the class consciousness of the labor class makes it an easy mark for the capital class. Further to that because the poor class has become hopeless about the labor struggle (surely with the condition that the laborers that never believed in struggle are also added to the calculation) it made itself believe that the only way is to become bourgeois and to accept the mentality and tendencies of the capital class.

This class unconsciousness is evolving the poor people to the aim of getting rid of this poor state they are in as soon as possible and to converge to a lot of money rather than strengthening the status and rights one is in. The adoption of the lower and middle classes to the characteristics to upper class, the ambition to become rich, live in luxury and to bring their life standards further, shows that the neo-liberal politics that had been implemented since the beginning of the 80's had reached a success. Another thought that can be expressed in this subject, is as we have underlined before, that the lower and middle classes already lacked a class based characteristic but throughout the leftist climate of 60's and 70's some of the people of this level have been subjected to an 'axis shift'.

The factors that threaten the class based peace and harmony of the lower economic class exist in the capitalist system. One of them is that the 'moving up the social ladder' cause put in front of the lower economic class is giving harm to the class consciousness of the lower class. To think that they will not remain in the lower class in their entire lives brings a fictive bridge of hope to the people belonging to the lower income group but if we look at the reality in percentage little amount of people can make this happen. Another point is that the ideological means such as media, educational establishment has a content and tendency that serves for the capital class. In this way, it can attract the lower economic class to a life and targets that do not belong to it. Indeed, the envy of the lower economic class to the lives of the people of higher income group, the effort to build a prosperous life within its limits by the effect of the patterns of 'consumer society' are all results of these tendencies (Öngen, 2002:20). The continuously increasing welfare of the lower economic class and the social state assistance has created an effect that decreased the struggle with the system and killed actuality. This situation is more common in the developed Western

societies; the actuality of labor throughout the 19. century, has been into a period that continuously lost its momentum throughout the 20. century.

4.5.2.3. Düttürü Dünya (Skimpy World), 1988

Düttürü Dünya, which is the last movie we will analyze within the 80's, reflects us in an epic way Dütdüt Mehmet who is a clarinet player from the lower class, with the 'music' notion it includes and with its naive cinema language. Dütdüt Mehmet is living in one of the squatter neighborhoods of 1980's Ankara that leans towards Ankara Castle, together with his wife Gülsüm, his daughters Mükerrerem and Fatma and his mentally disabled son Doğan. Mehmet works at a night club in Ulus, which is walking distance from his house. Mehmet composes his own songs and living with the hope that his songs will sell some day and he will earn a lot of money. While Mehmet is already living in economically insufficient conditions, the destruction of the squatter house he rented by the contractor comes up to the agenda, indeed, the owner of the house is his wife's brother Osman!! Osman finds him a second job close to the ministry he works at as a janitor so to say in order to make him economically move up the ladder: he is to fill lighters with gas.

As he is elderly of age and as he does not know the job, he cannot fulfil the lighter business; as he cannot sleep well, he constantly falls asleep. He goes late both to the night club he works at night and to the lighter business he works at day and one day the real owner of the lighter buffet Hamdi fires him and hires one of his fellow townsman in his place. Mehmet's next stop is the construction site and it was again Osman that found him this construction worker business. This situation is at one point is a loss of status in the lower class, Mehmet already finds the situation he is in odd. As a matter of fact, even while he was filling the lighters with gas, he made a lot of effort so that nobody from the night club would see him. However, Mehmet also gets laid off from his job at the construction site. After this, the only thing Mehmet would come across is the engineering vehicle that comes to destroy their house. While the house is destroyed, Mehmet plays his clarinet, the neighborhood starts dancing. At the end of the movie, Mehmet plays the clarinet in the night club and

everybody he met in his life dances together (imaginary scene building). Mehmet comes to Ulus playing the clarinet and disappears this way.

Burçak Evren evaluates Mehmet as a person who: “.. goes back and forth between a craftsman and an artist, trying to strengthen his labor that he attaches to his breath with the songs that he believes will sell a lot in the future..” The movie is in the eyes of Evren a ribbon that shows us: “.. the fling worlds of the people that gets depressed, cornered, grappling with despair by the struggle to earn a living to the extent that comes down to disregard ..” (Evren, 1990:114-115).

Mehmet is not happy with the social status he is in not only economically but also socially; he is more decent in comparison to the place he works at and the neighborhood he lives in. This emotion of him becomes more clear when he opposes to Cabbar, the police of his daughter as ‘falling to the night club’, after she runs away from home. Mehmet defends his situation as ‘we are working at the night club too’ but he is aware that most people underestimate the night club. When Mehmet started the construction business, to the worker who tells him ‘work, brother, work’, he says ‘probably I will start working as a gravedigger after this’ and by saying this he is expressing with a joke the distress he feels by moving to a job with lower social status. However, Mehmet was aiming his status getting higher instead of getting lower; which did not occur.

Mehmet at first has hopes from the lighter business: when he receives 10 thousand liras the first day and comes to his cold house in a winter day he says: ‘burn the wood, from now on money will come from the lighter business’. But he quickly understands that this is not the correct job for him and when he quits the job, he underestimates the lighter business. Apart from this, Mehmet is also underestimating the adjective ‘laborer’: just as many laborers in the 80’s did, because these people find the class consciousness and class struggle insignificant. The only status Mehmet gives value is his ‘artist’ status. He wants to work, get higher, earn money and prove himself this way. However, being a musician is also a type of labor; Mehmet is already in the identity he runs away from and he finds insignificant and he is earning his life attached to it.

When his wife tells him ‘had you been a man and rented a large house’, Mehmet responds ‘that will happen too once my songs come to the market one by one’. Actually we cannot blame Mehmet for his desire to move up the social ladder because the living standards of the lower class in Turkey, especially the lower class of the squatter environment are way below the conditions of the lower class of the developed countries of the West. Mehmet, who wants to save his family from the squatter houses whose conditions do not comply with the necessities of the era they are in and to human honor and who wants to move to a house that has the ‘should be’ style is very much excused and right in his wish. Mehmet’s wife also tried to support him by going to cleaning but due to her illness she has not been able to work for a while. The daily fee of a cleaning lady is 6 liras but the house they would like to rent with its two rooms and combi boiler is around 100 thousand liras! It is not only Mehmet who wants to move up the social ladder in the squatter environment. For example, the wife of Cabbar the police and the friend of Gülsüm, Neriman, ran away from home. It is surely not difficult to guess that this runaway stems from a husband and a squatter environment that give no hope and signal of change with respect to her life in the future.

I believe that the concept of ‘saving oneself’ is a notion the 80’s added to our societal culture. However the point that should busy us is the people’s targeting this not collectively but by thinking of only themselves and their families. The lower class people that were taken hostage by being broken apart from the class emotion by the egocentrism and egoism, are having great hopes from the realization of possibilities that are not likely such as ‘having an album’ or ‘winning the lottery’ instead of applying to class based and organization based movements.

In an open society, the system inserts in front of the individuals aims such as ‘becoming rich’, ‘reaching fame’, ‘feather one’s nest’. As a matter of fact, the number of people that achieves these goals is really limited but this little number of examples is presented to the society via exaggeration. However, the severe competition between the unequal distribution of opportunities and capabilities and capitalism, prevents the hopes to become real (Ergil, 1986:89).

Osman explains the jobs he found for Mehmet with the necessity of the laborer to work in more than one job: ‘you will not sleep if necessary, life is difficult tiger, work at another job at day’. The person who works as a bodyguard in the night club also approves Osman: “you cannot feed yourself with one job these days”. Osman also underestimates Mehmet’s efforts to move up the social ladder by composing songs and ‘slip through the net’: “as if he will have his album in the market, as if it will sell a lot..”. Arabesque, the sad music of the squatter environment, the music of those who could not find what they are looking for in the city that the generation before him or he migrated, also affected Mehmet’s songs. In the songs he recently composed we hear the word ‘trouble’ constantly. To his friend Rıfat’s comment of ‘it will sell’, Mehmet responds ‘it will sell like bread and cheese’ and then he explains ‘you should make this nation cry’.

Osman that the scenario presents us as a different lower class character is a person that is ‘adapted to the system’, ‘fixer’ and ‘functional’. Osman is the person who put Mehmet both in the lighter and the construction business. Mehmet goes to Osman to complain after he was fired from both jobs. Osman both has an ‘East craftiness’ that is compatible with the system within the lower class and also in a fox like state that is capable of staying alive all the time. As a person who has been working as a janitor for 16 years relays his experiences to Hamdi who started working in the ministry as a janitor as a permanent staff from being a lighter: “you should never make your stance clear, whoever is the government, you will act as if you are on their side” and then counts how many ministers, how many undersecretaries came and gone to the ministry in the past 16 years.

It is compatible with the societal realities that the scenario shows both Mehmet and Osman in a similar willingness to get higher even though they are from the lower class because there are plenty of both models in the lower class. The difference between them is that despite Osman’s full cooperation, Mehmet is very incapable at producing itself any income other than playing the clarinet. Mehmet is actually a very good clarinet artist, when he really wants to play, he makes the customers pour flowers on top of his head. However, it is unlucky that he cannot maintain the survival of himself and his family by playing the clarinet. Mehmet has no issues like

‘opposing the system’. While he is in the lighter business on of the women going to the demonstration asks him to fill her lighter. These women are shouting slogans by hitting the pot caps to the pots saying ‘let the empty pots play, enough, life should get inexpensive’. When the women ask Mehmet why he did not send his wife to the demonstration, Mehmet says ‘would life get inexpensive by playing the empty pots’. The women respond “it will, if everybody plays, you will see how it will”.

From this scene it is understood that Mehmet lacks class consciousness. Just like many laborers of the 80’s, Mehmet’s issue is to have a lot of money by moving up the social ladder and provide his family with a prosperous life. For this purpose Mehmet tries to become Osman just as Yoksul became Süleyman in the movie *The Poor*: While he is doing the lighter business he steals money from the daily earning but the owner of the buffet, Hamdi understands it and this is one of the reasons why he got fired. Osman chews him out on this subject saying ‘had we told you to get a little amount of the money we did not tell you to grab the entire sum’. However, Mehmet is closely tied to the notion of honesty of the labor class at the beginning of the movie: when he sends his mentally disabled son to find fagot to light the stove his wife opposes saying ‘he might get the wood in front of somebody’s house’ but Mehmet responds ‘my son wouldn’t take it, my son would not take what belongs to others’, he expects even his mentally disabled son not to steal.

Mehmet is a person that avoids politically conflicting with the system. Aunt Hafize, whose grandson is in jail for political reasons, complains to Mehmet for them not showing her son to them, the reason for this is the rebellious behavior of his son to the judge. Mehmet says ‘your son did not settle down yet, would you ever oppose a judge’. Actually this sentence is also an example of the laborer character that melted in the system day by day and lost his conscious apart from the system. In societies like Turkey, the lower class that has been cringing with embarrassment in relation to the economic impossibilities in front of bureaucracy that is one of the two main dominating classes, has become an extension of the system day by day since the beginning of the 80’s. The most important reason for Mehmet and his similar to be afraid of the overwhelming side of political /bureaucratic mechanisms, is possibly the effects of September 12 that has still not cooled down. The torture and human

rights violations that was displayed after September 12, also has its share in the evolution of this fear. The lower class has perceived this anti-democratic environment that developed after the coup d'état as a warning for 'not struggling with the state and stayed away from concepts like 'class consciousness' and 'class struggle' in order to avoid such struggle.

Nevertheless, in class cooperation is more than a choice but an obligation for the poor people. We witness this obligation when the one mandarin orange that Osman gave to Mehmet's little daughter Fatma is eaten. The kids start fighting with each other for a single mandarin orange: first Mehmet takes the mandarin orange and eats a slice, then he gives it to Fatma and Doğan, Doğan also shares it with Mükerrerem. The same sharing and cooperation is seen when the contractor destroys their house: the people that they have close ties with in the neighborhood share the family members until they find a permanent location. This state of cooperation that also somewhat stems from the forcing of the economic impossibilities, is the only way the squatter people could find to survive. Thus, even if they politically avoid to get involved in it and even if it occurs sociologically without them knowing, they are reflecting themselves the state of a 'class'.

The scenario is making a right choice by presenting Mehmet with his negative sides just as the case with Yoksul character in Yoksul film. By staying away from the cartoon characters of 'absolutely good' and 'absolutely evil' that we see in the melodramas, and its drawing of Mehmet with his positive and negative sides is compatible with the reality and is a characteristic that strengthens the stances of the movies we analyze. For example when Mehmet comes to the stage with the star performer Serap in the night club, he intentionally hits the wrong note just for the sake of an opposition. When Serap thanks to the audience at the end of the program, he says 'she is thanking as if there is anyone applauding', he also displays jealousy towards the baglama player who recently published an album saying 'even this guy is selling records'. This kind of little factors aggrandizes Dütdüt Mehmet in our minds and prevents us from seeing them as iconic characters just as it was presented in welder Mehmet in Acı Hayat by the scenario. It reminds us that nobody's character

becomes flawless by being in the lower class, that Mehmet is a person with enthusiasms and weaknesses just as everybody poor or rich.

The movie had added the concepts of ‘state’ and bureaucracy’ to the story different from the previous movies we analyzed. This connection is maintained by the character Osman. In this respect, the movie made its preference of location as Ankara the capital city which is the center of bureaucracy. We can also follow how respectful and highly reputable bureaucracy was in the 80’s over the society through Osman. When Osman visits the night club Mehmet works at to discuss with him the house issue, everybody working in the night club tells him ‘Osman Bey’. However, Osman is only a janitor in the ministry.

The ending of the movie with an epic, fairy tale like and imaginary ending stems from the movie’s belief that the people of the lower economic class has no place in the ‘real’ life. At the end of the same movie, just like the destruction of Mehmet’s house, the systems sees it too much for the poor to even have a house to live in, and does not provide him with another income that would finance another house after his house was destroyed.

4.5.3. Slums (Gecekondu) in 1980s

4.5.3.1. Bir Yudum Sevgi (A Sip of Love), 1984

Our study moves us to a movie that is not much known in Turkish cinema but actually one of the most significant examples. **A Sip of Love** is a show that has the love of Aygül and Cemal in the display but at the background perfectly presents the lower class of Turkey society. The movie of Atıf Yılmaz produced in 1984 expresses the squatter environment in a way that most of the time gets closer to a documentary in terms of realism and sensitivity.

The main dynamic of the movie at the beginning, is the lock up of the two lead characters in the social relationships network they are in. Aygül is a woman with 4 kids; her husband Cuma is a slowpoke, sluggish character who was incapable of holding a job for a long time, who is not eager to work. Cemal is working in the

factory as a worker; he has an unhappy marriage with the daughter of his aunt Nezaket. Their mother and father are also living with them. Cemal is having an affair with a woman called Feride who lives in the neighborhood; therefore, his mother and Nezaket are paying effort to make him become devoted to his house again by casting spells over him.

One of the first factors that the scenario shows us is the sexual dissatisfaction Aygül and Cemal has from their partners. I believe that *A Sip of Love* is one of the first movies where the sexual life of the lower class is 'critically' approached. Throughout the continuing scenario we see that until then the societal norms forced the individuals to continue their marriages 'no matter what the circumstances are', phenomenon like cheating are never considered to become real, within the squatter environment that is being inspected by the conservative criteria the things actually did not work the way the remaining society thinks. The scenario touches upon a confidential point which is 'woman sexuality'. Especially in the squatter environment, this motive hiding behind the more covered clothing fully comes out in the women's gathering that occurs in the house of a wanton woman called Didar; Didar is instructing them about sexual issues in her own way.

The astute character of Aygül is seeking a way out of the spiral that she is in and that is drowning her. Aygül, who is aware that this exit is only possible if she maintains her economic freedom, turns towards the closest option that she thinks is the most appropriate and decent place for a woman: the factory close to their neighborhood. Cemal who works in the same company tells her that woman workers will be employed and this is the beginning of them getting closer at least subconsciously. Aygül's friend's response to the situation as: 'if I dare, mine would surely kill me', tells us keeping in mind the surrounding environment and circumstances, how 'big' and 'important' is the step that Aygül is about to take.

As a matter of fact this is not the first time Aygül meets working life. She and her friend are doing per item business for a small production center. The person who is receiving their work tells them not to complain about the money they receive, that these works are now done by the big factories and that soon this production center

will be closed. This situation can be seen as the reflection of the businesses with big capital that keeps increasing their economic volume and societal sphere of influence to the squatter space. Not only do they not let little businesses to keep running, they are also making the people of the squatter environment obliged to work for themselves.

The belief of Nezaket and her mother in law that Cemal has spell on him is an example to the metaphysical espousal commonly seen in the squatter environment. The constant thinking that there are 'unseen' reasons to the solutions to an existing problem, proves us that cognitive thinking and the phenomenon of modern education are not notions that are common in the squatter environment. Nezaket on one hand started to doubt that there is something between Cemal and Aygül. His own mother and father are also on the side of Nezaket in front of Cemal. While his mother says Cemal 'she is the daughter of my sister man, have I brought her from the village to break her heart, be ashamed of your build', his father jumps on him saying 'you could not mix your wife to the women in the city did you, would you like it better if she uncovered her head, her ass man, ha'. The reflection of Cemal's family to him, a conservative reflex that advocates the continuity of the family, just as it is expected of them, shows us that they think the norms in the squatter environment should not be violated.

The man Nezaket and her mother in law goes for the spell, picks on Aygül and harasses her claiming that he is Cuma's friend, makes Aygül reprimand Cuma: "I gave up waiting for you to bring bread home, at least protect your honor. I got employed in the factory as a worker, for your information". Aygül's expectation from Cuma is to become a husband just the way a man becomes a husband in the squatter environment. Cuma's incapability to fill in this status and the dominant character of Aygül shows that their marriage is slowly approaching to an end.

Aygül's transfer from the traditional squatter environment to the partially 'modern' factory environment is a revolutionary step for her life. The woman workers in the factory do not wear clothes like baggy trousers that reflects village, they eat in the cafeteria in fixed menu. The factory is a platform where these people who have rural

roots are modernized through working life. In this platform, the first days of Aygül are difficult; at work she remains slower than the other woman, a male worker attempts to harass her. At that time when Aygül felt materially and emotionally desperate, it is not difficult to guess the role Cemal played in her world of meaning. As a matter of fact, Cemal also embraces her subconsciously.

Aygül quickly adapts to the modernist steps factory life brings: she gives her child to the kindergarten in the factory, her frequency of head scarf usage comes down, she starts to work at night shift. In the meantime, the gossip of Cemal and Aygül's relationship becomes widely spread among both Cemal's and Aygül's friends. This is actually a relationship model they live in their subconscious which they cannot confess to each other, so to say Cemal is acting like an elder brother to Aygül.

For Aygül, her divorce process from Cuma starts when her son Şener gets sick and Cuma leaves him alone; this is the final straw. Aygül leaves her home taking her kids with her. Cuma's brother reproaches Cuma saying "blatantly you engrossed your life to the factory tiger, you could not say don't go". It is clear that Cuma's brother perceives the factory as the representative of modern life and interprets it as a negative phenomenon. In this sense, it is possible to claim that while Aygül opposes the pre-modern family relationships where divorce is never approved, she also gets the support of the 'factory' concept which belongs to the modern life.

On the other hand, Nezaket and her mother in law, try to make Cemal jump over nakedly an incense 100 times, by the advice they receive from the man who previously picked on Aygül and whom they consider to be 'clergyman'. This offer unveils his bleeding wound: "what would you know besides spells? Shame on you. No talking, no communication, no humanity". Cemal is living within his family the 'miscommunication' problem which is a natural part of city life. His wife's incapability of satisfying him as a human, his own parent's advocacy of his wife to Cemal, turned him into a lonely man that nobody within the family understands.

Aygül's decision of divorce is surely not a choice that would easily and respectfully be accepted by the environment she lives in. Indeed, after she moved to another

house, Cuma's brother's wife and other female relatives come to visit her to convince her to go back to her marriage. Cuma sends Aygül 'lip paint' (that is how Cuma defines lipstick) and head scarf but Aygül scolds the women coming to her house. At the following step, Cuma, Cuma's brother and his wife bust Aygül's house altogether and ask her to come back to Cuma but Aygül walks up to them with a knife. At that moment Cuma's brother's wife tells her things reminding her of the gossips on her relationship with Cemal and her violation of the conservative norms: "you will easily play the harlot won't you, don't think we didn't hear". Aygül responds in a way she shows that she is aware of the fact that she cannot beat these people without opposing the norms: "I am a prostitute, is there anything you want to say".

The interpretation of Aygül's becoming closer with Cemal as 'prostitution' is the disapproval of the woman leaving the house in pre-modern man-woman relationships, her desire to get a divorce and her thought of starting a new relationship. The woman is expected to protect the family and maintain its continuity. The squatter people who migrated from rural areas to the city, have also exactly moved the norms they have in social relationships and moral understanding to the city. We can accept that with the next generations these moral standards will be eroded day by day but to get rid of these norms entirely is only possible by getting rid of the squatter space entirely because these norms are prerequisite for the squatter space which can be seen as the extension of village in the city.

One phenomenon that the movie displays which is seen rarely in the lower class is the 'dominant and astute' woman model. We see this when Aygül slowly seduces Cemal. Despite the fact that the sexuality and existence of woman is at a level of without any exceptions is accepted as the extension of man in squatter culture, Aygül is a woman who does not and cannot accept being an extension. She chooses the man she pleases, she presents her love and attention to him, actually she opens her emotions to Cemal with a dream she has not seen. In an environment where such an action is not tolerated, the quixotic attitude Aygül displays turns into a move that works for her own benefit.

The next assault to the quixotic attitude happens when Nezaket, Cemal's brother and sister bust the factory at rush hour and try to beat Aygül. They are not content with that. Nezaket and her mother in law bust Aygül's house and they stone the house. These aggressive attitudes of both Cuma's and Cemal's family do not only stem from the effort to save two marriages that are over; there is also the attempt to restrain as a 'community' those choices the two 'individuals' put forward.

If we analyze Aygül's husband Cuma and Cemal's wife Nezaket, we can perceive them with 'loser' word; how Americans define this type of people. Cuma, while seeking a job for himself, first tries to sell lemon in the marketplace, then carries wood at the hewer and finally starts working as a waiter. While he is working at the hewer, even though the other workers do not find the money paid sufficient and walk up to the employer, Cuma receives whatever is given to him without any objections and walks away. Despite Aygül and Cemal is not shown directly in a labor struggle, because of their being astute personalities in their private life, it could be said that the scenario see the two as the opposite of the profile Cuma draws. Another point is that the scenario clearly takes the stance of modernity in front of pre-modern approach: The movie takes Aygül from Cuma's side and puts her on Cemal's side. Both of them are now working in a modern factory, in modern clothes, with insurance and knowing how much they will be paid at the end of the month, having built a social environment with workers like themselves and having fused in that environment. At the end of the movie Aygül and Cemal moves from the squatter neighborhood (probably to a neighborhood with higher welfare and more urban) and giving the audience the message that they have now completely become a part of the city life.

Nezaket has the same lowliness that Cuma has. Even though Cemal has actually long finished the marriage, she is still looking for snake spells together with Cemal's mother. This flutter could be understood because in the conservative and lower class environment nobody wants to marry a divorced woman, especially if she has kids. Cemal is the only man for her and now she has lost him. On the other hand, Aygül went from one marriage to the other, this could be interpreted as a conservative choice, however, the movie does not break away from real life by displaying a possible choice. People who were raised and still living in a conservative

environment, surely cannot live in a society like Turkish society without marriage for years. Marriage is an expected end point for them.

The scenario of the movie running on the realist line, gets praised for its realist stance: “the most interesting part of the scenario, is giving that cultural texture to its tiniest detail .. it tells the transition period culture/process very well..” (Hakan, cited from Keni, 2012:424). Yılmaz Onay also praises and encourages the movie with his following sentence: “.. it looks like it is of the quality to become a corner stone among the examples of realism that developed by getting fed by the experiments of the past despite all obstructions ” (Hakan, cited from Onay, 2012:431).

4.5.4. Hopelessly Political Struggle

4.5.4.1. Çark (The Wheel), 1987

The Wheel, another movie of the 80’s, is a movie that tries to rebuild the labor consciousness that is at the verge of extinction through blue collar workers. While there is the chasing of the workers of the right of their labor first at a glass then at a leather factory at the general progress of the movie, we watch the story of Leman and Rauf in a more private situation.

Rauf is a worker, Leman is his girlfriend who could never enter into university but she is a woman that always wanted to be at top points in her life. Leman and Rauf get married, later, one day Leman succeeds in becoming a police. Her becoming a police meant that she has to go to a deep separation with Rauf: while Leman was now a member and representative of the system, Rauf is still a man who struggles with the system through his own labor.

The movie provides us with real sights of the labor class by touching upon the ordinary economic based issues of the labor class. For example, worker Ali’s father requires kidney transplantation but this transplantation requires a serious sum of money. The workers collect the money among themselves but Ali’s father dies during the surgery.

On the other hand the boss of the business wants to lay off all the workers except Rauf, Ali and Kerim. When he realizes his wish, Rauf tells him that ‘I won’t work either unless the friends come in, if it is for them today, it will be for us tomorrow’ and proves that he is a worker that did not yet lose his ‘class consciousness’. Rauf and Kerim, and finally Ali join the other workers.

Rauf and Ali represent different point in terms of differences of opinion in the class struggle within the labor class. Rauf responds to one of the workers who says ‘maybe we can talk and come to an understanding’ meaning the boss as ‘the repayment of effort cannot be received by begging’. When the doors of the business is closed Ali’s approach is ‘break the door, get in, blow-blow-blow, pay your debts’, Ali is more prone to working than strike because of his debts. Rauf’s response to Ali is as ‘if the boss has a door we have a billion’; he is reminding Ali that he can sell his labor freely in the free market order. Whereas Ali shows Rauf the hundreds of unemployed in the street and tells him that finding a job is not for granted.

Like Ali, it is not right to blame the workers that are not as hawkish and tough like Rauf directly for not being a participant in class consciousness and struggle. The reason for their tendency to work more than to strike is the forcing of the conditions of life.

For example we understand from his sentence above that Ali has debts and he is obliged to work because he has debts. The wife of another worker complains that his husband does not have an income while he is in strike: “you are asking for food as if you left money, find a job and work”. This is the greatest advantage of the capital class in comparison to labor class: it is very difficult for a person who is earning his life through labor to stand a strike state in the long-run unless he has a real-estate, spare money or some kind of financial support. The capital class always has the money necessary for its private life and because they know about this situation of the laborers they extend the strike as much as they can so that they target to intimidate the laborers.

Rauf, will become a less strike breaker worker in another experience in another factory. Rauf and his friends from the glass factory are among the new workers brought to the factory that has a strike and the strike spotters, with the effect of the police, cannot disable these workers to enter into the factory. The address of one worker that is not yet aware that the strike is broken is perhaps the strongest scene of the movie and a summary of what is being told in the movie: “Worker brothers, friends do not get cheated. They are using us against you. There is a strike in this business. Do not be fooled by the boss. What is being done to us today, will be done to you tomorrow. Worker brothers, don’t threaten our jobs. We have children and family, we are striking to receive our right”. Upon this call, the newly arrived workers quit their jobs. The subcontractor of the factory is now saying that as per law of the day whoever pleases can work and whoever pleases can strike. Upon this fight arises among the two worker groups and the police waiting at the door of the factory has to ask for support. Even the owner of the company goes further and says that even though he has brought Rauf and his friends that morning with his truck, he says that they are their workers. However, Rauf and his friends object that and express that this is a trick of the boss. Another point that the scenario picks is the patriarchal mentality that controls the lower class. Rauf found his wife’s working odd since Lemana became a police. On top of that her being a ‘police’ increases the oddness of the situation. On top of the violation of a sexual role of violating the status of ‘housewife’ that is expected of the woman of the lower class by working of the woman, a ‘class based separation’ is added because of her becoming a police. Her wife becoming a member of the security agency that the workers come across with in May 1st or other several demonstrations, turns Rauf into a mentally busy and disturbed state. The dialog he has with his wife the first time she became a police shows that this questioning on this subject was always present: “so you are a woman police, ha / yes, I am a woman police / at home? / I am your wife at home”.

After the glass factory Rauf starts to work at a leather factory this time. The leather factory has way harder working conditions in comparison to the glass factory. The qualified workman says as if he is reminding to bear with the heavy conditions, “the people who work here should be physically strong, talking-wise weak”. The worst point of the factory is its smell. The workers are working without insurance. One of

the workers that recently started faints because of the acid. The period of time allowed for food is only half an hour. When the worker sergeant try to beat a child worker because he has fallen asleep Rauf tries to prevent it. The leather sector is probably the worst sector for a laborer to work in, the workers expresses this case to the worker sergeant with the following sentence: “no right, no law, work like an animal. If you bind an animal here it won’t even stay”. Besides the extremely unhealthy working conditions and ill treatment of the workers, the wage policy applied to the workers is also depressing: where a leather jacket is 100 thousand liras, the monthly wage of a worker is 30 thousand liras. They carry the torture they display to such an extent that they try to give two people one salary because he is a child worker and his father is disabled.

In such a negative environment in terms of the value and rights of labor, it is inevitable that Rauf would distinguish himself as a character that resists injustice. Rauf, who has lead the workers and protected them in many examples, is called to the management office after a while and warned: “look around yourself, thousands of people wander about unemployed. We called you to give advice not to fire you”. Rauf is not laid off from work but only received a warning but the other workers insist that this is a game of the managerial office. They say that he is acting this way because he is afraid of the workers’ reaction and when the incident is forgotten and time comes, he will fire Rauf. The sentence of Süleyman Bey who is one of the bosses, that he spends to the other bosses seems to approve the estimation of the workers: “if we fire this all of them will attack us, if we fired him he would become a hero”.

Rauf and Leman’s perceptions of the ‘system’ and their individual actions are also as dichotomical as it can threaten the continuity of a marriage. In comparison to Leman’s attitude that is coherent to the system, that wants to remain coherent to the system and that wants Rauf to remain coherent to the system, Rauf is a person that struggles with the system and that cannot accept what the system foresees for him. Upon Rauf’s arrival to home with the smell reeked on him Leman says: “no matter how much you take a bath that smell would not come off” and adds: “I always wanted my husband to have a decent job”. Leman reminded Rauf of her

‘differentiation’ from the lower class stance in a previous quarrel they had when Rauf walked up to her to hit her: “you cannot hit me with that dress on”. In another quarrel Leman advises Rauf not to struggle with the boss and tells Rauf that she won’t let him go to the wrong way. This time Rauf’s response is a slap, Rauf asks her to make a choice between the identities of ‘wife’ and ‘police’ but Leman’s answer proves that she sees him as a person who needs rehabilitation: “I won’t go, I will stay always by you but against your wrongs”.

The end of the movie brings this conflict Leman and Rauf lives in the house and mentally to the public space for the first time. After Kerim gets his arm caught by the machine and dies the workers bring Kerim out in a ritualistic way. The workers take their coveralls out and leave them around Kerim’s body and start to demonstrate by crouching down. Even at a time when a funeral is at stake the factory speakers call: ‘workers, go back to your work, what you do is an illegal demonstration, leaving the workplace collectively is a legal crime’. When the workers do not give up the strike the factory calls the police and Leman is also among the arriving team. This situation that brought Rauf that was waiting by the side of Kerim and Leman that is among the police team face to face and is also the end of the movie.

We believe in that it is the correct option to see Çark as a ‘political’ movie like Maden or Demiryol of the 70’s. Rather than being a movie with a ‘sociological’ perspective such as Attack to Interest or A Sip of Love, it aimed to be a political movie by moving its viewfinder to the organized and class based struggle in the society. By the end of 80’s when even the movies that did not give political messages but only analyze societal issues were about to become extinct, this movie that called the labor class to class struggle in a way like the world of the 70’s stands as an exceptional example within the atmosphere of the 80’s. While it was clear that the junta that realized the September 12 coup d’etat and the state bureaucracy were defending the interests of the bourgeoisie that shared the government with themselves, we can perceive the production of such a movie that is produced at a period of time that is under their control as an example of courage.

As far as I am concerned, I always viewed people that preferred political way to the sociological way as people who are willing to take the short-cut to the target and who are in a hurry. This is also valid for the leftist organizations of the 70's: despite Marx's promise of socialism coincided after the capitalist phase, people who lacked patience and toleration have tried with the political way to reach the aimed socialist order through the short-cut that is done by taking the political mechanisms under control through force. The will to go to the result through a quick process by qualifying politically as 'revolution', the process that sociology defines as 'evolution', is an approach that is not compatible with the nature and rules of sociology. We, among us, accept that never could the political movements decide on societal structures, on the contrary, that the societal structure will produce and direct the political movements.

Apart from that Çark, as a movie that invites the labor class that has long deserted political struggle to struggle, is a movie that rows against the tide. Maybe by being a movie recommending political struggle, it is hoping for help from the method of the 70's: the retrieval of laborer's rights within a short period of time through political struggle. However, it was clearly experienced in the 70's that those rights cannot be derived that way and that what needs to be done is the spread of labor consciousness to societal layers in the long-run. The Wheel aims at shaping the society up that became under the control of the liberal discourse by slapping it on the face but as it was explained above, it is a problematic effort in methodological terms.

Nevertheless, the opposition built by Çark through the people Rauf and Leman is important in terms of questioning of the system. Especially Rauf's standing by his laid off friends in the glass factory and after that his leadership to the other workers in the leather factory that he started to work at, is the labor consciousness that the movie wants to see in a laborer. On the contrary, Leman's attitude that is willing to approach to the system and who finds struggle against the system incorrect, shows itself when she becomes a member of the security agency which represents and protects the system the most. Leman is at a state where she is unable to understand the class struggle of her husband, proud just like most people who lean their backs to the public establishment.

4.6. Conclusion

In this chapter, one of first things that we observe is decreasing the political tone and side of films in social realist line. The depolitization of society brought the depolitization of cinema. These alterations are closely related and depended on September 12th coup. Individuals do not feel themselves in safe, as politically because of the oppressive applications of state and as economically because of the results of neo-liberal policies. At this point, where he returns is his own 'self'. He is trying to save only himself and to stand on by only his own struggle without applying to any class stance or political ideology.

CHAPTER 5

5. TURKISH CINEMA AND URBAN POOR SINCE THE END OF 1980S TO PRESENT

5.1. Introduction

The case that there was not any example for social realist film genre of Turkish cinema between the end of 1980s and the end of 2000s could appeal the curiosity of the reader of the thesis. In this chapter, there is the explanation of the problems which Turkish cinema had in 1990s that is realized by the intellectuals who are closely related to Turkish cinema.

These cinematic reasons are depended on societal reasons certainly. The class consciousness that was melted since the beginning of 1980s slowly became the reason for disappearance of reflection of class on cinema. Because of that, the disappearance of class consciousness in Turkish society will be dissected in this chapter.

5.2. Turkish Cinema in 1980s

Our thesis asserts that by the end of 80's the societal realism movement that we analyzed and we know reached to an end. Surely, it is a clear thought for us that societal realism figuratively remained standing by the support of the class concept in its classical meaning.

Movie critic Cumhuriyet Canbazoglu, attributes the ending of the societal realist movies by the end of 1980's 100% to political environment, he underlines the political conditions. The people that are atomized and became captives of the practices of the consumer society that neo-liberal theses want to produce are surely very different from a societal structure that all types of positive and negative experience is lived collectively (Canbazoglu, 19 Mart 2013).

Şenay Aydemir opposes our argument that by the end of the 80's the movies that carried societal realist concerns ended in the cinema of Turkey: he thinks that the economic crisis that the cinema of Turkey went through at the end of 80's and at the beginning of 90's is not correctly perceived. He defines 'the effect of television' and 'the liberal disintegration in daily life' as two factors that led to the crisis of cinema of Turkey and naturally the societal realism movement (Aydemir, 17 Nisan 2013). Even if we accept these reasons that he details more by 'economic' reasons, we cannot accept that it is 'only' due to economic reasons. According to us, the reason for the ending of societal realist movies stems from the disappearance of societal consciousness and this disintegration works both ways: on one way, we cannot talk about a collective consciousness in the society anymore, individualism is at its peak and those individualized minds do not wish to puzzle their brains with negative social issues that commonly bother the society. Another point was that the director-producer people that produce the cinema did not have the desire to produce a movie that included the societal realist notions, meaning even if there were people in the society that missed this kind of movies, there was no cinema circle to provide the society with those movies. Both because most of the society did not feel the necessity or the will for such movie and the reluctance of the cinema circle prevented the production of movies in social realism genre.

We accept that in the mutual relationship between the society and the cinema, society shaped cinema more than cinema shaped society. Even though it is observed that in 1960's societal realist movies were produced under the leadership of the intellectual segment, had there not been a sum of laborers in the society that these movies would be built on, it is obvious that these movies would not be produced or watched. We should see the function of the intellectual segment here to do mental leadership to the

labor class that reached to the sufficient numbers quantitatively but does not know what to do in terms of an action and to imprint class consciousness. Yet this soul is valid for the 60's; by the end of the 80's the society has reached to such a point that resulted in the intellectuals to seize their hopes from the society and their relationship with the society which was already weak. This is a reason that blocks new movies to be added to societal realist movies.

This situation is actually a good example to the mutual interaction between the concepts of society and cinema. We can show the Turkish versions of the Hollywood style comedies that started in the 90's and that still continues as an example of the meeting of an expectation of the society by the cinema circles; the society takes real pleasure to go to the cinema and watch the Turkish style imitations of the American style comedies that they got used to see on the television.

Şenay Aydemir says that societal realism did not disappear, only that some differentiations occurred in its definition due to the effects of the conditions. Aydemir further asserts that the societal realism methods of 60's and 70's will not be valid on our day but he claims that the 'realism notion' that was always present in the cinema of Turkey will be a continuity or a part of societal realism. When it is thought like this, he says that many movies that were produced from 80's to present can be evaluated in line with societal realism (Aydemir, 17 Nisan 2013). Even if some of the movies Aydemir exemplifies can be defined as 'realist', they should not be seen as 'societal realist' in our view because they are not putting a societal issue to the center of the movie. The biggest characteristic of societal realist movies is that they give place to and analyze in the center of the movie one or more than one societal issues.

Aslıhan Doğan Topçu argues that at the second half of the 80's, the movies that were defined as 'depressing' or 'arty-farty' have increased. She says that this situation continued until the second half of the 90's but in this period of time there are movies that she sees as somewhat continuity of the societal realist line of hers such as *Eşkiya* (The Bandit), *Tabutta Rövaşata* (Somersault in a Coffin). Topçu claims that after the 80's the realist movies did not remain with their figurative ways of the 60's (Topçu,

20 Haziran 2013). We believe that social realism ended by the end of 80's both in terms of context and in terms of its figurative meaning but both Aydemir and Topçu think that only a methodological metamorphosis occurred but the content continues to express itself in different cinematic identities.

Scognamillo, in his analysis that he starts with the 70's and carries until 90's shows that the bad situation of Turkish cinema in the 90's leans on a long history: "In the second half of the 70's, television shakes the foundations, the disorder of the political environment distances the audience from cinema more and in the 80's, the video rush begins (yet the video rush-and later the private television channels-also provide a finance, money circulation) and the situation and the problems and the depressions makes up Turkish cinema of our day" (Scognamillo, 1996:245). As it seems, the crisis of the Turkish cinema that existed in the first half of the 90's is the final point that the ball of problems that came from 70's to 90's reached. This point has also become the beginning of the exit (which we can start with 'Eşkiya' that was produced in 1996), the successful commercial line of the movie and TV series sector is a proof of this. Again we need to inform that we view this exit with doubt. Turkish cinema had similar bright days in the 1960's as well but our cinema that could not overcome the problem of institutionalization, could not maintain the continuity of the commercial volume. Even if the sector of our day is more conscious and more down-to-earth, there is no guarantee that Turkish cinema will not face with a process similar to the 70's after its bright days today. If the institutionalization problem could not be overcome and if it cannot maintain a cycle that would sustain itself economically, probably it will.

The comments on the reasons of this dead-end street that was entered merges to a large extent at the same point. Giovanni Scognamillo asserts that at the end of the 80's and the beginning of the 90's the number of movies Turkish cinema produced decreased based on reasons such as the appearance of television and video, American cinema's becoming influential, the social and economic atmosphere that developed in relation to September 12 (Scognamillo, 2010:369-370). Whereas director Atif Yılmaz exhibits some reasons to understand the crisis of Turkish cinema in 1990s: "The anarchic environment before 1980, economic difficulty, the improvement of

television, emergence of video got the middle class attached to their homes” (Akman, 1997:86) Yağız’s findings about this period of time are as follows: “At the beginning of the 90’s multiple channel private televisions started to appear. The American companies got the right to put their movies directly into display. The movie theaters are renovated with modern technology. The movies started to come to display at the same time with the entire world” (Yağız, 2006:99).

Sevin Okyay explains the commercial impasse of the cinema of Turkey between the years 1985-1995 with her following words: “The material problems do not seem to have a solution. Whereas their roots are clear. They are reasons apart from the audience running away from cinema. Maybe they are even one of the reasons for such runaway: In Turkey cinema is at an unindustrialized state. We gave up on industry, even 10 percent of the huge money that was earned at the time did not return to cinema” (Okyay, 1996:225). The number of movies produced in Turkish cinema in 90’s cannot even be compared to the 80’s which can be considered to be stagnant in relation to 60’s and 70’s. Our cinema that could easily exceed the level of 100 movies in the 80’s, could only produce an average of 10 movies in the 90’s (Durmaz, 2014, aa.com.tr).

The audience that went to cinema to watch a movie in the 1960’s is replaced by a mass in 1990’s that watches television at home and I personally do not think that this is only due to the spread of television. Television is a secondary reason here. It is my opinion that the audience ran away from cinema because they cannot watch the movies they want to see, and this period which can be presumed to be between 1985-1995 has ended step by step starting from the mid 90’s. When the detachment of audience from the cinema caused loss on the commercial / industrial side, the possibility of production of the movies that deal with societal issues, which do not do well at the box office has naturally disappeared. We have to accept that the production of the societal realist movies is somewhat up to the economic movement that the guichet movies bring to the cinema sector.

Director Halit Refiğ also approves in his sentences that the Turkish cinema is having a downfall: “After the downfall of the Turkish cinema at the end of the 90’s there

were some movies being produced in Turkey. However, these movies are no longer the productions of a common system feeding cinema. These movies could be produced by the personal efforts and private opportunities the people who are producing these movies could provide. It is appropriate to call these movies with the names that often the directors use as ‘such-and-such movie’ or ‘an etcetera movie’. But to consider these movies as the representatives of the cinema of a country would be disrespectful to the people of the country that usually show no sign of interiorizing them” (Refiš, 1996:187).

According to Nigar Pösteki, Turkish cinema is reproducing itself by changing figure and drain, this is so to say like a snake getting rid of its dead skin. This changes also effect the profile of the audience: the majority is the audience that are fans of the American movie production style, the minority is the one’s showing the courtesy to festival or art movies (Hakan, cited from Pösteki, 2012:464). Sungu Çapan asserts that in the production of the cinema of Turkey, the term ‘producer’ is replaced by the sponsors (Çapan, 16 Ocak 2013), what this finding that we support actually shows is that the movies are unable to get the money for the producer to finance the next movie and that the commercial cycle requires outside assistance.

Scognamillo says that cinema has two different dimensions that are industrial and artistic and he finds it very natural that these two contradicts with each other (Scognamillo, 2010:451). The two lines he defines are the lines that Turkish cinema resorted to in 90’s and after but I think ‘societal realism’ is distant to both of them. Neither a line that disregards the social issues and juicing up the content in order to achieve commercial success, nor a line that turns its back to the social issues and claiming that it has a ‘high’ cinema language and that only targets the critics in the festival and a line that reflects nothing but the inner depressions of the individual. When we look at the movies that we analyzed, we can immediately see that they are not willing to become and rejecting to become either a commercial or a festival movie that is called ‘art’, that they are concerned with the problems of the people even if not a single person watches and that they do not sacrifice from what they want to express even if not a single critic likes and that they are the representatives of a devoted line.

The line that Scognamillo defines as 'artistic' was facing the paradoxes of the inner world of the individual with a higher income and higher education level by becoming distant to the societal issues. These are movies that move with the 'art for art' mentality, that has high intellectual concerns, that are philosophical, that analyzes the metaphoric concepts throughout the scenario, that are more elite and more for a mass that is accepted as 'educated'. Even if these movies showed their effectiveness between 1985-1995, there were also examples seen after 1995.

Scognamillo claims that these movies with psychological tendencies move through the inner dynamics of the individuals by taking inspiration from Freudian methods. The impasses, dilemmas and the dissatisfactions of the individual in front of the modern life are glanced. His problems and passions come in front of us very often in this type of movies. Most of the characters are keeping high social statuses. These people living away from the general standards of the society and their problematic private lives constitute the backbone. Scognamillo also criticizes these movies from a methodological perspective: in this period of time, it was considered that the intellectual level of the movie and its headiness, the scenario, characters, the ideas within the movie, the figurativeness of the movie were all bound to the movie being incomprehensible and complicated. A cinema language that was totally apart from societal realities was presenting its audience a reality built on dreams and hallucinations. The cinema understanding that evolved to abstract by breaking away from concrete, followed the way of the European art cinema (Scognamillo, 2010:440-441).

The characters and incidents being told were characters and incidents that included a minority in the society as percentage and more than that they were characters and individuals that this minority took as respondents. In terms of figure, it is closer to French style cinema understanding that is called 'art' movies, and has a cinema understanding that addresses festivals and critics. However, this kind of a cinema was very far to the society of Turkey in respect of content and figure and it was punished by the audience by not going to the cinema. Scognamillo attributes this situation to the laying hands of the highbrows which he perceives to be a bad copy of the intellectuals on the field of cinema. It was turned towards an

understanding of cinema that was had an individualistic style that Turkish cinema never displayed before and entirely different from the ordinary patterns of Yeşilçam. “However, the Turkish cinema audience is more prone to words and dialogs (encomiast, light comedy, karagöz). Turkish cinema audience does not want plain stories, it does not interiorize them, it gets confused by the flashbacks and time warps. The audience wants ‘action’, it wants melodrama, adventure, thriller and comedy all together (just as in Indian cinema!)” (Scognamillo, 2010:370).

“While the directors lived in the society in 50’s, 60’s, the directors after 1975 entirely broke away from the society. They became alienated to the public gradually. Their lifestyles changed. This change in their lifestyles had reflections on their movies” (Yağız, 2006:99) In our opinion, this is a very to the point finding; even if it seems to us it would be better if we shifted the time a little towards 1980 and after. Previously the directors were people becoming self-educated among the cinema circles. These directors were people that the great majority of came from the middle and lower class, that reflected the stories and the problems the numerical majority of the society. However, the assertion of ‘art cinema’ that started to get stronger at the beginning of the 1980’s and reached at its peak by the end of 80’s and the beginning of 90’s resulted in the directors’ becoming elite too. The leading directors of this era that fed themselves with Beyoğlu – Cihangir environments, tended towards telling the individual stories of people coming from high level economic and educational backgrounds instead of telling stories from the society. Surely, if the produced movies scenario comprises limited amount of people in the society, the number of audience that the subject movie would appeal would also be limited.

Scognamillo also asserts that Turkey that is displayed in these movies is not the real Turkey; that Turkey is the Turkey of a more decent, different from the majority, elite life. More precisely, it should be accepted as a Turkey that came out to the display of the city of Istanbul; this is neither Istanbul’s nor Turkey’s reality. The director uses himself as the base and considers himself to be the sole criteria while preparing the movie. The characters in his movie are also people who sometimes carry common characteristics with him. It seems like there is no world, no life, no society except the character’s, his individual world and the individuals that individual world

gets in contact with and it goes no further than to being a scene at the background of the movie (Scognamillo, 2010:445-446).

Sevin Okyay also criticizes this disconnection between the person who makes the movie and the audience with her following words: “The movie is also a mean of self-expression as a result. If the person has no concern of delivering what he wants to explain to the addressed people, it is better if he shoots a video movie and shows it at home to his friends and family..” (Okyay, 1996:225-226).

Another line is that by producing movies that are entertaining the ‘individuals’ coming from lower and middle classes and making them laugh, he was also providing them with temporary satisfactions. These movies that followed and imitated Hollywood movies started in the middle of 1990’s, were the movies that aimed at being displayed in the guichet and that kept consumption as the primary feature of their hidden agendas. Romantic comedy, drama, thriller, detective films, comedy, no matter what their genre is aims at stupefying people’s brains and the period of remembrance of these movies are limited with the duration of the movies. When the movie ends it is forgotten and very really do people feel the necessity to watch it for the second time. These kinds of movies are actually as consumption tools as the consumer society that its content is a representative of, they are consumed and left. Cinema that is mimetic of Hollywood, has gained strength with the movie Eşkiya’s great box-office success in 1996 and reminded to the Turkish cinema circle that cinema is a sector. This line of cinema finds its base and its mental foundation in the consumer society. It is the construction of a hedonistic society tended to consume, which is a societal engineering that got secretly involved in the society in the 60’s and 70’s and then clearly declared itself in the 80’s and reached at the peak of its strength in 90’s and after. It is more a project for the middle and lower class. The ‘gusto’ person built on a destructive individualism does not take into consideration any individual or societal problems except of himself. The only thing he thinks is to ‘enjoy his time’ and ‘take pleasure’. One point that post-modern hedonism hurt the most is the struggle of labor and class.

It could be understood why these movies reached a lot of audience because the audience profile that goes to the cinema have gone through a significant change: “Today the segment that comprises the majority of the Turkish cinema audience are educated people between 15-25 of age. This audience raised by the popular American culture is going to the cinema more because of them being social environments. Therefore, the cinema movies are produced according to this young audience. The issues dealt with in these movies are whatever this young audience likes and whatever they feel close to. The young audience like the exciting even thriller type adventure movies rather than the traditional fairy tales. They are a little odd, they have issues with adapting to the order” (Yağız, 2006:101). The change in the audience profile also changed the content of the movies produced; the youth between the age of 15-25 that become involved in the social life and that has money in his pocket has become definitive for the content of the movies. These people of which a significant amount is university students are carrying out the practices of consumer society with the confidence in being higher than a certain economic level. Because the consumer society is based on consumption it constantly approaches the person with a positive and smiling attitude, it aims at placing its own practices to his conscious by charming the inner world of this person. Surely at a cycle where money is the primary criteria and consumption is the main action, there is no time or attention to spare for the problems of the poor. The day starts in a shopping mall with fast food in one of the worldwide brands, continues with a movie that is a Hollywood production or a Turkish cinema substitute of it and ends with a coffee-desert duet had in the same shopping mall. This societal group besides being the biggest part of the audience base of Hollywood style cinema, is also the biggest client portfolio of the shopping malls that has been increasing its numbers since the beginning of the 90’s.

In my opinion, the common point of both lines is the notion of ‘individuality’ and the notion that locates itself so distant from societal realism is again individuality because the societal realism targets what is ‘societal’. This is also the reason why the movies of societal realism movement are very rare since the beginning of the 80’s until present: the society is made used to and even conditioned for the individual.

The 'family' institution that has a significant role and effect in the societal structure of Turkey, could not find the movies in the cinema it wants when we think about the second half of the 80's and the first half of the 90's; the family tended towards Turkish movies that previously sold well or to the TV series instead of going to the cinema. Another situation that affected this situation is the tendency of the cinema of Turkey towards characters that are not commonly seen in the society: scenarios appeared that tell the stories of depressed characters leading their lives at the extremes and that has communication issues with life. These characters with good education and income, coming from the upper-middle or upper class were people that got stuck in the human relationships in modern life. Or another dimension, movies were seen that tell the stories of the marginal characters that you cannot easily find outside the aura of Beyoğlu / Taksim, such as transvestite, prostitute, drug addict, homosexual etc. (Scognamillo, 2010:370-371).

There was no shift in the things watched by the mass that could be categorized as 40 of age and above and those that has classical watching habits despite they are younger of age: "There is a segment who is in front of the TV watching the local TV series produced in the format of old Turkish movies. This segment goes to the cinema only when a movie is produced by the Turkish movie tradition" (Yağız, 2006:101). The Yeşilçam style melodramas are carried from cinema to television. Even if the number of the movies of this sort is not zero, when compared to the romantic comedy, comedy, thriller style movies the cinema of Turkey produces they are little in number. Because the TV series provide the audience that wishes to watch melodrama with their necessity not only within the period of a movie, but each week and free, this option appeals more to the audience that is tended towards melodrama.

We see that directors such as Yavuz Turgul and Çağan Irmak produce movies by following the 'story telling' tradition of Yeşilçam (Yağız, 2006:100-101). *Eşkiya* in 1996 and *Babam ve Oğlum* (My Father and My Son) in 2004 undersigned huge box office successes. This amount of revenue was a proof of how much the society missed these types of movies. Nevertheless, while the audience is sparing his money and time for either the American style movies or old Yeşilçam style scenarios, the movies that tell the stories of the problems of the lower class are not produced in this

period of time. The main reason for this is the reluctance of the upper and middle class to watch a scenario that has such a story, and even worse, the reluctance of the lower class to watch a scenario that tells his own story. In a period when the impulses of consumption and becoming rich made everybody envy an elite, magnificent life, the lower class is also watching with admiration the scenarios of the TV series that go through in waterside residences or mansions. To be carried away with the story arc of the scenario that is accompanied by the grand wealth the characters own throughout the episode, was an ideal way to get out of the material-emotional pain that the economic deprivation brought. How much the effort paid by the leftist frame within the intellectual class in 60's and 70's affected the cinema and resulted in the birth of the societal realism movement, it affected the same way to the development of a leftist conscious in the society. But when we look at the society from 90's to present, neither is there an effort of the intellectual class to develop a leftist movement, nor is there a potential for struggle or will in the lower class to produce such consciousness.

“The movies that the people liked were the old Turkish movies that were displayed in the private channels over and over again. It was the traditional Turkish cinema that attracted the attention of the Turkish people between 1950 - 1975. This great interest understood from the television ratings proved that audience who like and watch those movies still has existed” (Yağız, 2006:99). This line that our cinema insisted on staying away in those years was a line that the people found factors of themselves and wanted to watch. Just like societal realism that we analyze in our thesis did not mean much for the people, the movies that displayed scenes from the problems and lives of elite people did not mean much for the people, too.

By attracting attention to the slight awakening in the movies going to the depth of the society by the end of 2000's, Canbazoğlu says that these movies seek their chances in festivals more than in box offices (Canbazoğlu, 19 Mart 2013), this is a situation that can somewhat be generalized for the societal realist movies of the past. It was never seen that the societal realist movies realized high numbers in the guiche, it cannot be said that it has such an aim either. However, Canbazoğlu's thought is true for us as well; it is possible to come across with movies that put the societal issues to

their centers, which could be accepted as a continuity of the movies out thesis analyzed by the end of 2000's. Some examples to these movies could be *Başka Semtin Çocukları* (Children of the Other Neighborhood), *Kara Köpekler Havlarken* (Black Dogs Barking), *Köprüdekiler* (Men on the Bridge) and *Çoğunluk* (Majority).

We know that the societal realist movies reflect the society and do it in a documentary like sensitivity. If we accept that these movies are also in a societal realist character, we can find many hints in them telling us about the society of our day. The first thing that catches our eye in these movies is that it all delivered the lead roles to the characters young of age. This preference is that the main point of movement of the society and the lower class in our day is the youth or it is expected to be so. Another point is that the scenarios make their preference of location as the neighborhoods the lower class lives in. *Başka Semtin Çocukları* and *Kara Köpekler Havlarken* are all produced in neighborhoods of Istanbul that were *gecekondu* and these *gecekondu* houses were converted to apartment buildings by adding the flats on them. One of the leading characters of *Köprüdekiler* lives in a *gecekondu*, indeed in a terrible *gecekondu*. Young girl that is one of the lead roles in *Çoğunluk*, lives in *Kuştepe* which is a lower class neighborhood close to the center of Istanbul and produces a dichotomy with the other lead role who lives in *Bahçelievler*, an upscale neighborhood of Istanbul, and that she wishes to be her boyfriend.

One of the points that differentiate the societal realist movies of our day, from those we analyzed in our thesis is lack of didacticism. Today's social realist films do not lead its audience to 'any truth'. Another point is that it does not put the societal message to anywhere where could be seen along the film, it is hidden in the scenario. The primary factors of the scenario are the young people who are living in low quality houses, envying people having richer lives, who have got stuck into working with minimum wages without a hope in terms of education or economic means and with loafing about. But while we are watching this, the movie does not relate what we watch with a reason, a result or a recipe to fix it. We become guests as observers to their lives with the beginning of the movie and our visit ends with the ending of the movie.

These movies do not include a search for a solution or recipe for the lower class as in *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* or an evaluation of the system as a problem and the methodology discussion to change it as in *Demiryol*. As a matter of fact, there is nothing presented to us as ‘problem’ within the content of the movie. The movies want us to deduct the phenomena that are to be seen as a problem while we are silently observing the movie. We can evaluate this silent show of the movies as a remnant of remaining apolitic that is the case since the 80’s. This line is a line that is unwilling to index itself to a certain ideology, that does not feel the necessity to it either, yet, eager to show people that it stands by the lower class and eager to show people what the lower class is going through. The biggest answer to the question why this return occurred in a ‘silent’ way is the neo-liberal authoritarianism that keeps society under control. The factionalism of liberal thought worldwide as an ideology without an alternative made all people so to say obliged to obey it. In a country where both liberal and conservative ideologies control the system being stuck to each other like Turkey, it is obvious that people from the cinema circles do not wish to be known as ‘advocating the lower class’ and ‘representing socialism’. It is possible to do the same reading through the personality of the rich boy Mertkan, who is the leading character of *Çoğunluk*: “Aydoğmuş (Radikal, 05.04.2011) when he says the following in his comments on the movie, “don’t ask me who I am, I neither belong to this side nor to the other. After a while, people already say what its significance is. The same applies to me” defines the stance and view of life of many young people today just like Mertkan in *Çoğunluk* film. To be eliminated, neither there nor here, what matters you are with whom, only to live the day, to take what is given, to be contented with it, to become quiet within the majority when you are alone, to be afraid, to blend, overwhelm the opposite side when being strong even if to be majority and to ignore them. To get identified with the force of another person, to be overwhelmed under someone else’s shadow, to be able to exist as long as he can consume, all these are presented to us as the story of a young generation in the movie through Mertkan character” (Uçar İlbuğa, 2013:55-56).

On top of this, there is no ideological demand to the cinema coming from the society, especially from the lower class. It also attracts attention that when we look at the rates of unionization, rates of participation in May 1st or rates of votes for the ‘real’

leftist parties, the socialist ideology is considered to be a dead ideology. Nevertheless, it is possible to claim that when we compare the lower class of our day with the lower class of 90's or 80's, they are more questioning and careful towards the system. One of the biggest benefits of the social networks and internet which has become the highway of life, is to realize that somewhere in Turkey or in the world, there are people who face with the same problems you have. We have known since the beginning that the same problem requires the same struggle and the same struggle requires the same consciousness; it means sharing the same conscious with someone that you do not even share the same place.

Another incident that requires attention is globalization. Just like the capital reached at a worldwide sum by globalizing, the labor is also in the necessity of getting out of the scope of the nation state and globalizing and uniting its power with the lower classes of other countries. Even if it does not do it as quick and organized as the capital class, its awareness on this way that it is moving along is an important first step to reunite the class consciousness that was disappeared by the beginning of the 80's. This consciousness which is blurred for the time being is being felt in the movies that we counted above: the young characters occupying the lead role are going through some events / struggles throughout the movie and lose / die at the end. It is again up to the point the societal struggle will reach for the movies to end hopefully just as in 'Arkadaş' or 'Demiryol' instead of ending tragically. Depending on the situation that class struggle and consciousness rises, the movies may also end themselves with hopeful, optimistic endings just as in 'Karanlıkta Uyananlar' or 'Düğün'.

5.3. The Change in Production Relations and Society

If we look at the important dates in 1980's and 1990's we can see step by step the equivalent of the order that globalization wants to fit in around the world in our country. Following the release of the foreign exchange transactions on December 29, 1983, on January 3, 1984 importing was also released. On July 5, 1993, the law for private radios and televisions took its place among the laws, on February 28, 1994, the mobile network started to operate (Bali, 2002:363-364). All these moves also

includes the situations that occurred following the advancements in technology such as mobile phones and internet, it also includes steps such as private radio and televisions which occurred previously in the Western world but can be considered as a huge innovation for Turkey. On top of this, the devaluation in April 1994, the crisis that developed further to the crisis in Asia in 1998 and the economic crisis of 2001 that dealt the real blow are all points that should not be forgotten in the representation of Turkey after 90's. While hundreds of thousands of people lost their jobs further to the crises, the breaking down of families and the suicides became the routines of life, the lower class was completely forgotten as a societal actor. As a natural result of such a sociological outlook the lower class and the problems of the lower class were also long forgotten in the cinema platform. Had the lower class faced with a similar economic crisis that would victimize itself in the 70's, it would surely give an entirely different reaction. The discomfort towards the system would be expressed aloud by pouring to the streets with the class consciousness depending on a political base but the lower class people of the 90's and 2000's are far far away from such an organization capacity.

It is obvious that the production relationships and the place of labor within the production relationships had gone through a great change from the 80's to our day. Gökhan Atılgan expresses this transformation that reorganized and defined the production relationships, capital, market and the state concepts in 5 items:

- “1. To provide the guarantee of limitless freedom to the domestic and foreign financial capital
2. Transforming the country into a warehouse of cheap labor by deregulating and elasticizing the labor force market; to advance in low technology and transforming the industry into a subcontractor of international corporations
3. Transforming the country into a cheap imports heaven by using imported goods in production and encouraging the consumption of imported goods
4. Transforming the public service institutions into commercial businesses and citizens into clients by commercializing the public services; handing over the state-owned economic enterprises to domestic and foreign capital

5. To maintain the restructuring of the state in accordance with the neo-liberal understanding” (Atılgan, 2012:302).

What all these items show is that the production relationships have gone through a serious transformation. Just as the location of production and sale changed by elevating from the national state to a global level, the role of labor within the production relationships changed even further. From the expression we read in the 2. item ‘transforming the country into a warehouse of cheap labor by deregulating and elasticizing the labor force market’ we can understand that social rights that were developed in the national state, especially in the welfare states are being subjected to an erosion. The structuring the capital developed since the beginning of the 90’s was a system that kept an army of laborers at hand that paid only a little amount of wage and never did insurance and never got concerned with the other necessities of its life.

By the end of the 1980’s there were again examples of populist implementations towards the labor class. The 142 percent wage increase of public laborers in 1989 and the wage increases of also the public officers were all moves aiming to eyewash. Yet the numbers told us that the labor class was far away from class struggle: the number of 7 million 170 thousand laborers in 1988 rose to a number of 12 million 937 in 2008 but the unionization rate that decreased to 5.8 percent in 2008 was 22 percent in 1988 (Atılgan, 2012:305).

Capital in Turkey has gained more aggressive identity after 1980. According to Tarık Şengül, this phase “.. is developing in the form of confiscation and attack of capital to the places that labor and state produce. This strategy which is based on dispossession and primitive accumulation substantially .. means a heavy destruction for laboring classes of cities” (Şengül, 2012:357-358).

Tarık Şengül with his thought of “..the spread and deepening of the mentality of capital to the city space spreads the contradictions of capitalism from production processes to the entire city space..” (Şengül, 2012:396) attracts attention to the spatial dimension of capitalism. Şengül also claims that this spatial spread not only fragmented the spaces in the city but also left the identities of the individuals and

their class belongings scattered. What he criticizes is while the capital class became completely urbanized, the urbanization of working segment without organizing an efficient anti-struggle that would protect its rights and future. The tendency which the middle and lower classes of our day show to the sub groups that are called ‘new-tribalism’, more communitarian, that have limited number of members and mostly dependent on single concept, keeps the subject classes away from a holistic societal struggle. Şengül underlines that the future of those at the ‘losing’ side is closely linked to the future of this disorganized situation that benefits the interests of the capital class (Şengül, 2012:396).

Nigar Pösteği evaluates the society of the 90’s as a period that carries and continuing the effects of the 80’s. 90’s is in a character that moved the 80’s one level up, and the most significant factor in this is the release of private television channels in Turkey. The TV series and programs and the music understanding that grew up together with them, the appraisal of what is earned effortless and the underestimation of what is earned thorough labor are all the dominant notions of 90’s (Pösteği’den aktaran Hakan, 2012:404-405). We see that the lower class is a passive actor in all these changes. Within all these developments, the lower class was not an authority that dominating the events or being taken into consideration, on the contrary it was at a state that left under the influence of whatever is done and dominating his life according to those changes. The lower class of the 70’s that spilled to the streets, sought its rights, raised its voice was replaces by a lower class in the 90’s that watches the TV series eating sunflower seeds, envying the lead characters or the magnificent lives pictured in the TV series.

Heath Lowry, writes that ‘the ideal of modernist lifestyle to spread in the society of Turkey’ seen in the republic elites has considerably eroded with the developments that took place in the 90’s: “While they were hoping to make Anatolia Istanbulized, they saw that it did not happen and got disappointed when they saw that Istanbul became Anatolianized” (Bali, cited from Lowry, 2002:359). Also according to Bali’s comment, witnessing such situation carried an intense feeling of hopelessness to the people who interiorized the modernist values and accepted Kemalizm as an ideology. The gradual transformation of this thought to hatred, the lower class becoming

discarded and not receiving any more investment brought with it the result of not being perceived as a mass (Bali, 2002:359). What Rifat Bali underlines is that the feeling of exhaustion among the elites prevents them from feeling as a 'missionary of modernism'. This line that targets the discharge to the rest of the people that lacks the lifestyle and values they have, includes an idealism that from time to time run by the state as well since the first years of the Republic. Yet the rot of this idealism brought with it the evolution of the lower class as a societal group that 'should be handled with care' to a group that needs to be called with the feeling of 'hatred and disgust'. That lower class is no longer a child that you wish to take the hand and teach to walk, but a competitor that shares your food, your job, your space and your life.

The mass that migrated to the city sometimes lead to comments among the city members that has the city culture that goes to hatred and insult. One of the actors expresses the reflection he has of the people living in the city with rural origins as follows: "I hate villagers because I am urbanized. I love the blessings of the city. I was raised in a family that has been living in Istanbul for generations. I call those who are unaware of themselves, meaning who do not know the gusto of being Turkish, the pleasure of it and those who do not get the taste of it villagers; I hate them and I underestimate them. They are idiot! They came to the city from the village, they want to compete with me by reading two books. I do not buy that. I love being from Istanbul, I underestimate those who are not. I love people living in Paris or London. We do not allow them to open kebab houses in Bebek, for example. I want to live with civilized people" (Altan, 2002:34) Economic and cultural class elitism is immediately felt from these words of humiliation, insult and separation. These sentences that considers a mass that were unable to fit in the modernist-urbanized life because of its limited economic conditions and because of not being able to get an institutionalized education as second class, should not be considered as an exception to the owner of these sentences. The transformation of the feeling above with respect to economic and cultural criteria in the city space to a disgust towards the people of migrant origin, is a reflex that can be seen from a considerable amount of people who thinks they are 'urbanized'.

As a matter of fact we also need to mention about the concept of 'lifestyle' that develops and encourages this feeling of hatred. This 'elite' soul that emerges out of the combination of the consumption practices with the economic and cultural advantages of being urban, reached to the concept of 'lifestyle' as a result of the search for 'quality' and 'difference'. The lifestyle aims to be superior in each compartment of life: to wear better clothes, to eat better food, to live in a better house, to listen to better music, to go to better destinations on holiday, to hang out in better places in night life etc. While the 'higher' id targeted, it is obvious that the anti-thesis of this action is the lower class, especially those that came through migration. The life they brought to the big cities that is considered to be 'philistinism' and 'vulgarism' by the majority of the older residents of the city, transformed into a collective hatred, stigmatization and even more a micro-fascism based on socio-cultural values in the city space.

The class that this 'lifestyle' concept had most effects on was the 'white collar' class which has a significantly young age medium. The 'white collar class' that maybe the most important link of the postmodern era and the consumption society, were the children of the families that got educated in the universities. These young people that were converted to business life after being educated in good universities, are working with inversely proportional wages in comparison to the education they got and the positions they occupy in the companies they work at.

In the interviews which were made by Tanil Bora, the current situation of white collar youngs can be seen clearly. They do not consider themselves as employee and they believe in that they can be promoted in their companies if they play the game in accordance with the rules of the system. They refuse strictly that they are laborers and because of the plazas, the luxury places where they work in, they are so meticulous about their wearing. In spite of these facts, an important amount of them are working for the salaries that are a bit above the minimum wage and also, are unhappy and in depression (Bora, 2010:53, 55). This 'new' class stance that pointed in 80's, was a laborer type that the new production relationships required. Actually the white collars existed for long years, even before the 80's but it was composed of a limited number of people, invisible to the society. With the 80's the criteria for

becoming a member of this class became clearer: After the graduation from a well-known university in Turkey, masters and even PhD in one of the Western countries (preferably in a country whose native is English) and upon the return a high position in a good company with a high wage.

The overwhelmed soul of the lower class is probably the most important reason for the radicalization of the lower class that has already lost its reflection in cinema, especially in its involvement in an extremity in political space. This state of manhandle that occurred in the support of fundamentalism and extreme nationalism in the 90's and extreme conservatism since the 2000's by the great masses, is the effort of the lower class that lacks a healthy societal stance and class consciousness to remind itself to the rest of the society by bringing itself to an extreme state. The worst part is that the ideological structuration is neither produced by the dynamics of the lower class nor the ideological objectives were in line with the interests of the lower class. Actually, the lower class is in the outlook of a pawn and bit player that provides only quantitative support to these extreme ideologies that invisibly serves the interests of the upper class. There is no benefit to those masses from the manipulation and agitation of these poor and uneducated big masses; an enlivenment and provocation that would bring an ideological chaos to the society would mean the covering up of things such as employment, poverty, unfair distribution of income that only directly concerns the lower class which is their real problem and means no solution will be sought for them.

The reflex of being urban does not stop here. One of the columnists of a known newspaper describes the recipe of 'becoming urbanized' as follows: "A proper profession or education.. to be able to speak a foreign language properly. The culture of music, painting, literature, art, cinema. Bathing every day at least twice. Brushing the teeth often. Neither the mouth is stinking garlic, onion nor the armpits sweat. Clean and unexaggerated clothing.. For instance, a shirt, a sport trousers, soft summery shoes.. Rather than staring from far like stirring up trouble any moment or glaring, supposedly –leering the girl-, going near her and invite to a glass of drink, to dance or to dinner with a soft voice .." (Cıvaoglu, 1996:21). It is obvious that this recipe the columnist gives has no intersection with the societal reality. Surely people

of the lower class would also like to own these: no one would reject an option of having a full command in a foreign language or knowing cinema well but it is not realistic to expect them to materialize these characteristics without taking into consideration the environment those people come from, the environment they were raised in, their educational and economic levels. The columnist believes that the society would reach at a certain quality level only if these characteristics were also present in middle and lower classes but the characteristics of the people of the lower class that he dislikes do not stem from their preferences but to many issues the urbanization, infrastructure and city life bring to them. It is neither a conscientious nor a rational preference to humiliate the lower class for the identity that developed beyond their preference and conscious that they carry. The person may not have a shower at home, he may also not have money to buy perfume or toothpaste, he may also not have the opportunity to buy 'soft sneakers'. What needs to be blamed is the 'system' that cannot carry the lower class to a level of 'decent job or education', that begrudges a wage, a house, a life to make him 'take shower twice a day'. These people including the columnist that perceives the lower class with a class based hatred, are reflecting the hatred they should have reflected to the system to the victims of the system, the lower class. The reason for them not directing this hatred towards the system is that they are the people who benefit the most from it and who do not want the system to change. Either consciously or unconsciously, viewing the focal point of the problem as lower class instead of the system, leads to nowhere but to play into the hands of the capitalist system.

The process of humiliating the lower class continues with the inspiration gained from the physical appearance: "The most important examples separating the New Turkish Person from the traditional Turkish figure is that men has no beard or moustache and women are blond like in the example of Tansu Çiller. The common characteristic of men and women is that they have white skin. The commercials took the lead to realize this transformation in the New Turkish Person. As a couple journalists observes the people played in the commercials were mostly people with blond hair, colored (preferably blue) eye and white skin" (Bali, 2002:310). It is clear that the Turkish people is not mostly white-skinned, blond and with color eyes; it is possible to claim that this preference is made in order to isolate themselves from the lower

class that lacks these characteristics. The dying of many women from the upper class their hair to blonde which is not their natural hair color, the effort of people to show their eye color differently by putting on blue or green lenses also includes in it a hidden elitism. The aim is to differentiate themselves from the rest of the society, especially the ones that arrived through migration through reinforcing economic and cultural elitism with physical appearance because of most of the migrating people have traditional Turkish appearance.

If we move on our way with the help of Marxist ideology, we can discuss the stance of the people that migrate from the rural areas in the city as a ‘thesis’. We can consider the above mentioned humiliating hatred of the city elites as ‘anti-thesis. The syntheses of both is the acceptance of the elite segment of a reality that it can ignore and initiate an effort to understand it. Two of the reasons Rıfat Bali counts attract attention: One of them is the success of Welfare Party in the local elections of 1994 and the parliamentary elections of 1995. The other point is the tendency of capitalism to produce clients from every class to show the desire to transform these people into consumers as well. Rather than keeping them out of the system, it is wiser to bring them in and it is necessary for the continuity of the system. “Therefore, the ‘Anatolian Turk’ figure that is from the rural area and that speaks Turkish with a regional accent started to appear more in the commercials as a warmhearted and positive figure” (Bali, 2002:336-337). The election success of Welfare Party was maintained the support of those the modernist mass alienated; just as the secular-urban mass realized that, it understood that there is a societal group in front of it that needs to be understood and taken seriously both politically and sociologically. In the same way also in the second premise there is the inclusion of the mass that was ignored up until that day, into the consumption cycle through the commercials. As a matter of fact, it is obvious that the lower class cannot comply with the material standards that the consumer society requires but the system makes them believe in such a way that the person can find the determination in himself to buy the highest model of mobile phone with his credit card while he has no money in his pocket.

5.4. Class Struggle and Consciousness

Karl Polanyi's questioning in his own piece help us examine the state of class today: Polanyi looks to the class with a looking that features the functional dimension of class: his questioning is on what the class functionality which exists in a specified societal structure will be, if that societal structure would change. He thinks that if class loses its functionality, that case brings the result of the disappearance of class itself, another class / classes substitute it (Polanyi, 2000:217). It is obvious that he means by the question he asks the location of the class concept in the societal structure while evolving from modernity to postmodernity. It has become a point that people always think hard on whether there will be a class concept and if so how it will be interpreted within the postmodern thought that already got its shape after World War II and strengthened its position with globalization after 1980's. Polanyi's this finding is more valid for the societies like Turkey where the class consciousness and structure is not institutionalized and does not have continuity. The lower class movement that began in the 60's, reached at its peak by the help of the political atmosphere in the 70's but dissolved like a cracker in the 80's.

Ahmet İnsel also emphasizes that the erasing of the class as a factor from the social life results in "the insignificance of collective attachment symbols" and "stigmatizing of individualization in social relationships" (İnsel, 2008:21). For him, the primary factor is "the fast spread of individualization in modern societies" (İnsel, 2008:21).

We can also see the problem the class concept faces in particular as a reflection of the transformation the society faces in general. In the International Sociology Congress that convened in July 2008, İpek Merçil has seen that the congress took place with the company of three different concepts: "the destruction in ways of existence", "new relationships between societal and cultural" and "the appearance of new regulations" (Merçil, 2008:221). The destruction of the class, the effort of forming new relationships among societal actors and the society, and the formations that appear as a result of this effort, all proves us that class lost its classical appearance and function. In this respect, it is obvious that if the people with incomes

lower than the average of the society is willing to express themselves under the 'class' umbrella, class requires a new interpretation and structuring.

Alain Touraine also claims in his presentation in the same conference that "the subject disappeared by getting stuck between the market economy, global systems and identity communities..that not the society but these communities construct history.." (Merçil, 2008:221). The subject (individual) that is left ownerless after the dissolution of the class concept is at a passivized state that lacks clarity about its place and power among the mentioned societal notions. At the same time the society concept is also going through a dissolution towards globalization which is a more macro structure than itself and communitarian societal units which is a more micro structure than itself. The individual, especially the individual belonging to the lower class is drawing an outlook that could not find its societal stance among the macro systems and micro communities.

For Bourdieu, who is another thinker that has important discourses on class, there are two types of stratification: he has attributed one of these ways to the economic criteria and he locates the unqualified laborers to the bottom and businessmen and senior executives to the top. The labor class is located at the bottom of the other way attributed to cultural capital. We see the teachers and managers in the middle class and at the top an intellectual class is defined such as artists and academicians (Van Der Loo and Reijen, 2006:109).

If we continue to read Habitus from the sentences of Weininger, ".. a causal connection between class location and 'habitus'; and, secondly, a relation of 'expression' between habitus and a variety of practices situated in different domains of consumption-practices which cohere symbolically to form a whole (a 'style of life')" (Weininger, 2005:86). This definition shows us how closely related the class concept with the concepts of consumption and lifestyle in Bourdieu and at the same time it also includes the claim that these concepts have several different practical reflections in societal life.

“.. classes are formed – to bargain in the short run, and to seize state power in the long run – and then disintegrate by virtue of their success. But they are then re-formed” (Wallerstein, 1979:227). With this definition Immanuel Wallerstein shows us the different stops of the existence of class. The class can get in different formations within its aims, struggle or forget to struggle. Maybe we can disagree with the word ‘disintegrate’ in this definition because we do not accept the possibility of disappearance of class. As long as the professional separation that unites the individuals filling in the contents of that class (social distribution of labor based on private property), the common social stance and the association of interests continue, class would not disappear; Wallerstein nullifies our concern with the word ‘re-form’ in his following sentence and informs us that the class is destroying its current structure to rebuild it

Both Bourdieu and Wallerstein have the aim of explaining us the current situation of class. Bourdieu has opened a new lane besides the classical materialist / economic stratification theory of Marxism based on the concepts of culture and consumption. This is a categorization which would help us understand the multidimensional class structuration of our day.

Since the 1980’s, in the arguments raised at national and international levels, the question of whether there is a concept called ‘class’ reached out to an ontological question. The real reason for this is the concept of class being the main notion of Marxism and the collapse of the Eastern Block which acted as the ideological leader of Marxism by the end of 80’s. This collapse gave many people of thought the idea of Marxism / socialism collapsed and thus, the concept of class collapsed.

As a matter of fact, what class went through is a change in style and crust. The inability of people who remember class in its institutionalized, organized form of the 60’s and 70’s to find a similar view of class at our day (Öğütler – Çeğin, 2010:18) was interpreted as the collapse of class and leftist consciousness. In our opinion this is not a correct interpretation; it is more appropriate and true that the class concept is considered as a material-societal reality rather than an organizational structure

because classes exist everywhere that exploitation exists: exploiting and exploited classes.

The changes that occurred in the societal structure in Turkey and the world in the past decades surely affected the labor class as well. While some thinkers claim that Marxism has lost its validity and function and that the term class struggle no longer existed, they linked this claim to the disintegration of the labor class in terms of class structure. These ideas are true for the lower class in Turkey as well. But it cannot be said that there was ever a serious struggle of the poor class in Turkey to protect their own interests. The already existing slight class stance has melted away against the neo-liberal politics that got stronger after 1980.

Our study rejects from the beginning the idea of the ‘collapse of class’ as it already began with the promise of evaluating the ‘lower income class’ within the period of 1960’s to the end of 1980’s. The approach of ‘class abolition’ is more of the claim of liberal thought. The rejection of class as a phenomenon in an inspired way is in place in the viewing of the concept of class as an outdated categorization (Öğütle – Çeğin, 2010:10).

The thought of “.. Marxism actually is a design that belongs to 19th century .. it is talented no longer to explain, therefore to orient, current ‘objective’ world ..” (Baker, korotonomedy.net) is one of the foremost views which criticize Marxism in worldwide. The acceptance of that the time of ‘meta narratives’ in which Marxism is considered foremost sample was finished long time ago, brought the acceptance of that Marxism was finished, too (Baker, korotonomedy.net).

That the class does not present a continuity in our day is another subject of criticism: “I believe that the points that the employees express their experiences through the terms of class can be mentioned as ‘class moments’.. these class moments do not necessarily point at a class development. The associations may disintegrate, people may continue to define themselves by referring to different environments and belongings, and express themselves with out of class terms..” (Buğra, 2008:18).

The society of the 80's being composed of gradually individualized people, brings to the mind the following option: As the opposite of individualism and in a natural way, has the concept of class disappeared or at least passivized? One response to this could be that collective struggle did not disappear but changed its shape. Meaning there is a common will and action for struggle but this does not go through the concept of 'class' in its classical meaning. The concepts such as organization, union, political party that represents the interests of the labor class in the public space in classical Marxism is in a somewhat outdated situation and has lost its representative power. Even if the system does not prohibit these for the usage of labor class, the labor class no longer resorts to them. It looks for the representation of its interests in the societal and cultural displays rather than the political sphere. Like being the fan of a song or singer; it takes its cultural representation as a mean to its class based status and it makes itself heard through that singer. Or the peaceful street protests, it comes together with the people that thinks like him about a subject he dislikes and expresses himself but this expansion to the street is different from the street demonstrations of the 70's, it is more conservative.

Another point of claim is that the discovery of internet entirely changed people's behavior, summoning and organizing practices. Through the internet that get involved in the societal life in the mid 90's and increased its effectiveness each year, people started to get organized and make their voices heard. 'The change in method' created the thought within the society, especially among the rightist oriented people, of the destruction of the concept of 'class', class struggle and the socialist consciousness. However, the change in method should not make people think that the content changed because there will always be people who stands against the system, hates it and trying to change it. People did not prefer to use the concept of class throughout the 80's and afterwards, at least they did not clearly express what existed in their subconscious. Nevertheless, they were aware that they had to unite by coming together with people that are uncomfortable with things that they are uncomfortable with against the system.

The main tendency in social sciences in the postmodernist era is not to see the labor class as a subject leading the societal state. We can define the "effort of

postmodernist thought to ‘decentralize’, to make the belongings ‘mobile’, ‘vague’ and ‘unclear’.. ”(Öngen, 2006:29-30) as one of the biggest factors that affected the lower class of our day. The lower class has lost the intense, organized and cooperative style it had before the 80’s and gained a completely messy, incapable of class struggle and already unwilling stance. Thus, if a class struggle will occur after the 80’s – which should occur -, what kind of a base it would lean to or whether there will be such a base became questions busying the minds of the leftist thinkers. This is already one question that is the key to the leftist thought to overcome the crisis it is in not only in Turkey but also in the world. It is obvious that against the globalizing capital, labor force also has to be globalized but how this labor bond will be formed internationally and what kind of an ideological base this global opposition will be fit are still questions without clear answers.

The boundaries of the labor class and its existence today that has no clear content, has created means to detach politics from the concept of class (Selçuk, 2006:42). We would not expect either that the labor class who displays its class stance more like a pile of people than like a mass, to pursue a line of honor and behind its interests. It is natural that the political parties do not wish to build relationships with a class whose societal stance is not consistent and principled. Just like CHP showed in the 60’s that changed its political current for the labor class, a societal movement that is consistent and knows what it wants can easily affect a political party.

It is clear that the consciousness of the labor class can only realize through struggle just as it was in 60’s and 70’s. The inference that Atilla Özsever made from the things he witnessed in TEKEL (Tütün, Tütün Mamulleri, Tuz ve Alkol İşletmeleri A.Ş, Turkish tobacco and alcoholic beverages state company) opposition which he watched in January 2010: “The oppositions, strikes are really a school for the labor class. A serious consciousness jump occurs in the laborer” (Atılğan, 2012:307).

Ahmet İnel is not hopeless either: “..among the new social class perceptions, we may not see the class struggles involving a conflict style and culture different from the past to come up as a distant possibility” (İnel, 2008:28). What is required is firstly to realize the new ‘class’ definition of the individuals that are victims of the

system and afterwards, to design the class struggle compatible with the conditions of our day.

The change in capital relationships and the understanding of labor would also change the struggle the labor would like to put front as a class. What we have witnessed is that labor could not adapt to the changes as quickly as capital and the change is perceived as ‘class struggle is over, now everybody is on their own’. However, what the labor class needed to have done was to be in cooperation within the conditions of the day to protect the rights and interests of labor just as the capital powers chose to interpret capital with new methods and a new economics philosophy by realizing a transformation. This could have been done had it been wished but as I mentioned above, not the methods but the belief in struggle became extinct.

A definition that Boratav previously made filters the changes in methods and thoughts of class opposition in Turkey. Boratav says “the poor people’s looking at the world with a class based perspective might be eroded; but the class based reflexes cannot disappear” (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:188) and “the class based reflex that was structured under the inspection of fundamentalist Islam, that targets the lifestyles of people who drinks alcohol during Ramadan in the Bosphorus and the miniskirts that Ayşe Arman represents with a destructive hatred concentration” (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:188). While Boratav elaborates on these findings, he also relates to geographical and societal reasons: “..class consciousness becomes eroded; the channels the class struggle will turn gradually becomes extinct. This process, also if it occurred while the class contradictions were getting deeper, the class based reflexes do not disappear..regarding the values, it spills to the ‘cultural’ spaces” (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:188). Boratav while continuing his words, is emphasizing on the geography of the Middle East: “I give importance to the separation between the Latin American style (namely, that involves class consciousness and tended towards class struggle) class-based reflexes and Middle East style ‘cultural’ class-based reflexes” (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:188).

The closure of the political-societal opposition channels does not mean that the class based opposition will stop. For example music made the translation of the

subconscious of especially the young people opposing the system that were kept away from politics after 80 or that keeps themselves away from politics. These two channels are important: one of them is arabesque that reflects the exhaustion of the people of the squatter environment and the other is the heavy metal music that reflects the eccentric stances of the children of the more urbanized, middle class families. In the geography of the Middle East and in a more general meaning among the Eastern societies, the political reflex is a less developed state of mind when compared to Latin America, especially a societal reflex and opposition is more rare than political soul. But if it is a must to drive an opposition, the understanding is more prone to violence based street demonstrations and battle with the police than to prefer getting organized and choosing milder ways. But even if there is a political conflict; which is rare and only seen at points where great oppressions turn into big explosions, remembering the right-left battles of the 70's would help us as an example. The protests, demonstrations not being seen by the state as a societal right is also an important thing in Turkey. In a society like this 'revolution' is always more important than the 'evolution' notion. The masses believe that they can gain their rights in the short-run in a quick and action based way rather than putting forward their organized interests in the long-run, yet the end of this belief is usually disappointment.

Boratav, develops the following identification towards the labor class in the period of time from 90's to 2010's: "...the economy had two deep crises in 1994 and in 2001; it seriously contracted in 1999. These shocks tore the labor classes apart. It destroyed their self-esteem" (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:192). The continuation of Boratav's comment was that the lower class went through a political turnout at the beginning of 90's: "A rivalry whose result was not certain yet for the support of classes, between a 'leftist block' which was composed of SHP (Sosyal Demokrat Halkçı Parti, Social Democratic Populist Party) – DSP (Demokratik Sol Parti, Democratic Left Party) and socialist parties, and political Islam that was represented by Refah (Refah Partisi, Welfare Party) had been emerged" (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:192).

Boratav explains with examples from Turkey that politics is engaged with the class concept, that it receives success when it pays attention to class: "In the years that

followed March 12 and September 12, CHP and SHP that continued the tradition, have turned to leftist lines with class based platforms despite in a revisionist way and won serious election successes” (Bora-Erdoğan, 2008:185). It is a question mark that how much these parties that Boratav mentions that are defined as ‘leftist’ in Turkey, take notice of the lower class despite their left stickers. With a habit coming from the single party period, this political line that has the habit of leaning towards bureaucracy and state establishment, has never bothered to take the lower class seriously or paid attention except exceptional times; it has left them to the mercy of the populist politics of the rightist parties.

The political radicalization of the millions of poor people throughout the 80’s that became abandoned after the disappearance of class consciousness, especially in a society like Turkey that imported capitalism is an expected situation. Even while in Western societies that reached further levels in capitalism than Turkey, economic crisis and unemployment left many people from the lower class to the hands of the extreme rightist movements that are against migrant laborers, radicalization in societies like Turkey where unemployment and inflation concepts were intensely felt is seemingly inevitable. On top of this, the ‘class’ concept being forgotten left all these poor masses abandoned. While the class consciousness was the thing that kept them together, connected them and more importantly the thing that made them protect their rights and interests against the system, with the disappearance of that class consciousness, the lower economic class that became abandoned in the public sphere turned to radical political movements with the hope of representing itself.

It is also important in this tendency that the leftist parties could not maintain a good organization and could not draw a program. These parties that are accepted to have leftist stances have made a Kemalist reflex live in their politics that reflects the concerns of the bureaucracy class rather than turning to politics that especially welcomes the poor masses and opposing and in accordance with our day on subjects like laicism, Kurdish nationalism, religious movements, European Union, globalization. If we exclude the limited effort paid by SHP in 80’s that is considered to be leftist, the disconnection of the organic bond between CHP and the lower class during and after 90’s has a big share in the lower class falling apart from the left.

5.5. Conclusion

The most important acquisition which we have from this chapter is that the evanescence of social realist films happened parallel with the tabescent class consciousness. Turkish cinema replaced two trends instead of social realist line: one is that the commercial one which was speaking to low income people and the other one is the artistic one which was speaking to high income people. If even the ‘realist’ examples were seen between the end of 1980s and the end of 2000s, ‘social realist’ examples were perished completely.

The vanishing of class consciousness is actually closely related with that the production relations changed form. Low income group who internalized the new production relations in 20 years has located itself to a semi-consciousness since the end of 2000s. This situation has provided the emergence of the films that have been sourced from low income people and that have given the centre of their scripts to low income people, since the end of 2000s.

The phase which is between the end of 1980s and the end of 2000s and the wiggling that has begun at the end of 2000s nebulously prove the relation between class consciousness of low income people and social realist films. As how happened in 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, social realist films have shown reaction parallel with the class consciousness in low income people.

CHAPTER 6

6. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

Throughout the study, we tried to find answers for the question ‘how the social realism of Turkish cinema presented urban poor from the beginning of 1960s to end of 1980s’. The reason that we favor social realism is because it carries the sensitivity and delicacy of a documentary. It focuses on urban poor problems unlike other cinema movements and functions as a mirror of urban poor life. This made it ideal tool for an academic analysis.

We have defined the goal of our thesis ‘to understand the relation between the social realism in Turkish cinema and the social transformation of the urban poor’. Our journey through dissertation gave us the opportunity to achieve our goal. Additionally, the research question which we defined as ‘how the social realism in Turkish cinema presented the change of the urban poor since the early 1960s to late 1980s’ brought us to an answer in which we can follow the social changes one on one in social realist films. As expected at the beginning, the films reflected the matters and the social stance which were existent in the real life when the films were produced of urban on cinema screen, as they were in the real life.

Actually, our study can be considered as a ‘rare’ study because it unifies cinema and sociology disciplines. Thus, it realizes a contribution both of the disciplines at the same time. Thesis is examining the issue which it chooses in three dimensions: One is the conversion of social realist films in 1960s, 70s and 80s. Thesis is providing sufficient material to examine all these three phases one by one and also, to compare those three phases each other. Secondly, we can observe urban poor by the same

method which we use for social realist films in first article: urban poor can be examined in 1960s, 70s and 80s separately and can be discussed comparatively. Another and may be the most important dimension is to analyse urban poor – social realist films mutually / interactively for every phase. That process provides a chance to understand how urban poor is picturized on social realist films and which cinematographic way that social realist films choose.

Cinema is an instrument to follow the societal conditions but it has to be underlined that, with social realist line, cinema art is realizing this duty much more effective than any other kind of cinema line. It can be thought that it is sourced from its feature which reflects the society ‘directly’. We have witnessed along the thesis that poor people’s first coming to the city and discovering the city; their permanent settlement, joining to the production relations and constructing ‘gecekondu’ areas; their adoption to neo-liberal system and gaining astuteness which wild capitalism needs. This is the societal conversion.

Also, we have witnessed that an important amount of poor people learnt the class consciousness by the effect and endeavor of intellectual class. Subsequently, they joined and supported socialist struggle; after that their standing and consciousness were collapsed and they became lost in the waves of neo-liberal approach. This is the political conversion.

When they first came to the city, an urban / modernist life is a complete obscurity for the rural people. Later on, they produced a kind of culture which is called ‘arabesque’; the place which arabesque rested on is gecekondu. Its extension on music area was known widely. After that, they continued arabesque and varied it in different styles in the city environment. This is the cultural conversion.

If we take the 6 films which are analyzed in the 60s in brief; we may summarize them with the phrase ‘unjust treatment / victimhood’. The customary victim position of the urban poor against the system is quite tragic in Turkish society that was exposed to change at a faster pace in 60s, which is compared, to previous periods of the Republic. The people who were the focus of *Gecelerin Ötesi* and *Acı Hayat* were

born and raised in the city and suppressed by poverty. All the 6 people in *Gecelerin Ötesi* and Nermin of *Acı Hayat* wanted to break the poverty cycle through illegal – unethical methods but neither of the scenarios allowed the laborers to realize this goal via immoral methods. *Otobüs Yolcuları* and *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* were films which represented the class awareness emergence of the poor people and tried to raise it even further. *Gurbet Kuşları* and *Bitmeyen Yol* focus on the phenomenon of migration and showed a commonality with regard to these notions. We may define the main sociological parameters of 60s, at least on account of the films we analyzed as follows: the rural population that flow to the city and the people born and raised in the city being introduced to the notion of migration; the suppression by the system of all low income people who met capitalism, make them city residents or migrants; the poor who try to organize and take action together against the increasing burden of the capitalist relations of production.

In our films in 70s, rather than migration itself, we see a concentration on its result, the concept of *gecekondu*. In all *Umut*, *Gelin*, *Düğün*, *Diyet*, *Maden* and *Düşman* films, the negative conditions of the poor people which are in leading roles are exhibited. The reason why ‘space’ criteria in the foreground, compared to 60s, is that the social stance and the change of the urban poor in the city is closely related to ‘*gecekondu*’ concept. *Gecekondu* is both a harbor for poor people to take refuge in and the platform where their hybrid culture in the city rests and the only place of settlement that their material opportunities can afford. In any case, if we are to conduct a study on urban poor, it is inevitable that study comes by migration and *gecekondu* in Turkey’s conditions.

In accordance with the left-right conflicts on the streets of the 70s, the mood and discourse of social realist films also toughened significantly: this is a political rage. Social realism evolved from Cabbar’s hurt and gloomy gaze in *Umut* to the temper of İlyas in *Maden* or aggression of Bülent in *Demiryol*. Another example we may give to show how social developments affected the films: Even Ömer Kavur who produced films in the line of festival films, in most of his artistic life, defined as ‘art films’ from 80s onward, used political dichotomies in *Yusuf ile Kenan*. These political films are away the sociological frameworks of *Umut* by Güney or the trilogy

Gelin – Düğün – Diyet by Akad. The 70s which started with the naivety of Umut and went on with the analysis of gecekondü and migrants by Gelin – Düğün – Diyet, reached to a point in Yusuf ile Kenan of 1979 that Kenan, who is the young member of the working class, is said that ‘eat boy, working class needs strong men’. The undoubted domination of socialist thought in secular and intellectual fractions was so overwhelming; the cinema / art community accepted this political approach as the only and prevailing ideology.

What we face in 80s is that the groups / individuals of 1970s who had wanted to change the regime, who had believed that they could change the regime and who had showed action for changing the regime, perished. Now, there are individuals who try to maintain their positions against the uncontrolled, uncontained and disrespectful economic attack of the system. With a single difference: they protected their stance not by defense but by offence. Kamil of Faize Hücum, Emine and Kamil of Bir Avuç Cennet, Yoksul of Yoksul, Mehmet of Düttürü Dünya were all the same. They were aware of that, if they did not attack as much as the system, if they were not as aggressive as the system, let alone going forward, they would even lose the position that they were holding. Thus, the struggle to survive and moving up the social ladder are the elements that foreground in the films of the 80s.

Social realist films can be criticized by forgetting the ‘entertainment’ side of cinema. Cinema has different faces and reflections; one of the incandescent sides of the cinema is to make the people have a good time and to make them enjoy the moment. Social realist films are very far away to provide a kind of pleasure to its audiences. Social realist films have always a worry to exhibit the social matters and negative notions which are in the poor people’s life. By doing so, they want to disturb the minds and the souls of people who have never faced (most probably) before the issues that social realist films mention and want to produce a kind of sensitivity and consciousness on these social issues.

A point that attracts our attention in terms of structures of the films we analyzed in 60s is that, films are idealized by directors. The dichotomies, the main axis of modernism, control the structures of these films. On another aspect, this is a

characteristic to be expected of films in the melodrama genre because there are no gray areas in melodrama: everything is either white or black. A person is good or evil, a situation is good or bad. The same situation continued into the 70s, in another direction. Now the contents of the films were controlled by the arguments of socialist ideology. Socialist ideology spread its discourse to all films, sometimes in sociological, sometimes in political sphere. This time one end of the dichotomy was the capitalist regime which is protested, and on the other end, revolution, the desire of socialist regime which promised people that the inequalities of the system would come to an end.

In the cinema line of 80s, we see neither the sharp and melodramatic black-white dichotomies of 60s nor the smell of an ideology that prevails in the films of 70s. The films of 80s, as the chaotic times that the society is going through, did not have a clear stance. However, the structure and the method of films should be appreciated in terms of structure and method that the characters such as Yoksul, Dütdüt Mehmet, Kamil Bey and others are demonstrated with both their positive and negative characteristics. This is more appropriate to the nature and goals of social realism in terms of cinema language. In any case, as the social realism evolved from 60s to 80s, when the examples in 80s are compared to the examples especially from 60s, it is seen that those from the 80s are closer to the cinema language of social realism, because they aim to have a documentarian nature. Social realism that proceeded with drawn prototypes and didactic cinema language in the 60s, and became the field of propaganda for political discourses in the 70s, produced simple films in 80s that hurt and agitated one's soul. Although the situation in 60 and 70s did not harm the character of social realism, it is clear that the examples which only 'displayed', were more compatible to its core and the real character. Although such examples are more apparent in the 80s, Umut and the Gelin-Düğün-Diyet trilogy of the 70s and Gecelerin Ötesi in 60s, are crystallized as the examples which comprehend the philosophy of social realism better and more appropriate samples to the goals and mentality of social realism.

Another point of comparison is the change in the urban poor. The leading character in 60s, idealized in Mehmet of Acı Hayat and Ekrem of Karanlıkta Uyananlar, is a

perfect prototype. As an example, Mehmet wins the lottery in *Acı Hayat* and becomes a businessman (bourgeois) but he does not lose his virtues (his stance as a worker). As opposed to utmost corruption of Ender's bourgeois father, Mehmet as a film character forms the spine of the film in order to show the bourgeois, the businessman, in the dreams of films. Indeed Ekrem too; has converted to the primary servant of the rights of the workers from being an irresponsible person who is wasting his time at pubs; he is a fearless hero of the class now. As to the reason why the superhuman models as such are portrayed in the films, we may state that an organized struggle is not known to society. As it can be seen in *Otobüs Yolcuları*, people of *gecekondu* who are asking Kemal to defend their rights, cannot think of organizing and uniting to reclaim their interests. This can be attributed to our society is a non-Western society. Uniting of ordinary people for a common cause or interest is a Western concept, especially after modernity. In non-Western societies, people need a hero: gathering around a person or devolve their power of decision to a person, they expect the protection of their rights/interests from this person. The political reflexes are not far from this either: the lower and middle classes that are only remembered toward the elections, also remembered politics only at the time of elections. Despite the fact that there is a democratic electoral system, the masses gathered around a charismatic political leader or a political party with absolute obedience, display an attachment without questioning whether the government that they choose take decisions regarding their interests or not. This herd psychology, which is unaware of their interests as an individual, is not individualized and cannot be organized. An organization based on interests needs individuals.

In the social realist films of the 80s, the idealist style of both 60s and 70 has disappeared. Hüseyin of *At*, Kamil of *Faize Hücum*, Kamil of *Bir Avuç Cennet*, Yoksul of *Yoksul* and Mehmet of *Düttürü Dünya* have all built their lives over the concept of moving forward to the higher class. And their methods to move up the social ladder change throughout the films. Apart from Hüseyin of *At*, their hearts and virtues cannot be trusted for one hundred percent. While wishing his son is to become an important man, Hüseyin chooses neither illegal nor immoral means. Whereas, when we have a look to the second half of the 80s, the sordid identity of neo-liberal thought had long invaded the individuals: Yoksul, the leading character

of *Yoksul* film, takes over the little cafe that he worked for and starts reducing the sugar cubes that he serves with tea. *Dütdüt Mehmet* in *Düttürü Dünya* steals some of the daily profit for himself while waiting on someone else's lighter stall.

Issuing low class by social realism is open to examine in regards of woman identity. Sexual identity is seen mostly to be belonged to woman gender and it is mostly under control of woman identity. That fact was reflected to the films which we have examined.

On the women of 1960s, it is seen an intensive emulation for modernist / urbanized living which forms the basis of the city. Additionally, same emulation is valid for consumption society practices which are the natural result of capitalist production relations that began to make its power feel in 1960s. But this emulation appeared in different faces. For instance, while *Nermin* of *Acı Hayat* is goaling *Ender*, she is enchanted to his economic fortune but *Fatma* of *Gurbet Kuşları* and *Fatma* of *Bitmeyen Yol* aim the dimension of the city which is stirring, attracting and shows consumption as a goal. The living in city probably seems to these two women more refined and more high up. Wide economic and cultural opportunities of city make both of these women dizzy and both of them want to adapt to the living and customs of the city by forgetting soon as possible the countryside; the place where they came.

The captivation for consumption society also continued in 1980s. The wife of *Kamil* in *Faize Hücum* and the fiancée of *Yoksul*, who left *Yoksul*, the leading character of *Yoksul* movie, have serious desire to live the life ritzy, although both of them are employed relatively unimportant roles.

We meet in *Gelin-Düğün-Diyet* trilogy of 1970s very different stance than impotent and wannabe women of 60s. The leading roles of *Gelin*, *Düğün* and *Diyet* belong to the women who improved a honorable posture against the city. They improved this posture slowly along the film time and exposed it at the end of the film distinctly. May be, this stance is a posture which director *Lütfi Akad*, who is the director of all three films, would like to see.

Neither a woman who is surrendering and emulating to daily practices which are under bourgeois class affect nor a woman who is completely stranger to the city life and still following the countryside practices. That is a stance which is not middle of these points but is absolutely different else both of them; an original third way. The spacial point which this stance leans on is gecekondu and the theoretical point which this stance on is labor. The human being, who exists in the life with her / his labor, is aware of her / his rights and class interests, has no shame to live in gecekondu and does not emulate to the life or rich class. Briefly, a person who is aware of the conditions she lives in, aware of the class, stand and existence, and a person who realizes the necessities of these concepts. This person left already behind him the countryside where he had migrated from; he knows that he is in urban now and the things he has to do as life style are so different now. At the same time, he is aware of that he is not from bourgeois class and furthermore, he does not have to be. So that, he does not envy the bourgeois practices.

The ‘honor representation’ which is based on labor exists also in Arkadaş and Düşman films which have scripts that belong to Yılmaz Güney. Azem recommends to Cemil in Arkadaş and Selim recommends İsmail in Düşman a social stance which will be composed in urban environment and as based on labor. This stance is much more appropriate for the texture of labor and low class than organized / politic struggle which were carried out in Maden and Demiryol films. It means healthier and longer term preference to make the person gain a social stance which he can recognizes his own existence in production relations than calling the poor people to a political adventure which finishes mostly at a bloody end. Turkish society expiated the price that its preference was not on long term sociologically structuring but on short term political struggle in 1980s, just after 1970s. An institutional and deeply class stance could not be generated and that results in 1980s class stance of low class was almost thoroughly vanished.

It can be seen this ‘honorable stance’ and ‘discovering her / his own existence’ cases in Bir Yudum Sevgi film also, in 1980s. Aygül of Bir Yudum Sevgi constructs herself in sociological dimension, although it is not a political construction: firstly she gets a job and gets rid of being a housewife; she gains her economic

independence. After that, she finds a man whom she can fall in love and relinquishes her sluggish husband. Constructing ‘gecekondu’ woman who continues her life by her labor support gradually along the film is in the line of Gelin-Düğün-Diyet trilogy. It is different from Arkadaş and Düşman movies; that is realizing without assistance of any political ideology. Or with another definition, it can be said that, this non-ideological construction embraces ‘apolitical’ stand as a latent ideology. Whereas, Yoksul and Düttürü Dünya which are the last two films of 1980s, let alone the construction which leans on labor, prove that in what extent laborer people embrace an obnoxious shiftiness.

An interest to city life which is similar with Fatma of Gurbet Kuşları and Fatma of Bitmeyen Yol have is seen on Hüseyin of At but with difference; Hüseyin has no interest to the consumption side of city life while he works in the merciless gears of capitalism. All he wants is to make his son join to the city life which he knows quite well that he cannot join. Moreover, he wants that his son to reach high positions in urban environment. It can be understood easily that Hüseyin’s desire about city is sourced from the concept of social stratification. His desire about his son is his ascent to higher classes and to have a better life than Hüseyin’s one. He is imagining a son who is well-educated. In that respect, Hüseyin’s expectation is differentiating than both Fatmas’ desires which are dragging after glittering world of city.

One of the most important notions in the 80s was that the system openly attacked the middle class. While living in a standard capitalist upper-middle-lower class order, it was exposed to a high cost of living and inflation. As opposed to the comfortable and carefree life of the upper class and the astuteness of the lower class, which is leaned on informal business, the middle class is in despair and hopelessness. But no matter to which class you belong, the system teaches the society and individuals that ‘if you want to survive, you have to keep up’. The struggle now is for the personal life of the individual; it is locked to ‘saving his own life’. This is due to the fact that the goal to ‘change the system’ via organized struggle was no longer valid. Due to individual effort, it evolved to ‘saving himself’. In other words, there was a change both in terms of goals and methods since 70s to 80s.

While the cruelty of the system prioritized ‘money’ among all social phenomena, the system also designed a framework in which it expected ordinary people to be experts of economy. This insane cycle of production and consumption where economy is not for the people but the people are for the economy, has positioned the economy more above where it should actually be in social life and whereby, trivialized all other institutions which have been constructed in the name of civilization. Social institutions such as politics, culture, law, health, education etc. gained importance only as much as they served and answered to the expectations of economy institution. There is no society in which one institution is more powerful than the other ones can be a healthy society if the balance between institutions is disturbed.

The exclusion of poor people is a case which is witnessed also in our thesis films. Toff brother of Nevin and his friends humiliates Kemal because of he is a driver in *Otobüs Yolcuları*, Headworker awakes Ahmet like poking an animal in *Bitmeyen Yol*, Cabbar faces a scornful treatment in police station in *Umut*, Hüseyin is insulted by a rich man in *At*, Emine and her family is labeled as ‘pikey’ by an urban woman in *Bir Avuç Cennet*, Yoksul character is called always ‘Yoksul’ (Poor) by the people in the office block where he works in *Yoksul* film.. The examples can be increased but the clear fact is that social exclusion in regards of any criteria can be followed in the films that we have examined.

Although the societal dynamics and social transformation are rather different from Western countries, it can be followed ‘culture of poverty’ and ‘underclass’ concepts in social realist films of Turkish cinema. We are determining that there is a parallel trend in social realist films with these scientific discussions: ‘cultural crash and conflict’ are widely examined in the films of our thesis: *Gurbet Kuşları*, *Bitmeyen Yol*, *Gelin*, *Düğün*, *Diyet* and ‘underclass’ notion can be seen in *Yusuf ile Kenan*, *At*, *Bir Avuç Cennet* films. There are some conceptual overlappings but because of the dynamics of Western and Turkish societies are different, % 100 match-up between both of urban poor people of two sides can not be possible. Even ‘class’ is unfamiliar to Turkish society and ‘underclass’ concept is very unfamiliar. It can be understood from ‘underclass’: the people who can not include even to gecekondu environment after the migration process. Also, it is not possible to talk about ‘culture of poverty’

in 1960s Turkey. Along 1970s, by the affect of gecekonu as a platform and arabesque music as a cultural instrument, culture of poor people was formed. In 1980s, that culture became the dominant culture and it has controlled the city environment culturally in various forms since then.

The place of the poor who aims to integrate himself to the city life is shanty. Although shanty did not change so much in regards of its facilities since 1960s to 1980s, the poor who live there had a serious change. I am thinking that this change is related mostly with the 'state of belonging' The poor who was very unfamiliar to city life and can be considered nearly in a guest position in 1960s, internalized the 'shanty' environment due to getting used to the city life in 1970s. The poor defended himself against city by making shanty as a shelter for himself; furthermore the exposed arabesque life philosophy and arabesque music which is his cultural brand. Poor people who passed to offence position from defence position in 1980s proclaimed sovereignty in the city by seizing the city. Shanty environment did not support this lunge only by quantitative plenty; shanty is also proof about change in mentality that controls the urban life.

We saw the representation of this fact while watching the films. The poor in Bitmeyen Yol of 1960s who saw the traffic for the first time and who is impotent for accrossing the road converted to a position in Gelin of 1970s having a shanty home and a job; he considered himself as a part of the city. It is faced with a poor who is trying to go up to higher class by embracing the capitalist approach in Düttürü Dünya of 1980s. In Bir Yudum Sevgi, which is another film of 1980s, a woman and a man are occupying the lead roles who would like to pass to the modernist understanding of city by abandoning traditional / conservative values.

We meet the 'shanty' concept in almost all films of our film list but the films which shanty joins to the movie as an actor by leaving its 'place' identity are Bitmeyen Yol, Umut, Gelin, Düğün, Diyet, Düşman, At, Bir Yudum Sevgi, Bir Avuç Cennet and Düttürü Dünya. In Bitmeyen Yol, the film reflects wonderful how the migrant people consider the shanty as a shelter for themselves against the utmost eeriness of the city. In Gelin-Düğün-Diyet, the poor got used and learn the urban life much more. He

noticed that he was a part of city; he was needed in capitalist production relations but this did not change that he had to struggle against the wild conditions of shanty area and city. In *At* and *Bir Avuç Cennet*, which are the two examples from 1980s, engrossingly, the places where the poor people living can not be considered even shanty. The poor people stay in a desolated, open-air in a garden in *At* film and the family of *Bir Avuç Cennet* film live in a forsaken train carriage. We can interpret this situation as ‘retrogradation’ in regards of the stance of poor. And, it is understood how shanty is important for the ‘struggle against system’ and ‘class consciousness’ as a platform. The poor who had timid steps in 1960s did not have a valorous settling and a honored social stance that is leaned on shanty. Moreover, it was needed to teach this stance against capitalist system by the assist of socialist realist films. But when it came to 1970s, poor constructed and owned a place which was called ‘shanty’; this location did not only produce a sociological identity for himself but also resulted in a political interrogation at most of the times. But in 1980s, neither *At* nor *Bir Avuç Cennet* provided even a shanty for poor. This preference of films can be also understood the reflection of collapsing in class consciousness. Without a location, it is not possible to construct a class consciousness and without a class consciousness, it is not possible to have a home and a place. Whereas, in *Bir Yudum Sevgi*, the leading characters produced a posture by falling love with each other in shanty environment and they could defeat together all difficulties and people around them, in this wise. If they did not take heart from the shanty environment, most probably, they could not realize their love. I am interpreting their love and uniting of their forces as an indirectly and non-political jibbing against the system.

Another point which we can underline is the separation between the poor who join the city by migration and the poor who already is born and raised up in the city. In the same time, that separation specifies the relation with modernity; to what extent the poor is modernized or not. It is witnessed mostly the migrated poor in our film list and it is compatible with the societal facts because the majority of the urban poor is rural-rooted people. Sometimes, a migrant story accompanies the poor in the films, sometimes it does not. *Gurbet Kuşları*, *Bitmeyen Yol*, *Yusuf ile Kenan*, *At*, *Bir Avuç Cennet* films begin their scripts by migration and it can be followed the effects and the reflections of migration along the film.

In *Umut*, *Gelin*, *Düğün*, *Diyet*, *Düşman*, *Bir Yudum Sevgi*, *Yoksul*; we detect a ‘stable’ poor. Although he does not reflect an astonishment and has been getting used to the city environment due to the time he had in the city, he is still keep going on to the countryside traditions largely. May be, we can show *Gecelerin Ötesi*, *Acı Hayat* and *Faize Hücum* as exceptions because the leading characters of these films are urbanized and embracing the modernist life although they are poor. The poor also in *Otobüs Yolcuları* and *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, the samples of 1960s whose ideological sides are more distinctive, are on this way. Generally, the poor characters exhibit a more qualified and sophisticated poor model in 1960s films than 1970s and 1980s films. They use articular dialect of Turkish, they are seen in modern clothes and they don’t have any top level cultural conflict with urban life besides relatively smaller ones. These facts are valid for all films except *Bitmeyen Yol*. *Gecelerin Otesi*, *Otobüs Yolcuları*, *Acı Hayat*, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* do not contain migration stories already. Family in *Gurbet Kuşları*, especially the children of family, do not exhibit contrary language dialect or wearing style to urban life. Only *Bitmeyen Yol* makes us face with the countryside and migration facts, with their utmost reality. This situation is sourced mostly the social structure of low income people at that time: the poor who are born and raised up in the city is exhibiting more decent and elegant attitudes. That must be happened to raised up in city culture and the affects of city culture.

The poor which is picturized in 1970s and 1980s films are the migrant-rooted and as a natural consequence of that, they are the people who have not internalized the features of city life. In *Gelin*, the father of the family, *Hacı İlyas* and the elder brother, *Hıdır* are showing a massive cultural protection on the family. When migrants settle in the city, they are exhibiting huge defence against the cultural norms and modern life. Especially, we are witnessing this fact in *Gelin-Düğün-Diyet* trio of *Lütfi Akad*. *Akad* is underlining the with the capital letters the conflicts which the poor people have and which are sourced from modernist – antimodernist dichotomy. This is different from the young people of *Gurbet Kuşları* who wonder and try to learn the city culture or the peasants of *Bitmeyen Yol*, who are showing a wide admiration and curiosity to urban.

In 1980s, poor have begun to attack. It can be seen that attack in the ‘keen set’ journey of Hüseyin in *At* which is towards to urban from countryside. Kamil of *Faize Hücüm*, Aygül and Cemal in *Bir Yudum Sevgi*, Kamil and Emine of *Bir Avuç Cennet*, Yoksul of *Yoksul*, Rauf of *Çark*, Mehmet of *Düttürü Dünya..* In spite of their instruments and ways are different, the common point of all of them that they can find a power and a courage in their inside to attack to the system. This is different than the poor who is diffident and admirative for city in 1960s and also different than the poor who is in self-defence against the city in 1970s. That poor in 1980s is attacking with a confidence which is come from to know that, having the quantitative majority in city and turning the intellectual axis of urban area in the favor of poor by the help of arabesque music.

We can follow modernist – antimodernist dichotomy mostly in 1960s, when poor people, Turkish society and Turkish cinema were looking for identities for themselves. In 1970s, it is possible to talk about a hybrid-constructed identity that can be a bracket point for poor people. In 1980s, this hybrid identity that contains notions from both of urban and countryside cultures completed its occupation in urban environment.

Actually, the films which should be considered in ‘socialist realism’; *Otobüs Yolcuları*, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar*, *Arkadaş*, *Maden*, *Demiryol* and *Çark*, have more aggressive and political cinema culture. Poor people are presented in class culture and political context. Namely, the films dont bring into prominence the conflicts which are seen on modernist – antimodernist dichotomy. However, the differences of the reflection on cinema screen of poor people which is sourced from the time when the film in question is made. For instance, the poor in 1960s films talk with a kind Istanbul dialect, even if they migrate from Anatolia, like in *Gurbet Kuşları*. They do not use peasant style clothes or any cultural thing that reminds countryside. Their only difference is ‘being poor’ unlike the middle and rich class; they dont reflect any cultural difference. Whereas, in 1970s, the poor of *Umut*, *Gelin*, *Düğün*, *Diyet* and *Düşman* have absolutely countryside cultural features and notions although they are existing in urban area in the script. That case should be seen as a situation which belongs to developing countries that have not finished their modernization process.

People are migrating to city and living in the city, and they are still so away the cultural dynamics and necessities of urban area. In 1980s films, poor people are mostly present a hybrid stance. This hybrid stance is sourced from both the rural values that are inherited to them previous generations of their family and the urban values that they could learn and adapt themselves as far as they can do. In this hybrid posture, rural values are participating much more portion in their inner world. For instance, Yoksul of Yoksul, as a person who works in tea shop, is stil wearing peasant-style flat cap and peasant style jacket. They are adapting themselves to the city life only in economic criteria and that reflects mostly a ‘peasant shiftiness’ into their life. In Faize Hücüm, Yoksul and Düttürü Dünya, we can follow this ‘playing the economy play according to capitalist rules’ endeavor so clearly.

We can open a different trace due to ‘place’ criteria: some of poor people whom we examine are born and raised up in city. Some of them are ‘newcomer’ to the city and some of them have lived in the city for a while in gecekondu area and blended to the city to some extent. Gecelerin Ötesi, Acı Hayat, Faize Hücüm and Düttürü Dünya must be considered in the first definition. Gurbet Kuşları, Bitmeyen Yol, Yusuf ile Kenan, At and Bir Avuç Cennet can be shown in the second cathegory and Umut, Gelin, Düğün, Diyet, Bir Yudum Sevgi can be seen in the third cathegory. The most interesting point in this categorization is the second section, the ‘newcomer’ ones. They are seen in a great shock but on the other hand, they are in defiance with a huge eagerness and self-confidence against the city. This defiance begins in Gurbet Kuşları by the expression of ‘we will be the king of this city’, continues the words of Hasan in Bitmeyen Yol ‘the pavements are golden here, you just need to know how to earn it’. In Yusuf ile Kenan, Yusuf’s tendency to the illegal jobs is rested on substantially his emulation to city life and the facilities which are presented by city. Hüseyin of At comes to the city with an unbelievable motivation to make his son educate. Also, Emine and Kamil of Bir Avuç Cennet have high hopes from the city about that city provides them a wealthy and comfortable life. That ‘first crash with the city’ and ‘first expression from the city’ mostly are full of hopes and expectations; sometimes so lofty ones that city never presents to the poor people. These hopes and expectations are rationalized in the time and converted to the realistic points. When poor spends time for a while in the city, he notices that city’s

pavements are not golden and being a king in the city is not easy as far as they expect. Sometimes, they learn like Hüseyin of *At* that city is not a kind of place which should be emulated as well as they do. Sometimes, they notice like Kenan of *Yusuf ile Kenan* that the acquisitions that are not leaned on labor in the city can be leaned on illegal, dirty jobs; like how his elder brother Yusuf gets. Sometimes, they understand like Emine and Kamil of *Bir Avuç Cennet* that city does not give to the poor people even an accommodation place, even a shanty.

Briefly, the transformation of poor people have two dimensions: one is the transformation in production relations and the other one is the transformation in their social values and life, which is depended on the extent of the influence of modernity. Considering ‘the change in social values and life’ in ‘the change in production relations’ seems the right preference because the change in the life styles is the natural result of the change in the production relations, with a Marxist view.

Our study, while continuing the examination of low class by social realism line, at the same time, has thrown light on a phase of Turkish society indirectly. This situation proves the close and alive relation between cinema and society once again.

REFERENCES

ABİSEL, Nilgün. 1994. Türk sinemasında demokrasi kavramının gelişmesi. Editör, Oğuz Onaran. Ankara. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.

ACAR, Erhan. 1986. 'Kapitalizm Yaşamak İşi: Emek Sürecinin İşyeri Mekanı ve İşbaşı Zamanı Ötesine Uzantıları'. 11.Tez Kitap Dizisi, 'Sağda ve Solda Liberalizm'. İstanbul. Uluslararası Yayıncılık.

ADAMAN, Fikret – KEYDER, Çağlar. 2006. "Türkiye'de Büyük Kentlerin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma". Avrupa Komisyonu, Sosyal Dışlanma ile Mücadelede Mahalli Topluluk Eylem Programı, 2002-2006 Raporu. http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/2006/study_turkey_tr.pdf Access Date: 21 March 2015.

AKERSON, Tanju. 1966. *Yeni Sinema*. Ekim – Kasım sayısı.

AKKAYA, Yüksel. 2010. Cumhuriyet'in Hamalları: İşçiler. İstanbul. Yordam Kitap.

AKMAN, Nuriye. 1997. (Interview with Atıf Yılmaz, 10 September 1995, Sabah, Turkish Daily Newspaper) in 'Üzümünü Ye, Bağını Sor'. İmge Kitabevi Yayınları. Ankara.

AKTAŞ, Ahmet Salih. 2006. "Sınıf Analizleri ve Sınıf Şemaları: Türkiye Örneğine Ampirik Yaklaşım" in "2. Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye'yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak". Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı. İstanbul.

ALKAN, Türker. 1981. Kadın-Erkek Eşitsizliği Sorunu. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları. Ankara.

ALTAN, Senem. 2002. 'Önsevişmede Tedirginim', (Interview with Okan Bayülgen). Aktüel, Weekly Magazine. April, 11-17. Issue 560. Pages 32-34.

ARSLAN, Ali. 2004. Temel Sorunları ve Açılımları ile Sınıf Teorisi, Sınıf Bilinci ve Orta Sınıflar. *Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2004 / 2. 126-143.

ARSLAN, Tunca. 2011, November 3rd. The interview that I did with him.

ATAKAV, Eylem. 2013. Women and Turkish Cinema – Gender Politics, Cultural Identity and Representation. Routledge. London – New York.

ATILGAN, Gökhan. 2012. “Türkiye’de Toplumsal Sınıflar:1923 – 2010” in “1920’den Günümüze Türkiye’de Toplumsal Yapı ve Değişim. Phoenix Yayınevi. Ankara.

AYBAR, Mehmet Ali. 1962. Öncü Gazetesi, 19 Ağustos sayısı, Sayfa 5.

AYÇA, Engin. 1974. “ ‘Umut’ filmi üstüne tartışma “. Yedinci Sanat, Mayıs sayısı.

AYDEMİR, Şenay. 2013. The interview that I did with him on 17 April 2013, via e-mail.

AYDINOĞLU, Ergun. 2006. “Türkiye’de Sol (1960-1980): Hangi Sınıfın Solu” in “2. Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye’yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak”. Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı. İstanbul.

AYKAÇ YANARDAĞ, Aslıhan. 2008. “İşçi sınıfı oluşumunu yeniden düşünmek: Turizm sektöründen örnekler”. Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

BALİ, Rıfat N. 2002. Tarz-ı Hayat’tan Life Style’a: Yeni Seçkinler, Yeni Mekanlar, Yeni Yaşamlar. İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul.

Birikim. 1975. “ Brecht, Althusser ve Marksist Sanat “. Monthly Journal, September issue.

<http://www.birikimdergisi.com/birikim/dergiyazi.aspx?did=2&dsid=254&dyid=39>.

Access Date: 23 May 2015.

BELGE, Murat. 1992a. 12 Yıl Sonra 12 Eylül. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

BELGE, Murat. 1992b. 'Sol' in 'Geçiş Sürecinde Türkiye' (Derleyenler: Irvin Cemil SCHICK – Ertuğrul Ahmet TONAK). Belge Yayınları. İstanbul.

BERBER, Şakir. 2003. Modern Bir Olgu Olarak Sosyal Sınıflar. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 2003-9. Pg. 223-232.

BERMAN, Marshall. 1994. Katı Olan Her Şey Buharlaşıyor. İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul.

BIÇKI, Doğan. 2011. "Geleceğin Kentte İnşası: Çanakkale Kırsalında Göç Eğilimleri". Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi. Cilt 16, Sayı 3.

BAKER, Ulus. "Marx'ın Bir Çift Sözü Var" <http://www.korotonomedy.net/kor/index.php?id=21,33,0,0,1,0> (The article was published firstly in Birikim journal, April 1996, Issue 84). Access Date: 13 August 2015.

BONDANELLA, Peter. 2006. "Italian Neorealism, The postwar renaissance of Italian cinema" in "Traditions In World Cinema". Edited by Linda Badley, R. Barton Palmer and Steven Jay Schneider. Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.

BORA, Tanıl. 2010. "Mavileşen Beyaz Yakalar / 'İşadami Görünümlü Memurlar, İşçiler..' ".Birikim, monthly journal. Issue 259, November 2010. Birikim Publications, İstanbul.

BORA, Tanıl – ERDOĞAN, Necmi. 2008. Giriş Yazısı. Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

BORA, Tanıl – ERDOĞAN, Necmi. 2008. "Korkut Boratav'la sınıf analizi üzerine". Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

BORATAV, Korkut. 1983. "Türkiye'de Popülizm:1962-1976 Dönemi Üzerine Notlar" in 'Yapıt'. Sayı 1, Ekim-Kasım.

BORATAV, Korkut. 1995. Türkiye İktisat Tarihi, 1908 – 1985. Gerçek Yayınevi. İstanbul.

BORATAV, Korkut. 1996. 'İktisat Politikaları 1980-1994'. Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi. Cilt 13, İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul.

BORDWELL, David – THOMPSON, Kristin. 2009. Film Sanatı. De Ki Yayınları. Ankara.

BOSTANCIOĞLU, Adnan. 2011. Bitmeyen Yolculuk, Oğuzhan Müftüoğlu Kitabı. Ayrıntı Yayınları. İstanbul.

BUĞRA, Ayşe. 2008. " Sınıf ve Siyaset ". Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

CANBAZOĞLU, Cumhur. 2013. The interview that I did with him on 19 March 2013, via e-mail.

CIVAOĞLU, Güneri. 1996. "Tavla – Satranç – Üçkağıt" (Backgammon – Chess – Swindle). Milliyet, daily newspaper. 15 September 1996.

COOK, Pam. 2007. "The Nouvelle Vague" in "The Cinema Book", Editor: Pam Cook. British Film Institute. London.

CORRIGAN, Timothy. 2008. Film Eleştirisi. Dipnot Yayınları. Ankara.

ÇAYAN, Mahir. 1976. Bütün Yazılar (Hazırlayan: Mehmet Ali Mugultay). Evren Yayınları. İstanbul.

DALDAL, Aslı. 2005. 1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik. Homer Kitabevi, İstanbul.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/social+realism>. Access Date: 15 May 2015.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/socialist%20realism>. Access Date: 15 May 2015.

DOĞAN, Zafer. 2004. "Gecekonduyan Varoşlara". Teori ve Politika Dergisi. 'Dosya: Ezilenlerin Marksizmi'. Yaz – Güz, Sayı: 35 – 36.

<http://www.teorivepolitika.net/index.php/okunabilir-yazilar/item/205-gecekondudan-varoslara> Access date: 1 April 2015.

DOĞAN TOPÇU, Aslıhan. 2013. The interview that I did with him on 20 June 2013, via e-mail.

DORSAY, Atilla. 1985. Cumhuriyet, Turkish daily newspaper. 15 November.

DÖNMEZ-COLİN, Gönül. 2014. The Routledge Dictionary of Turkish Cinema. Routledge. London, New York.

DUBEN, Alan. 1982. "The Significance of Family and Kinship in Urban Turkey" in "Sex Roles, Family and Community in Turkey". (ed. Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı). Indiana University Turkish Studies. Bloomington, Indiana, USA.

ECEVİT, Bülent. 2009. Ortanın Solu. Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları. İstanbul.

EKİCİ, Aslı. 2007. "1980-1990 Arası Türk Sinemasında Kentsel Ailede Kadının Konumu". Basılmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Radyo Televizyon Sinema Anabilim Dalı.

<http://ekitap.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR,80306/farkli-sinema-calismalari.html>. Access Date: 12 February 2015.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Film_analysis. Access Date: 18 February 2015.

ERDER, Sema. 1995. "Yeni Kentliler ve Kentin Yeni Yoksulları". Toplum ve Bilim. Bahar 95, Sayı 66.

ERDOĞAN, Necmi. 1998. "Demokratik Soldan Devrimci Yol'a: 1970'lerde Sol Poülizm Üzerine". Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 78, 1998 Güz.

ERDOĞAN, Nezih. 2006. "Narrative of resistance: national identity and ambivalence in the Turkish melodrama between 1965 and 1975" in "Screening World Cinema" (ed. Catherine GRANT – Annette KUHN). Routledge. London – New York.

ERGİL, Doğu. 1986. Toplumsal Eşitsizliğin Yapısı. Ankara. Sevin Matbaası.

ERMAN, Tahire. 2004: “Gecekondu Çalışmalarında ‘Öteki’ Olarak Gecekondu Kurguları”, European Journal Of Turkish Studies, Sayı:1. <http://ejts.revues.org/85>. Access date: 27 March 2015.

ERSÖZ, Cezmi. 1985. ‘Arabesk ve Nevroz’. Yeni Gündem. 16 Ocak 1985. Sayı 14.

ESEN, Şükran. 2000. 80’ler Türkiye’inde Sinema. Beta Yayıncılık. İstanbul.

EVREN, Burçak. 1990. Türk Sinemasında Yeni Konumlar. Broy Yayınları. İstanbul.

GÖKTÜRK, Yücel – BENGİ, Derya. 2000. ‘Bir Köprüyüm Aslında’ (Interview with Maria Rita Epik) in ‘Roll’ magazine. September – October, 46th issue.

GÜZEL, Şehmus. 1983. “Cumhuriyet Türkiye’inde İşçi Hareketleri” in “Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye Ansiklopedisi”. Cilt 7. İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul.

HAKAN, Fikret. 2012. Türk Sinema Tarihi. İstanbul. İnkılap Kitabevi.

HALE, William. 1981. “The Political and Economic Developmet of Modern Turkey”. Croom Helm. London.

HALPERN, Manfred. 1963. The Politics of Social Change in the Middle East and North Africa. Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton University Press.

HARVEY, David L. – REED, Michael. 1992. “Paradigms of Poverty: A Critical Assessment of Contemporary Perspectives”. International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society. Volume 6, No 2.

HEINICH, Nathalie. 2013. Sanat Sosyolojisi. Bağlam Yayıncılık. İstanbul.

HOBBSAWM, Eric John. 1971. “Class Consciousness in History” in “Aspects of History and Class Consciousness” (ed. Istvan Meszaros). Routledge&Kegan Paul. London.

HUNTINGTON, Samuel. 1969. Political Order in Changing Societies. New Haven, Connecticut. Yale University Press.

İNSEL, Ahmet. 2008. “ Sosyal Sınıflar Tarihe Mi Karıştı? ”. Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

KABADAYI, Lale. 2013. Film Eleştirisi: Kuramsal Çerçeve ve Sinemamızdan Örnek Çözümlemeler. Ayrıntı Yayınları. İstanbul.

KAĞITÇIBAŞI, Çiğdem. 2007. Kültürel Psikoloji: Kültür Bağlamında İnsan ve Aile. Evrim Yayınları. İstanbul.

KAPLAN, Neşe. 2003. “Toplumsal Konumu ve Bu Konumunun değişimiyle Türk Sinemasında Kadın”. İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 2003; 2(4):149-173. İstanbul.

KARA, Mesut. 2012. 7 August. http://www.sadibey.com/2012/07/31/toplumsal-gercekci-sinema-metin-erksanla-baslar/#.VEj1xnJ_tHU. Access Date: 15 June 2014.

KARADOĞAN, Ali. 1999. Şerif Gören Sineması. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Radyo TV Sinema Ana Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ankara.

KARAŞİN, Hamdi. 2012. “Ülkemizin ve Sinemamızın Sacayağı: Ömer Lütfi Akad’ın Türkiye Üçlemesi”. Yeni Film, Sayı 25, Mart.

KEYDER, Çağlar. 1987. State and Class in Turkey: A Study in Capitalist Development. London, New York. Verso Books.

KREUGER, Larry W. – NEUMAN, W. Lawrance. 2006. Social Work Research Methods with Research Navigator. Pearson Education Ltd. Harlow, Essex. <http://www.pearsonhighered.com/samplechapter/0205470114.pdf>. Access Date: 17 January 2015.

KRISHNAN, Maya. 2012. Transformation of the Human Conscience: The Origins of Socialist Realism. The Concord Review, Inc. (online journal article), June month. http://www.tcr.org/tcr/essays/EP_TCR_21_1_F10_Socialist.pdf. Access Date: 8 May 2014.

KNOX, Paul – PINCH, Steven. 2010. Urban Social Geography, An Introduction. Pearson Education Limited. Harlow, Essex.

KOÇ, Yıldırım. 1999. Türk-İş Tarihinden Portreler, Eski Sendikacılardan Anılar – Gözlemler. 1. Türkiye İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu Yayınları. Ankara.

KOÇ, Yıldırım. 2010. 30. Yıldönümünde 12 Eylül Darbesi ve İşçi Sınıfı. Mülkiye Dergisi. Güz, Sayı 268.

KOÇAK, Hakan. 2008. “Türkiye işçi sınıfı oluşumunun sessiz yılları:1950’ler”. Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

KOZANOĞLU, Hayri. 1993. Yuppiler, Prensler ve Bizim Kuşak. İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul.

KOZANOĞLU, Hayri. 1997. ‘Kanunsuzluk Ekonomisi’. Birikim. Ocak-Şubat, Sayı 93-94.

KUHN, Annette. 2007. “Soviet Cinema” in “The Cinema Book”, Editor: Pam Cook. British Film Institute. London.

KURTULUŞ, Hatice – TÜRKÜN, Asuman. 2006. “ Türkiye’de Sosyal Bilimlerde ‘Sınıf’ ” in “2. Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye’yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak”. Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı. İstanbul.

KURTULUŞ, Özgür. “V için bir film eleştirisi”. <http://cinnet.org/cinaynalar/vforvandetta.php>. Access Date: 14 March 2015.

KUTLAR, Onat. 1975. “Toplumcu ve Gerçekçi Bir Sinema Sanatı İçin Teorik Alanın Gözden Geçirilmesi Amacıyla İlk Notlar”. Birikim Dergisi. Mart, 1. Sayı. Sayfa 10-14.

LAÇİNER, Ömer. 1996. ‘Kentlerin Dönüşümü’. Birikim dergisi. Haziran-Temmuz. Sayı 86-87.

LANGE, Matthew. 2013. “Comparative-Historical Methods: An Introduction” in ‘Comparative-Historical Methods’. SAGE Publications Ltd., Thousand Oaks,

California. http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/50317_Lange_Chapter_1.pdf. Access Date: 11 May 2015.

LANGFORD, Barry. 2006. *Film Genre Hollywood and Beyond*. Edinburgh University Press. Edinburgh.

LEWIS, Oscar. 1966. 'The Culture of Poverty'. *Scientific American*, Volume 215, No 4. October 1966.

LIPOVSKY, Igor. 1992. *The Socialist Movement in Turkey 1960-1980*. Brill Press. Leiden.

LOTMAN, Yuri. 1999. *Sinema estetiğinin sorunları, filmin semiotiğine giriş*. Öteki Yayınevi. Ankara.

MAKAL, Oğuz. 1987. *Sinemada Yedinci Adam, Türk Sinemasında İç ve Dış Göç Olayı*. Marş Matbaası. İzmir.

MAKTAV, Hilmi. 1998. *1980 Sonrasında Türkiye'de Yaşanan İdeolojik ve Kültürel Dönüşümlerin Türk Sinemasına Yansımaları*. İzmir. Basılmamış Doktora Tezi.

MAKTAV, Hilmi. 2001. "Türk Sinemasında Yoksulluk ve Yoksul Kahramanlar". *Toplum ve Bilim*. Yaz, Sayı 89.

MARX, Karl – ENGELS, Friedrich. 1992. *Alman İdeolojisi*. Ankara, Sol Yayınları.

MARX, Karl. 1990. *Louis Bonaparte'in 18 Brumaire'i*. Ankara. Sol Yayınları.

Milliyet. Turkish Daily Newspaper. 7 April 2014. "Festival Günlüğü 7 Nisan, İstanbul Film Festivali'nde bugün ne var ne yok?". <http://www.milliyet.com.tr/festival-gunlugu-7-nisan-sinema-1863297/>. Access Date: 13 May 2015.

MERÇİL, İpek. 2008. "Toplumda olmak: Toplumsal bağın kültürlerle imtihanı". *Toplum ve Bilim*. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

MONACO, James. 2009. How To Read A Film: Movies, Media And Beyond. Oxford University Press. New York.

NOWELL-SMITH, Geoffrey. 2007. "Italian Neo-Realism" in "The Cinema Book", Editor: Pam Cook. British Film Institute. London.

OKTAY, Ahmet. 2000. Toplumcu gerçekçiliğin kaynakları. İstanbul. Tümsamanlar Yayıncılık.

OKYAY, Sevin. 1996. "Bugünden Yarına" in "Türk Sineması Üzerine Düşünceler" (ed. Süleyman Murat DİNÇER). Doruk Yayıncılık. Ankara.

OLLMAN, Bertell. 2008. Diyalektiğin Dansı. İstanbul. Yordam Kitap.

OSTANDER, Susan. 1980. "Upper Class Women: Class consciousness as Conduct and Meaning" in "Power Structure Research". (ed. George William DOMHOFF). Sage Publications. London.

OZAN, Ebru Deniz. 2012. Gülme Sırası Bizde: 12 Eylül'e Giderken Sermaye Sınıfı, Kriz ve Devlet. Metis Yayınları. İstanbul.

ÖĞÜTLE, Vefa Saygın – ÇEĞİN, Güney. 2010. Toplumsal Sınıfların İlişkisel Gerçekliği. Ankara. Tan Kitabevi Yayınları.

ÖNGEN, Tülin. 1999. Sınıf ve Sınıf Mücadelesi Nedir. *Sağlık Çalışanlarının Sağlığı 1. Ulusal Kongresi*, 26-28 Kasım 1999. Ankara. Pg 27-32.

ÖNGEN, Tülin. 2002. Marx ve Sınıf. *Praksis Dergisi*. Güz-8. Pg. 9-28.

ÖNGEN, Tülin. 2006. "Marksist Sınıf Kavramının ve Sınıf Analizinin Ayırt Edici Özellikleri" in "2. Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye'yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak". Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı. İstanbul.

ÖZBEK SÖNMEZ, İpek. 2007. Concentrated Urban Poverty: The Case of Izmir Inner Area, Turkey. *European Planning Studies*, Volume 15, No 3, April.

ÖZDEN, Zafer. 2004. Film Eleştirisi. İmge Kitabevi. Ankara.

ÖZGENTÜRK, Ali. 1983. At. Say Yayınları. İstanbul.

ÖZGÜÇ, Agah. 2005. Türlerle Türk Sineması. Dünya Kitapları. İstanbul.

ÖZGÜR DURMAZ, Tuğba. 2014. “Türk sineması bir asrı devirdi”, 8 Mart 2014. <http://www.aa.com.tr/tr/kultur-sanat/turk-sineması-bir-asrı-devirdi/176411>. Access Date: 22 April 2015.

ÖZÖN, Nijat. 1995. Karagöz'den Sinemaya, Türk Sineması ve Sorunları. 2nd Volume. Kitle Yayınları, Ankara.

ÖZSEVER, Atilla. 1998. “15-16 Haziran Olayları”. Türkiye Sendikacılık Ansiklopedisi, Cilt 2. Kültür Bakanlığı ve Tarih Vakfı. İstanbul.

POLANYI, Karl. 2000. Büyük Dönüşüm. İletişim Yayınları. İstanbul.

PRZEWORSKI, Adam. 1977. ‘Proletariat into a Class’, Politics and Society, Volume 7, No 4, 343 – 401.

PÖSTEKİ, Nigar. 2005. 1990 Sonrası Türk Sineması, 1990-2005. Es Yayınları. İstanbul.

Radikal. 2006. Daily Newspaper. December 29th, Page 6.

REFİĞ, Halit. 1971. Ulusal Sinema Kavgası. İstanbul. Hareket Yayınları.

REFİĞ, Halit. 1996. “Türk Sineması'nın Yükseliş ve Çöküşü Üzerine Bazı Düşünceler” in “Türk Sineması Üzerine Düşünceler” (ed. Süleyman Murat DİNÇER). Doruk Yayıncılık. Ankara.

RYAN, Michael – KELLNER, Douglas. 1997. Politik Kamera : Çağdaş Hollywood Sinemasının İdeolojisi ve Politikası. Ayrıntı Yayınları. İstanbul.

RUDER, Cynthia A. 2004. Socialist Realism. Encyclopedia of Russian History. The Gale Group Inc. http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/socialist_realism.aspx. Access Date: 12 April 2015.

SAVRAN, Sungur. 2010. Türkiye’de Sınıf Mücadeleleri, Cilt1: 1908-1980. Yordam Kitap. İstanbul.

SELÇUK, İlhan. 1965. Cumhuriyet, Turkish Daily Newspaper. 22 May.

SELÇUK, Fatma Ülkü. 2006. “İşçi Sınıfının Kapsamının Belirlenmesinde Bazı Marksist Yaklaşımlar ve Bu Yaklaşımların Temel Politik Sonuçları” in “2. Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye’yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak”. Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı. İstanbul.

SENCER, Muzaffer. 1974. Türkiye’de Siyasal Partilerin Sosyal Temelleri. May Yayınları. İstanbul.

SCHICK, Irvin Cemil – TONAK, Ertuğrul Ahmet. 1992. ‘Sonuç’ in ‘Geçiş Sürecinde Türkiye’. Belge Yayınları. İstanbul.

SCOGNAMILLO, Giovanni. 1990. Türk Sinema Tarihi, 1896-1959. Volume 1. Metis Yayınları, İstanbul.

SCOGNAMILLO, Giovanni. 1996. “Türk Sineması’nın Bugünü ve Yarını” in “Türk Sineması Üzerine Düşünceler” (ed. Süleyman Murat DİNÇER). Doruk Yayıncılık. Ankara.

SCOGNAMILLO, Giovanni. 2010. Türk Sinema Tarihi. İstanbul. Kabalcı Yayınevi.

https://www.soc.umn.edu/soc3801w/Lecture%20Slides/Lecture_21_sp06.pdf. Access Date: 26 December 2014.

SOYKAN, Ömer Naci. 2009. ‘Kuramsal Çerçeve’ in ‘Sanat Sosyolojisi, Kuram ve Uygulama’ (derleyen: Ömer Naci Soykan). Dönence Yayınları. İstanbul.

ŞENGÜL, H.Tarık. 2012. “ Kentleşme ” in “1920’den Günümüze Türkiye’de Toplumsal Yapı ve Değişim. Phoenix Yayınevi. Ankara.

SUNAR, İlkay. 1974. *State and society in the politics of Turkey's development*. Ankara, Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.

SUNAR, İlkay. 2004. The politics of state interventionism in 'populist' Egypt and Turkey in *State, Society and Democracy in Turkey*. İstanbul. Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Yayınları.

THERBORN, Goran. 1983. "Why some classes are more successful than others", *New Left Review*, Sayı 138, sf 37-55.

THOMPSON, Edward Palmer. 1995. 'Class and Class Struggle' in 'Class' (ed. Patrick Joyce). Oxford University Press. Oxford-New York.

THOMPSON, Edward Palmer. 2004. *İngiliz İşçi Sınıfının Oluşumu*. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

TEKELİ, İlhan. 2000. "Kent Yoksulluğu Ve Modernite'nin Bu Soruna Yaklaşım Seçenekleri Üzerine" in "Devlet Reformu, Yoksulluk, Bölgesel Gelişme ve Kırsal Yoksulluk, Kent Yoksulluğu". Editing: A. Halis Akder, Murat Güvenç. TESEV Yayınları. İstanbul.

TEZCAN, Mahmut. 2011. *Sanat Sosyolojisi*. Anı Yayıncılık. Ankara.

TOKUL, Ahmet. <http://www.filmelestirisi.com/2013/11/v-v-for-vendetta/>. Access Date: 22 April 2015.

TOPÇU, Aslıhan Doğan. 2006. "Türk Sinemasında Sınıfların Temsili: Dönemsel Bir İnceleme" in "2. Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye'yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak". Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı. İstanbul.

TOURAINÉ, Alain. 1994. *Modernliğin Eleştirisi*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları. İstanbul.

TURAN, Ömer. 2013. 'Alternatif tahayyüller, devingenlik, popülizm: 1970'ler için bir çerçeve denemesi'. *Toplum ve Bilim*. Sayı 127. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

TÜRKALİ, Vedat. 1985. *Bu Gemi Nereye*. İstanbul. Cem Yayınları.

Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu. İstatistik Göstergeler 1935 – 2006, 1935 – 2000 Nüfus Sayımlarına Göre Okuryazarlık Oranları. <http://www.ataturkiye.com/devrimleri/harfdevrimi/okuryazarlikistatistikleri.html>. Access Date: 24 March 2014.

UÇAR İLBUĞA, Emine. 2013. “12 Eylül Askeri Darbesinden Günümüz Türk Sinemasına Yansımaları: Bornova Bornova ve Çoğunluk Film Örnekleriyle”. ETHOS: Felsefe ve Toplumsal Bilimlerde Diyaloglar. No.1, pp.38-62.

UYSAL, Ayşen. 2013. “Devlet Şiddetinin Biyografik Sonuçları: 1970’li Yılların Militanlarının Siyasal Yol Haritaları”. Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 127. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

UYSAL, Yıldırım. 2011. Uluslararası Altın Koza Sinema Kongresi Kitabı. Adana Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayını. Adana.

ÜNSER, Orhan. 2006. “Gelin / Düğün / Diyet”. 25 June 2006. <http://www.sadibey.com/2006/06/25/gelin-dugun-diyet/>. Access Date: 14 April 2011.

ÜNÜVAR, Kerem. 2013.” ‘70’ler: ‘80’lerin öncesi ‘60’ların sonrası “. Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 127. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

VAN DER LOO, Hans – VAN REIJEN, Willem. 2006. Modernleşmenin Paradoksları. İstanbul. İnsan Yayınları.

WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel. 1979. The Capitalist World-Economy. Maison des Sciences de l’Homme ve Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

WEININGER, Elliot. 2005. “Foundations of Pierre Bourdieu’s Class Analysis” in “Approaches to Class Analysis” (ed. Erik Olin Wright). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

WRATTEN, Ellen. 1995. “Conceptualizing Urban Poverty”. Environment & Urbanization, Volume 7, No 1, April.

WRIGHT, Erik Olin. 1994. Interrogating Inequality. Verso Publications. London.

YAĞIZ, Nebihat. 2006. “1950-1975 Dönemi Türk Sinemasında Karakter ve Tipler: Türk Sinemasının Türk Toplumuna Bakışı”. Sanatta Yeterlik Tezi. Mimar Sinan Güzel Sanatlar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sinema-TV Ana Sanat Dalı, Sinema-TV Programı. İstanbul.

YALÇIN, Cemal. 2004. Göç Sosyolojisi. Anı Yayıncılık. Ankara.

YASA, İbrahim. 1970. “Gecekondu Ailesi, Geçiş Halinde Bir Aile Tipolojisi”. Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi. Cilt 25, Sayı 4.

YILMAZ, Bediz. 2008. “Türkiye’de sınıf-altı: Nöbetleşe yoksulluktan müebbet yoksulluğa” Toplum ve Bilim. Sayı 113. Birikim Yayınları. İstanbul.

YILMAZ, Bediz. 2006. “Yakındaki Uzak: İstanbul’un Bir Kentiçi Mahallesinde Sosyal Dışlanma ve Mekansal Sürgün” in “Türkiye’de Büyük Kentlerin Gecekondu ve Çöküntü Mahallelerinde Yaşanan Yoksulluk ve Sosyal Dışlanma”. Avrupa Komisyonu, Sosyal Dışlanma ile Mücadelede Mahalli Topluluk Eylem Programı, 2002-2006 Raporu. The authors of article: Fikret ADAMAN – Çağlar KEYDER http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_inclusion/docs/2006/study_turkey_tr.pdf Access Date: 21 March 2015.

YILMAZ, Koray R. 2006. “Türkiye’de Kapitalist Sistemin Gelişme Sürecini Anlamak: Referanslar ve Tartışmalara Eleştirel Bir Bakış” in “2. Sınıf Çalışmaları Sempozyumu, Türkiye’yi Sınıf Gerçeğiyle Anlamak”. Sosyal Araştırmalar Vakfı. İstanbul.

<http://zamanegezgini.wordpress.com/2011/12/08/60lar-sinemasinin-toplumsal-gercekci-yonetmeni-metin-erksan/>. “60’lar Sinemasının Toplumsal-gerçekçi Yönetmeni Metin Erksan”. 8 November 2011. Access Date: 22 February 2013.

ZİLELİ, Gün. 2013. 1 Mayıs 1977, İşçi Bayramı Neden ve Nasıl Kana Bulandı ?. (Hazırlayan: Korhan Atay). Metis Yayınları. İstanbul.

APPENDICES

A. SURVEY

1 - Türkiye sinemasında “toplumsal gerçekçilik” adı altında da değerlendirilen, sosyal sorunları filmlerin temel güzergahı yapma sürecinin 1960’ların başında başladığı kabul edilir. Bunun nedeni sizce nedir?

2 - 1960’ların başından 1980’lerin sonuna kadar devam eden bu süreci 1960’lar, 1970’ler ve 1980’ler olmak üzere on yıllar üzerinden üçe bölersek, toplumsal gerçekçi akım her bir zaman diliminde sinemamıza nasıl yansımış ve hangi sorunları ele almıştır ?

3 - Toplumsal gerçekçilik akımından hangi yönetmenler yararlanmış ve sinemasal çizgisine toplumsal gerçekçiliği nasıl yansıtmıştır?

4 - Sosyal sorunları sinema dilinin temel problemi yapan bu çizginin 1980’lerin sonunda bittiğini kabul ediyorsak, bunun nedenleri olarak açıklanabilecek olgular nelerdir?

5 - 1980’lerin sonundan günümüze Türkiye sineması hangi sinemasal çizgilere kendi içinde yer vermiştir ve toplumsal gerçekçilik akımı dahilinde gösterilebilecek film hiç üretilmiş midir?

B. TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu çalışma, 1960'lar, 1970'ler ve 1980'ler zaman diliminde kentteki yoksulların hayatını ve kentteki yoksulların Türkiye sinemasındaki toplumsal gerçekçilik akımında nasıl temsil edildiğini anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Tez, 1960'ların başından 1980'lerin sonuna kadar olan süreçte, Türkiye sinemasındaki toplumsal gerçekçilik akımının kentteki yoksulların sorunlarını direkt veya dolaylı olarak yansıttığını ve sorunsallaştırdığını iddia etmektedir.

Bu çalışma, yoksulların üç on yıl boyunca gösterdiği değişimin, filmlerde nasıl yansıtıldığını incelemeyi amaçlar. Toplumsal gerçekçi filmleri bu zaman dilimlerinde kentteki yoksulları irdelemek açısından ideal bir enstrüman olarak görüyorum. Toplumsal gerçekçiliğin seçilmesinin temel nedeni, toplumsal gerçekçiliğin yoksul insanların sorunları keşfetme ve gösterme konusunda özel bir hassasiyet göstermesidir. Tez boyunca, kentli yoksul kavramı ile toplumsal gerçekçilik kavramı arasındaki ilişkiyi netleştirmeyi amaçlıyorum. Yoksul kişilerin seçtiğim filmlerde nasıl sunulduğuna odaklanmak istiyorum.

Bu amacımız için, öncelikle toplumsal gerçekçilik dahilinde tanımlayabileceğimiz filmlere ihtiyacımız olacaktır. Filmlerin yapıldığı zamanlardaki yoksul insanları, değişik durum ve senaryolarla resmeden 22 film seçildi. Toplumsal gerçekçiliğin belgesel özelliği bizim işimizi kolaylaştırır çünkü amaç zaten, hayatı olduğu gibi yansıtmaktır. İlki 1960'da ve sonuncusu 1988'de yapılan bu filmler üzerinden yoksulların 30 yıla yaklaşan bir zaman dilimindeki değişimi izlenebilmektedir.

Tez, yalnızca bahsi geçen zaman dilimindeki filmleri incelemeyecektir; aynı zamanda 1980'lerin sonundan bu yana Türkiye sinemasında toplumsal gerçekçi akım dahilinde bir film üretilmediğini savlamaktadır ve bunun nedenlerini de inceleyecektir. Esasen bu tip filmler yok değildir, 2000'lerin sonundan günümüze toplumsal gerçekçi çizgi içinde kabul edilebilecek filmlere, geçmiştekilere oranla

sayıca daha az ve şablon olarak daha değişik de olsa, rastlıyoruz. Toplumsal gerçekçilik 1980'lerin sonundan 2000'lerin sonuna kadar olmaması tabii ki toplumun ve yoksul kesimin yaşamış olduğu değişmelere bağlıdır. Tezimizin toplumsal gerçekçiliği kendisinin temel hattı olarak seçmesinin nedeni, toplumsal gerçekçiliğin yalnızca yoksulların sorunlarını yansıtmadaki ısrarı değildir; aynı zamanda toplumun ve özellikle alt gelir grubundaki insanların sorunlarını en çok ve en iyi gösteren film janrı olmasıdır.

Bu tezin başlangıç noktası Sayın Prof. Dr. Kurtuluş Kayalı'nın 2007 Güz döneminde almış olduğumuz dersidir. Ders boyunca öğrenmiş olduklarımızdan ve izlediğimiz filmlerden fark ettiğim nokta, Türkiye sinemasında 1960'lardan 1980'lere doğru giden sinemasal bir damarın varlığıydı. Bu nokta, tezin başlangıcı ve gelişimi için bir nirengi noktası olmuştur.

'Toplumsal gerçekçilik' kavramının 'sınıf' ve 'yoksulluk' kavramlarıyla beraber kullanımı, tezimize teorik bir akışkanlık kazandırır. Böylelikle tezin teorik tabanı üç ayaklı bir platforma dayanmış olur. Bu kavramları tek başına ve birbiriyle ilintili olarak incelerken, üzerinde en çok hareket edeceğimiz yol zaman mefhumudur. 1960'ların başından 1980'lerin sonuna kadar uzanan bir dilimde, alt gelir grubunun yolculuğu Batılı muadillerinden çok daha karmaşık bir görüntü arz eder. Bu durumun iki boyutu vardır: bir tanesi Cumhuriyet'in kuruluşuna, hatta Osmanlı dönemine kadar yaslanan bir zamanda inşa edilmeye çalışılan kapitalist üretim ilişkileridir. Bu çabanın sonuçlarının en netleştiği zaman dilimi olaraksa 1960'ları gösterebiliriz. Şehirlerde giderek palazlanan sanayinin ihtiyacı olan işçiler, 1950'lerde başlayan ve 1960'larda daha da artan göç dalgası ile kırsal kesimden gelen insanlardan oluşmuştur. Kırsal kesimden göç ile gelen insanlar, kendilerini üretim ilişkilerinde benzer bir noktada konumlanmış buldular.

Bu konum, sınıfsal yönden bakıldığında 'işçi sınıfını' oluşturmaktadır ancak Marx'ın yaptığı ayırma olduğu gibi, bu sınıfın yalnızca 'kendinde' sınıf olduğundan bahsedebiliriz; 'kendi için' sınıf olması söz konusu değildir. Böylesi bir bilinç ancak zaman içinde ve kısmen gerçekleşmiştir. Sınıfsal bilinç, Türkiye'deki alt sınıfın kendi içindeki sınıfsal dönüşümden kaynaklanmamıştır: nedenlerden bir tanesi,

dünyada özellikle üniversite gençlerini mobilize eden sol harekettir. Diğer nedense, dünyada meydana gelen sol hareketin yansımalarını üzerinde taşıyan ve bunu Türkiye'deki alt gelir grubuna taşımak için büyük çaba sarf eden Türk entelijansiyasıdır.

Kentteki yoksulun değişiminde bizim gözlemlediğimiz, sergilediği seçimlerde kendi irade ve etkisinin sınırlı oluşudur. 1960'larda kapitalist üretim ilişkileri içindeki yerini ve haklarını öğrenirken, bu öğrenmeyi kendi gerçekleştirmekten çok Türk entelijansiyasının ona bu bilinci indirmek için gösterdiği çabaya borçludur. 70'lerde alt gelir grubunun taşıdığı sınıfsal bilinç de, büyük ölçüde 70'ler boyunca devam eden yüksek politik tansiyona ve sosyalist ideolojiye bağlıdır. 80'ler boyunca giderek neo-liberal ideolojinin kontrolüne giren alt gelir grubu, sınıf bilincini tamamen kaybetti ve büyük kapitalist resmin içinde eridi.

1960'lı yılların Türkiye'de üretim ilişkilerinin değişmesinin zirve yaptığı bir zaman dilimidir. Geleneksel metotlarla yapılan tarımdan ithal ikameye dayalı sanayiye doğru üretim ilişkilerinin evrildiği dönemdir. Kapitalist üretim anlayışı Türkiye için, aynen modernite gibi ithaldir; bu durum özellikle kente göç ile dahil olan kırsal kesim insanları için, şehirde doğup büyümüş insanlardan daha zordur. Göç ile şehre gelen insanlar yalnızca o zamana kadar şahit olmadıkları türde bir üretim ilişkileri bütünü ile tanışmamaktadır; karşılına çıkan aynı zamanda kentin sosyo-kültürel yönü olan modernitedir. Kırsal bölgede pre-modern koşullar dahilinde yaşayan insanların şehre göç etmesi, onların şehir yaşantısına adapte olması zorunluluğunu beraberinde getirmiştir. Ancak bu adaptasyon, şehir kültürü % 100 kabullenmek şeklinde değil, içinden geldiği köy kültürüyle şehir kültürünü harmanlayan bir çerçevede gerçekleşmiştir. Bu karma kültür, şehre göç edenlerin yaşadığı gecekondu ortamında büyüüp palazlanmıştır. Aynı zamanda gecekondu kültürü, şehre az veya çok adapte olabilenlerin sahip olduğu yaşantıdır: adapte olamayanların önemli kısmı 1970'lerde meydana gelen şiddete dayalı politik ortamın nedenlerinden biri olmuş ve taraflardan birine dahil olarak gerginliğin hem nedeni hem de bir parçası haline gelmiştir.

80'ler boyunca alt sınıf, neo-liberal saldırı karşısında adeta benliğini kaybetmiştir. Rejimin toplumun tamamını ve özellikle genç kuşakları depolitize etme çabası, neo-liberal anlayışın içinde var olan tüketim toplumu ve bireyselleşme birleşince, 70'lerin yüksek seviyedeki sınıf bilincini kırdığı gibi, gelen genç kuşakları da emek ve sınıf bilincinden uzak tutmuştur.

Alt gelir sınıfı, edindiği geçici ve göreceli sınıf bilincine karşın, modernite ve şehir kültürüyle hep mesafeli olmuştur. Modernist şehir kültürünü içselleştirmek yerine kendisi ona alternatif bir kültür geliştirmeyi ve modernist kültürün harici bir kulvar açmayı tercih etmiştir. Göç insanlarının bu tercihi, geldikleri kırsal kesimle ilişkilerini % 100 kesmemeleri, şehir hayatının bir parçası olan eğitim kurumunun imkanlarından faydalanmamaları, şehir hayatından hem ekonomik hem kültürel-eğitimsel dışlanmalarına binaen anti-şehir / anti-modernite bir tavır geliştirmeleri vb. nedenler gösterilebilir.

Tezimiz kentteki alt gelir grubunu yani yoksul insanları incelerken yararlandığı enstrüman filmlerdir. Sinema sanatları içerisinde toplumsal değişimleri en hızlı özümseyen ve kendisinde yansıtan sinema dalıdır. Sinemanın dahilindeki toplumsal gerçekçilik akımı ise, toplumsal değişimlere ve özellikle yoksul kesimin hayatına, sorunlarına en çok ilgi gösteren sinema alt dalıdır. Türkiye sinemasındaki toplumsal gerçekçilik akımı ise Sovyet sosyalist gerçekçiliğinden ya da Fransız Yeni Dalga'sından çok, İtalyan Yeni Gerçekçiliği'nden ilham almış bir akımdır. Akımın ortaya çıkışı, hem dünya hem Türkiye gerçekleriyle uyumludur: 2. Dünya Savaşı sonrası 'sokaktaki' ve 'yoksul' insanın sorunlarına eğilen İtalyan Yeni-Gerçekçiliği, kısa ömrüne rağmen çok etkili ve verimli örnekler vermiştir. İtalya'dakine benzer şekilde, Türkiye toplumsal gerçekçiliği de, dönemin toplumsal koşullarından imkan bularak ortaya çıkmıştır. Sanayi burjuvazisinin net bir şekilde ortaya çıkması ve onun dikotomik karşıtı olan işçi sınıfının şehirlerde belirmesi, bu emekçi kitlenin kaynağının büyük ölçüde göç olması, 60'lı yıllarda toplumsal gerçekçiliğin sinemamızda açığa çıkmasına zemin oluşturan etmenlerdendir. 60'lı yıllar modernitenin seyri açısından da önemli bir kırılma noktasıdır. Hem göç ile şehre dahil olan kırsal kesim insanlarının şehrin yaşam kurgusunu düzenleyen Batı modernitesi ile tanışmaları, hem de şehir kültürüyle yetişmiş insanların köy

kültüründen gelen insanlarla aynı şehir ortamını paylaşmaya başlaması, Türkiye toplumu açısından bir ilktir. Buradan ilkten kasıt, 60'lara kadar kente hiç göç olmadığı anlamına gelmemelidir; ilkten kasıt şehrin demografisini ve dengesini değiştirecek ölçüde büyüklükte bir niceliğe sahip göç hareketidir.

70'li yıllarda, 60'lardaki şehirle ilk kez muhatap olmanın getirdiği şaşkınlık ve ezikliği üzerinden atan yoksul kitle, şehre daha çok adapte olmuş, hem sosyal hem ekonomik şehirdeki varlığını genişletmiştir. Yoksul kesimin ekonomik duruşu daha çok informel sektöre dayalıdır: bunun dışında küçük ticari işletmeler veya sanayi işçisi olarak ekonomik hayatın içinde var olur. Gecekonduyunun onlar için oluşturduğu korunaklı faunada yaşar; kendine has, köy ve kent kültürünün karışımından ortaya çıkan hibrit bir kültür ve kimlik iddiasındadır.

80'li yıllarda alt gelir grubu, şehirdeki gücünü ve kapladığı alanı daha da arttırmıştır. Türkiye'yi kontrol etmeye başlayan neo-liberal ideolojinin toplumdaki ve alt sınıftaki yansıması, etik ve hukuki kuralları umursamayan bir açgözlülükle ile 'köşeyi dönme' mantığıdır. Sağ siyasetin popülist uygulamalarla (imar affı, gecekondulara tapu dağıtma vb.) bu köşeyi dönme arzusuna alan açması, informel sektörden dolayı sistem dışılığı (kayıt dışılığı) alışkın alt sınıfın sistemde daha da güçlenmesine yol açmıştır.

Film listemize aldığımız 22 film, bütün bu yazdıklarımıza örnekler sunan, yaşanan toplumsal değişimleri kendi bünyesinde yansıtan filmlerdir ki, bu onları toplumsal gerçekçilik dahilinde tanımlamamızı kolaylaştırır. Film listemiz 1960 yapımı *Gecelerin Ötesi* ile başlar; bu film İstanbul'un yoksul bir semtinde yaşayan 6 genç insanın içine düştükleri parasızlık sarmalını soygunlar yaparak kırmaya çalışmasını konu edinir. 1962 yapımı *Acı Hayat*'ta da, gene *Gecelerin Ötesi* gibi, şehirde doğup büyümüş yoksul iki gencin etrafında dönen bir hikayeye dayalıdır. 19602larda sol düşüncenin alt sınıfa yansımasıyla belirmeye başlayan sınıf bilinci, toplumsal gerçekçiliğin bünyesinde de kendine yer bulmuştur. 1961 yapımı *Otobüs Yolcuları*, bir otobüs şoförünün merkezinde olduğu bir senaryoda, insanların inşaat işindeki bir burjuvaya karşı kendi haklarını arama serüvenini anlatır. 1964 yapımı *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* ise, mekan olarak seçtiği fabrika ortamında, 'sendika' kavramını

seyircinin önünde en hararetli tartışan filmidir belki de o zamana kadarki Türk filmleri arasında. 60'ların diğer iki filmi Gurbet Kuşları ve Bitmeyen Yol ise 'göç' nosyonuna dayanan filmlerdir. 1964 yapımı Gurbet Kuşları, Maraş'tan İstanbul'a hep beraber göç eden bir ailenin kötü bir sona doğru yuvarlanan hikayesini ihtiva etmektedir. Diğer film Bitmeyen Yol ise 1965 yılına aittir; göç olgusu bu sefer köyden göç eden 6 erkek ve onların şehirde yaşadıkları filmin masumane sinema dilinde sergilenir.

1970'lere geldiğimizde sinemamızda devreye giren Yılmaz Güney faktörü, hem toplumsal gerçekçiliğe hem de sosyalist gerçekçi anlayışa yeni bir soluk ve dinamizm getirmiştir. Güney, yönettiği ve yönetmediği ancak senaryosuna etki ettiği filmlerle, 70'lerin dominant sinema insanıdır. Güney'in kendi çektiği Umut filmi 1970 yapımıdır ve Adana'da yaşayan yoksul bir arabacı olan Cabbar'ın öyküsünü bize sunar. 1979 yapımı bir Ökten filmi olan Düşman'da ise Çanakkale'de yaşayan ve bulduğu günübirlik işlerle ailesine bakma derdindeki İsmail anlatılır. Bu iki filmi beraber anmamızın nedeni, 70'lerin yoğun politik ve kamusal ortamında sisteme karşı 'bireysel' mücadele veren kişileri göstermesidir. Bu tercihiyle filmler, mücadelenin illa sınıfsal ve örgütsel bir tabanda olması gerektiğini kişinin yanında kimseyi bulamasa bile doğru bellediği yola yalnız gitmesi gerektiği mesajını bizlere göndermektedir. 70'ler, toplumsal gerçekçiliğin bir alt kulvarı olarak gösterilebilecek, politik özlü sosyalist gerçekçiliğin örneklerini içerir. 1974 yapımı Arkadaş, 1978 yapımı Maden ve 1979 yapımı Demiryol bu çizginin örnekleridir. Bir Güney filmi olan Arkadaş'ta Güney sosyalist karakter Azem'i burjuva hayatının en bariz simge-mekanlarından olan 'tatil sitesine' gönderir ve onu orada, burjuva hayatının içinde kaybolmuş arkadaşı Cemil'in yaşantısına ortak eder. Azem, Umut ve Düşman'ı hatırlatır şekilde, filmde yalnız iş gören bir sosyalizm misyoneri gibidir. Maden ve Demiryol ise Yavuz Özkan'ın filmleridir. Maden, Anadolu'nun bir kasabasında, maden işçilerinin günlük ve iş hayatında kesitler sunarken, işçilerin film boyunca kazandığı sınıf bilincine odaklanır. Demiryol'da ise sınıf mücadelesi ve bilinci demiryolu işçileri üzerinden irdelenmektedir: 70'lerde, sol düşünce dahilindeki fraksiyon ve yöntem tartışmaları filmin politik dozajını arttırmaktadır. 70'lerdeki diğer filmlerimiz, 1973 yapımı Gelin, 1973 yapımı Dügün 1974 yapımı Diyet ve 1979 yapımı Yusuf ile Kenan'dır. Gelin-Dügün-Diyet hem üçünün de

yönetmeninin aynı olmasından, hem de benzer sosyolojik mevzuları bıçak altına yatırmasından mütevellit, üçleme olarak anılırlar. Üç filmin de hakim dekoru gecekondudur. 1960'larda göç ile büyükşehri yoklayan yoksul köylüler, artık şehrin bir parçası haline dönüşmüştür. Maddi durumu kötü ve kötüye göre görece olarak iyi olsa da, yaşama alanı olarak tercihleri büyük ölçüde kendilerini mutlu ve korunaklı hissettikleri gecekondudur. Üçleme boyunca çözülmesi hedeflenen, göç sonrası şehrin periferilerine yerleşmiş alt gelir grubunun yaşadığı hayat ve muhatap kaldığı sorunlardır. Üçleme, içeriğini daima sosyolojik bir teşhis çerçevesinde tutmaktadır; bu bağlamda Arkadaş, Maden, Demiryol gibi siyasi tartışmalarla ve ideolojik reçetelerle ilgilenmez. Yusuf ile Kenan ise, daha sonra 80'lerdeki Bir Avuç Cennet göreceğimiz şekilde, toplumsal gerçekçiliğin bir diğer alt kulvarı olarak görülebilecek 'şiiresel gerçekçilik' üzerinden hareket eder. Bu motivesinde en büyük dayanağı, filmin hemen bütün rollerini teslim ettiği çocuklardır.

80'lerdeki filmlerde ilk göze çarpabilecek olgu, 12 Eylül 1980 darbesinin etkisiyle politik filmlerin azalmış olmasıdır. Listemizde de yalnızca Çark filmine rastlayabiliyoruz. Diğer bir nokta, neo-liberal düşüncenin toplumu giderek kontrol altına almasına binaen, filmlerin içeriğinde görülen değişimdir. Filmlerin başrolünde artık arkadaş grupları, aileler değil bireyler vardır. Bireyler parçalanmış ve enkaza dönüşmüş 70'lerin kolektif ve örgütsel toplumsal hareketlerinden çok uzaktır; tek başlarına kalmışlardır ve herkeste kendini kurtarma, sınıf atlama, çok para kazanma, çok tüketme vb. kapitalist özlü saiklerin peşinden sürüklenmektedir. Kentli alt sınıfta bunun yansımaları farklı çerçevelerde ilerler. 1982 yapımı Faize Hücum filmi, yoksul bir devlet memurunun o zamanların Türkiye'sine hükmeden bir fenomen olan bankerlik olgusundan yararlanarak sınıf atlama çabasını anlatır. Gene 1982 yapımı At filmi, esasen kırsalda yaşayan Hüseyin'in çocuğunu okutmayı hayatının tek amacı haline getirmesini, bunun için İstanbul'a göç etmesini ve trajik ölümüyle sonuçlanan yaşam kavgasını anlatmaktadır. 1986 yapımı Yoksul ve 1988 yapımı Düttürü Dünya'da ise sisteme daha çok adapte olan, oyunu kurallarıyla oynamaya çalışan ve çok para kazanarak sınıf atlama çabası içinde olan yoksullar vardır. Yoksul filminin baş karakteri Yoksul, bir handa çay ocağında çalışan bir emekçidir ve Düttürü Dünya'nın baş karakteri Mehmet ise pavyonda çalışan bir klarnetçidir. 70'lerin Umut ve Düşman filmlerindeki yoksul emekçilerin kendi emeği üzerinden sisteme karşı

diklenmesi gibi bir durum asla söz konusu değildir Yoksul ve Mehmet için. Yoksul ve Mehmet sisteme karşı değildirler ve emek nosyonu onlar için önemli değildir. Onlar için önemli olan, kazanabildikleri kadar çok kazanarak sınıf atlamayı gerçekleştirmektedir.

1984 yapımı Bir Yudum Sevgi ise içeriğinden daha da çok, sinema dili, biçimsel duruşu, filmin çoğunluğunda gördüğümüz ve bize gecekondular üzerine bir belgesel izlettiren duru görüntülerinden kuvvet alan bir filmidir. Fabrika işçisi iki kişinin aşkını filmin ön planına alsada, arka planda öylesine kudretli ve realistik bir çerçeve inşa edilmiştir ki, film toplumsal gerçekçilik çizgisinde yer alan diğer filmleri de aşan bir gerçekçiliğe sahiptir. Diğer bir film, 1985 yapımı Bir Avuç Cennet, gene Anadolu'dan İstanbul'a göç eden ancak bir gecekondular bile bulamayıp metruk bir otobüse yerleşebilen bir aileyi filmin merkezine alır. Bir Avuç Cennet, 60'lar ve 70'ler boyunca süratle devam eden göçün daha stabil bir noktaya ulaştığını bize söylemektedir. Artık göç edenler ve kent ortamı arasında ilginç bir denge kurulmuştur. Aile, film boyunca buldukları alanı sisteme karşı savunma kavgası verir. 80'lerde incelediğimiz tek politik içerikli film olan Çark'ın başrolünde önce bir fabrikada, daha sonra bir başka fabrikada işçi direnişini örgütlemeye çalışan bir işçi vardır. Bu işçinin eşinin polis olması, klasik olarak var olan işçi-burjuvazi dikotomisinden başka, filme işçi sınıfı ve devlet (devlet kurumunu temsil eden polis üzerinden) arasındaki ilişkiyi de katar.

Çalışmamıza genel olarak baktığımızda, bize üç farklı boyutta analiz etme imkanı sağlamaktadır. Bunlardan biri, kentteki yoksulun yaşadığı toplumsal dönüşümü takip etmektir. Bu dönüşümün izini kentte doğup büyüye yoksullar ile değil, daha çok göç ile gelen yoksullar ile takip ediyoruz. Kentlerdeki yoksulların önemli bölümünü göç ile gelen yoksullar oluşturmaktadır. Film listemiz de bu sosyolojik gerçekliği onaylar şekilde, kentte doğup büyümüş yoksulların hayatını anlatan az film vardır. Gecelerin Ötesi, Acı Hayat, Otobüs Yolcuları, Faize Hücum ve Düttürü Dünya kent kültürü yaşantısında doğup büyüdüğü tahmin edilebilecek yoksullara kendi senaryolarında yer verir. Diğer filmlerdeki bir çok yoksul, göç ile şehre dahil olan ve zaman içinde şehre adaptasyon geliştirmiş kişilerdir: 60'larda, Bitmeyen Yol'da şehre yeni gelen yoksulun, 70'lerin Düğün filminde kendine ait bir gecekondusu vardır; 80'lerin

Yoksul’unda emekçi olarak çalıştığı çay ocağının işletmeciliğine soyunur. Göç ile gelen yoksul, kentte doğup büyümüş yoksuldan belki de daha atak, daha hırslı, daha gözüpektir.

Diğer bir boyut, toplumsal gerçekçi filmlerin sinemasal yönden dönüşümüdür. Sinema dili açısından toplumsal gerçekçi filmler 1960’larda melodram dilinin etkisindedir; bununla beraber sınıf bilincini arttırma amaçlı, didaktik özlü filmler görülür. Bu iki yol 70’lere geldiğimizde varlığını korur: politik olan taraf, yani sosyalist gerçekçilik, sinema dilini sertleştirmiştir ve bu çizgide görülen film sayısı artmıştır. Diğer yandan toplumsal gerçekçiliğin sosyolojik yönü kuvvetli filmleri de melodramın karton kalıplarından kurtulmuş; Umut’ta, Gelin’de, Düğün’de, Diyet’te, Düşman’da olduğu gibi kendine has bir sinema diliyle toplumsal mevzuların üstüne daha cesaretli gitmişlerdir. 1980’lere gelindiğinde karşılaştığımız, sosyalist gerçekçiliğin 80 darbesinin de etkisiyle önemli ölçüde gerilediğidir. Politik sinemada başka örnekler olmasına rağmen sınıf bilincini kazandırma çabası gösteren film olarak Çark’ı tespit edebiliyoruz. Buna rağmen, toplumsal gerçekçilik 60’lar ve 70’ler boyunca Türkiye sinemasında oluşturduğu kültürünü 80’lere de taşımıştır. Faize Hücum, At, Bir Yudum Sevgi, Bir Avuç Cennet ve çalışmamız dahilinde yer almayan daha bir çok film bunun ispatı niteliktedir. Ancak şu var ki, toplumsal gerçekçiliğin menzili ancak 80’lerin sonuna kadar yetmiştir. Toplumun neo-liberal kültürün kontrolünde depolitize olması, tüketim toplumu pratiklerinin hakimiyetini ilan etmesi, cunta yönetiminin yürürlüğe koyduğu Anayasa’nın toplumsal hayattaki yansımaları, toplumu hedonist ve apolitik bir çizgiye çekmiş, bunun neticesinde toplumsal gerçekçilik toplumsal tabanını kaybetmiştir.

Üçüncü bir boyut olarak, yukarıda açıklanan iki boyutun birbiriyle olan karşılıklı etkileşimi söylenebilir. Sinema, sanat dalları içinde toplumsal değişimleri en çok yansıtan sanat dalıdır. Bununla beraber toplumsal gerçekçilik de, sinema sanatı içinde, toplumsal değişimleri en çok ve en iyi yansıtan sinema türüdür. 1960’larda daha da belirginleşen kapitalist üretim ilişkilerine binaen ortaya çıkan işçi sınıfı ve sınıf mücadelesi arayışı, toplumsal gerçekçilikte kendine yer bulmuştur. 70’lere geçtiğimizde toplumun muhatap kaldığı hararetli ve şiddete dayalı politik ortam, gene toplumsal gerçekçiliğe yansımıştır. Bu yansıma daha çok sosyalist ideoloji

yörüngesindedir. Diğer yönden gecekondular ve göç gibi unsurlar gene 70'lerin sosyal gerçeklerine ve gündemine uygun olarak toplumsal gerçekliğin tevecüh gösterdiği mevzulardır. 80'lere geldiğimizde yoksul sınıftaki sınıf atlama arzusu, sınıf bilincinin kayboluşu, gecekondular ve göç olgularının toplumsal hayattaki devamı, filmlerde de karşılığını bulmuştur. Diğer yönden, sinemadan topluma doğru da bir iletim mevcuttur. Özellikle Vedat Türkali'nin senaryolarını yazdığı 60'lı yıllar filmleri ve 70'lerdeki sosyalist özlü filmler didaktik yönleriyle izleyiciye, özellikle emekçi kesime, sınıf bilincini ve hatta bunun da ötesinde, sosyalist ideolojiyi aşılama gayretindedir. Bu bağlamda, toplum ve sinema arasında etkileşimin hem toplumdaki sinemaya hem sinemadan topluma ama daha çok toplumdaki sinemaya olduğunu kabul etmeliyiz.

Tezimiz metodolojik kulvar olarak tarihsel analizi tercih etmektedir. 3 tane 10 yıllık dönemin incelenmesinden ve karşılaştırılmasından müteşekkil bir çalışma için uygun olan metod budur. Tarihsel analize içkin bir şekilde tezin veri altyapısını oluşturacak bilgiye ulaşmak için film listemizde var olan 22 filmin analiz edilmesi gerekir. Bu filmlerin analizinde kullanılacak analiz metodları, tarihsel film analizi, sosyolojik film analizi ve ideolojik film analizidir. Tarihsel film analizi, filmlerin çevrildikleri zaman dönemiyle olan ilişkisini irdelemektedir. Sosyolojik film analizi, filmin anlatma merakını güttüğü toplumsal ilişkiler ağını nasıl yansıttığını anlama amacındadır. İdeolojik film analizi ise filmin bünyesinde var olan değer yargılarını, özellikle politik olanları, seyirciye nasıl iletildiğini çözümlenmek ister. Hem tezimizin amaç ve içeriği, hem de tezin analiz edeceği filmler bu üç analiz için de uygundur ve bu üç analize de ihtiyaç duyar. Bundan başka, tezin yorum gücüne derinlik kazandırması amacıyla 6 sinema uzmanıyla gerçekleştirilen mülakatlar vardır. Bu mülakatlar boyunca mülakatın yapıldığı kişiye 5 soru yöneltilmiş ve toplumsal gerçekçi akımın 60'lar başından 80'ler sonuna kadar olan yolculuğu uzman kişilerin perspektifinden de anlaşılmasına çalışılmıştır.

Bütün bu çalışmanın bize getirdiği bulgular, çalışma öncesi beklenti ve düşüncelerimizi destekler mahiyettedir. Yoksulların yaşamış olduğu dönüşümün çok boyutlu olduğu, çalışmamız boyunca ortaya çıkmıştır. Yoksullar öncelikle 60'lardan 80'lere uzanan zaman diliminde, topluma giderek yerleşen kapitalist üretim

ilişkilerini öğrenmiş ve adapte olmuştur. 60'larda göçle kente gelen kişiler için kentteki kapitalist anlayış, yalnızca bir şaşkınlık ve öğrenme sürecidir. 70'lerde gecekondu ile şehre sırtını yaslama imkanı bulan yoksul kesim, informel sektör ile ekonomik hayatın bir parçası olmuştur. 80'lerde Türkiye gibi ülkelerde sık görülen, hukuki ve etik bir altyapısı bulunmayan bir kapitalizmden en çok faydalanan gene alt sınıftı; böyle bir kapitalizm yorumunu oluşturanlardan biri de alt sınıftı.

Politik yönden alt gelir sınıfının 60'larda bir tercihi ve yönelimi olduğunu söylemek zordur. Türk entelijansiyası göç ile şehre yeni gelmiş, geleneksel yöntemlerle yapılan tarımsal üretimden yeni kopmuş yoksul insanlara sınıf bilincini öğretmenin endişesindedir. 70'lerde bu çaba, toplumsal dönüşüme bağlı olmak meyvelerini verir ancak toplumun 'sağ' ve 'sol' diye ikiye bölünmesi ve bir şiddet ortamının toplumu esir alması, alt sınıfın sınıf bilinci kavramından çıkarları doğrultusunda fayda görmesini engeller. 80'lerde ise toplum ve özellikle alt sınıf, politikaya yabancılaşmış ve uzaklaşmıştır. Kısa vadede darbe rejiminin uyguladığı baskıcı yöntemler ve uzun vadede kapitalist anlayışın topluma yerleştirdiği tüketim toplumu kalıpları, insanları peyderpey siyaset kurumuna yabancılaştırmıştır.

Yoksulların yaşadığı kültürel ve toplumsal değişim ise ekonomik dönüşümle yakından ilgilidir ancak tamamen onunla ilintilendirilemez ve tamamen de onun sonucu değildir. Bu değişimi modernite / antimodernite ekseninde okumak çok doğru olur çünkü şehrin kimliği kapitalist üretim anlayışı / modernite / sekülerlik şeklindedir; oysa şehre göç eden insanlar geleneksel tarım (pre-modern) üretim anlayışı / modernite-dışı / muhafazakar bir yaşantıdan geliyorlardı. 60'larda yaşanan bu kültürel şok, çalışmamızın 60'lı yıllar filmlerinde Gurbet Kuşları ve Bitmeyen Yol filmlerinde net olarak takip ediliyor. 70'lerde şehrin daha çok bir parçası haline gelen yoksul, ne tam olarak modernist kültürü benimsemiş ne de tam olarak kırsal geleneklerine bağlı kalmıştır; bunun yerine kırsal kültür temelinde şehir kültürünü yorumlayan ve şehir kültürünün unsurlarına seçmeli olarak kendi yorumunda yer açan miks bir kültür, bir yaşam tarzı geliştirmiştir. Bunu 70'lerde daha çok Gelin-Düğün-Diyet üçlemesinde tespit ediyoruz. 80'lerde ise yoksul, şehrin bir parçası olmaktan öte, hem onun demografik çoğunluğu hem de şehrin genel kültürel yapısını yönlendiren karar mercii konumuna gelmiştir. Yoksulun kültürel seçimlerinin şehrin

kültürel gidişatına yön vermesi 80'ler boyunca Türkiye'yi işgal eden arabesk müzikte en net görülür. Yoksul filmindeki han, Türkiye'nin 80'lerdeki kültürel panoraması gibidir. Düttürü Dünya ve Bir Yudum Sevgi filmleri de çizdikleri gecekondu tasvirleriyle, 80'lerdeki yoksulun yaşama alanını anlamamızı kolaylaştırır.

Filmlerdeki temsillerde de her dönemin kendi içinde dahi önemli değişimler mevcuttur. 60'ların ilk filmi olan Gecelerin Ötesi'nde şehirde büyümüş 6 arkadaş sınıf atlama hayalleri kurarken, son filmi olan Bitmeyen Yol'da şehre yeni gelmiş 6 köylü arkadaşın şehir hayatını öğrenme süreci konu edinilir. 70'lerin ilk filmi olan Umut'ta Adana'da yaşayan yoksul bir arabacı olan Cabbar'ın umutsuz yaşamı sosyolojik bir tasvir ve naif bir sinema diliyle aktarılırken 70'lerin sonunda Maden ve Demiryol filmlerindeki politik ton ve hırçın sinema dili, filmin kabına sığmayacak kadar belirgindir. 80'lerde bu değişimi, toplumsal değerlerin bireylerin hayatına etkimesi şeklinde görürüz. At'ın ve Faize Hücum'un dürüst ve temiz geçmişten gelen başrolleri, 80'lerin sonunda Yoksul filminin Yoksul'u veya Düttürü Dünya'nın Mehmet'i gibi, sınıf atlama ve daha çok para kazanma yolunda emekçi duruşundan ve ahlaki değerlerinden vazgeçmeye hazır hale dönüşmüştür.

Sinema dilindeki değişim de gözlerden kaçmamalıdır. 60'lardaki filmlerimizde melodram kaynaklı iyi-kötü çatışmasına dayalı, gri bölgelerin olmadığı, dikotomik bir sinema dili vardır. Bu durum Otobüs Yolcuları ve Karanlıkta Uyananlar'da burjuva sınıfı – işçi sınıfı şeklinde tezahür ederken, Gurbet Kuşları ve Bitmeyen Yol'da modernite – antimodernite düzleminde bir zıtlık söz konusudur. 70'lere geldiğimizde filmlerin biçimselliği politik kaynaklı bir dikotominin kontrolüne girmiştir. Filmler sürekli ve kızgın bir muhalefet gider. Umut ve Düşman'ın taşra şehirlerindeki yalnız ve mağrur başrolleri Arkadaş'ın sosyalist misyoneri Azem, Maden ve Demiryol'da sınıfsal amaçlarla yanan emekçi karakterler, hatta Gelin-Düğün-Diyet'in başrollerindeki gecekondu kadını.. hepsi ama hepsi sistemle derdi olan, sisteme karşı gelen ve sisteme söyleyeceği sözü olan kişilerdir. 80'lerin 60'lar ve 70'lerden farkı, sinema dilinin dikotomik bir çerçeveden çıkmasıdır. Modernden postmoderne doğru yol alırken modernitenin karakterinden var olan dualizmden uzaklaşarak çok-boyutlu ve kaotik bir sinema diline doğru filmler evrilir. Bu sinema

dili, 80'lerin kakafonik Türkiye'sinin ve özellikle İstanbul'unun toplumsal yapısını çok iyi yansıtır. 60'lardan bu yana alt sınıf bir türlü kimliğini bulamamıştır. 60'larda kapitalist üretim ilişkilerindeki konumunu ve göçle geldiği şehirdeki konumunu tespit edemeyen yoksul, 70'lerde politik çatışma, şiddet ve gerilim ortamında gene konumunu ve kimliğini doğru ifade etmekten uzaktır. Darbenin 70'lerin politik atmosferini bıçakla keser gibi durdurması, 80'lerin Türkiye'sini sudan çıkmış balık gibi, ne yapacağını bilemez bir halde bırakmıştır. Esasen bu durum, Türkiye toplumunun sosyolojik yapısının oturmamışlığından ve kurumsal bir altyapısının olmayışından kaynaklanmaktadır. Toplumsal yapının belirli bir tutarlılık ve kurumsallaşma göstermemesi, aynen alt sınıfa da sirayet eder ve onu da başı ve sonu olmayan bir hayat içerisinde çaresiz bırakır. Kentteki yoksul, arabesk müzikte net yansımaları görebildiğimiz köy ve kent kültürlerinin harmanlanmasından oluşan hibrid kültürüyle, şehrin vahşi ekonomik ortamında hayatta kalma mücadelesi vermektedir.

60'lar ve 70'ler filmlerinde, günün kitlesel, örgütlü, beraber hareket eden insanlarıyla uyumlu olarak insan gruplarının hikayesi anlatılır. 80'lerde giderek güçlenen liberal düşüncenin temel subjeksi olan 'birey', filmlerin de merkezine yerleşmiştir. Çark'ın sınıf mücadelesi üzerinden haklarını arama amacıyla olan işçileri hariç, bütün filmler bireylerin hikayelerini bizlere aktarır. Esasen bireyler üzerinden bir sinemasal takip geliştirmek istesek, filmlerimiz bunu da yapma imkanını bize sunmaktadır. Mesela Bitmeyen Yol'un Fatma'sı ve Acı Hayat'ın Nermin'i Türkiye'ye 60'larda yeni yerleşmeye başlayan tüketim toplumu pratiklerinin peşinde kaybolup gitmişlerdir. Oysa Gelin-Düğün-Diyet'te başrolde çizilen karakter iki açıdan da sınıf bilincinin görmek istediği insandır: birinci nokta, onurlu duran Anadolu kadını olmasıdır. İkinci nokta ise, emeğiyle var olan alt gelir insanı olmasıdır. Güney'in etkisiyle şekillenmiş olan Umut, Arkadaş ve Düşman gibi 70'li yıllar filmlerinde de benzer şekilde 'emeğine, ideolojisine ve sınıfsal duruşuna sahip çıkmak' olgusunu takip ederiz. Bu 'onurlu durma' ve 'emeğiyle var olma' nosyonları 80'lerdeki Bir Yudum Sevgi, At, Bir Avuç Cennet ve Çark filmlerinde, 60'lar ve 70'lerde olduğu kadar açık açık dillendirilmese de, kendini tekrar eder. Bu emek bilinci ve emeğine sahip çıkma hissi, büyük ölçüde 60'ların ve 70'lerin 80'lere bıraktığı bir mirastır. Diğer yandan ise, sınıf ve emek bilincindeki çürüme giderek kendini hissettirir; diğer bir yoksul

çizgisi üretim ilişkilerinde işgal ettiği noktayı görmezden gelmek, hatta inkar etmek yoluna tevessül etmiştir. Bunu Yoksul, Düttürü Dünya ve kısmen de Faize Hücum filmlerinde görürüz.

Tezimiz boyunca birçok filmde karşımıza çıkan gecekondü kavramı, yoksul insanın sınıf bilinciyle yakından ilgilidir. Yoksulun diğer yoksullarla bir araya gelerek bir komünite dahilinde yaşadığı gecekondü, yoksulun yaşam tarzının çıkış noktası, kültürel altyapısını sağlayan platform ve şehirde ekonomik durumu kendinden daha iyi bütün insanlara karşı bir kaledir. Yoksulun bazen ekonomik ama çoğunlukla da kültürel yönden hor görülmesi, toplumsal yönden dışlanmasına yol açar. Diğer bir tanım ise, İngilizce ‘underclass’ denen, bir gecekondüsü bile olmayan ‘sınıf altı’ insanlardır. Çalışmamızda bu şekilde 3 film mevcuttur: Yusuf ile Kenan, At ve Bir Avuç Cennet. 3 filmin de ortak noktası, filmin karakterlerinin toplumsal normların algılayabileceği bir barınma mekanlarının olmayışıdır. Yusuf ile Kenan, köyden kente gelmiş ve sağda-solda barınan iki çocuğu anlatır. At’taki kişiler üstü açık bir avluyu ortaklaşa paylaşmaktadır. Bir Avuç Cennet’te aile terk edilmiş bir otobüsün içinde yaşar. Kendilerini sadece ‘yoksul’ olarak tanımlayabilmek için bile bu insanların, gecekondü olsun veya olmasın, düzenli bir yerleşime ihtiyaçları vardır. Aslında bu mekan üzerinde kökleşme, hem üretim ilişkilerindeki konumunu anlama hem sınıf bilincini üretme açısından hayati bir işleve sahiptir. Gecekondü, aynı zamanda, kendi gibi insanlarla bir araya gelerek bir komünite oluşturmak, tek tek mücadele edemediği ve karşısında ezildiği şehir hayatını hep birlikte göğüslemek demektir. Sınıf altı insanlar böylesi bir dayanışmanın artıklarından yoksundur.

Tezimizde takip edebildiğimiz diğer noktaysa, sınıf bilincinin oluşum aşamaları, sosyalizmin etkisiyle zirveye çıkması ve gene politik nedenlere bağlı olarak sınıf bilincinin çözülmesidir. 1960’larda Karanlıkta Uyananlar’da ilmek ilmek örülen sınıf bilinci Maden filminin sonunda işçiler arkadaşlarının ölü bedenini madenden çıkartırken en yüksek noktasına ulaşmıştır. Aynı sınıf bilinci 80’lerde, Çark filminde görüldüğü üzere, bitip tükenmiştir. Fabrikanın dışında, ölmüş arkadaşlarının vücudunun etrafında toplanan işçiler, adeta ölü bir insanın etrafında değil, son nefesini vermiş sınıf bilincinin etrafında toplanmışlardı.

C. CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Yildirim

Surname: UYSAL

Email: yildirimuysal@gmail.com

Date of Birth: March 20th, 1978

Place of Birth: Edirne, Turkey

Citizenship: Republic of Turkey

Sex: Male

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

Work History: February 2004 – Present, Middle East Technical University

Academic Position: Research Assistant

EDUCATION

High School: Yalova High School, 1994.

University: Undergraduate, Department of Sociology, Ege University, 2002.

Graduate School:

Master, Department of Sociology, Middle East Technical University, 2008.

Doctorate, Department of Sociology, Middle East Technical University, 2009

- .. , Still Process, Thesis Level.

PUBLICATIONS & APPEARANCES

** ‘The Class Standing of Ajda Pekkan’s Music’. *Agora*, The Young Social Science Forum. Issue 16, December – January – February 2007.

** Guest Appearance, May 15, 2010, ‘Ondan Sonra’ radio programme which issued ‘The Representation of Low Income Class on Turkish Cinema’, TRT Ankara Radio.

** Poster Presentation. ‘Yilmaz Guney Cinema’ in a conference which is titled ‘State, Society and Economy in the Modern Middle East’. May 7 – 8, 2011. School of Oriental and African Studies, London Middle East Institute. London, United Kingdom.

** Paper Presentation. ‘The Sociology of Yilmaz Guney’s Cinema’. 1st International Altin Koza Cinema Conference. September 21 – 24, 2011. Adana, Turkey.

** Paper Presentation. ‘The Reflection of Kemalist Ideology in the Perception of

METU Students’. 12th National Congress of Social Sciences. December 14 – 16, 2011. Ankara, Turkey.

** Paper Presentation. ‘Low Income Class People in Social Realist Films of 1960s Turkish Cinema’. IJAS Conference. February 20 – 23, 2012. Gozo, Malta.

** Paper Presentation. ‘Young Migrant – Rooted Generations of Germany in Fatih Akin’s Films’. 5th Global Conference, ‘Diasporas: Exploring Critical Issues’. June 29 – July 1, 2012. Oxford, United Kingdom.

** “Low Income Class People in Social Realist Films of 1960s Turkish Cinema”. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Thought*. ISSN: 2156-6992. Volume 02, Number 03, 2012.

** “Young Migrant: Rooted Generations of Germany in Fatih Akin’s Films”.
Diasporic Choices. Inter-Disciplinary Pres. Oxford, United Kingdom.

INTERESTS

Cinema, Political Sociology, Social Stratification, Social Change, Social Class,
Cultural Studies.

D. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı : UYSAL

Adı : YILDIRIM

Bölümü : SOCIOLOGY

TEZİN ADI : REFLECTIONS OF URBAN POOR IN SOCIAL REALIST FILMS
IN TURKEY

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınmaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: