

Screenwriter Ayse Sasa's Cinema Thought and Discourse Analysis of Sample Films*

Senarist Ayşe Şasa'nın Sinema Düşüncesi ve Örnek Filmlerin Söylem Analizi

Lect. Meltem İŞLER SEVİNDİ**

DOI: 10.46641/medeniyetsanat.1383119

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Abstract

Screenwriter Ayse Sasa, with her active role in the intellectual history of Turkish cinema, her ideas and determinations, and the theories of cinema she put forward, is the subject of this study. The general question addressed in the study is whether Ayse Sasa establishes her idea of cinema in her screenplays. Discourse analysis using the concepts of Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu, and Karl Marx was used to answer this question. The two films that Sasa highlighted the most in the books she wrote and in the interviews with her were classified and analyzed according to the evolution of her cinematic thought. In her own words, Sasa's cinematic thought consists of two periods. In this study, Ayse Sasa's cinematic thought is traced through the films *Ah Güzel İstanbul* (1966), which she wrote in her first period, and *Gramofon Avrat* (1987), which she wrote in her second period. As a result of the research, it was determined that Sasa's thoughts existed in her screenplays within the limits of possibility.

Keywords: Ayse Sasa, Discourse Analysis, Turkish Cinema, Scenario, 1960s Period

Öz

Türk sinemasının düşünce tarihinde oynadığı aktif rolle, kendi fikirleri ve tespitleri ile öne çıkardığı sinema kuramlarıyla senarist Ayşe Şasa bu çalışmanın araştırma konusunu oluşturur. Çalışmada ele alınan genel soru, Ayşe Şasa'nın sinema düşüncesini yazdığı senaryolarda kurup kurmadığıdır. Bu soruya cevap aranırken de Michel Foucault'un, Pierre Bourdieu'nun ve Karl Marx'ın kavramları kullanılarak hazırlanan söylem analizi kullanılmıştır. Şasa'nın yazdığı kitaplarda ve kendisiyle yapılan röportajlarda en fazla öne çıkardığı iki filmi, Şasa'nın sinema düşüncesinin tekâmülüne göre sınıflandırılmış ve incelenmiştir. Şasa'nın sinemasal düşüncesi kendi deyimiyle iki dönemden oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, ilk döneminde yazdığı *Ah Güzel İstanbul* (1966) ve ikinci döneminde yazdığı *Gramofon Avrat* (1987) filmleri özelinde Ayşe Şasa'nın sinema düşüncesinin izleri sürülmüştür. Araştırmanın sonucunda Şasa'nın düşüncelerini senaryolarında imkân dâhilinde var ettiği tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ayşe Şasa, Söylem Analizi, Türk Sineması, Senaryo, 1960'lar Dönemi

* This article is derived from her master's thesis entitled "A Critical Approach to Ayse Sasa's Cinematic Thought", written by Meltem İŞLER SEVİNDİ under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatime Nese KAPLAN İLHAN in 2018.

** PhD Student, Istanbul University, Institute of Social Sciences, islirmeltem@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-8429-8574

Introduction

Since the first-day cinema came to Türkiye, thoughts on cinema have been written, various theories have been put forward, and many studies have been conducted. When the history of Turkish cinema is analyzed, it is seen that most of these studies were introduced in the 60s. The effort to create a "cinematic language", which was realized in theory and practice during this period, significantly impacted cinema. In these years, when cinema was freed from its identity as an entertainment tool and the cinema idea was developed, theories such as National Cinema and Revolutionary Cinema emerged - with the influence of the environment of freedom in Türkiye- and there was a period in which social realist films were predominant. Directors and screenwriters, influenced by Kemal Tahir's thoughts, try to create unique cinematic language while navigating his ideas. Tahir, who questioned his understanding of Marxism, talked about the emergence of a local and traditional understanding by saying that Western narrative patterns should be broken. This idea constituted one of the building blocks of National Cinema (Daldal, 2005: 121-122).

The Socio-Realism movement was a result of the efforts of directors and screenwriters to present stories based on everyday life in a more realistic language in the environment of freedom provided by the 1961 Constitution. Traces of Kemal Tahir's ideas can be seen in the works of names such as Halit Refig, Metin Erksan, Duygu Sagiroglu, and Vedat Turkali, who worked within the context of this movement. The Socio-Realism movement was frequently discussed by filmmakers of the period, and Ayse Sasa actively participated in these discussions and the production relations in cinema. Sasa said that in the 60s, she often met with Metin Erksan, Halit Refig, Lutfi Akad, and Atif Yilmaz, who saw cinema as art, and that they had a situation discussion on this issue. She stated that the main issue they discussed in these cinema meetings was to produce "dignified" products by getting away from the commercial cinema approach of the period. The primary condition for producing "dignified" products was to feed on an indigenous aesthetic. Kemal Tahir became a critical authority and "focus of respectability" on the question of indigenouness, which was also the main agenda of the leftist directors. Sasa, who closely experienced this period and these environments, was greatly influenced by Kemal Tahir (Şasa, 2010: 81-82).

Kemal Tahir, who studied Ottoman History in the 1960s, tried to understand the psychology of the Turkish people with his observations as a result of these studies. He said that one should know one's history and produce one's own culture and values, emphasizing that Western narrative patterns must be destroyed. This perception of civilization that Tahir tried to create becomes a road map for Sasa's screenplays. Sasa, who was influenced by this idea, did not even sign her name to the scripts she wrote at that time that she thought were out of this context.

In 1968, Ayse Sasa, together with Atif Yilmaz, put forward the idea of utilizing arts such as ortaoyunu (eulogy show in Ottoman culture and entertainment life) and miniature in order to help Turkish cinema gain a local identity, but critics ridiculed her. Saying that it was considered a "virtue" for a Western filmmaker to be influenced by the Impressionists or use gothic inspirations, Sasa expressed that Turkish filmmakers' turning to their material and their world is ridiculed. Despite all this, Sasa stated that since the 1950s, there have been hints of local cinematography, albeit in a primarily artless and unconscious manner, and that directors such as Lutfi Akad, Metin Erksan, Halit Refig and Atif Yilmaz have had a share in this (Şasa, 2010: 34). She cited Atif Yilmaz's *Ah Guzel*

Istanbul (1966), *Yedi Kocalı Hurmuz* (1971) and *Koroglu* (1968) as the first films in Türkiye in which the theatrical arts, ortaoyunu and Karagöz were used consciously and assertively (Şasa, 2010: 99).

Ayşe Sasa's approach and production mode changed direction after the 1980s. Sasa began to criticize Kemal Tahir's failure to say anything about Islam in his thoughts because, according to Sasa, Islam is the foundation of this civilization, and the analysis of Turkish history remains inadequate and "secular" when nothing is said about Islam. Sasa stated that it was crucial for Kemal Tahir to show the distinction between Ottoman Civilization and Western Civilization and to instill the idea that art cannot be made without tradition. However, according to her, if the role of Islam is not emphasized enough, civilization can only be viewed from a worldly perspective. Thus, only limited aspects of history and culture can be addressed. According to Sasa, the same "secular" approach is also present in Halit Refik, who was influenced by Tahir, and in his theory of National Cinema. Ayşe Sasa, who participated in many of Kemal Tahir's conversations, began to read about Turkish history and civilization with Tahir's inspiration. She saw Karagöz, ortaoyunu, and miniatures mentioned in these readings, but these were folkloric aspects. According to Sasa, the real issue was the continuing influence of Islam and its connection with daily life. According to her, even Yesilcam has a deep connection with the Islamic civilization, but they are unaware of it (Şasa, 2010: 100-102).

Ayşe Sasa's "cinema language" in her cinematic thought consists of two periods that cannot be considered separately. In this study, Sasa's adventure of searching for a language is analyzed using the discourse analysis method in the films *Ah Güzel İstanbul* (1966) and *Gramofon Avrat* (1987), which she highlighted in her works and interviews with her.

1. Conceptual Framework

In order to understand Ayşe Sasa's cinematic beliefs and the theories she put forward, it is necessary to understand and analyze the environment in which she was born and her cinematic experience. In her book *Bir Ruh Macerası* (An Adventure of the Soul), she describes in detail how she used her family and the community she belonged to as a source of motivation for her first step into cinema and her efforts to continue her work in cinema. Sasa, whose father was a famous timber merchant and whose mother was a prominent member of the community, was given into the hands of a Hungarian Jewish nanny who had fled the Second World War and sought refuge in Türkiye as soon as she opened her eyes in 1941 (Şasa, 2013: 16). Describing these years of growing up with foreign nannies as "a life of hell", Sasa said that the most challenging thing about those years was learning to speak Turkish. This process of alienation, which was considered acceptable by her family, caused her to turn against her family and the community she was part of. Sasa, who was tried to be raised as a "Westerner", said that her parents' generation was a dual-identity and fragmented generation; on the one hand, they adhered to tradition, but on the other hand, they idealized the West, but as the generation that came after them, they did not give her anything from the tradition. This situation, in which her parents, who came from a patriarchal family structure, were caught between the Western lifestyle and traditional rules, created a state of in-betweenness for Sasa, and this caused her to live the rest of her life in a state of depression (Şasa, 2013: 16, 20-21).

According to Sasa, the attempt to erase a society's cultural heritage accumulated over centuries is troubling regarding cultural continuity. Sasa stated that Westernization in Türkiye is very misunderstood, and the degeneration of the language is very objectionable as it blunts the intellectual connection of Turkish-speaking individuals with the society. Teaching other languages before Turkish causes this atrophy, and this understanding is presented and imposed as a necessity of a particular lifestyle. Another example she gives is the insulting attitude towards Turkish music. She said that when playing alaturka (Turkish style) music on the radio, it is called "grandmother's music" and that this affects her, which is why her ears cannot accept Classical Turkish Music. Two of the symbols of Westernization are Western music and the piano. Sasa explained that although she was interested in music, she hated the ballet and piano lessons she took in primary school (Şasa, 2013: 46-51). These anecdotes about Sasa's childhood can be summarized as the reflections and damages caused by the post-Republican enthusiasm for Westernization. This situation is important in showing how she and the elites of that period experienced a break with tradition.

Ayşe Sasa mentioned that when she was a child, her mother, grandmother, and her uncle Rauf Orbay were constantly talking about the injustices they had suffered and that this situation affected her mentally just as governesses talk about war and death. For this reason, she said she closed herself off to recent history even in her old age (Şasa, 2013: 115). Nevertheless, many of Sasa's screenplays contain historical elements, and Sasa uses these elements to signify tradition. Her family is Muslim, but she was raised with Christian elements by her nannies and often taken to church, which causes her to be in between in terms of faith. After the rule-oriented and disciplined governess education she experienced during childhood, she relaxes when she reaches college. Having failed her primary and secondary school classes, Sasa becomes a popular student who shines in college and graduates at the top. She received an inferior education in Turkish literature during her years of education. This system, which was a direct transition to modern literature in which Western literary sources were prioritized and the classics of Turkish literature were relegated to the background, created a kind of "breakdown" in Sasa. Saying that she realized this situation later, Sasa explains that she wanted to commit suicide to a psychiatrist she visited in her last year of secondary school. She later said that the doctor's words and warnings greatly impacted her, and from that day on, she tried to create a point of connection with society. Thus, she became interested in socialist views (Şasa, 2013: 68-70).

During high school, Sasa started reading books on the history and art of cinema and was introduced to Kemal Tahir during the same period. According to Sasa, this meeting was a critical moment that would affect her entire life (Şasa, 2014: 89). Sasa, who devoted herself to cinema after this meeting, expresses the reasons for this as follows:

"...Gradually I am involving in cinema, the goal of getting into cinema, becoming a screenwriter comes to the fore... One reason for this is that I realized that I had nothing to say about life in those years. I would rather be a typer than a writer in the first place. Another reason is that Turkish cinema is extremely despised; this fuels my feeling of opposition... My mother wants me to be a painter. Cevat Capan advises me to be a theater actress, but I am considering becoming a screenwriter because cinema is not even considered an art in Türkiye yet. It's looked down upon because it's a public, ordinary form of entertainment..." (Şasa, 2013: 76-78)

Ayşe Sasa's oppositional side led her to sympathize with Turkish cinema, which was despised by intellectuals at the time. Cinema had no prestige and was even considered

shameful by some. Sasa started to work as an assistant to Atif Yılmaz and is subjected to ridicule, especially from her family and coterie. Sasa's sense of revenge against her family, who handed her over to nannies and caused her to grow up in a crisis of alienation, made her embrace cinema even more. Despite her family's objections, she even married her first husband, director Atilla Tokatlı. Meanwhile, Sasa, who also worked as Vedat Türkali's secretary, succeeded in coming up with ideas and writing scripts and started to write and sell them (Şasa, 2013: 82-84). Sasa's intellectual environment also expanded day by day. Names such as Aziz Nesin, Ruhi Su, Ayberk Colok, and Lutfi Akad came to her and Tokatlı's house. The marriage ended after lasting for a year and a half. After taking a break from working for a while, she returned to the cinema, but even though she found a job, she was excluded from the Yesilcam because she was an unconventional figure. The social caste she came from, the cultural understanding she represents, and the function she performs caused her to be alienated from the Yesilcam and pushed her back into miscommunication (Şasa, 2014: 132).

Sasa continued her meetings with Kemal Tahir with the same frequency, and in the meantime, she started working with Atif Yılmaz and wrote screenplays with Safa Onal. After a while, her work friendship with Atif Yılmaz turned into marriage. While continuing to write screenplays, Sasa was idealistically driven by the idea that she had significant big things to do in Yesilcam. Her ties with Kemal Tahir gradually increased, and the intellectual environment she entered powerfully influenced her world of thought (Şasa, 2013, 93-98). Being in the same working life all the time, being colleagues and married at the same time, wore Ayşe Sasa and Atif Yılmaz out. In 1971, the outbreak of March 12, Kemal Tahir's being subjected to repression, and his subsequent cancer diagnosis were devastating for Sasa. This process triggered Sasa's illness, and she was diagnosed with schizophrenia (Şasa, 2013: 105). As a result of the devastation caused by the events she experienced, Sasa was hospitalized for a long time. Ayşe Sasa, who was a Marxist in those years, started to pray and think about Allah and the Islamic prophet Muhammad. During this period, Kemal Tahir's death came as a shock to Sasa. For the first time after this event, she read the Holy Quran's translation and went to Kemal Tahir's library to do various readings. Gradually, she moved away from her materialist mindset and ended her marriage to Atif Yılmaz simultaneously. Living alone for a long time, Sasa decided to marry Bulent Oran, who did not leave her alone during her therapy process. With Oran's support, she started writing screenplays again (Şasa, 2013: 113-119).

This period, which Ayşe Sasa considered the second half of her life, was the process of rethinking the issues that preoccupied her in Yesilcam.

"...I'm constantly making little notes, and I'm re-examining the issues of cinema in the light of the new faith I've reached, in the light of Islamic aesthetics. From a completely different perspective, this is a revolution for me... My point of view has completely changed; I am dealing with Yesilcam issues more in-depth than secular analyses. I start to publish the things I write in pieces in Dergah (magazine)..." (Şasa, 2013: 135-136).

Sasa, who has been on a quest throughout her life, said that she found the answer she was looking for in her world and made sense of it with Islam. This situation significantly changed her life, thoughts, and cinema language (Şasa, 2013: 151).

Ayşe Sasa's idea of cinema can be evaluated in two different periods. The first period was the screenplays she wrote in the 1960s within the Yesilcam narrative in which she endeavored to put socially realistic details. Towards the end of this period, Sasa struggled

with her identity questions, and after a while, she felt ill. In this process, which lasted for many years, Sasa's perspective on cinema and her life underwent many changes. Her second period was the concept of Dream Cinema, which she developed with the ideas brought by her spiritual journey after her illness. Even though Ayse Sasa could not express her thoughts and words in her films as she wished due to the circumstances, it is imperative that she established an intellectual ground for Turkish cinema. The films that have stripped away the elements of tragedy and put forth an epic narrative, which signifies Sasa's thoughts, have continued to find a place today, apart from the examples she mentioned in *Yesilcam Diary* (book). Thus, it can be said that Sasa's ideas have materialized in practical life.

Ayse Sasa noted that the drama genre could not be achieved in *Yesilcam* and that melodrama emerged even though the drama was tried to be made. She put forward two reasons for this: The lack of an Aristotelian drama tradition and the lack of a contemporary culture of critical discourse. Sasa presented the Islamic tradition's understanding of life through harmony rather than conflict, the human structure that avoids contradiction - especially the awareness of its social psychological contradictions-, and the incompatibility of the approaches of figures such as Nietzsche and Freud with the culture in Türkiye as evidence for the lack of development of drama -mainly psychological drama-. She stated that socialism, which she considers a Western ideology, has not been able to be placed in a Western dramaturgy in Türkiye and that Turkish films, as well as Turkish novels that use social-psychological themes, have been "crippled." According to Sasa, Turkish filmmakers could close their intellectual-artistic gap only by coming to their realization and giving up imitating Western cinema. She cited the Eastern artists Akira Kurosawa and Sergei Eisenstein as examples. She said that these names refined the epic mold with a modern consciousness and used it in their cinemas, thus adapting history and psychology (Şasa, 2010: 45-46). Sasa explained that Hegel also emphasizes the lack of dramatic elements in Eastern art and the strength of lyrical factors. She expressed that Metin Erksan's *Sevmek Zamani* (1965) broke the dramatic molds of the West to a great extent and formed the first ground for a narrative that could be called lyrical in Turkish cinema (Şasa, 2010: 25). As can be understood from this, the first practical example of Ruya Sinemasi (Dream Cinema), which was first put forward by İsmet Özel and later discussed by Ayse Sasa, Sadik Yalsizucanlar and İhsan Kabil, was put forward by Metin Erksan in 1965.

According to Sasa, Turkish cinema, from the very beginning and throughout all its processes, reflected, albeit "unconsciously" and vaguely, the traditional understanding of the universe of the Islamic world, the environment of civilization in which it was born. Sasa stated that this conception, which puts forth a non-tragic understanding of drama and art, which brings about harmony between oneself, other people (community-other), and the universe, and trust in the face of fate, is deeper and more dominant than the Promethean view that comes from the West. The Promethean view wants human beings to conflict with themselves constantly, others, and the universe. This state of conflict has been internalized by Western people both personally and as a social style, and "rebellion" against fate has become almost naturalized. Turkish people and art did not adopt and internalize this understanding (Şasa, 2010: 132). Sasa said that the reckoning and search between her and cinema was the basis of the change she experienced and that cinema was an important element in shaping her identity. She established a close connection between herself and Turkish cinema. She stated that at the end of her search process, she realized that she had a unique tradition and that Islamic identity and metaphysics

offered her and Turkish cinema an excellent opportunity for development and deepening. Sasa criticized the constant destruction of social memory and the fact that collective symbols and values are far behind in people's consciousness and criticized the attempt to comprehend the world through the norms of another culture.

2. Methodology

This study asked whether Ayşe Sasa established her cinematic thought in her scripts, and evaluations were made through discourse analysis. Class contradiction/social stratum contradiction constitutes the main skeleton of Sasa's films. Sasa prefers constructing her arguments in her films through contradictions rather than conflicts. Although she discusses conflicts in her discourses, she uses contradictions in her scripts. The reason for this is the result of Sasa's effort to keep the viewer away from alienation from her tradition. At the same time, Sasa -during the years of change considered as her second period- stated that the universe is in harmony and integrity. For this reason, Sasa explained many times that she tried to avoid conflictual narration, an element of tragedy, and expressed that the application of conflictual language in cinema was not very encouraging. In *Ah Güzel İstanbul*, an analyzed film, there is an intense element of conflict and contradictions. This may be because of Sasa's claim that her screenplays were interfered with and that another screenwriter, Safa Onal, was involved in the movie. It is known that Safa Onal used Yesilcam codes in hundreds of scripts he wrote and especially used melodramatic conflict elements.

Sasa explained the class/social stratum contradiction by revealing the discrepancies in language, costume, consciousness, space, representations of men and women, and the contradictions in the social status, language, costume, space, and consciousness of the protagonists who create the film's story. Some questions arise: Do the traumas that emerge from these contradictions carry the protagonists into the space required by Ayşe Sasa's cinematic thinking? Is it possible to imagine a new imagination without abandoning traditional spiritual values and cultural identity? Is it possible to capture and imagine the new without alienating from the past and tradition? The answers to these questions will be sought in the analysis.

Ayşe Sasa eliminated the effect of alienation by holding on to tradition. According to Sasa, the biggest problem in society is alienation. She stated that the key to overcoming this problem is to know one's own history and tradition. Therefore, the fact that she posits alienation and class contradiction as the most significant problem shows that Sasa has developed a Marxist attitude. The environment Sasa came from and the people she was in contact with enabled her to experience this class contradiction and to observe the reality in Türkiye at the time. By trying to say something new with her discourse and applying it to the scenarios she wrote, Sasa set herself a challenge. She created a cinema that constantly brings the present and the past together; in doing so, she sometimes used an object, an event, and sometimes a person. The tradition that Sasa talks about is actually "what belongs to you". This situation, this flow of time in cinema, is a theme Deleuze created inspired by Bergson's concept of duration. This theme neither serves a clear purpose nor is it chronological. This duration reflects a configuration of the character's own world (Parr, 2015: 271). Sasa took this idea as a ground for herself and shaped the structure she would build accordingly. All traditional codes are the things that make man himself. Sasa did not deny change because she knew that change would also become a tradition after a while. She said that change should also be based on tradition.

Therefore, this idea does not alienate society from itself. On the contrary, it brings it closer. In the films evaluated in this study, evaluations will be made on whether this cinematic approach of Sasa is reflected in her films. In doing so, Ayse Sasa's thoughts, historical and theoretical studies, and theoretical thoughts will be used as reference areas.

Ayşe Sasa's Marxist discourse changed slightly in the scripts she wrote after 1980. This differentiation was not to break the Marxist discourse but to create her thoughts. She proceeds through contradictions rather than the usual codes while showing men, women, intellectuals, the poor, or the uneducated.

3. Findings

As a screenwriter, Ayşe Sasa wrote thirty-one films. Twenty-nine of these were feature films, and two were television series. She did not want to put her signature on scripts that she had to write for various reasons or that were changed against her will after she wrote them. Although she was active as a screenwriter between 1963 and 2008, her most productive output was between 1965 and 1981. Eighteen of the twenty-one screenplays she wrote until 1981 were made into movies by Atif Yılmaz (İşler Sevindi, 2015: 107-108). In her scripts, she utilized traditional Turkish life and practiced traditional arts. She tried to incorporate concepts such as traditional eating habits, the traditional guest experience, and the traditional family structure into her screenplays. Turkish family structure, problems in the countryside, banditry, kidnapping of girls, the tradition of agha, and customs were the subjects she used a lot. She emphasized that men dominate the family structure, but women are more robust in the background. She used people trying to hold onto the city. In her scripts, she reminded her contemporaries that they have a past and history and pointed to a memory (İşler Sevindi, 2014: 63-64).

This section of the study analyzes Ayşe Sasa's scripts through discourse analysis using the concepts of Michel Foucault, Pierre Bourdieu, and Karl Marx. While determining Sasa's scripts, one movie from her two periods was selected. The films she highlighted the most in her interviews were determined, and *Ah Guzel Istanbul (1966)* was chosen for her first period, and *Gramofon Avrat (1987)* was chosen for her second period.

3.1. Short Story and Analysis of *Ah Guzel Istanbul (1966)*

The film was directed by Atif Yılmaz and written by Ayşe Sasa and Safa Onal. The movie is about a man born and raised in Istanbul who falls in love with a young woman from the countryside. In her book *Yesilcam Diary*, Sasa says that she wrote this screenplay in two months, working day and night - almost insane - and that no one else at that time had made such an effort (Şasa, 2010: 164). Nevertheless, despite all this effort, she did not put her name on the screenplay because scenes not in the script were included, and she found the movie "deficient" (Şasa, 2013: 101).

The behavior of the character Ayşe determines the main flow of the film. The movie's first half tells the story of Ayşe's efforts to become famous in Istanbul. The second half is about her experiences after she became famous. Hasmet, the male character of the movie, comes to the forefront as the balance element in this woman's journey. The main

elements of the movie are migration from the village to the city, admiration for the West, friendship, compassion, making money the easy way, and love. Another important sub-heading in the film's second half is a criticism of modernization based on the disdain for Turkish music. Since the movie builds its framework on conflicts and contradictions, some contrasts are especially underlined, and the themes are mostly built on these polarities.

The main male character of the film is Hasmet Ibrikaroglu. Hasmet is a cultured and wealthy man from a rich family, but his business has gone bankrupt and lost his assets. Against the existing standards of living, he is a traveling photographer in his way, which cannot be considered normal according to the general public. In his own words, he describes his preferences as *"...I wanted to be my own boss. I didn't want to sell my identity for two or three cents..."*. Even his name, "hasmet", can be considered the product of a bourgeois attitude, of a superior view. Alternatively, it may signify the power and greatness of the past because it reminds us of the past. The fact that he lives in his inner world with the help of constant monologues and has some ebbs and flows within himself gives many clues to deepen his character. He is emotional, kind to the outside, and does not hesitate to cry when necessary. He appears outward from his wealthy times with his hat, overcoat, and cane umbrella. The cigarettes he never stops smoking are also a part of his character. He lives in a hovel in the mansion's garden where he was born and raised but later had to dispose of it. *"It's not a shanty, it's called a 'kulübe-i ahzan'..."* Hasmet's "shed of sadness" has an important place in the movie as a reflection of his inner world and subconscious. Books, old clothes, and the piano are the only things in Hasmet's world.

Hasmet has an elite economic condition in which he codes himself with the codes inherited from his family, and this brings Bourdieu's concept of "habitus" to mind at the first stage. According to Bourdieu, determining one's cultural space with the codes from the family refers to the concept of "habitus". "These cultural spaces establish a category that transfers social power to individuals, a way of judging the world and others (Malpas and Wake, 2006: 157)". Therefore, the fact that Hasmet is characterized as a bohemian by others despite being a former factory bankrupt and that he carries the identity of a "loser" who graduated from Galatasaray High School shows that the cultural codes he rejected in the economic context are still stereotypically present in him. Hasmet represents the "wise man" as a character with roots in the palace and a historical background. Considering his life adventure, it can be inferred that he is the counterpart of his culture and the historical consciousness of the people he lives with.

The female protagonist of the film is Ayşe. She is a girl from the masses who thinks modernization promises them something. She wears a headscarf and is a timid type. As a provincial, she has established her subjectivity as an "artist" and comes from a family with a cultural code opposite Hasmet's. Both Hasmet and Ayşe are characters who have broken away from the power of their families. Hasmet's adoption of Ayşe can be read as a practice of power established with masculine and protective codes against Oguz Baranlı character in the movie. Because Hasmet is coming to the brothel to save, Ayşe's honor melts the concepts of honor and power in the same pot. Here, Hasmet's calling the woman named Duriye, whom he deals with, a loser also transforms this dilemma of honor and power into a sexual organization because Duriye is also disgusted by herself.

The values Hasmet and Ayse believe in keeping them somewhere in the system. In the film, Sasa has created and discussed her cinematic thought by focusing on the relationship between two people who are different from each other on the range of language-costume-consciousness. In the film, it is natural for Ayse to dream of a more advanced lifestyle, come to Istanbul from the countryside for hope, and want to become famous. However, for this to happen, Ayse must go through a process of consciousness, self-discovery, and finding her own language. Her clothes look out of place on her, the incompatibility of her language, her reaction to the dog, etc., result from Ayse not having completed this process or not being involved in it at all. In line with her cinematic thought, Sasa prefers her character to choose tradition and return to Hasmet's side in the finale; however, this preference can be evaluated not as "simple" advocacy of tradition but as the importance of the process that Sasa underlines. Sasa's decision to allow Ayse to become famous may lead to the risk of alienating the audience from the film. For this reason, returning the character to Hasmet's side and turning the script into a story of "failure" can be seen as completing the structure Sasa tried to establish and the codes she underlined.

Oguz Baranli's initial plan for Ayse and the plans with which Ayse begins her adventure of becoming an actress overlap with Foucault's concept of governmentality. The myth of Ayse's acting, in which she acts with her economic freedom in mind, turns into a relationship of managerial domination that manipulates the subjectivities of different figures through this manipulation (Akalın and Beteş, 2017: 42). At the end of the movie, the loser Ayse finds the opportunity to enter a process of consciousness and maturation. She has the chance to do this with Hasmet, the wise man. Thus, Hasmet can prevent Ayse from making mistakes due to her lack of class consciousness. Because Hasmet - even though he does not have the material power of that stratum/class at the moment - can protect Ayse and provide her with a stream of consciousness thanks to the consciousness of the higher class/stratum that he is aware of due to his cultural background. Sasa did not establish a hierarchy between men and women here and did not use a patriarchal structure, which is common in Turkish cinema. Therefore, her positioning of women and men is different. Rather than discussing a woman's or a man's problem, she addresses a human problem. The character Ayse does not display a weak profile nor submit to Hasmet. She comes to Istanbul on her own accord and enters the environment she wants in her way. Ayse could be replaced by a young boy from the countryside, or a wise woman figure could replace Hasmet. The difference here is not about gender identities.

While Ayse is initially an utterly naive character independent of sexual themes, Hasmet first awakens her regarding the aesthetics of existence. She comes to Hasmet for a photograph and wants to have an "artistic" photograph taken. When it comes to posing, she removes her headscarf and starts to pose in the "artist poses" she sees in artist magazines. She mentions that she is called "Artist Ayse" in the neighborhood and fled from her family in Izmir to Istanbul to become an artist. Ayse's forms of appearance, which she refers to as artistic poses or looks, literally describe the essential aesthetics of the existence of the Yesilcam artist. Here, Ayse makes herself an object of artistic appearance in the sense of knowing herself and reflects the "anxiety of the self" in the

way she presents herself in the photograph (Revel, 2012: 88). In fact, what Ayşe is trying to do is to get out of the "monotonous" life of her working-class family and move to an upper class. Ayşe is portrayed as an ignorant, uneducated, ambitious, and naive woman through her film dialogues and behavior. According to Hasmet, Ayşe's *"ignorant head is filled with rotten hopes"*. While Ayşe is under the authority of a band that wants to take advantage of her, she also takes refuge in the savior position of Hasmet who wants to save her. She starts an adventure of free will and is constantly dragged somewhere. When she stumbles, she ends up at Hasmet's side. However, this is not the classic narrative of a woman being protected by a man. It is Ayşe's coming out of a stratum/class where her range of awareness is not accepted and coming to the "wise man" to complete her journey.

The police raid on the brothel symbolizes the control relationship of sexual practices with the state's dispositif. The concept of the dispositif, which for Foucault is considered the apparatus established by discourses, is an essential point of observation in the film to observe how the state problematizes brothels. "For Foucault, sexual experiences, which were seen as singular events in history, started to be seen as subjective experiences with the problematization of the concept of sexuality (Akalin, 2015: 28)". When specific subjective experiences are coded as harmful dangerous and illegal for the legislator, a space excluded by society is automatically established. Here, Ayşe is a figure in need of protection for Hasmet, far from physical and psychological freedoms. In fact, Ayşe is subjectivized through her artistic discourse. There are discursive and non-discursive sets of practices that make this subjectification possible. These sets can be understood from Hasmet's reference to the concept of civilization when he says, *"How will I tell you the truth?"*. The discourse of civilization can be read as a criticism of the disposition of individuals against their bodily practices. This may be a consequence of Sasa's effort to reveal contradictions.

Hasmet does not plan to get married and finds many flaws in his suitors. He has three suitors in the movie and has various dreams about each. His first suitor is Ms. Leman, who *"graduated from two faculties"*. She is a modern woman with sunglasses and a coat and is impressed by Hasmet's knowledge of literature. *"There are difficulties in setting up a home with an educated woman,"* says Hasmet. *"An educated woman makes you sit on a pin. She bewilders her husband. She gives neither rest nor sleep..."* Hasmet does not want to marry Ms. Leman. There is an age difference between him and his other suitor, Ms. Belkis, *"a woman of means"*. He does not want to marry Ms. Belkis, who has a chauffeur, is well-groomed, finds Hasmet handsome and kind, and *"owns half of Istanbul,"* saying, *"...you can either be a gigolo or a slave. You will be a slave too..."* and he does not want to marry her. His last suitor, "Fat Ayten", the daughter of Butcher Salih, is the daughter of a middling family with few suitors. Her father wants to give her to Hasmet, but Hasmet also finds fault with her. He explains why: *"It is difficult to marry a girl from a middle-class family. She always has stars in her eyes. A middle-class girl wants to see everything from her husband. She wants to do what she cannot do in her father's house. Invitations, night outings... Above all, she wants a hardworking husband. She also wants half a dozen children..."*. Hasmet avoids marrying these women due to his insecurity because he comes from a "fallen" family. Although he unconsciously has nightmares about prospective wives, he encounters Ayşe once in every dream. Although

he is insecure and suppresses his desires because of the fallenness of his family, despite all this, he has his eyes on Ayse, who is actually at the top.

"My harm is to myself when I'm single. But in marriage..." Hasmet, who has always been distant from marriage, changes his mind when he meets Ayse. When she asks him to marry her, he suddenly tries to throw away his existing identity. He quits smoking and starts looking for a job. Hasmet says, *"All my life I've been looking for ways to live without working, that's why I'm so tired"*. He tries to be someone different, to sacrifice something. The contradiction here is to give up himself, the person he is. As he states at the beginning of the movie, he tries to give up his identity, which he does not want to sell for *"a few cents"*, for the sake of love, but this conflict does not last long and he returns to his usual self after a while.

In this film, Ayse emerges as a product of the "tradition-modern conflict" that Ayse Sasa centers on in some of her screenplays. Sasa grounds this conflict intertwined with the issue of the "degeneration" of music in Türkiye, which she has often expressed in her previous articles. In the film, the issue of *"getting rid of the alaturkishness (Turkish manners) of local music and alafrangalizing (European manners) it"* is attempted to be put into practice by saying *"...we are trying to save the taste of our people from banality..."*. Even within this ground of conflict, Sasa continues to talk about contradictions. On the wall of Hasmet, which appears as an image of tradition, hangs the photographs of his family, who are Ottoman subjects. In front of this wall is a piano, considered one of the most important elements of Westernization in Republican Türkiye. Hasmet plays the piano as well as a virtuoso and even composes on it. With this choice, Sasa tries to convince the audience that the new/modern can exist within the tradition. After a while, Hasmet, rebelling against the lack of money, composed for this movement/fury, and thanks to him, Ayse became a singer of this new style. Although they captured a new audience by deconstructing Turkish music, it was felt that they were against this "Europeanism" in themselves. For example, the phrase *"When has the public ever been closed to the good and the true?"* emphasizes the lack of taste of this audience. Hasmet does not hesitate to use radical words such as *"cosmopolitan fools of unknown parentage"*. In the end, the woman, who has always tried to be saved from evil, applies her resistance practices to implement the self-practices of her choosing and leaves Hasmet in the middle of the sea. With this discourse, Sasa turns Ayse into a free figure practicing her resistance on her range of awareness by pushing the dominant discourses with the back of her hand. Ayse's own experience leads her off the path she has taken.

Sasa's criticism of Westernization increases when she places the character of Ayse at the center of the conflict. This conflict is strengthened by some details such as her replying *"eyvallah (thanks!)"* to the words *"thanks for everything sweetie"* of a man who gives her a ride home, pronouncing the word Hilton as "Hinton", dressing in a hippie style and calling out to the dog *"shoo!"* while walking the dog, adding an English song to her repertoire but not liking the song at all after singing it. In addition, some of the details Sasa adds to the movie ensure the continuation of this conflict. However, as stated before, these conflict elements are softened by contradictions within themselves and create a space for questioning. Some of these details include the fact that the house used as a brothel is called "Pension Civilization", that a fight breaks out in the tavern after a

Western music record is played, that the painter in the tavern is proud of following Parisian actuality closely, and that the woman encountered in the tavern boasts of being the fourth assistant of Italian director Antonioni. Sasa summarizes these references in a single sentence with Hasmet's words: *"Oh old civilization... Are you going to feed us with the fancy lies you brought us from foreign lands..."*. While criticizing the perception of civilization, this criticism emphasizes that the elements perceived as Westernization do not correspond to the range of awareness of the local people represented by Hasmet and Ayşe. The absurdity of this situation is an attempt to show that the supporters of Westernization have misunderstood it.

At the film's beginning, Hasmet speaks while looking at the camera and breaks the fourth wall, a crucial cinematographic choice. This behavior undermines the viewer's power over the film by showing that the viewer, as an observer, is known by the characters. This, which is a new choice for the period of the film, is important in terms of using one of the examples presented by the French New Wave cinema as a rebellion against Hollywood. In the scenes with Hasmet, the movie tries to involve the audience more in the actor's inner world by using close-ups. In the dream sequences, on the other hand, the film presents an unreal environment with deliberate light plays and rack focuses, telling the audience to establish their relationship with the images they come into contact with accordingly. Costume choices highlight the range of awareness of the characters in the film. Hasmet's outfit carries the codes of the coterie in which he was born and raised. Ayşe's headscarf, on the other hand, can be regarded as a symbol of tradition and the countryside and disappears when she tries to get the title of "artist". In other words, she removes the figure, an indicator of her range of consciousness, from her body. Instead, the fact that she buys fancy and glittery clothes while trying to become a singer, prefers a hippie-style outfit after she becomes famous, and wears fur-like clothes after she becomes rich are examples of the expression of this change through clothes. Nevertheless, Ayşe's language and habitus give her away in this change she wants to make.

Understanding Ayşe's subcultural mobilization through the symbolic connotations of the clothes she changes brings to mind Levi Strauss' concept of "bricolage". The subculture into which Ayşe is integrated with her dream of becoming an artist can be understood as a "collective self-portrait". All the signifiers, including the clothes, favorite music style, attitudes, and behaviors of the actress who comes to the city to become an artist, overlap with the collective norm of being an artist (Gelder, 2007: 93-94).

The movie's use of Istanbul as a location preference is also important. Istanbul has a cosmopolitan structure that brings together different types, classes, and people due to its historical past and characteristics that cover all periods and carry both the modern and the traditional. Different social strata/classes from the upper class and rural areas come together in Istanbul and feed each other. For this reason, Istanbul allows for many different choices of places and people in order to show Ayşe's journey. Istanbul is also an important spatial figure with contradictions within itself. Because modern Istanbul is also the Istanbul of tradition, Sasa especially prefers Istanbul in her films; all the contradictions she wants to show are present in Istanbul. It is possible to say this in all details. Istanbul allows all of these planes to be told. It is perhaps impossible to realize

this in any other city in this geography. Sasa uses Istanbul as a motif belonging to both tradition and modernity.

As a result, in this film, Sasa applies the idea of "let's create our cinema with codes that belong to us" and in practice, she can establish the class/social stratum contradiction, which is the basic mechanisms of her scripts, in costume, language, space, consciousness and representations of men and women. The fact that they are two different people from high and low classes can be found in their language, costumes - even if their clothes change, the result does not change - and consciousness because one tries to keep the other down by saying, "*You are not a modern person, you are not an urbanite, you cannot be*". Hasmet tells Ayse that to be civilized, "*you need to have a historical process like me, and these are not civilizations anyway*." He states that what the current order promises is not modernization. The two are at different levels of class/stratum consciousness in terms of revealing the class/social stratum contradiction. Therefore, while this film depicts the approach of two people who are different from each other on the level of language, costume, and consciousness, it draws the class contradiction to the ground of discussion by making it the main subject of the script.

3.2. Short Story and Analysis of the Movie *Gramofon Avrat* (1987)

Directed by Yusuf Kurcenli and co-written with Ayse Sasa, *Gramofon Avrat* is, in Sasa's own words, "the script that she found the most decent" (Şasa, 2013: 131). Adapted from Sabahattin Ali's story of the same name, the film focuses on the story of Cemile, popularly known as "Gramophone Avrat", who became famous for her beauty in Konya *oturak* (traditional drinking party with belly dancers) world. In the movie, this traditional entertainment culture is portrayed verbatim. Sometimes, some narratives are based on failing to comply with traditions and manners.

In the movie, the fact that individuals in the society outside appear to be highly conservative means conformity to a kind of general discourse, normativity. "Although normality is a statistical category here, normal is usually established at the moral level and has the power of command". The normativity of sexuality gives Konya's "social normativity the status of a norm and defines it according to abnormal practices and desires (Spargo, 2000: 76-77)". Contrary to the existing superego within the household, a breach of normativity takes place in the triangle of dancing, gambling, and drinking. This is also normalized and conventionalized. For Foucault, the fact that the boundaries of the breach are predetermined is explained by the concept of governmentality. "Governmentality, as biopolitics, includes not only the management of society but also the control of the strategies that individuals can have for themselves and each other within their freedom (Revel, 2012: 129)". At the same time, Sasa shows that the forms of entertainment, women's freedom, and male-female relations, which are supposed to exist in the modern, also existed in the past and can be found in the tradition itself.

Sasa's choice to take the viewer to an *oturak* world in Konya in the early 1900s is the right choice for her to produce her cinematic thought. As she expresses, this scenario contains traces of Sasa's cinematic thought in every corner. Sasa's discourse that modern exists within the tradition, that it can exist, can be, and only needs to be looked at, becomes flesh and bones with this scenario. For these reasons, Sasa prefers a reality lived in a city like Konya, which signifies Sufism, tradition, and Islam at a time when

modernization had not yet been implemented by the state and the people were still living by traditional values. With this scenario, she reproduces her discourse that what is called Westernization is misunderstood. At the same time, she reveals the contradictions within tradition and the contradictions within the idea of being modern.

In *Gramofon Avrat*, similar to *Ah Guzel Istanbul*, there is the image of a free and determined woman. In this movie, Rifat's raid on Gramofon's house exemplifies the dichotomy between male ownership and female freedom and the attempt to correct women through masculine pressure. Despite this, the women in the movie make all decisions of their own free will. Cemile voluntarily works as an *oturak* woman and does not go to the place of the man she does not want. So much so that she starts working in a brothel rather than under Manifaturaci Ali's yoke.

Cemile is the main female character of the movie. Although she is not very dissatisfied with her work, she is disturbed by the excesses of some of the rakehells. By saying, "*Neither honor nor decency...*", it is understood that she is aware of the manners and tradition of her work, but she is also disturbed by the fact that it has started to degenerate. Cemile is a trendy woman in the town but does not communicate much with people. Everyone knows her as "Gramophone Avrat". In the words of a man from the town, "*even what she wears is different*" and "*suits Gramophone*". Since the *oturak* parties are thrown at night, she only rides in the phaeton of the coachman Murat for fear of being kidnapped. Murat is a decent man who abstains from even looking at Gramophone but is very much in love with her. Cemile is one of Sasa's characters who is free within tradition. Like Ayşe in *Ah Guzel Istanbul*, Cemile is a character who does not exclude tradition and is free within it. Thus, Sasa shows the Marxist discourse here by choosing women who cling to tradition rather than women who are alienated from it.

There are two other female characters in the movie. The first one is Azime, an old *oturak* woman. Azime, who represents the past and tradition of the *oturak* world, always protects Cemile and wants to build a life with her in a big city. Although she is an honest woman, she does not hesitate to accuse Murat at the police station scene in order to protect Cemile. The other female character is Nurve, a tailor. She is a comfortable woman who lives alone and can be friends with men. She tries to set Cemile up with Ali, but in a drunken moment, she mentions that she is interested in Cemile. This is a sexual practice that is only revealed through the unconscious -in this case through drunkenness- that does not conform to normativity. The fact that Nurve hides this from everyone and tries to push Cemile away from her after she opens up to her means that she does not show any resistance against heteronormative discourse. Gramophone's running away from home or being sent away by the practice of heteronormative discourse despite having a radical life also points to this. In other words, the tailor sends Cemile to a heteronormative relationship. This sexual intimacy between Nurve the tailor and Cemile is important in that it shows that the liberated relationships and life practices in *oturak* world do not have a relationship with modernization and can also be found within the tradition. Here, the film underlines that the demand for different homosexual tendencies is not related to modernization and that such situations can also occur within tradition.

There are two "rascals" in the movie. The first is Rifat, one of the wealthy members of the gentry, who takes a close interest in Gramophone. He is a vagabond and constantly causes trouble. He is finally shot and killed by Murat one evening when he tries to kidnap Gramophone. The second "rascal" is Ali, the draper. Ali, who is calmer and politer, is interested in Gramophone but tries to make it official. He sends gifts to Cemile and wants

to marry her. His hat and clothes are pretty modern. His family is very religious, and his wife is mentally unstable. For this reason, even though his family allows him to marry someone else and have children, he wants to be together with Gramophone. Ali has authority as he is rich and influential in the town and tries to use it on Cemile. Ali goes to the woman's house without being married, which is not by normativity, and this implies a resistance against normativity. While it is unconventional to have a relationship with the *oturak* women even in the *oturak* world, what Ali experiences with Cemile is a resistance against tradition. His desire to control her and include her in his world turns into jealousy after a while and leads him to send Murat to his death. Although Ali regrets this afterward, Cemile does not accept this situation and settles in the brothel of her own accord. She aims to keep Ali away from her world. Ali cannot leave his existing power, authority, and prestige behind and dare not enter the brothel door. That door is a boundary for him.

The movie has many examples of the contradiction between tradition and modernity, which Ayşe Sasa has addressed in many of her screenplays. Sasa puts the criticism of veiling and modernism on the floor of discussion through the words and actions of a teacher character in the script. The teacher, Ismail, is the character who speaks the most in the movie. He prepares for a play he organizes at the People's House, saying, "*We will create tomorrow's modern nation from yesterday's ummah*". In this play, many little girls dressed in colorful and modern clothes as "angels of civilization" put on a theatrical performance accompanied by Western music. A woman is in the center of the stage, dressed in a black chador and tied with ropes. The little girls dance around her, untie the ropes, and open the chador. A woman in a white dress and a sash with the word "civilization" written on it comes out from underneath. Sasa's revealing of the order of civilization wrapped in a black sheet here can be considered an absurd situation. This criticism of the absurdity of understanding civilization by covering up is a tragic reference to the "civilized" things already openly experienced in the town. Sasa thus uses how she sees the object of veiling to create her thoughts. She creates a kind of indirect narrative by placing this detail, which could have been quite didactic within the movie, into a play. Considering the overall script of the movie, it can be said that the scene is entirely "glued". The fact that the same teacher is invited to an *oturak* party, and while watching Cemile there, he speaks without following the *oturak* manners is a reference to the contradictions between tradition and modernity. The teacher's statement, "I'm sure the Turkish ballet will be born from here," is a detail that shows how alien he is to his environment.

In *Gramofon Avrat*, Sasa takes the audience back to the past and tradition, showing that what is demanded as modern today already exists in tradition. Thus, she also forms her thoughts with this movie. Sasa does not criticize modernity as Refig or Akad do. Whereas Akad depicts the flaws in modernity through sharp contrasts, Sasa does not have such an aim. Sasa reveals class contradictions and the absurdity of perceiving them. She uses her cinematic thinking to distort perception, to remove the blur in all perception. In other words, she says that what is called modern is already in the tradition, and she aims not to break the connection with the past. The fact that the film is a period drama is also an important choice for the audience to recognize the tradition and to establish the connection that Sasa underlines more easily.

This work, which Sasa describes as the script she finds closest to her, is a work that deals with, examines, and reconstructs the class/social stratum contradiction from different angles, thus carrying Sasa's cinematic thought. She establishes this through the *oturak* world within the tradition and the fact that not using a veil is considered civilized. In doing so, costumes continue to be the building blocks that serve her idea. For example, Cemile,

who dances in an outfit reminiscent of a belly dancer during the evening *oturak* parties, walks around the city in a burqa during the day. Azime, the wise one of the two *oturak* women in the movie, who raises Cemile by teaching her the *oturak* tradition, transfers a consciousness to Cemile while raising her. This can be understood from Cemile's discourses and the approval she receives from Azime when she tells these discourses to her. In addition, all the characters in the movie are treated as individuals, and everyone has to live the lives of their own decisions.

Conclusion

Ayşe Sasa says that her life story summarizes a search for truth. She was born into a wealthy family in a society of low-income people, which causes her to question oppression and belonging. The fact that she is in a search pushes her towards socialist thoughts after a while, and she constantly feels the need to belong to something. She expresses that the understanding of Westernization in Türkiye is misunderstood, that the attempt to erase a society's cultural heritage accumulated over centuries is very troublesome in terms of cultural continuity, and that the corruption of the language is especially problematic and that this situation blunts the bond of Turkish-speaking individuals with the society. Sasa says that the West should not be idealized. She states that confrontational language has no place in this land, that the local material, Turkish life, behavior, morality, and gesture are very different from Western art and understanding of form, and that if this understanding is tried to be imposed, "an ugliness that the material constantly vomits" will emerge. The Promethean view, which comes from the West, demands that man be in constant conflict with himself, others, and the universe. Although Western people internalized this state of conflict personally and socially, Turkish people and Turkish art could not adopt this mentality.

According to Sasa, two elements shape Turkish films: locality and modernity. Sasa states that these two opposing factors play a complex role in the productivity of Turkish cinema. Therefore, she preferred to use contradictions rather than opposites in the language of cinema. She carries this understanding to her two periods. In her first period, she tries to create a tragedy that draws on tradition and includes conflict elements in her films. In her second period, although she again emphasized the importance of drawing on tradition, she decided that tragedy was unsuitable for Turkish cinema and that an epic approach should come to the fore.

Sasa says that cinema is an art that reveals the subconscious of its creator like a mirror. In the *Yesilcam Diary*, she notes that she did not find the first-period scripts very successful because her mood and tension were very much felt. Reading the psychological contradictions in her scripts leads her to an identity crisis. This process, which was a kind of self-analysis, created a severe nervous illness in Sasa and caused her to enter a period of depression that led her to withdraw from the profession altogether. In her second period, Sasa turned to Sufism and Islam. She explains that she looks at her profession with her values and that Islam lies at the foundation of her civilization. The concept of Dream Cinema that emerged here is connected to the Sufi concept of the dream being a dream of the creator of the universe. Sasa states that Sufism should be utilized when making cinema. After all, in Islam, the dream is seen as an area where one

can establish personal contact with the Creator. What Sasa raises is the issue of whether cinema is in the hands of the dream or the imagination. The fact that cinema is a Western art has increased the gap between matter and meaning since its inception and idolized matter and man. Imagination transcended reality and became the primary goal in social life. Sasa states that this situation continues in European society and that cinema progresses under the command of imagination. The concept that Sasa refers to here is the possibility of cinema breaking free from the command of the imagination and gaining the quality of a dream.

Ayşe Sasa established an intellectual ground for Turkish cinema even if she could not fully express what she said in her films. These ideas, which she put forward and found a place in cinema literature, contributed to the reading of the films produced in the past and served as a reference for later films. With her Marxist line, she presents a class contradiction/social stratum contradiction in her films and brings people from different strata together. The environment Sasa came from and the people she was in contact with enabled her to experience this class contradiction and to observe the reality in Türkiye at the time. She prefers constructing her arguments in her films through contradictions rather than conflicts. Although she discusses conflicts in her discourses, she uses contradictions in her screenplays. Thus, Sasa tries to keep the viewer away from alienation from their tradition. Sasa favors using tradition as a backdrop because tradition is "what belongs to you". All traditional codes are the elements that make a person who they are, and if there is to be a change, it must occur within tradition. According to Sasa, discovering the new is through oneself. In order to eliminate the effect of alienation, it is necessary to hold on to tradition. For this reason, Sasa's thought does not alienate; on the contrary, it allows for intimacy.

In her films, Sasa did not establish a hierarchy between men and women and did not use a patriarchal structure, which is common in Turkish cinema. Therefore, her positioning of women and men is different. Rather than discussing a woman's or a man's problem, she addresses a human problem. The character Ayşe in *Ah Güzel İstanbul* does not display a weak profile and does not submit to Hasmet. She comes to İstanbul independently and enters environments the way she wants. Ayşe could be replaced by a young boy from the countryside, or a wise woman figure could replace Hasmet. In *Ah Güzel İstanbul*, it is seen that Sasa applies the idea of "let's create our cinema with our codes," and in practice, she can establish the class/social stratum contradiction, which is the basic mechanisms of her scripts, in costume, language, space, consciousness and representations of men and women. The fact that Hasmet and Ayşe are two different people from two different classes can be found in their language, their costumes -even if their clothes change, the result does not change- and their consciousness. The two characters are at different levels of class/stratum consciousness in terms of revealing the class/social stratum contradiction. Therefore, while this film portrays the approach of two people who are different from each other on the level of language, costume, and consciousness, it draws the class contradiction to the ground of discussion by making it the main subject of the screenplay.

Gramofon Avrat, which Sasa describes as the script she finds closest to her, is a work that deals with, examines, and reconstructs the class/social stratum contradiction from

different angles, thus carrying Sasa's cinematic thought. It establishes this through the *oturak* world within the tradition and the fact that not using a veil is considered civilized. In doing so, costumes continue to be the building blocks that serve her thoughts. Azime, the wise one of the two *oturak* women in the film, who raises Cemile by teaching her the tradition of *oturak*, transfers consciousness to Cemile while raising her. This can be understood from Cemile's discourses and the approval she receives from Azime when she tells these discourses to her. In addition, all characters in the movie are treated as individuals, and everyone has to live the lives of their own decisions.

References

- Akalın, A. & Beteş, F. (2017), "Soyut-Makineler ve Energeia Kavramları Üzerinden Kafka'nın Ceza Kolonisi ve Duchamp'ın Büyük Cam Yapıtlarının Analizi", *Medeniyet Sanat Hakemli Dergisi*, Cilt: 3, Sayı: 1, s. 29-44.
- Akalın, A. (2015), Tekillik Tartışmasında Öz Sorunu, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Daldal, A. (2005), 1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik, İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi.
- Gelder, K. (2007), *Subcultures: Cultural Histories and Social Practice*, Routledge.
- İşler Sevindi, M. (2014), "Ayşe Şasa'yı Senaryolarından Okumak", *Ayşe Şasa*, Burçak Evren (hzl.), Malatya Uluslararası Film Festivali.
- İşler Sevindi, M. (2015), "Senaryolarıyla Ayşe Şasa", *Hayret Perdesini Temâşâ*, Serdar Arslan (hzl.), İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.
- Malpas, S. & Wake, P. (2006), *The Routledge Companion to Critical Theory*, New York: Routledge.
- Parr, A. (2015), *The Deleuze Dictionary Revised Edition*, Edinburgh University Press.
- Revel, J. (2012), *Foucault Sözlüğü*, İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- Spargo, T. (2000), *Foucault ve Kaçıklık Kuramı*, İstanbul: Everest Yayınları.
- Şasa, A. (2013), *Bir Ruh Macerası*, İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Şasa, A. (2014), *Delilik Ülkesinden Notlar*, İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Şasa, A. (2010), *Yeşilçam Günlüğü*, İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.

Bu makale iThenticate intihal tespit yazılımıyla taranmıştır. / This article has been scanned by iThenticate plagiarism detection software.

Bu çalışmada "Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Yönergesi" kapsamında uyulması belirtilen kurallara uyulmuştur. / In this study, the rules stated in the "Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive" were followed.

Araştırma tek bir yazar tarafından yürütülmüştür (Katkı Oranı: %100). / The research was conducted by a single author (Author Contribution: 100%).

Çalışma kapsamında herhangi bir kurum veya kişi ile çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır. / There is no conflict of interest with any institution or person within the scope of the study.