

Representations of Cinematic Istanbul: Expressions, Clichés and Transformations

Sertaç Timur DEMİR*

Öz

İstanbul sinema temsili açısından zengin bir kent olmasına rağmen, modern kente ışık tutacak niteliklere sahip yetkin filmler bulmak güçtür. Daha ziyade, bu filmlerin büyük bir kısmı kenti en popüler ve basmakalıp söylem ve imgelerden yararlanarak resmetmektedir. Hollywood ve Yeşilçam sinemasında İstanbul, ağırlıklı olarak üç renk üzerinden görselleştirilmiştir: egzotikliği vurgulayan pembe, kötücüllüğü ifade eden siyah ve kutsallığı çağrıştıran beyaz. Hollywood, daha çok Boğaziçi'ne ve Tarihi Yarımada'ya odaklanırken, Yeşilçam gecekondu ve göçmenlerin yaşamlarına yoğunlaşmıştır. Ancak, zamanla Hollywood ve Yeşilçam'ın bu renklendirme ve tasvirleri katı birer klişeye dönüştü. O kadar ki, her sosyal ve mekânsal ilişki ya gizemli bir güzellik ya da ölümcül bir çirkinlik olarak gösterildi, sanki kentteki hiçbir şeyin antitezi yokmuş gibi. Bu çalışma, sinematik İstanbul etrafında oluşan görsel ve metinsel külliyatı özetleyerek, geleneksel ifadelerin güncellenmesinin önünü açmaktadır. Nitekim sosyolojik anlamda İstanbul'a dönük bakış, büyük oranda bu sinemasal anlatıların üzerine inşa edilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İstanbul, Sinema, Yeşilçam, Hollywood, Klişe, Değişim.

* Assoc.Prof., Gümüşhane University, Faculty of Communication Department of Radio, Television and Cinema, Gümüşhane, Turkey. E-mail address: stdemir@gumushane.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9420-9416

Representations of Cinematic Istanbul: Expressions, Clichés and Transformations

Abstract

Although Istanbul is a rich city in terms of cinema representation, it is difficult to find competent films that shed light on the modern city. Rather, a large part of these films depicts the city utilising the most popular and stereotypical discourses and images. During the Hollywood and Yeşilçam eras, Istanbul has been cinematised and visualised predominantly through three colours: pink to exoticise, black to detract, and white to sacralise. Hollywood has focused mostly on the Bosphorus Strait and the Historic Peninsula, while Yeşilçam gained insight into the *gecekondu*s (squatters) and internal immigrants' lives. But, with time, each colourisation and depiction by Hollywood and Yeşilçam turned into a rigid cliché—so much so that each social and spatial relationship was shown as being *either* a mysterious beauty *or* as a fatal ugliness as if everything in the city were pure without antithesis. This study paves the way for updating traditional expressions by summarizing the visual and textual corpus of cinematic Istanbul. As a matter of fact, the sociological perspective towards Istanbul is largely built on these cinematic narratives.

Keywords: Istanbul, Cinema, Yeşilçam, Hollywood, Clichés, Change.

Introduction

As every single city that is captured by the camera is special and has its cinematic texture, each of them can be analysed in terms of cinematic parameters. As for Istanbul, the cinematic panorama of Istanbul, which is, at least, as rooted as cinematic Berlin and cinematic Paris, was born with the invention of cinematography. Alexandre Promio, one of the Lumière Brothers' operators, filmed Istanbul in 1897. He made four actualités. The most well-known of them is *Constantinople, Panorama des Rives du Bosphore* (1897).¹ In that film, he put his camera on a gondola and captured the Bosphorus, which was, as usual, a charming space and symbol of Istanbul for tourists and voyagers.² Istanbul at that time was a decrepit city of the Ottoman Empire that was partially collapsing upon itself. Nevertheless, even though about one hundred and twenty years have elapsed between the very first and the very last film set in Istanbul, the *chaotic*, *mystic*, and *exotic* faces of the city have remained substantially the same.

For instance, James Bond has passed through the streets of Istanbul at three different times. What Sean Connery, Istanbul's first James Bond, in the film, *From Russia with Love* (1963), shows is not that much different from what Pierce Brosnan, its second Bond, in the film, *The World is not Enough* (1999), sees. Similarly, what Daniel Craig, its last James Bond, in the film, *Skyfall* (2012), realises is no different from what the previous films display, either. Despite the many long years which have passed since the first filming of the city, there have not been any broad-sweeping changes in the cinematic perception of Istanbul. In the sight of Hollywood, Istanbul remains a bygone city that will probably never change.

Not only in films but also travel books, Istanbul has been perceived as either being entirely ruined or as "the double Door to Bliss, opening out on both Europe and Asia".³ Jean Ebersolt, the writer of the book, *Constantinople Byzantine et les Voyageurs du Levant*⁴, defines these voyagers' descriptions about Istanbul as precious but imaginary portraits that have been reflected from a faulty mirror. These writings, replete in decoration and exaggeration, primarily focused on the

1 The other films made by Promio and that are set in Istanbul were *Défile de L'infanterie Turque* (1897), *Panorama de la Corne d'Or* (1897) and *Artillerie Turque* (1897).

2 For more details, see. Mustafa Özen, "Hareketli Resimler' İstanbul'da (1896-1908)", *Kebikeç*, 2009/27, pp. 183-190. Also see. Aslı Özgen Tuncer, "İstanbul ve Boğaz Kıyılarının Akışkan Panoraması", *Toplumsal Tarih*, 2015/263, pp. 26-34.

3 Adophe Thalasso and Fausto Zonaro, *Istanbul, the Gate to Bliss: Scenes from Turkish Life*, Istanbul: Istanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2009, p. 33.

4 Jean Ebersolt, *Constantinople Byzantine et les Voyageurs du Levant*, Paris: E. Leroux, 1918. This book was translated from French into Turkish by Arda İlhan. For more details, see. Jean Ebersolt, *Bizans İstanbulu ve Doğu Seyyahları*, İstanbul: Pera, 1996.



Figure 1

James Bond (Daniel Craig) in *Skyfall* (2012) is still pursuing his anonymous enemy on the rooftop of the Grand Bazaar.

Bosphorus Strait. This portrayal may be accepted as being justifiable preferences of the 18th and 19th Century European Romanticism since Istanbul consisted of so many eye-catching, exotic and mystical spaces. It is precisely for this reason that a descriptive rather than comparative methodology is proposed in the context of the films and literature examined in this article.

Literature Review on Cinematic Istanbul⁵

There are some English books on “cinematic Istanbul”. The first to be mentioned is *World Film Locations: Istanbul*, edited by Özlem Köksal.⁶ This book is entirely about Istanbul in cinema. The other two books, *Orienteering Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe?*⁷ and *New Turkish Cinema: Belonging, Identity and Memory*⁸, cover this issue within one or two chapters. As for Turkish books, although there are many writings on the city itself, books about cinematic Istanbul are relatively limited. These three English books and six Turkish books were published after 2000, and especially in 2010 within the frame of the “Istanbul 2010 European Capital of Culture” projects. This may also relate to great progress in new Turkish cinema. Even if the new wave of Turkish films that have been made during

5 In this section, unpublished theses have not been analysed and are therefore excluded. Nevertheless, the thesis titled “Changing Pleasures of Spectatorship: Early and Silent Cinema in Istanbul” written by Canan Balan, can be studied as an important thesis on early period cinematic Istanbul.

6 Özlem Köksal, *World Film Locations: Istanbul*, Briston and Chicago: Intellect, 2012.

7 Deniz Göktürk, Levent Soysal and İpek Türeli (eds.), *Orienteering Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe?*, London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

8 Asuman Suner, *New Turkish Cinema: Belonging, Identity and Memory*, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010.

the last decade is few in quantity in comparison with Yeşilçam⁹, and even if they concentrate mostly on provincial towns rather than on Istanbul,¹⁰ the artistic and sociological qualifications of these contemporary films, with most of them having been appreciated by film festivals and authorities, are many and valuable. For instance, Nuri Bilge Ceylan, who won the Cannes Film Festival Best Director Award in 2008 with *Three Monkeys* (*Üç Maymun*, 2008) and the Grand Prix and Jury Grand Prize twice with his films *Distant* (*Uzak*, 2002) and *Once Upon a Time in Anatolia* (*Bir Zamanlar Anadolu'da*, 2011), is one of the most important contemporary Turkish directors. Another influential director is Semih Kaplanoğlu, who won the Golden Bear at the 60th Berlin International Film Festival for *Honey* (*Bal*, 2010). Other internationally known directors are Fatih Akin, Reha Erdem, Zeki Demirkubuz, Ferzan Özpetek, Yavuz Turgul, Çağan Irmak, Derviş Zaim, Sinan Çetin, Yılmaz Erdoğan, Yesim Ustaoglu and Handan İpekçi.¹¹

As for the works about cinematic Istanbul itself, I would firstly like to begin with the book *World Film Locations: Istanbul*, which is part of the “World Film Locations” series that was published by Intellect Ltd between 2011 and 2013.¹² More than sixty films are *superficially* stated in this book, which can be informally titled as ‘a basic guide for beginners to cinematic Istanbul studies’. The contributors to this book attempt to summarise stories and to set the spatial frameworks of these films. The significant meanings behind these films and spaces in terms of social and urban experiences, however, are not *theoretically* discussed.

The second book, *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe?*, which is edited by Deniz Göktürk, Levent Soysal, and İpek Türeli covers the globalisation, heritage, urban art, and cultural politics of Istanbul. Only the third part of this book focuses on contemporary debates about the films that depict the city. According to its authors, “cinema never represents cities as given; it plays an active part in shaping the urban imagination and fabric”.¹³ This part, titled “The Mediated City”, consists of four chapters. In the first chapter, Nezhir Erdogan defines Turkish

9 Yeşilçam refers to an Istanbul-centred era in Turkish cinema between the 1950s and 1980s. It involves mostly melancholic stories and characters. As Richardson, Gorbman and Vernallis state, the Yeşilçam industry is the Turkish equivalent of Hollywood, see Richardson, John, “Gorbman, Claudia., and Vernallis, Carol”, *The Oxford Handbook of New Audiovisual Aesthetics*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013, p. 391.

10 Suner, *New Turkish Cinema: Belonging, Identity and Memory*, p. 141.

11 In this sense, “cinematic Istanbul” is a timely project for both researches and films.

12 Apart from Istanbul, the cinematic representations of the following cities have also been analysed by series: Los Angeles, Tokyo, London, New York, Dublin, Paris, Madrid, Las Vegas, New Orleans, Vienna, Reykjavik, Berlin, Mumbai, Melbourne, Helsinki, Chicago, Glasgow, Marseilles, Vancouver, Venice, Barcelona, São Paulo, Prague, Liverpool, San Francisco and Hong Kong.

13 Göktürk, Soysal and Türeli (eds.), *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe?*, p. 127.

cinema as a historical eyewitness of Istanbul's modernisation.¹⁴ He underlines the fact that films that are set in Istanbul capture its transformation process from multiculturalism to homogenisation and makes it visible. This chapter, which is highly significant in terms of the 'history of the Turkish cinema', however, merely deals with the surfaces of films that depict Istanbul without delving into much theoretical discourse or image analysis about the same. The second chapter zooms into the city's internal immigration issue by examining two Turkish films: *Birds of Exile* (*Gurbet Kuşları*, 1964), directed by Halit Refig; and *Distant* (*Uzak*, 2002), directed by Nuri Bilge Ceylan.¹⁵ Accordingly, the impacts of the migration process in Istanbul and the dilemma between Europeanism and the local traditions are discussed through the characters of those films; however, the theoretical aspects of these sociological debates remain relatively weak. In the third chapter, Bayraktar and Akçalı analyse the Turkish film *Magic Carpet Ride* (*Organize İşler*, 2005), a film that attempts to display the contradictions between the epic and criminal faces of Istanbul.¹⁶ Although the authors efficiently highlight the technical sides of the film (like montage, sound, camera angles, etc.), they do not similarly draw any theoretical inferences about the movie. Deniz Göktürk, in the last chapter, attempts to discuss the stereotypical images and sounds of Istanbul by analysing the films *Head on* (*Duvara Karşı*, 2004), *Crossing the Bridge: The Sound of Istanbul* (*Istanbul Hatırası: Köprüyü Geçmek*, 2005), *Cholera Street* (*Ağır Roman*, 1997), *Journey to the Sun* (*Güneş Yolculuk*, 1999) and *Three Monkeys* (*Üç Maymun*, 2008). She also touches upon the works of Siegfried Kracauer and Georg Simmel.

One of the other significant written sources on new Turkish cinema is the book *New Turkish Cinema: Belonging, Identity and Memory*¹⁷ written by Asuman Suner. Of especial salience is the fifth chapter of this book, entitled "New Istanbul Films" which analyses four Istanbul films: *Somersault in a Coffin* (*Tabutta Roveşata*, 1996), *Istanbul Tales* (*Anlat Istanbul*, 2005), *Head-On* (*Duvara Karşı*, 2004) and *Crossing the Bridge: The Sound of Istanbul* (*Istanbul Hatırası: Köprüyü Geçmek*, 2005). In the author's opinion, each of these films refers to a different socio-urban dimension of Istanbul. More importantly, she implicitly separates the new wave

14 Nezih Erdoğan, "The Spectator in the Making: Modernity and Cinema in Istanbul 1896-1928", In *Orienteering Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, Göktürk, Soysal and Türeli (eds.), London and New York: Routledge, 2010, pp. 129-142.

15 İpek Türeli, "Istanbul through Migrants' Eyes", In *Orienteering Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, Göktürk, Soysal and Türeli (eds.), London and New York: Routledge, 2010, pp. 144-164.

16 Deniz Bayraktar and Elif, "Istanbul Convertible: A Magic Carpet Ride through Genres", In *Orienteering Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, Göktürk, Soysal and Türeli (eds.), London and New York: Routledge, 2010, pp. 165-176.

17 A similar book was written by Savaş Arslan. He analysed Turkish cinema mainly in terms of historical and industrial contexts. For more detail, see. Savaş Arslan, *Cinema in Turkey: A New Critical History*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

of films about Istanbul which were produced during the last decade from the films that were made previously, in terms not only of chronological order but also of sociological and urban stances. She asserts some technical details about directors, characters, and stories. Afterwards, she highlights some remarkable points about these films in terms of urban spaces and social relations. And, in the last instance, she reveals what films project upon Istanbul.

There are also some Turkish books—as well as some English books—that have been written regarding the relationship between cinema and Istanbul; however, none of these books attempt to analyse the social and urban experiences of Istanbul through films. Rather, they deal with Istanbul as the heart of the film industry in Turkey. Two of them were written by Giovanni Scognamillo, a film critic who was born into a family of Italian Levantines. The first of these books, *Batı Sinemasında Türkiye ve Türkler*,¹⁸ portrays Turkey beginning from the silent-film era. In the following pages, he exposes the cinematic representation of the “Türk” through short and superficial stories from some of those films. He also zooms in on Istanbul without elaborating upon the sociological references made in those films. Despite its superficiality, this book provides a wide framework for seeing the general picture and lists some of the films that have been set in Istanbul. His second book, *Cadde-i Kebir’de Sinema*,¹⁹ penetrates the history behind İstiklal Street that was called Cadde-i Kebir during the Ottoman period and that was at the heart of both ‘modernised’ Istanbul and of Yeşilçam cinema. Nevertheless, Scognamillo is content with portraying it in the context of cinema, stars, and the film industry. Another book that portrays the same region is *Benim Beyoğlum*²⁰. Dorsay, a Turkish film critic, touches slightly upon the socio-historical background of Pera. However, it is obvious that Pera, İstiklal Street and Taksim (all of which refer both to space and a culture) reveal modern contrasts and conflicts between tradition and modernism, conservatism and secularism, morality and the money economy, aesthetics and functionality, etc.

Another Turkish book, *Türk Sinemasında İstanbul*,²¹ written by Agah Özgüç, a Turkish cinema historian, is something like an archive that presents a filmography about cinematic Istanbul. It includes nearly five hundred films and categorises them under the names of significant towns, such as Beyoğlu, Kadıköy, Adalar (the Prince Islands) and the Bosphorus; under the name of remarkable spaces, such as train stations, suburbs, and *meyhanes* (taverns); and under urban images, such as raki, belly-dancers, porters and automobiles. The problematic point about

18 Giovanni Scognamillo, *Batı Sinemasında Türkiye ve Türkler*, İstanbul: +1 Kitap, 2006.

19 Giovanni Scognamillo, *Cadde-i Kebir’de Sinema*, İstanbul: Agorakitaplığı, 2008.

20 Atilla Dorsay, *Benim Beyoğlum*, İstanbul, Çağdaş Yayıncılık ve Basım Sanayi A.Ş., 1991.

21 Agah Özgüç, *Türk Sinemasında İstanbul*, İstanbul: Horizon International, 2010.

this panoramic classification, just like in other works, is a lack of theoretical and socio-psychological discussions on these cultures, places, spaces, and images.

The last two project books were published by the 2010 European Capital of Culture Agency. The first one of these is only a catalogue that lists the films and documentaries funded by the agency. Nevertheless, the catalogue begins with a comprehensive article written by Aslı Özge Tuncer, a film critic.²² This article approaches Istanbul films without separating them from their social impacts on the city. Also, it implicitly invites researchers and filmmakers to rethink and focus more on urban images and representations. The second *catalogue* that was prepared under its aegis was *İstanbul'un 100 Filmi*.²³ This book compiles a hundred films that were either partially or entirely set in Istanbul. Each film in this book is represented with an image and summarised within one or two pages. However, no references were made as to the reasons why these films are so crucial for Istanbul or why Istanbul was so precious for these films.

Thus, and in brief, (cinematic) Istanbul has been largely ignored in both the artistic and academic fields in the hands of exaggerated reviews and is collectively sacrificed on the altar of touristic expectations. In general, writers or filmmakers somehow feel as if they must either dignify or degrade the city; either miss or hate it; either protect or demolish it. Thus, (cinematic) Istanbul turns into an emotionally charged academic and intellectual field. Therefore, as an academic and artistic gap, it is highly necessary to gain more insight into the lives of secondary people, secondary values, secondary places, secondary feelings, and secondary details to escape, albeit only partially, from the dominant emotional ambience that has come to veil the city's true essence.

Istanbul through Documentary²⁴

There is a documentary, entitled *Istanbul*. It is about Istanbul and was made by the BBC in 1967.²⁵ Throughout the film, which supports the cinematic representations of Hollywood and Yeşilçam, an English narrator persistently underlines how Istanbul is one of the most ancient cities in the world, while the most typical exotic places are seen utilising a panoramic view: Istanbul's (Theodosian) Walls, the Hagia Sophia, the Blue Mosque, the Galata Tower, the Golden Horn, the Galata

22 Aslı Özge Tuncer, *Sinemada İstanbul: Kentsel İmgenin Beyazperdeki Serüveni*, İstanbul: Avrupa Kültür Başkenti Ajansı Yayınları, 2010, pp. 9-25.

23 Semra Kır, *İstanbul'un 100 Filmi*, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş. Yayınları, 2010.

24 There are many documentaries made about Istanbul. It can even be said that documentaries are perhaps the largest part of cinematic Istanbul scenes. Among these, the documentary titled *Istanbul: A Şehrin Hikayesi*, made by Ali İpar and İlhan Arakon, has a special place.

25 This film can be accessed via YouTube utilising the following web address: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fK09Vz75EyQ> [Accessed Date: 10.04.2021].

Bridge, Taksim square, wooden mansions on the Bosphorus, ports, palaces, other mosques, etc. In parallel to this visual emphasis, Istanbul is defined as a mysterious city between East and West and is a world in which men, most of whom are perceived as carefree and rapturous (because they are seen either while eating fish, drinking Turkish coffee, or smoking hubble-bubble), are dominant while the women are conversely either veiled or hidden away.²⁶

Soon after I watched this video, I encountered another documentary, which was another BBC film about Istanbul made forty-three years after the film just noted in 2010.²⁷ Its title was more assertive than the previous one: *The Real Istanbul*. Is there a *real* Istanbul? If yes, what and where is it? To answer these questions, this time, the BBC preferred to use three “native” narrators—or, more precisely, three “informants” (in Spivak’s sense)—rather than an outsider. The stories of “others” that are told by the natives are frequently more convincing and tend to be believed as “real”. As for the documentary, all of these native narrators were artists: Haluk Bilginer (a star of the stage and screen), Zeynep Fadilloğlu (an interior designer), and İdil Biret (a pianist). I wonder if it is possible to look for and even find “the real Istanbul” (if there is one) through the eyes of the three *elites* who are far from the reality of the *others’* lives. To learn this, I watched the documentary patiently till its end.

The documentary starts with an Arabic melody, with the following images being unsurprisingly in harmony with the sound: Arab tourist - depicted as if they were Istanbulites -, mosques, and palm trees. I think if tulips, roses, or judas trees were preferred instead of palm trees, which themselves bring Middle Eastern cities to mind, it would have been more authentic in terms of Istanbul’s image. With relation to these scenes, the first native narrator, Haluk Bilginer, takes the viewers of the film to Istanbul’s clichés: the Hagia Sophia, the Blue Mosque, the city’s veiled women, as usual, phaetons, fish in the market, *lokum* (Turkish delight), raki (an anise-flavoured alcoholic drink), etc. Then, he goes to a luxury restaurant located on the Bosphorus and eats octopus with raki. Is this the “real” Istanbul? I wonder how often regular Istanbulites are able to eat such expensive foods in such remarkable places.

As for the second native narrator, Zeynep Fadilloğlu, she also is always wandering around the Bosphorus Strait: Sariyer, Rumeli Hisarı (Rumeli or European Fortress), Anadolu Kavağı (Anatolian Poplar), etc. She underlines how Istanbul

26 In the video, which is fictionalised around superficial information and stereotypical images, there are some obvious contradictions and mistakes. For instance, the Galata Bridge is defined as a bridge between East (Asia) and West (Europe). However, the bridge links Eminönü to Karaköy, both of which are located on the European side of the city.

27 This film can be accessed via YouTube utilising the following web address: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hBelavt6zWQ> [Accessed Date: 10.04.2021].

has a dynamic, multi-dimensional, and mixed cultural form. Is she really in the right place to capture the real Istanbul and to realise the complex notion of the city? Just then, the third and last narrator, İdil Biret, unsurprisingly, brings the viewers to the town of Moda—which literally means “fashion” in Turkish, where once upon a time Greek, Armenian and British community dwelled. However, today, Moda is a “purified” town in which the past is experienced only as an imaginative nostalgia and is occupied mostly by Turk elites. Despite this, the narrator only meets the “wealthy and happy” inhabitants of Moda and their “smooth and comfortable” lives, as if everybody is unexceptionally serene and as if no one was a stranger in Istanbul.

Similar attempts at describing the city through disconnecting it from its own socio-urban reality have been made, not only by international but also by local, productions. For instance, in *Istanbul 2020 Olympic Bid Film*²⁸ (2013), as well as in the commercial film *Istanbul Experience*,²⁹ (2014) that was promoted by Turkish Airlines, similar images and discourses are repeated: the Bosphorus Bridge, the city’s palaces, the Historic Peninsula, the Hagia Sophia, the Grand Bazaar, roofs, the Galata Tower, the Galata Bridge, the Maiden’s Tower, night clubs, belly-dancers, fish, seagulls, spices, etc. According to these representations, Istanbul is doomed to be depicted as an epic, surreal and fun-filled city in which urbanites are intoxicated under the influence of its magical and tempting atmosphere.

Istanbul: The Eastern City of the West!

Most films about Istanbul were made either by Hollywood or by Yeşilçam, so it would have been relatively easy for me to find films that are relevant to the social and urban issues I focused on with this article. However, as was already mentioned, they tend *to recycle semi-blessed surfaces and clichés* endlessly. Yeşilçam, just like Hollywood, was highly dependent on the global market, the film industry, and daily events. Also, it consisted of easy scenarios, repetitive narratives, and stars. Even though there had been deep changes in Turkish society, Yeşilçam became an instrument for escaping from annoying problems instead of facing them. Moreover, it kept silent about real dramatic experiences such as military coups, unidentified murders, unfair trials, deportation events, political and ethnic discriminations, etc. Nevertheless, Yeşilçam remained the cinema of mostly happy endings by being inspired by 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s Hollywood.³⁰

28 This film can be accessed via YouTube utilising the following web address: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ftz6t59yWRA> [Accessed Date: 15.04.2021].

29 This film can be accessed via YouTube utilising the following web address: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S_jX5ulgOc4 [Accessed Date: 15.04.2021].

30 Giovanni Scognamillo, *Giovanni Scognamillo'nun Gözüyle Yeşilçam*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2011, p. 294.

As for Hollywood, it, with its sexism and violence-based stories, promoted the life of consumption as a commodity instead of observing or improving it.³¹ Also, it reflected Istanbul as a hyper-real, or surreal, city of the past. However, European cinema, in compliance with its existential nature and response to Hollywood films, brought a different and more comprehensive perspective on life and cities. Film production and theoretical discussions about film synchronically improved in Europe; in other words, Hollywood was developing some marketing strategies to sell movie tickets while film and theory enlightened each other in European cinema.³² As a consequence, various film movements (e.g., German Expressionism, Poetic Realism, Italian Neorealism, French New Wave, Czech New Wave, Dogme 95, etc.) developed different approaches to life. Accordingly, all of them, in comparison with Hollywood, looked for satisfactory answers to the most essential questions about humanity without getting involved in populist and opportunist expectations like other profit-mindedness global industries. European cinema generally reflected even the most ordinary details of everyday life without trying to escape from tragic endings.

Istanbul might be an easily understandable city for those who have not visited it yet but who have merely seen it through Hollywood and Yeşilçam films. Some of these spectators, just like Sean Connery (*007 James Bond: From Russia with Love*, 1963), may look for mysterious cases, intoxicated Sufis, belly dancers, and an environment in which people easily kill each other. Tod Browning, the director of *The Virgin of Stamboul* (1920), identifies Istanbul with harems and palaces that are controlled through intrigue. In his imagination, men are insidious, malevolent, and womanisers; while women are passive, off-guard, and dreamers—with the dream somehow always being that of the American dream. In this sense, Captain Carlisle Pemberton (Wheeler Oakman), the protagonist in *The Virgin of Stamboul*, ironically represents American heroism, mercy, and kindness when compared with *stereotypical* Turk vandalism and rusticity. Even the word “virgin” in itself is considerably ironic in terms of its reflecting an exotic Oriental image.

James Brennan (Errol Flynn) in *Istanbul* (1957) shows Istanbul as the city of extraordinary relationships, surprises, weird loves, and dangerous secrets: Istanbul is a common space “where the passion of the East meets the sins of the West”.³³ This film creates a magical nostalgia by using panoramic shots over the Blue Mosque, the Golden Horn, and the Galata Tower. *Topkapı* (1964), another Hollywood film, is the story of international robbers who plan to steal the emerald dagger from the Topkapı Palace. What an ironic object: “the emerald” that

31 Roy Armes, *Film and Reality: An Historical Survey*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974, pp. 85-86.

32 Giovanni Scognamiglio, *Amerikan Sineması*, İstanbul: Ağaç Yayıncılık, 2004, pp. 41-42.

33 This quote is extracted from the film’s cinematic poster.



Figure 2

Film Poster: *Istanbul*
(1957).

For an outsider, the easiest way to depict Istanbul, just like in this film, is to highlight some images: the starry night, the mosque silhouette, pink ambience, rosary, moustache and a scared woman.

refers to the magnificent sultanate; and “the dagger” that refers to deadly power. In this film, Istanbul consists of pursuits between cops and robbers in the shade of historical and exotic images. As for *Murder on the Orient Express* (1974), here, Istanbul is associated with a ruined village that is full of sheep herds and with a rough camp that is occupied by stubborn beggars and hawkers.

Zombie and the Ghost Train (*Zombie ja Kummitusjuna*, 1991), which is a Finnish film, depicts Istanbul utilising a dark ambience and depicts it as an ideal city for “zombies” who wish to be isolated. Contrariwise, Bei (Jackie Chan), in *The Accidental Spy* (2001), is as usual, in a hustle and bustle. This film depicts Istanbul as a test-city in which courage and endurance can be measured. *The Net 2.0* (2006), *The International* (2009), *Tinker Tailor Soldier Spy* (2011), *Taken 2* (2012), and *Skyfall* (2012) also consolidate the exotic - chaotic images of Istanbul and fictionalise it as being an “action-city” in terms of editing, sound, colour, cinematography, and narrative genres. Places, spaces, and images that leap to the eye at first glance through these films are the Sirkeci and Haydarpaşa train stations, the Blue Mosque, Hagia Sophia, the Bosphorus Strait and its bridges, the Grand Bazaar, the Galata Tower, the Golden Horn, the city’s labyrinthine streets, men with moustaches, hamals (porters) and beggars. The women of the city are predominantly displayed either as belly dancers or as veiled women—in other words, either fully naked or fully dressed.



Figure 3

A Scene from ‘*From Russia with Love*’ (1963).

A belly dancer playing for James Bond (Sean Connery) who is drinking *raki*.

Argo (2012), directed by Ben Affleck and won Best Adapted Screenplay, Best Editing, and Best Picture at 85th Academy Awards, portrays Istanbul as the social antithesis of Tehran in terms of citizen rights and legal affairs. In the film, Tehran is shown as a city of captivity, enclosure, threat, and oppression, whereas Istanbul is depicted as a city in which people are relatively free and peaceful. Despite this, paradoxically, scenes in Tehran could not be shot in Tehran due to the political disagreements which exist between Iran and the United States; hence, the film’s producers looked for another city that looked similar to Tehran. Many cities in Bulgaria, Jordan, Morocco, and Turkey were observed and compared with Tehran. In the end, Istanbul was chosen: “Istanbul is a phenomenal city to be in and work in”, Ben Affleck says.³⁴ There are indeed many cities inside Istanbul, and Tehran may merely be one of the thousands of these cities. Istanbul is like a flexible mask that suits all kinds of faces. Similarly, it shows how the same city can be depicted for two extremely different ends—liberalism vis-à-vis totalitarianism and plenty vis-à-vis poverty.

³⁴ Emanuel Levy, *Argo: Shooting in Istanbul* (2012). Available at: <https://emanuellevy.com/review/argo-location-shooting/> [Accessed Date: 15.4.2021].



Figure 4

A Scene from *Argo* (2012).

The place is, as usual, Hagia Sophia. The camera, or the viewer, is like a third person who looks in the same direction with Ben Affleck and his friend.

Not Seeing the Change

Today, Istanbul has a new and continuously renewing social and urban structure which is largely different from what Hollywood and Yeşilçam films, tourist guides, voyagers, and urban historians have portrayed for so many years. This is because the city's social and urban dilemmas, such as ethnicity, minority, immigration, westernisation, the explosion of the city's population, unemployment, housing problems, spatial segregation, isolation, alienation, cultural heritage, memory, risks of natural disasters and urban transformation³⁵ have generally been ignored by researchers and filmmakers. According to Perousé, what they look for in Istanbul is the city's past: they prefer to zoom in mostly on the sultans, harems, palaces, and mosques; hence, they skip the industrial zones, back streets, small people, and simple lives.³⁶ Accordingly, this amaurosis (vision loss) is based on an idealisation of the past. This orientation, as Işın argues, has played the role of a lifebuoy - especially for the Turkish intellectuals who cannot endure to face themselves.³⁷

Even those who have attempted to criticise researchers who are only interested in the surfaces of Istanbul have produced a different kind of exoticism which highlights extraordinarily tragic stories and characters such as street urchins, smugglers, beggars, and prostitutes. Consequently, the sociological, architectural, and morphological changes in Istanbul have not yet been properly dealt with

35 Doğan Kuban, *Istanbul: An Urban History: Byzantion, Constantinopolis, Istanbul*, İstanbul: The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey, 1996, pp. 415-458.

36 Jean-François Perousé, *İstanbul'la Yüzleşme Denemeleri: Çeperler, Hareketlilik ve Kentsel Bellek*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2011, p. 18.

37 Ekrem Işın, *İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995.

and analysed. For instance, during a short time, many towns and suburbs where domestic immigrants have legally - or illegally - come to inhabit have sprung up within the city; afterwards, new living spaces, which are indeed far removed from the Bosphorus and Historic Peninsula,³⁸ emerged and swiftly expanded. The social structure and urban experience in these areas are inherently different from the sensual and experiential aura that is familiar to the Bosphorus and the Historic Peninsula; therefore, analysing today's Istanbul by merely examining its touristic places with a touristic gaze may be a misleading approach for understanding modern Istanbul.

This *misorientation* requires rethinking the clichés of the city. It should also be remembered that these superficial clichés which are reproduced through Yeşilçam, Hollywood, sightseeing guides, and travel notes may be an obstruction in front of the eyes of those who wish to gain more insight into Istanbul itself. An example of this stereotypic approach, the well-known *bridges* of Istanbul have been shown and represented, not only as a geographical but also as a cultural connector between the East and the West; however, this cliché-like assumption that is related to its geographical position may be deceptive for the image of a *bridge*, which is commonly identified with “connection”, “transitivity” and “convergence”, may also refer to “distance”, “conflict” and “separation” in some cases.

It can be asserted that there is more than one Istanbul inside Istanbul. The city that is defined as a *tectonic layer* by Baudrillard is also open to all kinds of antitheses:

I now believe that this stage consists of the subterranean world, the corridor, the void, and the temple in the depths. While what appears attractive in Istanbul at first sight is enthusiasm, confusion and intense superficiality, what remains (from this city) is what is buried in the depths of time, the sediments of periods and empires, an interminable warehouse of imperial and mortal shadows – the whole history of a city that comes back to life thousands of years later.³⁹

In this respect, many cities may have a definable identity; in other words, they can be identifiable with certain distinctive images, colours, experiences, and thoughts. Due to Istanbul's *compartmentalised geography*,⁴⁰ it is hard to determine its socio-urban identity. If it was possible to draw a portrait of the city,

38 The Historic Peninsula, which is the heart of cinematic Istanbul in Hollywood films, is also the heart of the past empires of the city. There are many significant places, mosques, churches and palaces therein, such as the Hagia Sophia, the Blue Mosque, the Süleymaniye Mosque, the Grand Bazaar, the Spice Bazaar, the Basilica Cistern and the Topkapı Palace.

39 Jean Baudrillard, “Water, Empire, Gold, Primitive Stage”, *Atlas*, 1999.

40 Deyan Sudjic and Fabio Casiroli, “The City Too Big to Fail”, London: LSE, 2009. Available at: <https://urbanage.lsecities.net/essays/the-city-too-big-to-fail> [Accessed Date: 15.4.2021].

a city that still carries the traces of Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman heritages (both as a wound and as an honour), it would be necessary to use hundreds of crayons and colours. Despite this, those who have attempted to depict it traditionally have used only three: white [to sacralise], black [to detract], and pink [to exoticise]. Until now, many filmmakers and researchers who have been interested in Istanbul have chosen to paint the city with one of these three colours in order to promote their own image of Istanbul either negatively or positively – as if they had to choose only one colour!

Thus, a veil has covered the city of Istanbul,⁴¹ portraying it with absolute immaculacy. The thousand-faced city, however, involves various contrasts and conflicts that encourage us to rethink this veil. Even today, it bears the traces of dichotomies between the Ottoman tradition and the Republican regime, and feels crises of nationalism, internal immigration, urbanisation, modernisation, a money economy, consumerism, and security regimes. In Istanbul (which may be understood both as a victim and an abettor to both of these corrosive dichotomies) there are various versions of these problems—conflicts and contrasts which should be analysed sociologically. I think that what makes Istanbul a researchable city is not its indispensability in terms of its rapidly-increasing population, growing economy, or challenging politics, but its complex socio-urban basis, which includes many kinds of contrasts and conflicts in the sociological issues.

Conclusion

Istanbul is sociologically a laboratory-city, oscillating between the past and the future, and, in “accommodating at once centuries of history and an expanding urban modernity, Istanbul acts as a microcosm patchwork of Turkey’s diverse settlement typologies”.⁴² This refers to a multiple *in-betweenness* in values, emotions, fears, expectations, streets, and apartment buildings, as well as to an incomplete urbanisation process in spite of dramatically increase in urban population.⁴³ All these things make Istanbul in itself a sociological case study for debating some social and spatial contrasts and conflicts such as heritage and liquidity, pluralism and nationalism, inside and outside, province and urban, spirituality and money economy, individualism and collectivism, risk and security, and time and memory.

Istanbul has become many things throughout the ages, including the bridge between East and West and between tradition and modernity;

41 In this sense, the veil may metaphorically refer to Istanbul as being a female who is watched through a *keyhole*.

42 Sudjic and Casiroli, “The City Too Big to Fail”.

43 İclal Dinçer, Senem Kozaman Som, Yiğit Evren and Zeynep Enlil, *Istanbul’un Tarihi ve Doğal Miras Değerleri: Potansiyeller, Riskler ve Koruma Sorunları*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011, p. 146.

the capital of the Islamic world; and finally, the cultural capital of Europe in 2010. It has gained eventually the status of an icon, in the sense that it has become an epistemological tool, opening up to discussion a wide range of issues.⁴⁴

It is obvious that Istanbul, which is no longer an imperial city, is like a cubist picture that has a multitude of viewpoints. Irregularity is the layout of the city. As Keyder explains, some parts of Istanbul are just like Kabul, while other parts resemble modern European cities.⁴⁵ There is also a Frankfurt and a Venice, to name but a few cities, in Istanbul. Perhaps, for this reason, Richard Sennett asks the question: “Does Istanbul in the future want to look more like modern Frankfurt or Renaissance Venice?”⁴⁶ Truly, how many Istanbuls are there inside Istanbul? An anonymous poet indicates well its complex plurality:⁴⁷

Istanbul is a Babylon, a world, and chaos.

Is it beautiful? Extraordinarily beautiful.

Is it ugly? Horrible!

Did you like it? Crazyly.

Do you want to live there permanently? How can I know!

Who can want to live on another planet willingly?

Tevfik Fikret, a Turkish poet, also describes Istanbul as *an untouched widow that was left by a thousand husbands*.⁴⁸ This notion of the city does not only create a dichotomy but also leads to its shared attraction in the sight of those who wonder about the city. Istanbul is defined as *an interminable warehouse* by Baudrillard.⁴⁹ The warehouse is not only interminable but also messy and unmanageable. According to Kuban, if Istanbul was properly managed, at least its quantitative dimensions could be known.⁵⁰ However, nobody knows how many permits are given for properties, how many pieces of fabric are produced by how many factories, how many books are published, how many phones, televisions,

44 Erdoğan, *The Spectator in the Making: Modernity and Cinema in Istanbul 1896-1928*, p. 129.

45 Çağlar Keyder, *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Maryland and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1999, p. 233.

46 Richard Sennett, “Istanbul within a Europe of Cities”, London: LSE, 2009. Available at: <https://urbanage.lsecities.net/essays/istanbul-within-a-europe-of-cities> [Accessed Date: 15.4.2021].

47 Afife Batur, *Yarın'ın İstanbul'u*, In *İstanbul'un Dört Çağı: İstanbul Panelleri*, F. Türe (ed.), İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996, p. 95.

48 Tevfik Fikret, *Rubab-i Şikeste*, İstanbul: Ahmet Sait Matbaası, 1945.

49 Baudrillard, “Water, Empire, Gold, Primitive Stage”.

50 Kuban, *Istanbul: An Urban History: Byzantium, Constantinopolis, Istanbul*, p. 250.

or radios there are in the city. Istanbul is an infinite city that has a population that cannot exactly be known since neither its cadastre can be filled in nor its tax system fully implemented; in other words, ambiguity, plurality, and complexity are the main features of Istanbul—so much so that Istanbul has civilisations rather than a single civilisation, has *histories* rather than a single history and has lifestyles rather than a single lifestyle.⁵¹ (Since plural concepts and multiple definitions should be used for describing Istanbul, it can no longer be conceived merely with statistical and empirical researches.

As was stated previously, three James Bonds visited Istanbul up to the present time and none of them went out of the Bosphorus or the Historic Peninsula. I suggest that if the fourth James Bond comes to the city, he should go inside Istanbul, even though that would not be an attractive choice for a gaze that desires to experience extraordinary exotic stories and images. I think that plain cinematography, simple characters, and minimalist stories are more convenient for depicting and analysing the city. At this point, there is an essential issue which researchers and filmmakers should carefully dwell upon: the selection that they make of films and theories. First of all, films should not simply be seen as an instrument that merely captures and displays reality, but also as an art that has a self-appointed language and that adapts every reality into its grammar.

Due to the reasons which have already been extrapolated upon in this paper, those who wish to conduct sociological studies on modern Turkey and Istanbul using film should focus more on the New Turkish Cinema rather than the Yeşilçam and Hollywood eras. Although the New Cinema Films generally get low box-office returns and remain mostly as festival selections, they exceed the stereotypical approaches taken by the Yeşilçam and Hollywood cinemas and penetrate the untouched details of the city. In the sight of researchers, the worth and strength of films should come from the films' sociological references and artistry rather than their popularity and box-office success. Put it differently, it can be claimed that the best films to be analysed in sociological researches is that film which establishes the intellectual grounds for making theoretical discussions.

On the one hand, while cinematic parameters, such as music, camera angles, sound, lighting, editing, effects, and acting, should be taken into consideration during analysis, on the other hand, the researchers' eyes should go beyond the world which the filmmakers fictionalise. To formulate a better analysis, researchers should benefit from all of the required academic disciplines. In this respect, the worth of social theory, which approaches life using an interdisciplinary view, is precisely in analysing such sociologically salient films. Indeed, not only social theory but also life itself and its forms of stranger hood can be sophisticatedly evaluated with relation to many different academic disciplines. This and similar

51 Işın, *İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat*, p. 15.

theses, which are all centred around films and social theory, draw their strength and attractiveness, as well as their difficulty, from their interdisciplinarity, thereby making them, not only challenging, but also improvable as well.

References

- Armes, Roy, *Film and Reality: An Historical Survey*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974, pp. 85-86.
- Arslan, Savaş, *Cinema in Turkey: A New Critical History*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Batur, Afife, *Yarın'ın İstanbul'u*. In F. Türe (Ed.) *İstanbul'un Dört Çağı: İstanbul Panelleri*, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1996, p. 95.
- Baudrillard, Jean, "Water, Empire, Gold, Primitive Stage", *Atlas*, 1999.
- Bayraktar, Deniz and Elif Akçalı, "İstanbul Convertible: A Magic Carpet Ride through Genres", In *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, D. Göktürk, L. Soysal and İ. Türeli (eds.), London and New York: Routledge, 2010, p. 175.
- Dinçer, İclal, Senem Kozaman Som, Yiğit Evren and Zeynep Enlil, *İstanbul'un Tarihi ve Doğal Miras Değerleri: Potansiyeller, Riskler ve Koruma Sorunları*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2011, p. 146.
- Dorsay, Atilla, *Benim Beyoğlum*, İstanbul, Çağdaş Yayıncılık ve Basın Sanayi A.Ş., 1991.
- Ebersolt, Jean, *Constantinople Byzantine et les Voyageurs du Levant*, Paris: E. Leroux, 1918.
- Ebersolt, Jean, *Bizans İstanbullu ve Doğu Seyyahları*, İstanbul: Pera, 1996.
- Erdoğan, Nezih, "The Spectator in the Making: Modernity and Cinema in Istanbul 1896-1928", In *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, D. Göktürk, L. Soysal and İ. Türeli (eds.), London and New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Fikret, Tevfik, *Rubab-i Şikeste*, İstanbul: Ahmet Sait Matbaası, 1945.
- Göktürk, Deniz, "Protecting Polyphony: Moving Images, Travelling Sounds", In *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, D. Göktürk, L. Soysal and İ. Türeli (eds.), London and New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Işın, Ekrem, *İstanbul'da Gündelik Hayat*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1995.
- Keyder, Çağlar, *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local*, Maryland and Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1999, p. 233.
- Kır, Semra, *İstanbul'un 100 Filmi*, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür A.Ş Yayınları, 2010.
- Köksal, Özlem, *World Film Locations: Istanbul*, Briston and Chicago: Intellect, 2012.
- Kuban, Doğan, *Istanbul: An Urban History: Byzantion, Constantinopolis, Istanbul*, İstanbul: The Economic and Social History Foundation of Turkey, 1996.
- Kuban, Doğan, *Kent ve Mimarlık Üzerine İstanbul Yazıları*, İstanbul: Yapı-Endüstri Merkezi Yayınları, 1998.
- Levy, Emanuel, *Argo: Shooting in Istanbul*, 2012. Available at: <https://emanuellevy.com/review/argo-location-shooting/> [Accessed Date: 15.4.2021].
- Özgüç, Agah, *Türk Sinemasında İstanbul*, İstanbul: Horizon International, 2010.

- Perousé, Jean-François, *İstanbul'la Yüzleşme Denemeleri: Çeperler, Hareketlilik ve Kentsel Bellek*, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2011, p. 18.
- Richardson, John, "Gorbman, Claudia., and Vernallis, Carol", *The Oxford Handbook of New Audiovisual Aesthetics*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni, *Amerikan Sineması*, İstanbul: Ağaç Yayıncılık, 2004.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni, *Batı Sinemasında Türkiye ve Türkler*, İstanbul: +1 Kitap, 2006.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni, *Giovanni Scognamillo'nun Gözüyle Yeşilçam*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları, 2011.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni, *Cadde-i Kebir'de Sinema*, İstanbul: Agorakitaplığı, 2008.
- Sennett, Richard, *Istanbul within a Europe of Cities*, 2009, London: LSE. Available at: <https://urbanage.lsecities.net/essays/istanbul-within-a-europe-of-cities>, 2009.
- Sudjic, Deyan and Fabio Casioli, "The City Too Big to Fail", London: LSE, 2009. Available at: <https://urbanage.lsecities.net/essays/the-city-too-big-to-fail> [Accessed Date: 15.4.2021].
- Suner, Asuman, *New Turkish Cinema: Belonging, Identity and Memory*, New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010.
- Thalasso, Adophe and Fausto Zonaro, *Istanbul, the Gate to Bliss: Scenes from Turkish Life*, İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları, 2009, p. 33.
- Tuncer, Aslı Özge, *Sinemada İstanbul: Kentsel İmgenin Beyazperdeki Serüveni*, İstanbul: Avrupa Kültür Başkenti Ajansı Yayınları, 2010.
- Türel, İpek, "Istanbul through Migrants' Eyes", In *Orienting Istanbul: Cultural Capital of Europe*, D. Göktürk, L. Soysal and İ. Türel (eds.), London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Filmography

007 James Bond: From Russia with Love, 1963. Directed by Terence Young, UK: Eon Productions and Danjaq [115 min].

Ağır Roman (Colera Street), 1997. Directed by Mustafa Altıoklar, Turkey, Hungary and France: Belge Film, Focus Film, Les Films Singuliers, Soz Film, Özen Film [120 min].

Anlat İstanbul (Istanbul Tales), 2005. Directed by Ömur Atay, Selim Demirdelen, Kudret Sabancı, Yücel Yolcu and Ümit Ünal, Turkey: TMC Film [99 min].

Argo, 2012. Directed by Ben Affleck, USA: Warner Bros., GK Films and Smokehouse Pictures [120 min].

Artillerie Turque, 1897. Filmed by Lumière Brothers, France: Lumière [1 min].

Bal (Honey), 2010. Directed by Semih Kaplanoğlu, Turkey, Germany and France: Kaplan Film Production, Heimatfilm, Eurimages, Filmstiftung Nordrhein-Westfalen, ZDF/Arte and Programme MEDIA de la Communauté Européenne [103 min].

Berlin: Die Sinfonie der Grosstadt (Berlin: Symphony of a Great City), 1927. Directed by Walter Ruttmann, Germany: Deutsche Vereins-Film and Les Productions Fox Europa [65 min].

Bir zamanlar Anadolu'da (Once upon a Time in Anatolia), 2011. Directed by Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Turkey and Bosnia and Herzegovina: Zeynofilm, Production 2006, 1000 Volt, Turkish Radio and Television (TRT), Imaj, Fida Film and NBC Film [150 min].

Constantinople, Panorama des Rives du Bosphore, 1897. Directed by Alexandre Promio, France: Lumière [1 min].

Crossing the Bridge: The Sound of Istanbul, 2005. Directed by Fatih Akın, Germany and Turkey: Corazón International, NFP Marketing and Distribution, Norddeutscher Rundfunk (NDR), Panfilm, Pictorion Pictures GmbH and entrevista digital media [90 min].

Défile de L'infanterie Turque, 1897. Filmed by Lumière Brothers, France: Lumière [1 min].

Gegen die Wand (Head on), 2004. Directed by Fatih Akın, Germany and Turkey: Arte, Bavaria Film International, Corazón International, Norddeutscher Rundfunk (NDR), Panfilm and Wuste Filmproduktion [121 min].

Güneşe Yolculuk (Journey to the Sun), 1999. Directed by Yeşim Ustaoglu, Turkey, Netherlands and Germany: İstisnai Filmler ve Reklamlar (IFR), Medias Res Filmproduktion and The Film Company [104 min].

Gurbet Kuşları (Birds of Exile), 1964. Directed by Halit Refiğ, Turkey: Artist Film [90 min].

Istanbul 2020 Olympic Bid Film, 2013. Directed by Nigel Simpkins, UK: New Moon Production [2.55 min].

Istanbul Experience, 2014. Directed by Marco Grandia, Turkey: Alametifarika Production [2.51 min].

Istanbul, 1957. Directed by Joseph Pevney, USA: Universal International Pictures [84 min].

Istanbul, 1967. BBC. UK [6.50 min].

Murder on the Orient Express, 1974. Directed by Sidney Lumet, UK: EMI Film and G.W. Films Limited [128 min].

Organize İşler (Magic Carpet Ride), 2005. Directed by Yılmaz Erdoğan, Turkey: Beşiktaş Kültür Merkezi (BKM) [106 min].

Panorama de la Corne d'Or, 1897. Filmed by Lumière Brothers, France: Lumière [1 min].

Skyfall, 2012. Directed by Sam Mendes, UK and USA: Eon Productions and Danjaq [143 min].

Tabutta Röveşata (Somersault in a Coffin), 1996. Directed by Derviş Zaim, Turkey: İstisnai Filmler ve Reklamlar (IFR) [76 min].

Taken 2, 2012. Directed by Olivier Megaton, France: EuropaCorp, Grive Productions, Canal+, M6 Films and Ciné+ [92 min].

The Accidental Spy, 2001. Directed by Teddy Chan, Hong Kong: Golden Harvest Company and Panfilm [108 min].

The International, 2009. Directed by Tom Tykwer, USA, Germany and UK: Columbia Pictures, Relativity Media, Atlas Entertainment, Beverly Blvd, Rose Line Productions, Siebente Babelsberg Film [118 min].

The Net 2.0, 2006. Directed by Charles Winkler, USA: Columbia Pictures Corporation, Istisnai Filmler ve Reklamlar (IFR) and Winkler Films [95 min].

The Real Istanbul, 2010. BBC. UK [21 min].

The Virgin of Stamboul, 1920. Directed by Tod Browning, USA: Universal Film Manufacturing Company [70 min].

The World is not Enough, 1999. Directed by Michael Apted, UK and USA: Danjaq, Eon Productions, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and United Artists [128 min].

Tinker Tailor Soldier Spy, 2011. Directed by Tomas Alfredson, France, UK and Germany: StudioCanal, Karla Films, Paradis Films, Kinowelt Filmproduktion, Working Title Films, Canal+ and CinéCinéma [127 min].

Topkapı, 1964. Directed by Jules Dassin, USA: Filmways Pictures [120 min].

Üç Maymun (Three Monkeys), 2008. Directed by Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Turkey, France and Italy: Zeynofilm, NBC Film, Pyramide Productions, BIM Distribuzione, Centre National de la Cinématographie, Conseil de l'Europe, Imaj Sound Post Production, Imaj and Ministry of Culture and Tourism [109 min].

Uzak (Distant), 2002. Directed by Nuri Bilge Ceylan, Turkey: NBC Film [110 min].

Zombie ja Kummitusjuna (Zombie and the Ghost Train), 1991. Directed by Mika Kaurismäki, Finland: Asya Film, Marianna Films and Villealfa Filmproduction [88 min].