

AN ANALYSIS OF A SHORT-LIVED CINEMA JOURNAL: *THE YOUNG
CINEMA* (GENÇ SİNEMA) IN TURKEY, 1968 – 1971

by
CENK CENGİZ

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in History
Sabancı University
Spring 2010

AN ANALYSIS OF A SHORT-LIVED CINEMA JOURNAL: *THE YOUNG CINEMA*
(GENÇ SİNEMA) IN TURKEY, 1968 – 1971

APPROVED BY:

Prof. Dr. Cemil Koçak

(Dissertation Supervisor)

Asst. Prof. Dr. Y. Hakan Erdem

Prof. Dr. Ali Carkoğlu

DATE OF APPROVAL: 30 / 07 / 2010

© Cenk Cengiz, 2010

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF A SHORT-LIVED CINEMA JOURNAL: *THE YOUNG CINEMA* (GENÇ SİNEMA) IN TURKEY, 1968 – 1971

CENK CENGİZ

M.A., History

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Cemil Koçak

Spring 2010, xii + 159 pages

This study, starting from the analysis of the journal *The Young Cinema* (Genç Sinema), which was issued sixteen volumes between October 1968 and April 1971, aims to analyze how the namesake cinema group organized around the journal, *The Young Cinema* perceives their socio-politic conjunctures and how this perception is reflected on the perspective of their own cinema. The study claims that a cinema movement/group appeared at a certain period or era or the improvement thereof, is influenced to a great extent by the cinematic developments in the previous and/or contemporary period as well as the socio-political climate in which it is situated. From this point forth, this study tries to analyze the influences of cinema movements germinating on a national and international scale in the 1960s and the highly politicized social context on the emergence of Young Cinema and exemplify this influence through the articles and essays in the journal.

This study points out that the subject group has the two characteristics of the cinematic movements in the 1960s (despite the differences in dimension and degree). These characteristics are the opposition to the dominant economic relations (capitalism) and ideology (imperialism) of the era in which it emerged and the disengagement from the international (Hollywood) and national (for Young Cinema – *Yeşilçam*) cinema sector. The fact that Young Cinema Group is oppositional to the existing economic and political system and is inspirational for a new system conduces the group to co-operate with the revolutionist young movements on a operational and theoretical level as well as to perceive cinema as tool in the realization of the revolution (the prior aim of the group). Simultaneously, the disengagement from *Yeşilçam*, which symbolizes the dependence on imperialist powers and the reflection of capitalist-imperialist infrastructure causes the members in the *Young Cinema* to discuss the ways to found an independent structure which will completely isolate them from the existing system and the ways to integrate their films into the organizational process

created by the alternative economic relations of this independent structure. This study examines all the above-mentioned subject matters by referring to the articles and discussions in the Group's Journal on a fundamental level as well as to oral history studies carried out with some of the representatives of the Group.

ÖZET

KISA SÜRELİ BİR SİNEMA DERGİSİNİN ANALİZİ: GENÇ SİNEMA, TÜRKİYE, 1968 – 1971

CENK CENGİZ

Tarih Yüksek Lisans Programı
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Cemil Koçak
Bahar 2010, xii + 159 sayfa

Bu çalışma, Ekim 1968 ve Nisan 1971 yılları arasında yayınlanmış olan ve 16 sayıdan oluşan *Genç Sinema* Dergisi'nin incelenmesinden yola çıkarak, dergi etrafında örgütlenmiş olan aynı isimdeki sinema grubunun içinde yaşadıkları sosyopolitik konjontürü nasıl algıladıkları ve bu algılayışın kendi sinema perspektiflerine nasıl yansıdığını ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştır. Çalışma belirli bir dönemde ortaya çıkmış bir sinema hareketi / grubu ya da gelişmesinin kendinden önceki ve/veya yaşadığı dönemin diğer sinemasal gelişmelerinin yanı sıra içinde bulunduğu sosyal ve politik ortamdan da belirgin bir şekilde etkilendiği iddiasında bulunur. Bu iddiadan hareketle elinizdeki bu tez, Genç Sinema'nın ortaya çıkmasında 1960'lı yılların ulusal ve uluslararası ölçekte filizlenen sinema hareketlerinin ve yüksek derecede politize olmuş sosyal bağlamın etkisini açıklamaya ve dergide yazılan makalelerle bu etkiyi örneklendirmeye çalışmıştır.

Bu tez söz konusu Grup'un 1960'ların sinema hareketlerinin (boyutları ve derecesinin farklı olmasına rağmen) barındırdığı iki temel karakteristiğini göstermekte olduğuna işaret eder. Bunlar, ortaya çıktığı dönemin baskın olan ekonomi ilişkilerine (kapitalizm) ve ideolojisine (emperyalizm) bir 'karşı' duruş ve uluslararası (Hollywood) ve yerel (Genç Sinema için – Yeşilçam) sinema sektörüne karşı da bir 'kopuş' niteliğine sahip olmasıdır. Genç Sinema Grubu'nun var olan ekonomik ve politik sisteme karşı bir duruşta olması ve yeni bir düzen isteği onu dönemin devrimci gençlik hareketleriyle eylemsel ve teorik düzeyde beraber hareket etmelerine ve sinemayı (Grup'un öncelikli amacı olan) devrimi gerçekleştirme yolunda bir araç olarak algılamalarına yol açmıştır. Aynı zamanda, emperyalist güçlere bağımlı olan ve kapitalist-emperyalist altyapının bir yansıması niteliği taşıyan Yeşilçam'a karşı bir kopuş özelliği göstermesi, *Genç Sinema* dergisinde, üyelerin kendilerini bu sistemden tamamen soyutlayacak bağımsız bir yapı kurma ve filmlerini bu

yapının oluřturduđu alternatif ekonomik iliřkilerle uturecek bir ‘organizasyon’ sũrecine dahil etme yollarını tartiřmalarına neden olmuřtur. Bu alıřma, bahsedilen tũm bu konuları temelde Grup’un dergisi olan Gen Sinema’daki makaleler ve tartiřmalara riayet ederek ayrıca Grup’un bazı temsilcileriyle yapılan sũzlũ tarihi alıřmalarını dahil ederek irdelemiřtir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank Sabancı University's History Department for giving me the opportunity to make this kind of research combining two important domains, cinema and history. In this manner, I wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Cemil Koçak for guiding me throughout my research and directing me in the most appropriate way especially with relevance to the topic and the contents of the thesis. Furthermore Hakan Erdem and Ali Çarkoğlu are very significant professors who make valuable comments and instructions providing me to reach the final format of my study. Thus, I am so grateful to Mr. Erdem and Çarkoğlu for their contributions in the process of writing and arranging my research.

Very significantly, it couldn't be possible to write this thesis without the presence and supports of Enis Rıza Sakızlı. As one of the pioneers of the Young Cinema Group and the significant documentarists today as well, he provided me the sources, especially the Journal of the Group and the contacts with whom I made oral history in order to conduct my research. In terms of these contacts, I should mention two important members of the Young Cinema, Ahmet Soner and Veysel Atayman who admit my request for making oral history with and share very relevant information about the emergence and progress of the Group in question. Therefore, I owe a debt of gratitude to them for their favours and interests.

In addition, I am thankful to my friends, Adile Aslan, Serkan Aras, Şirin Çalışkan, Hülya Çağlayan and Alparslan Nas for all their help and motivation in the writing process. I also owe many thanks to Bojana D. Savić, Şeyma Afacan, Pınar Ceylan, Tarek Abdul-Rahim Abu Hussein, Ceyda Sol, Tolga Dinçer, Murat Öziş and Zeynep Kutluata for making me feel not lonely over the long months of living on Sabancı campus where the major part of this work have been written.

And of course, I want to thank my family who were living all the phases, problems and developments of this thesis with me as they do in all steps and aspects of my life.

*FOR THE MEMORY OF MY GRANDMOTHER
EMİNE ORHAN*

To All Revolutionary Directors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Copyright.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Özet.....	vi
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Dedication.....	ix
Table of Contents.....	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE YOUNG CINEMA.....	12
I.1. 1960s Cinematic Developments in the World.....	13
I.2. Cinematic Developments in Turkey during the 1960s.....	19
A.Social Realism.....	19
B.People’s Cinema and National Cinema (Halk Sineması ve Ulusal Sinema).....	21
C. <i>Sinematek</i>	23
I.3. The Young Cinema Group is on the Stage.....	26
A.Brief History.....	26
B.Political Context.....	28
C.The Frictions in the Third Hisar Movie Competition.....	29
D.The Complete Detachment from <i>Sinematek</i>	32
E.An Independent Festival: <i>Devrimci Sinema Şenliği</i> (Revolutionary Cinema Festival)	33
I.4. Conclusion.....	34
II. ‘ANTI–YESILCAM’ STANCE OF THE YOUNG CINEMA GROUP.....	36
II.1.Infrastructure – Superstructure Debate.....	37
II.2. Class-Based Understanding of <i>Yeşilçam</i>	42

II.3.Anti-Feudal Stance of the Young Cinema.....	45
II.4.Anti – Capitalist Perception of the Young Cinema.....	46
II.5.Anti- Imperialist Character of the Young Cinema.....	48
II.6.Conclusion.....	54
III. ORGANIZATION.....	57
III.1. The Emphasis on Solidarity.....	58
III.2. Economic Function of Organization.....	60
III.3. The Emphasis on Activism.....	63
III.4. The Artistic Function of Organization.....	65
III.5. Conclusion.....	73
IV. REVOLUTION AND CINEMA.....	76
IV.1. The Relationship between Cinema and Revolution.....	76
IV.2. Revolutionary Cinema.....	85
A.The Definition of Revolutionary Cinema by the Young Cinema.....	86
B.Approaching To People.....	89
C.The Unity of Essence and Form.....	94
D.Traditional Values as a Source	98
IV.3. Conclusion: An Evaluation.....	99
CONCLUSION.....	105
An Evaluation: Heterogenity or Homogenity?.....	108
APPENDIX I: TRANSCRIPTS OF ORAL HISTORY STUDIES.....	112
APPENDIX II: BIOGRAPHIES OF THE MEMBERS.....	146
APPENDIX III: THE LIST OF THE MOVIES ATTENDED IN THE FIRST <i>DEVİRİMCİ SİNEMA ŞENLİĞİ</i> (REVOLUTIONARY CINEMA FESTIVAL) IN MAY 26- 28, 1970	153
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	154

INTRODUCTION

The fact that the historical period between 1960-1971 began and ended with military interventions is very significant with regard to the development of leftist ideologies and movements in Turkey. As a very distinctive part of the history of the Turkish Left, this specific period should be analyzed thoroughly in order to comprehend the ideological and practical evolution of the political left in the country. Moreover, it is not possible to examine the political history of Turkey in the 1960s by neglecting the theoretical-intellectual debates and main political factions and movements revolving around the leftist ideology. Those developments are related not only to the political sphere but also the social, economic, cultural and artistic domains which reflected the perception of the Turkish Left in general and in different political segments as well. Furthermore, a cinematic development can't be contemplated elaborately by isolating it from the political and artistic developments emerging around. It was a very prominent instrument to display and understand the historical process of the Turkish left in 1960s. In my thesis, by examining one of the cinematic journal called the *Young Cinema* and the Group (whose name is the same as the Journal) emerging around this Journal, I would like to develop the argument that cinema, as one of the most recent types of art in history, could be considered as very crucial for demonstrating that political history and art go hand in hand. From this starting point, I will present my thesis topic as “An Analysis of a Short-lived Cinema Journal: *The Young Cinema (Genç Sinema)* in Turkey, 1968 - 1971”.

The process of reaching that thesis topic has been begun with the main motivation pointing out this question which is also related to the degree of this interconnection: To what extent did the political atmosphere influence the essence of the films recorded and the depiction of major movements in the cinematographic experiments in the period? The effect of the 1960 Coup on the evolution of cinematography in Turkey is one of the issues to be discussed in order to find a satisfactory answer to this question. According to my findings from secondary sources and a thesis originally called '*1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik*' (Arts, Politics and Society: Social Realism in Italian and Turkish

Cinemas) written by Aslı Daldal, a new artistic movement emerged after the Coup and the constitution of 1961 which recognized poverty as a social problem resulting from class distinction, and this was totally contrary to previous movies produced in 1940s and 1950s. The pioneers of this ‘Social Realism Movement’ touched upon political developments and their effects on social questions in movies like *Yılanların Öcü* (Revenge of the Snakes) (Metin Erksan), *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* (The People Waking Up in the Night) (Ertem Göreç), *Şehirdeki Yabancı* (Stranger in the City) (Halit Refiğ).¹ Other important development which emerged especially in the second half of this period were *Sinematek* (a foundation established with the aim of theorizing and improving the Anti- Yesilcam language in Turkish cinema in 1965) which could be helpful to indicate the relation between the context of political history and cinematic improvements. About this foundation, a thesis is written by Hakkı Başgüney and then this thesis is transformed into a book called *‘Türk Sinematek Derneği: Türkiye’de Sinema ve Politik Tartışma’* (Turkish Cinemateque Foundation: Cinema and Political Debates in Turkey). In this book, the writer states his intention as debating the development and activities of *Sinematek* foundation which creates a cultural and intellectual environment for cinema and art in general in 1960s Turkey.²

Apart from the domestic cinematic developments, the new initiations in the continents of Europe and America, the places where the most prominent political movements are experienced, and their manifests about their cinematic outlook, it is seen that those cinematic endeavors represent a radical ‘detachment’ from the ‘mainstream’ artistic and cultural works; and an ‘opponent’ stance against the dominant – current political and social order as well. In addition to this, all international cinematographic developments influence each other in constructing their cinematic perceptions and languages. For instance, relating to the capture of reality in motion pictures, French *Nouvelle Vogue*, one of the significant movements of Europe in 1960s, and the initiations of Third World Cinema emerged in Brazil, Chile and Argentina share the same ideas in common, whereas their degrees to opposition to the current political and economic system and the detachment from the dominant cinema sector are different. Besides the interrelation between the major cinematic developments abroad, the Turkish counterparts also reflect and adopt main techniques, theories and perspectives of those international initiations. The main example of this is the considerable effect of *Nouvelle*

¹ Aslı Daldal, *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik*, (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2005)

² Hakkı Başgüney, *Türk Sinematek Derneği: Türkiye’de Sinema ve Politik Tartışma*, (İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2009) p. 13

Vogue on Turkish Social Realists and the milieu of Turkish *Sinematek*. As I will talk about the next chapter, especially the intellectuals, movie makers and cinema critics see various instances of this new French Cinema in *Sinematek* and make so many debates after the presentations of the movies. The natural outcome of those activities is the influence of the French *Nouvelle Vogue* on this group in shaping and contemplating their cinematic outlook. It is not only the French *Nouvelle Vogue* affecting the formation of this foundations' ideas on cinema, but also Third World Cinema and Dziga Vertov Group constructed by Truffaut especially in terms of supporting the detachment from the main capitalist economic relations conducting the main cinema sector.

As we turn back to the process until defining this thesis topic, after I had searched the cinematic movements of Turkey in 1960s which are very engaged in political and social atmosphere of the time in which they live and are very influenced by their contemporary cinematic developments, I realized that there is not a comprehensive academic study which concerns another cinematic development reflecting these two important characteristics of its counterparts as I mentioned before (opposition to the political- economic system and detachment from the dominant cinema sector) and distinctive qualities possessed by them. Thus, I have decided to study this Group in order to contribute the fact that cinema is very inextricable part of the political and social context. Moreover I intend to study this cinematic milieu to demonstrate that politics and cinema are very interrelated, and they are always in interaction, consisting one of the subject matters of history.

This study is mainly concentrated on the Journal of the movement because of which is the other intention of this study: how did the members of the Group perceive the sociopolitical conjunction in which they live and how did they reflect this perception on their cinematic outlook. Since the articles in *the Young Cinema* directly reflect the ideas and perceptions of the members, I decided to determine the main source of this study is *the Young Cinema* itself. All translations of the excerpts from the *Young Cinema* are mine. But, the problem is that this Journal doesn't exist in the main libraries which are *İstanbul Üniversitesi Beyazıt Kütüphanesi* (Istanbul University Beyazıt Library), the libraries in Boğaziçi University, Mimar Sinan University, and Sabancı University; *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Mithat Alam Film Merkezi* (Boğaziçi University Mithat Alam Cinema Center) and *Türkiye Sosyal Tarih Araştırma Vakfı*. (The Foundation of Turkish Social History Research) That's why I directly provide this Journal from one of the members of this group, Enis Rıza Sakızlı.

Although the journal is a very reliable source to contemplate the cinematic and political perceptions of the authors and the members, I tried to reach the members who live today in order to learn their experiences during the Group's emergence and examine how they define this cinematic initiation today. In this matter, Enis Rıza Sakızlı helps me again to contact with two pioneers of the movement who are Veysel Atayman and Ahmet Soner. I also make a conversation with Enis Rıza about the nature of this development which I will mention later. This study also contains those people's statements in proper parts of the topics in order to bolster and sometimes clarify the ideas proclaimed in the articles of the *Young Cinema*, and contradict some opinions asserted by the authors of the Journal as well. Moreover, the transcripts of these Oral History studies made with Soner and Atayman are available in this study as Appendix 1. Although I couldn't reach the majority of the them, I collect so many information about the members of the Group from Soner, Sakızlı and Atayman to whom I talked and the internet source in order to point out what they did before and after the Young Cinema experiment, if they continue dealing with cinema theoretically and practically or not, which professions they were educated and (if they are alive) what they are doing now. The purpose of this work is to provide short information about the members of the Group and the authors of the *Young Cinema* while the reader is encountering their statements in this thesis. I also attached all this information at the end of the study as Appendix 2.

Unfortunately, the movies made by the members of the Group can't be a source for this study because of their complete annihilation after the coup made in September, 12 1980. According to Ahmet Soner, he could accomplish to hide those movies even after the 1971 Memorandum and then he decided to surrender all of them to the *Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Birliği* (DİSK). Yet, after the Coup in 1980, all of them were annihilated or vanished, rendering those sources inaccessible. For this reason, instead of benefitting from the movies as a source or referring to them in this thesis, I prepared a list of the movies participating in the *Devrimci Sinema Şenliği* (Revolutionary Cinema Festival) organized by the Group itself in 1970 which is attached as Appendix 3 at the end of the study from the information in the *Young Cinema* and the Oral History having made with the members.

Apart from the inaccessibility of the *Young Cinema*, the movies made by the Group and the majority of the members, another problem is the nomenclature of this cinematic development. In this point Cemil Koçak, my thesis advisor, Hakan Erdem and Ali Çarkoğlu, the members of the defense jury of my thesis instruct me to entitle this development. By

departing from their instructions, I searched for the main literature of Turkish Cinematic History and the other supplementary books and I didn't encounter the presence of this Group as a movement or a cinematic development. These sources are mainly Rekin Teksoy's *Sinema Tarihi* (History of Cinema) published by *Ođlak Yayıncılık*; Fikret Hakan's *Türk Sinema Tarihi* (History of Turkish Cinema) published by *İnkılâp Kitabevi* in 2008, Giovanni Scognamillo's *Türk Sinema Tarihi : 1867-1997* (History of Turkish Cinema: 1867 – 1997) published by *Kabalıcı Yayınevi* in 1998, Agah Özgüç's *Türk Filmleri Sözlüğü* (The Dictionary of Turkish Movies) published by *Sesam Yayınları* in 1998 and Nijat Özön's *Türk Sineması Kronolojisi* (The Chronology of Turkish Cinema) published by *Bilgi Yayınevi* in 1968. One important reason of this can be the fact that all of those studies are concentrated on the fictional movies produced in Turkish Cinematography. Since the members of the Group scarcely made those kinds of movies and mostly they tended to record the ones having documentary feature, this Group didn't locate in those works. However lots of them mention the Turkish *Sinematek*, although this foundation doesn't produce the fictional movies because it causes the emergence of so many directors and cinema critics in Turkish Cinema like Atilla Dorsay, Atif Yılmaz, Ali Özgentürk, Umur Bugay, Onat Kutlar so on and so forth who experienced their upbringing process in the cinematic domain by attending the cinematic presentations and intellectual conversations. Yet, the same situation can be talked about in *Young Cinema* case. As it can be discerned in case of looking at the short biographies of the members who learn a lot of things about cinema in theoretic and technical manner by making movies for the people in order to introduce the revolutionary ideas, writing articles to the *Young Cinema*, and making so much meetings in order to discuss the cinematic matters, considerable amount of them continue their cinematic works like Enis Rıza Sakızlı, Ahmet Soner, Artun Yeres, Veysel Atayman, Ömer Pekmez, Engin Ayça so on and so forth. In fact, some of them like Soner, Ayça and Yeres make fictional movies. Thus, it can be claimed that the absence of this Group in those studies is a deficiency for Turkish Cinematic Histiography in terms of its contributions to the upbringing and maturation process of the directors.

With relevance to this claim, it should be turned back to the problem of nomenclature: if *Young Cinema* should be included to the literature of Turkish Cinematic History, how can we entitle this development. In terms of this, I searched for the other supplementary studies like Aslı Daldal's book originated from her doctorate thesis called *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik* published by *Homer Kitabevi* in 2005, Hakkı Başgüney's book derived from his master thesis called *Türk Sinematek Derneği: Türkiye'de Sinema ve*

Politik Tartışma published by *Libra Kitap* in 2009, *Üçüncü Sinema ve Üçüncü Dünya Sineması* (Third Cinema and Third World Cinema) which is edited by Esra Binyıldız and Zeynep Çetin Erus and published by *Es Yayınları* in 2007 and A Filiz Susar's book called *Türkiye'de Belgesel Sinemacılar* (The Documentarists in Turkey) published by *Es Yayınları* in 2004. All of those name Young Cinema Group as '*Genç Sinemacılar*'. (Young Movie Makers) Although Şükran Kuyucak Esen mentions Young Cinema under the title of the Third Cinema and regards this Group as this genre because of demonstrating the characteristics of its principles, she doesn't entitle this development as a 'movement'. Moreover, the majority of members also cite their Group as '*Genç Sinemacılar*' in *Young Cinema*, whereas some of them like Yakup Barokas³ and Enis Rıza Sakızlı⁴ claim that it is a movement. According to Enis Rıza, we should mention this development as a movement because, this initiation was not a hobby, instead it has a counteractive position against the current cinema system and this stance is tried to bolster by new, authentic concepts and ideas. Furthermore, because of its refusal to all economic relations of the dominant cinema sector, it strives for initiating its own structure conducting with different modes of producing, making and distributing their movies. Alike my statements which I claimed above, although it couldn't finish its maturity process because of the limited amount of time it lives for producing considerable amount of movies and authentic technical and theoretical studies, it causes to bring so many directors, professors and cinema critics who would influence Turkish cinematic milieu with their works.

Finally in my opinion, this group comes on the stage as a movement by publishing its own edict which includes their own cinematic perspective and intentions, endeavoring to make own movies and theorizing *Anti- Yeşilçamist* stance by benefitting from the Marksist concepts so on and so forth, it couldn't influence the Turkish Cinematic environment as a 'group' or 'collectively' like Italian *Neo-realismo*, French *Nouvelle Vogue*, although it enhances the personal initiatives after its disappear in 1971. Thus in this study I entitle this development like all studies having mentioned above as a Group instead of the Movement. Moreover, I translate '*Genç Sinemacılar*' in some excerpts deducted from the articles in *Young Cinema* as 'The Young Film Makers', 'Young Directors' or 'The Young Cinema Group'. From now on, I will mention the content of this thesis briefly based on four main chapters.

³ See Yakup Barokas, 'Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması için Genç Sinema Bir Harekettir', *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol.12, p. 25

⁴ Interview with Enis Rıza Sakızlı having made in June 12, 2010.

In the first chapter of this study the history of Young Cinema Group will be examined by looking at the political and cultural conditions in which it emerged; the oppositions against main cinematic milieus, the process of making short film practice and idea as an ideological and political instrument will be presented. In the same chapter, the establishments of its other departments in Ankara and Eskişehir; the engagements and detachments from the movement; its unique ‘Revolutionary Cinema Festival’ in 1970 etc. will also be discussed. The Young Cinema Group appears in October, 1968 by defining its characteristics and objectives in the announcement published with the Journal whose name was the same as the Group’s itself. The aims of the Group indicated in that announcement are primarily to create a new, independent, people-oriented and revolutionary cinema by altering and refusing all the ways of the previous cinematic developments, especially dominated by the institution of *Yeşilçam* Cinema followed up until that time. This important milieu emerges out of a highly politicized atmosphere shaped by the rise of the leftist-socialist student and worker movements and their clashes with the right-oriented movements. Moreover the movies of the directors in Young Cinema who are also the active members of socialist movements reflect the second half of 1960s historical context by recording the strikes, movements, demonstrations, clashes etc. with the aim of witnessing every kind of political event in that period. The Group disappears as a result of the political atmosphere after March 12, 1971 by publishing their last *Young Cinema* volume in April 1971 (only 18 days after the coup).⁵

The second part of this study is about the Group’s oppositional stance against *Yeşilçam*, the single and dominant cinema system in Turkey. The members define the movement as a civil and radical detachment from this monopoly of Turkish Cinema, and this position is one of the indications demonstrating them as a revolutionary movement. Very importantly, this Anti- *Yeşilçamist* character of the group not only helps us understand how they perceive the current cinematographic environment, but also the international and domestic political context of late 1960s in which they lived. Moreover, when we look at the articles in the *Young Cinema* and the content or the name of their movies, they give us very significant evidences about their political, social and economic perception on 1960s Turkey. They are naturally influenced by 1960s leftist ideological debates, political fractions and they also attend the movements of leftist students and workers. This strong engagement in political life is reflected all in their analysis on *Yeşilçam* and all in statements about their resistance against this system. Indeed, they all use socialist terminology while they talk about what

⁵ Ahmet Soner, “Tarihçe”, *Belgesel Sinema*, (ilkbahar – Yaz, 2003) vol.3, p. 43

Turkish Monopoly of cinema is, how it works, which kind of films produced and how those films affect the audience. Thus in this chapter, it will be consulted some important socialist concepts while mentioning the Young Cinema's perception on existing cinema system and – very relevantly- the current political and socio-economic structure. By doing this, it is aimed to show how Young Cinema Group is influenced by the conflicts and discussions among the leftist group and how they adopt leftist terminology in order to examine the *Yeşilçam* system and their opposition against it. Those concepts are 'underdevelopment', 'class', 'the relationship between base and superstructure', 'anti – imperialism', 'anti – capitalism' and 'anti – feudalism'.

The counteractive position against the existing cinema system, *Yeşilçam* requires a new platform in order to create a new genre of film and discuss the opportunities for generating it. According to the directors of Young Cinema Group, an alternative cinematic milieu could only be accomplished by constituting an 'organization'. Furthermore, for them *The Young Cinema* was only a platform for education and unification of the revolutionary directors, which also precipitates the establishment process of this organization.⁶ In the first issue of *The Young Cinema*, it is claimed that the basis of this future organization should be economic for providing directors financial support in order to record their films independently from the Turkish dominant cinema sector, *Yeşilçam*.⁷ In other words, the ultimate aim is to form an alternative cinematic structure which has different economic rules and new facilities in terms of making and distributing their movies. Thus, in the third chapter of this survey, the Young Cinema Group's perception of organization will be examined and the reason why they attach importance to this issue so much will be analyzed. Moreover as departing from the main intentions of being organized by the directors who share minimum political and artistic tendencies in common mentioned in Üstün Barışta's article 'Toward the Economic Organization', it will be tried to illustrate the structure and the process of organization. Then, by looking at other articles in subsequent volumes, it will be demonstrated how those claims are implemented. Moreover, the issue of amateurism, the relationship between essence and form, the priority of practice other than theory or artform are the other subtopics derived from this organization problem. The perception of the Group about these subtopics will be tackled for contemplating and interpreting.

⁶ "Genç Sinema'dan", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol.1, p. 1

⁷ Gaye Petek, "Devrim ve Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol.1, p. 6

The fourth chapter includes the main debates of Young Cinema Group developed from the relationship between cinema and revolution. This issue is stated in almost every volume of the journal by the members of the group. This chapter helps to understand how they define the role and place of the cinema in the process of revolution, which functions the cinema may perform in revolutionary movements and demonstrations, how a revolutionary cinema should be, what the responsibilities of a revolutionary artist are. In this part, prevalent opinions shared by the directors and the writers about those themes in general will be mentioned and some questions which are going to be debated in the chapter will be propounded.

In the first part of the chapter, there will be various debates of the members prevailed in the Young Cinema with relevance to the relationship between cinema and revolution. At first, the Group supports that art and politics are very interrelated and they cannot be separated. The claim that art must be isolated from politics and they are distinct domains is only a fallacy alleged by the dominant imperialist powers who desensitize people by their films so as to keep the existing system going and maintain their overwhelming position in the capitalist order.⁸ Jak Şalom claims that the creation of a new cinema structure is closely dependent on the radical transformation of the societal system. So the cinema of the movement must be 'political' because it has to serve its function towards changing the social structure.⁹ Moreover, according to Young Cinema Movement, the artists have a very significant and historic role in this process of transformation. This role is related to witnessing the revolution by their cameras. Yet, the witnessing is not enough for fulfilling the historic responsibility. Moreover, Artun Yares contributes that the Young Directors adds their revolutionary interpretations to those evidence and demonstrates those films to the majority of people. If a director accomplishes all of these functions, he will complete his responsibility to which he entitles for the advancement of history.¹⁰ Then, it will be given Gaye Petek's issue about the relationship between cinema and revolution: Which one takes the priority: revolution or cinema? Is the ultimate aim the revolution in cinema or the utilization of cinema as a means of revolution?¹¹ All directors support the priority of revolution over the cinema, so cinema is a tool of attaining the revolution. Yet, it is stressed by some of writers that cinema couldn't achieve the revolution alone, it is only one of the weapons used against the existing powers representing the capitalist system. Engin Ayça also supports this idea by

⁸ Tanju Akerson, "Sinemada Barış İçinde Beraber Yaşamaya Hayır", *Genç Sinema*, (November 1968) vol.2, p. 7

⁹ Jak Şalom, "Bir", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol.1, p. 8

¹⁰ Artun Yares, "Genç Sinema'da Anti-Amerikan Gözlem ve Eylem", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol.6 p. 16

¹¹ Gaye Petek, "Devrim ve Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol.1, pp. 6-7

saying that the art itself couldn't succeed the political, social and economic transformation but it could awake the relevant thoughts and senses for it. Moreover the art is able to guide the foundation of new society after the revolution is achieved.¹²

Apart from the relationship between cinema and politics; and cinema's function in the process of revolution, the other part of the chapter will be the movement's perception on 'Revolutionary Cinema'. Some questions will be asked in this part: What are the basic features of Revolutionary Cinema? Which qualities make cinema revolutionary? Has it got any technical and artistic characteristics that render it different from other cinematographic practices? And very importantly, in which step of revolution does this genre of cinema occur? In the course of the revolution? Or after it is attained? Especially the last problematic tends us to think this issue with relevance to the 1960s leftist projects of revolution. In other words, it should be thought which leftist revolutionary project of 1960s the Young Directors find more suitable for creating their cinema or it should be searched for if they propound alternative solutions for creating this cinema according to the changing conditions that one project overrides another. In this part, as most of the other parts, the oral history study with the members of the movement is very significant resource to consult for learning their life stories, their political engagements, and their own thesis on this revolution issue. Furthermore it will be consulted with the articles from both the directors of the Group and the leading actors of political fractions. For instance, if we look at two texts containing the statements of Mihri Belli, one of the most important figure among the supporters of *Milli Demokratik Devrim* (MDD) (National Democratic Revolution) about his thesis on 'National Revolutionary Culture' (*Ulusal Devrimci Kültür*), we could find very similarities with the claims of Young Cinema. It could be meaningful to show the connection between these texts ('National Revolutionary Culture' published in *Ankara Birliđi Dergisi* in January, 1970 and his speech in the *Devrimci Sinema Şenliđi* in 1970 published in *Young Cinema* in June 1970) and an article written by Yakup Barokas and published in *Young Cinema*'s 12th volume in May 1970.

As a consequence, the aim of this survey is to try to demonstrate the effects of political and social conditions (especially the influence of leftist ideology and practice), and the international and domestic cinematic developments on the cinematic character of Turkey by looking at a specific cinematic development emerged out of the social and political context of

¹² Engin Ayça, "Sinema ile Uğraşmak", *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) vol.5, p. 7

1960s Turkey. In other words, it will be analyzed: Firstly, to what degree does the development of leftist history pertaining to its theories debated by intellectuals and its subtheories and submovements separated from the whole Left influence this cinematographic advance or how the articles in *The Young Cinema* reflect the leftist discourse, language and values. I am trying to examine this problematic through four determined chapters. These are: the brief history of the Group by looking at political and cultural context in which it emerges; the analysis of their anti-*Yeşilçamist* character by applying socialist terminology as they used in the articles; their particular stress on organization; their perception on the relationship between cinema and revolution and the features of ‘revolutionary cinema’; and the debate: their position on the leftist fractions and the thesis about revolution in Turkey. Furthermore I am planning to use three kinds of primary sources: *The Young Cinema* issued during the movement is active and oral history with the three members of the Group. In the conclusion part, it will also be made an evaluation about what this development brings to cinematic environment and affects the cinematic history of Turkey and why this initiation is important in spite of its short-lived history and limited number of products. All in all, my eventual aim by doing this kind of academic research is to shed light on the history of the Turkish Cinema by connecting it with its political and cultural context, thus hopefully making a contribution to academic works stressing the interconnection between history and cinema, an issue which has not been given the proper scholarly attention.

I. THE BEGINNINGS OF THE YOUNG CINEMA

A cinematic development or a movement can't be contemplated elaborately by isolating it from the political and artistic developments emerging around. Thus the headline of the chapter that is 'the beginnings' of the Young Cinema Group encompasses the most significant artistic movements emanating out of their political context in domestic and international manner. It is possible to discern that they affect each other from their theories and ideas about how the most appropriate cinema could be; and cinematic practices how they use the technical and methodological facilities of this branch of art. As we look at the new initiations in the continents of Europe and America, the places where the most prominent political movements are experienced, and their manifests about their cinematic outlook, it is seen that those endeavors represent a radical 'detachment' from the 'mainstream' artistic and cultural works; and an 'opponent' stance against the dominant – current political and social order as well. It won't be wrong to say that those two main features (detachment and opposition) are generally prevailed in the cinematic milieu. The anti-capitalist (at least against some reflections of capitalist-imperialist practices in daily life) liberal movements in 1968's Europe (in our case, we will talk about USA and France) and the anti –imperialist atmosphere along with the Third World concept in Latin America make the movements more artistically politically radical movies. In other words, the fact that the opposition against the political order and the detachment from current – dominant cinema go hand in hand renders cinema shape its nature according to its function for being a tool of attaining revolution in political and social structure. Yet, a detailed examination of those cinematic developments is out of this study which is mainly concentrated on the analysis of the Young Cinema Group's cinematic perception by deriving from its journal. Thus, in the first part of this chapter, I will talk about those 'politic' cinemas which are The American New Hollywood, French '*New Wave*' or '*Nouvelle Vogue*', Brazilian '*Cinema Novo*', Argentinean Manifesto called

‘Towards A Third Cinema’ (Üçüncü Sinemaya Doğru) and lastly the Cuban Manifesto called ‘For the Cinema which is not Perfect’ (*Mükemmel Olmayan Bir Sinema İçin*) very briefly.

These developments also reflect in the Turkish Cinematic environment in the whole 1960s. The majority of cinema critics and academicians say that the first initiations in terms of the cinematic language and theories; and the movies issuing socio-political problems are accomplished with the beginning of the 1960s. The reasons of this development are mostly concentrated on the relatively moderate and liberal political context of the country. Although it is a true statement, if those movements are analyzed with their contemporaries in the world, it is possible to claim that the domestic political atmosphere is not a sole reason propelling the Turkish movie makers to deal with the social problems more realistically and put forward some theoretic underpinnings of the cinema what they intend to do. In this manner we can’t ignore the influence of realistic concerns of the *Nouvelle Vogue* movement or the manifest of Third World Cinema on Turkish film makers. The other important thing is especially in the second half of the 1960s, along with the rise of the discussions among the leftist political fractions, Turkish cinema encounters various discussions and evenly frictions like between the members of National Cinema and *Sinematek*. In the next part of the chapter I will mention those movements and cinematic debates laying the foundation of the artistic context of the emergence of Young Cinema Group.

The last part is allocated to Young Cinema’s brief history and its conflicts with *Sinematek* (Sinemateque) the foundation from which it emanates and the Robert College in which the members of the movement meet and come together in the first time. According to the process of its emergence, it is seemed that the Group goes along with the other cinematic organizations and foundations in the first times it is established. Yet, it gradually becomes more radicalized in terms of its opposition to the existing order and its all institutions; and the detachment from all cinematic initiations, making it being left alone.

I.1. 1960s Cinematic Developments in the World:

The first country in which the radical social movements and more relatively to those the alternative cinematic developments raised especially in the second half of 1960s is the

United States. The dominant cinematic area of America, Hollywood which carries out the studio system¹³ permanently up to 1960s also encounters very significant and counteractive works as in the political sphere. The important thing is that the liberty movements concentrating on the daily social problems with the ideas of anti-militarism and anti-racism instead of transforming the political system influence the cinematic milieu pertaining to the considerable changes in the cinematic traditions of Hollywood mainly in contents, artforms and themes of the movies rather than the complete removal of the cinematic system itself. The other reason of those alternative developments in cinema is that the studio system loses its power, paving the way for independent movie makers. These kinds of movies cover the problems about the daily life or the political events happened in history or the present by using the metaphors. *Cool Hand Luke* (Stuart Rosenberg – 1967), *Bonnie and Clyde* (Arthur Penn – 1967) and *The Graduate* (Mike Nichols – 1967) criticizing authoritarianism or *Easy Rider* (Dennis Hopper – 1969) revealing the culture of Hippies and the other subcultures are the instances of the first tendency and *Little Big Man* (Arthur Penn – 1970) representing the General Custer as a megalomaniac and butcher and criticizing the Vietnam War metaphorically and *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?* (Sydney Pollack – 1969) describing the competitor and relentless ethics of capitalism with a metaphor of dance competition can be regarded as the examples of the latter.¹⁴

The most significant cinematic movement in the last 1950s and all 1960s Europe is undoubtedly *Nouvelle Vogue* emerging in France. The pioneers of the movement, mainly Jean – Luc Godard, Alain Resnais and François Truffaut start their cinema career as the authors in *Cahiers in Cinema* and then they position themselves against two cinemas which are the domestic institutional cinema establishing after the Second World War at first and the Hollywood whose movies are very prevalent in the cinema theaters of 1950s French in second. In the articles of the *Cahiers*, the post-war French Movies generally adaptations of

¹³ The Studio System is the American Cinema System which is implemented in 1930s, 40s and 50s. In this system, the movies have a certain and dominant content and artform also called as 'classical'. They generally include the contents supporting American ideology, realistic and manipulative, the artforms like, the continuity of screens, the identification of the character, voyeuristic objectification so on and so forth. After the rise of television and the tendency to watch TV rather than going to cinema by the people migrating in suburbs from the cities, the Studio system weakens and loses its importance. R.P.Kolker, *A Cinema of Loneliness*, (Oxford University Press: New York – Oxford, 1988), p.238

¹⁴ For further information about 'New Hollywood', see, for example: *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 459-471. David Parkinson, *History of Film*, (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995), pp. 185-217. Tracey Grant, "The Counteractive Rebellion and the Quest for Authenticity", *Filmography of American History*, (New York: Greenwood Press, 2002), pp. 257-281. Ryan, Michael and Kellner, Douglas, *Camera Politica*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990), pp. 1-27.

classical literary outputs and the Hollywood movies recorded according to the studio system are bravely criticized by the members which would generate their own cinematic movement by initially making some short movies and then starting to create motion pictures since 1960. After a while this new cinema obtains a considerable place in the French industry and the world by benefitting from the financial support of French Film Institute whose name is *Centre National de la Cinematographie* (CNC). As a matter of fact, even though in the first times of the movement, the members have a relatively radical stance against the dominant cinematic institution of France in comparison to the new American Cinema, it gradually becomes dependent on the institution which they refuse before because of its financial funds. This situation is generally criticized by the Young Cinema due to the *Nouvelle Vogue*'s dependence to the superstructural institutions of the capitalist-imperialist base of the society, thus it can't represent a radical detachment from the system.

However, it can't be ignored that this movement brings various innovations in the cinematic language and represents a real alternative and different sphere in the history of cinema. They create artistically innovative methods and techniques in making their movies. The rationale behind all methods is that they use is to approach the reality as much as possible by their recordings. At first they leave the closed studios and record their movies in the streets especially Paris' streets, and using the unprofessional artists. This dimension make the movement also becoming closed to the Young Cinema Group recording the screens from the real life, whereas their ultimate aims could be claimed as different: for the Group, cinema should serve for revolution which is the first intention of the movement thus the members places the society at the center of their cinema, as for the *Nouvelle Vogue* the artistic creativeness takes the priority and the problems of individuals are generally issued notwithstanding all movies have a social background.¹⁵ The other common point of the

¹⁵ The main instances form the movement are Claude Chabrol's *Le Beau Serge* (1958), *Les Cousins* (The Cousins - 1959), Eric Rohmer's *Le Carrier de Suzanne* (Suzanne's Carrier - 1963), *La Boulangere de Monceau* (The Girl at the Monceau Bakery - 1963), *La Collectionneuse* (The Collector - 1966), Allain Resnais' *Nuit et Brouillard* (1956), *Hiroshima Mon Amour* (Hiroshima, My Love - 1959), *L'année Dernière à Marienbad* (The Last Year in Marienbad - 1961), François Truffaut's *Les quatre cents coups* (The 400 Blows - 1959), *Jules et Jim* (Jules and Jim - 1962), *Fahrenheit 451* (1966), *La Mariée Était en Noir* (The Bride Wore Black - 1968) and Jean-Luc Godard's *À Bout de Soufflé* (Breathless - 1960), *Une Femme Mariée* (1964), *Alphaville* (1965), *Masculin Féminin: 15 Faits Précis* (Masculine, Feminine: In 15 Acts - 1966)

For further information about *Nouvelle Vogue*, see, for example: **The Oxford History of World Cinema**, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 576-586. David Parkinson, *History of Film*, (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995), pp. 185-217. Richard Neupert, *A History of the French New Wave Cinema*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002). James Monaco, *The New Wave*, (Oxford - New York: Oxford University Press, 1981). Chris Wiegand, *French New Wave*, (Harpenden : Pocket Essentials, 2001). Susan Hayward, *French National Cinema*, (London ; New York : Routledge, 1993).

movement with Young Cinema Group is that the members of each learn the theoretical and artistic features of the cinema and see the most significant instances of the cinematic worlds in the world from the institutions of *Sinematek*. As a matter of fact Turkish *Cinemtaque* is already established by the founder of *Sinematek Française*, Henri Langlois supporting that the history of movies should be thought as that of art and literature. The main institution in France and its branch office in Turkey (and Onat Kutlar is appointed as the administrated of it) provides the members of those two movements to obtain a strong cinematic background through the presentations and the discussions of the movies. For Young Cinema Group, this institution is the place in which the members has met and from which then they separate.

1968 is not only a turning point in political history of France like the various countries in the world but also in the movement. While the majority of pioneers prefer to stay in the French Institution's auspices and to be dependent on the cinema market conducting with the capitalist economy and relations, indeed some of them like Truffaut transfer to Hollywood, Jean-Luc Godard departs from the movement and the system in which the movies are produced, distributed and marketed and establishes a revolutionary group with Jean-Pierre Gorin and some militants called Dziga Vertov Group. The anti-authoritarian and revolutionist character of the political movements in 1968 affects the position of Godard on the cinema and -unlikely to American cinema- he establishes a radical group refusing all relations all commercial relations based on the dominant economy and conducted by the main institutions and looking at the cinema as the part of revolutionary activity. This group has very significant features some of which are very similar to the Young Cinema Group's characteristics. (I will talk about in the next chapters). Firstly, it possesses two-sided revolutionary perspective meaning that the film maker should struggle with/for two domains: society and cinema meaning that the cinema should use the cinema as serving for the revolutionary process. It also try to rescue the audiences from passivity and modifies its camera technique according to create the opportunity to make the audiences think of and analyze the scenes. Thirdly, in order to approach the reality more, it advances one step beyond the *Nouvelle Vogue* recording the scenes from real life and streets rather than the closure in studio and claiming that the audiences shouldn't forget they are seeing a movie, the director himself participate in the movie and indeed sometimes he gives the camera to an ordinary man for breaking and criticizing the authoritarian types of relations in society. The most important movies which

Godard makes with the Dziga Vertov Group characterizing those features are *La Chinoise* (1967), *Loin du Vietnam* (War from Vietnam – 1967), *Week End* (1967).¹⁶

Before starting to talk about the main third world cinemas appeared in 1960s, it is important to distinguish between the terms of ‘The Third World Cinema’ and ‘The Third Cinema’. The first one is used for the cinemas emerging in the third world countries like Brazilian Cinema Novo or the cinemas in Argentina and Cuba while the latter is relating to all cinemas including an anti-imperialist character and ideological envisagement regardless of the country which is in the third world category or not. I have decided to define the title as Third World Cinema which can be said as a branch of Third Cinema, simply because all cinemas it will be analyzed briefly emerging in the third world countries and contain an anti-imperialist character.

The *Cinema Novo* is generally accepted as the pioneer of the Third World concept the members of which are Glauber Rocha, Ruy Guerra and Nelson Pereira dos Santos. The contents of the movies are the inequalities in the society especially the Brazilian society, the economic and social problems of people living in the countryside and villages more than in the cities. They are aimed to address the ethnic minorities, peasants, landless workers, and generally disadvantageous people. In the manner of target group of the cinema the members are making is so similar to the Young Cinema apart from their commonality that is being anti-imperialist. In terms of the artform of the movies, they adopt most of techniques and methods from the *Nouvelle Vogue* movement, whereas they are concentrated on using the national and conventional elements in their works. The emphasis on the national and traditional values pertaining to the country in which they live is also supported by the Young Cinema. This cinema is also departing from in some senses with Young Cinema, for instance, by the help of the separation between the political power and the capital that left to banks, the directors can produce their own movies independently from any political and economic dominance.¹⁷

¹⁶ For further information about *Dziga Vertov Group*, see, for example: James Roy Macbean, *Film and Revolution*, (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1975), pp. 23-27. Colin Maccabe, *Godard: Images, Sounds, Politics*, (London: British Film Institute, 1980), pp. 53-54. *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 576-586. David Parkinson, *History of Film*, (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995), pp. 185-217. Richard Neupert, *A History of the French New Wave Cinema* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002). James Monaco, *The New Wave*, (Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 1981). Chris Wiegand, *French New Wave*, (Harpenden : Pocket Essentials, 2001). Susan Hayward, *French National Cinema*, (London ; New York : Routledge, 1993).

¹⁷ For further information about *Cinema Novo*, see, for example: *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 740 – 747. Lúcia Nagib, *Brazil on Screen: Cinema Novo, New Cinema, Utopia*, (London - New York : I.B. Tauris : Distributed by Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

‘Towards A Third Cinema’ is the manifest of two important Argentinean directors, Solanas and Getino describing the main features of a Third Cinema by emphasizing the difference of the Third World Cinema as described above. This manifest is derived from the distribution, production and presentation process of their movie, *La Hora de los Hornos*, (The Hour of the Furnaces – 1968) recorded two years later the 1966 coup by the *Grupo Cine Liberacion* (GCL). The matters in the manifesto are very commensurate to the main principles of Young Cinema. At first, Solanas and Getino believe that the imperialist powers use the science, culture and art in order to spread their ideology and it is so dominant in the world, thus supporting that the third world nations must have their own revolutionary science, culture, art and especially cinema. Secondly, the manifest also declares the necessity to reach the people with cinema (as a part of its revolutionary function) in order to gain those the revolutionary consciousness and to render the people an active audience rather than a passive one only watching the movie as the imperialist cinema like Hollywood. Furthermore, the discussions after the presentations of the movie should be performed in order to bolster this intention. This document is also criticizing the *Nouvelle Vogue* and *Cinema Novo* in two matters: at first both of them seek for capitalist markets in order to enhance financial funds for profiting from their movies and producing new ones resulting that they can’t detach from the current, dominant system under the auspices of imperialism and capitalism; secondly, they are mostly concentrated on the individual problems in their movies and ignore the social problems rendering them be far from the social opposition. In other words, they are focused on the universal art and models and by this way, they become detached from nationality. Apart from the commonalities with the Young Cinema Group, the authors of ‘Towards a Third Cinema’ don’t see the revolutionary cinematic language as compulsory for adopting it in the movies, which is the most distinctive statement of the manifest from the movement in question supporting a new cinematic artform peculiar to the Group in question.¹⁸

Alike Solanas and Getino, Julio Garcia Espinosa writes a manifesto called ‘For the Cinema which is not Perfect’ in 1969s Cuba, the country having accomplished anti-imperialist revolution in 1959. After the revolution, an institution was established called *El*

Teshome H. Gabriel, *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetics of Liberation*, (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982). Robert Stam, *Film Theory: An Introduction*, (USA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), p. 95. Bordwell, David and Thompson, Kristin, *Film History*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994), p. 606.

¹⁸ For further information about *Towards A Third Cinema*, see, for example: *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 740 – 747. Teshome H. Gabriel, *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetics of Liberation*, (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982). Solanas, Fernando and Getino, Octavio, “Towards A Third Cinema”, *Film and Theory: An Anthology*, Stam, Robert and Miller, Toby (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000. pp. 263 – 280.

Instituto Cubano de Arte e Industria Cinematográficos (ICAIC) in order to support a new revolutionary cinema financially and artistically in terms of being pluralist and independent in artistic style. This also provides the directors to create their products without any kind of restrictions in similar to the *Cinema Novo*. In this manifest, Espinosa, one of those directors discusses that the cinema should be produced by masses instead by the elite group and if it is created by the mass, it will reach its aesthetic maturity which is also the derivation of the manifests' name.¹⁹ Thus, until that time the cinema bounds to remaining as imperfect. An analogy with the Young Cinema can be constructed in this manner. It supports that artistic maturity would be gradually achieved by creating so much amateur movies in the process of achieving revolution. Yet, it is important to say that, if we compare two statements, the starting points of this process in order to generate this aesthetic maturity are different: the manifest gets started after the revolution and finishes with when the cinema would identify with the masses, on the other hand, the Young Cinema Group addresses the whole process of struggling for revolution, thus define the starting point as the time in which the movement is established and final threshold after the revolution. Moreover, the manifest also supports the cinema should be clear and comprehensible for people. Besides this, only presenting the social and economic problems derived from imperialistic tendencies is not enough for the third world cinema, instead it should analyze the reasons of those problems. The interesting point is that although the Young Cinema adopts the similar opinions with this manifest, the members don't mention or give reference to Cuban Cinema or the manifest of Espinoza as they mention *Cinema Novo* or Solanas.

I.2. Cinematic Developments in Turkey during the 1960s

A. Social Realism:

Some cinema critics and academicians support that a new artistic movement emerges within the *Yeşilçam* after the 1960 Coup and with the liberal social and political context after

¹⁹ For further information about, *For the Cinema which is not Perfect*, see, for example: ***The Oxford History of World Cinema***, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 740 – 747. Teshome H. Gabriel, *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetics of Liberation*, (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982). Julio Garcia Espinosa, "For An Imperfect Sinema", *Film and Theory: An Anthology*, Robert Stam, Toby Miller (eds.), (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000). pp. 294 – 296. Robert Stam, *Film Theory: An Introduction*, (USA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), p. 97

the 1961 Constitution which deals with social problems resulting from class distinction, which is totally on the contrary to previous movies produced in 1940s and 1950s. The pioneers of this Social Realism movement are Metin Erksan, Duygu Sagioglu, Halit Refig and Ertem Göreç. They touched upon political developments and their effects on social questions. The most important study for this movement is the doctorate thesis of Aslı Daldal *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik* (Arts, Politics and Society: Social Realism in Italian and Turkish Cinemas) supporting this idea by contributing that those directors regard themselves as the representatives of the progressive bourgeoisie middle class led by the military and the responsible group to approach people by perceiving and using cinema in a more opportunist manner. She also suggests that they don't compromise in terms of the aesthetic and theoretical dimensions of their cinema, yet they adopt a common stance regarding the way of dealing with the social problems, the political tendencies which are more closed to the *Yön* (Direction) Movement and have a anti-capitalist position, and the depictions of their characters which is not independent from their social context.²⁰

According to the movies which can be regarded as Social Realist, they generally criticize the value judgments and the greed for profit of traditional bourgeoisie (those also represents the advantageous sections of Adnan Menderes' period as 1950s) like *Suçlular Aramızda* (The Criminals are Among Us) (Metin Erksan – 1964) and also extols the bourgeoisie new middle class emerging after the coup like students in *Otobüs Yolcuları* (The Bus Passangers) (Ertem Göreç - 1961) , engineers in *Şehirdeki Yabancı* (Stranger in the City) (Halit Refiğ – 1960) or the appointed officers by the state in *Yılanların Öcü* (Revenge of the Snakes) (Metin Erksan – 1962). The other instances are *Gecelerin Ötesi* (Beyond the Nights) (1960) and *Susuz Yaz* (Reflections) (1963) by Metin Erksan, *Karanlıkta Uyananlar* (People Waking Up in the Night) (1965) by Ertem Göreç, *Bitmeyen Yol* (The Road That Has No End) (1965) by Duygu Sağıroğlu and *Şafak Bekçileri* (Watchmen of Dawn) (1963), *Gurbet Kuşları* (Birds of Exile) (1964) and *Haremde Dört Kadın* (Four Women in the Harem) (1965) by Halit Refiğ.²¹

Even though, they both accept that there are some movies manifesting the social problems in the first half of 1960s, Gülseren Güçhan and Nijat Özön are not agree with the idea that those cannot be collected under a 'movement'. They emphasize that those movies

²⁰ Aslı Daldal, *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik*, (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2005), pp. 93-95

²¹ *ibid.* p. 63

are the products of the relative liberal context influencing all dimensions of society including the cinematic sphere. As to Güçhan, besides stressing 1960 is a turning point in the social life, and the cinema as well resulting from the transformation of the sociopolitical life after the Coup and the constitution, the cinema eventually finds an opportunity to deal with social problems in the first time.²² On the other hand, agreeing with the argument of Güçhan, Nijat Özön claims that those movies are not actually a ‘realistic’, because they can only deal with some problems superficially and within the limitations of censorship. He also defines the tendency to make those kinds of ‘realist’ movies as a ‘vogue’ of those times.²³ The Young Cinema Group and *Sinematek* also criticize those movies based on its dependency to the *Yeşilçam*, and its superficiality of their realism. Apart from their realistic dimensions, Esin Coşkun points out that those movies are not relied on a theoretical base and don’t come up with a new artistic style and a cinematic language rendering the movies genuine and distinctive. What’s more the movies include the traditional *Yeşilçam* style.²⁴

The discussions about the hallmarks of those realistic movies making them a movement or the debates concentrated on whether they can be collected under a movement or not are out of the scope of this study. Yet, it is useful to state that those movies represent a new tendency in terms of dealing with social problems in the cinematography of Turkey and pave the way for the first theoretical debates about the Turkish cinema along with the National Cinema and People’s Cinema (*Halk Sineması*) propounded by Halit Refiğ.

B. People’s Cinema and National Cinema (Halk Sineması ve Ulusal Sinema)

Those two interrelated concepts propounded by Halit Refiğ, one of the members of so called Social Realists are significant related to the first leftist theoretical study in Turkish cinematography. Those theories can be said a natural outcome of Refiğ’s intention towards legitimizing the directors renunciation of making movies dealing with the social problems. According to Aslı Daldal two reasons are possible to propound for examining the members retreatment of making Social Realist movies. I will analyze the content of two concepts and the reactions to those by benefitting from these reasons.

²² Gülseren Güçhan, *Toplumsal Gelişme ve Türk Sineması*, (Ankara: İmge Kitapevi, 1992), p. 82

²³ Nijat Özön, *Karagöz’den Sinemaya, Türk Sineması ve Sorunları*, (Ankara: Kitle Yayınları, 1985), Vol: 1, p. 32 - 33

²⁴ Esin Coşkun, *Türk Sinemasında Akım Araştırması*, (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları, 2009), p. 48

For Daldal, the first reason is related to the transformation of political context after 1965 when *Adalet Partisi* (AP) which had an anti-communist and conservatist tendency comes to power and terminates the relatively liberal and progressive social and political context of Turkey. This creates seeking for new endeavors to keep their position in this new political order and commercial *Yeşilçam* environment as well.²⁵ Then Refiğ announces that he refuses all the Social Realist movies he made before because it doesn't address ordinary people and remains as a bourgeoisie and intellectual movement. Then he propounds people's cinema by stating that the Turkish cinema is not financed with capitalist class, instead by movie distributors and owners of cinema theaters demanding movies according to the people's interests, making it a 'People's Cinema'.²⁶ Moreover, this isolated system of Turkish Cinema from the capitalist powers, The Young Cinema Group and *Sinematek* think about this matter very differently as I will mention later, brings about its tendency to deal with Anatolian People's pictures, Turkish folk stories and arts like *Karagöz* (A Punch-and-Judy style of Turkish shadow show), *Orta Oyunu* (Low Comedy), *Meddah* (Storyteller) so on and so forth. Yet, *Yeşilçam* has become corrupted by recent movies, so the duty of a movie maker is to make those kinds of movies reflecting the values, cultures and habits of Turkish people.²⁷ This idea is also supported by Metin Erksan and Ertem Göreç who are former Social Realists.

Although, this People's Cinema concept would be used by Young Cinema Group as well, this theory of Refiğ is not adequate and effective in keeping the prestige and presence of the directors in the *Yeşilçam* system, making Refiğ a second concept called 'National Cinema'.²⁸ According to it, Turkey has very different features from the western societies in political, social and cultural manner. So it is not possible to examine the development process of Turkish society by using the concepts invented for analyzing that of Western societies. For instance, the fact that Turkish Social Realists used Marxist concepts like 'capitalist bourgeoisie society' and 'class' or methods like 'historic materialism' is refused by the members of that movement after 1965. Moreover, by referring to Ottoman Society, he states that there is no place of individuals and humanism in Ottoman traditions, thus the directors shouldn't use those concepts in their works with the concern of reaching 'universal' cinematic values of cinema. This claim also triggers the rigorous debates between the intellectuals and

²⁵ Aslı Daldal, *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik*, (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2005), p. 120

²⁶ Esin Coşkun, *Türk Sinemasında Akım Araştırması*, (Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları, 2009), p. 4

²⁷ Halit Refiğ, *Ulusal Sinema Kavgası*, (İstanbul: Hareket Yayınları, 1971), pp. 87 - 88

²⁸ Aslı Daldal, *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik*, (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2005), p. 121

cinema critics most of whom are then gathered under the foundation of *Sinematek* in 1965 and the movie makers like Refiğ, Göreç, Sağıroğlu so on and so forth.²⁹

This leads us the second reason of Refiğ and the other directors' propounding and then supporting these two concepts, especially The National Cinema so strictly that is to strengthen their position stressing the 'Ottomanism' and 'Locality' against the intellectuals and cinema critics supporting to reach 'universal cinema' by using Western aesthetic values and cinematic language. This polarization between two sides rises after the *I. Sinema Şurası* in 1964 after the discussions become so rigorous and the moviemakers abandon the *Şura*.³⁰ The discussions about these contradicted concepts (locality or nationality versus universalism) continue after the foundation of *Sinematek*. Moreover, Young Cinema Group later supports the nationality and locality after the separation from the foundation.

In terms of the emphasis on national values, National Cinema and Young Cinema Group share similar things in common, yet there is a considerable difference: Young Cinema Group perceives Turkey as an underdeveloped and closer to third world countries in which imperialist powers are dominant. Moreover, as the other Third World Film Makers they want to use those national and traditional values for creating a revolutionary cinema out of the sphere in which the imperialism defines. By this way, they want to integrate a different universality whose values composed by revolutionary third world countries. On the other hand, the film makers of National Cinema don't perceive Turkey as a third world country because of its strong and fundamental state tradition and claim that Turkey doesn't possess a colonial past as third world countries. Thus, they sublime the Ottoman and national values in a more nostalgic way, and more importantly they don't concern to reach a kind of universality.

C. Sinematek:

While the theoretical approaches are being developed and the strict discussions are being made, on August 25, 1965 a new foundation is established by Onat Kutlar, Şakir Eczacıbaşı (as the leading figures), Hüseyin Baş, Cevat Çapan, Nijat Özön and Henri Langlois who is the founder of *Sinemateque Française* and is very effective in the

²⁹ İbid.

³⁰ Şengün Kılıç Hristidis, *Sinemada Ulusal Tavrı 'Halit Refiğ Kitabı'*, (İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2007), pp. 145-150

establishment process of the foundation.³¹ The main functions of the foundation are many. Firstly to present the significant examples of the world cinema like the movies of Truffaut, Chabrol and Godard in French *Nouvelle Vogue*, of Luis Bunuel, of Luchino Visconti, Vittorio De Sica in *Italian Neo-Realismo*³² and from the Eastern European Cinemas and significantly Soviet Russian ones; to compose the cinematic archive of those instances. Moreover, the presentations of movies are followed by important discussions and conversations organized by the foundation to increase the intellectual potential of the country.³³

As we look at the times of their appearance (after 1965), this dimension is also very akin to the intentions of Third Cinema and *Nouvelle Vogue* (along with the Dziga Vertov Group) instances especially the manifest and movies of Solanas and Getino related to creating an active audience prototype by organizing intellectual and theoretical discussions and sessions with the audiences. Moreover, those organizations also render the foundation a place in which the contemporary leftist students, significant intellectuals gather and meet, and produce a common identity sprung from the interest on cinema. It is possible to say that these kinds of social relations are established in the French case, affecting the formation of *Nouvelle Vogue* albeit not directly as the influence of Turkish *Sinematek* in that of Young Cinema Group. Although the perceptions of the Third Cinema film makers and *Sinematek* milieu on the nature of the audiences are the same, if we take into consideration the emphasis of it on the aim of reaching universalist values by developing the aesthetic dimension of the movies more than its revolutionist intentions, and the bounds to the capitalist funds of Eczacıbaşı, it becomes far from the Third World perception and more closed to the *Nouvelle Vogue*.

As I mention before, since this foundation is established by intellectuals more, it takes its part to the Universalist wing in the polarization of Turkish cinematic milieu emerging between the directors of National Cinema (and supporting nationality and locality) and the critics and intellectuals. It is important to mention that this foundation is very momentous for the Young Film Makers due to the place in which they meet and from where they detach

³¹ Hakkı Başgüneş, *Türk Sinematek Derneği: Türkiye’de Sinema ve Politik Tartışma*, (İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2009), p.66

³² Italian Neo-Realismo (Neo-realism) is a movement emerging after the Second World War in Italy which appears a more radical stance against the studio system of Hollywood by recording the real scenes from the streets in the first time. The main members of this movement is Vittorio De Sica, Luchino Visconti and Roberto Rossellini. The movement lasts until the middle of 1950s, yet its effects continue as long as the inspiration of the other significant movements like *Nouvelle Vogue*, The Third Cinema and ensuing Italian directors like Pier Paolo Pasolini, Michelangelo Antonioni so on and so forth. *The Oxford History of World Cinema*, Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp.

³³ Şükran Kuyucak Esen, “Türkiye’de Üçüncü Sinema” in *Üçüncü Sinema ve Üçüncü Dünya Sineması*, Binyıldız, Esra and Erus, Zeynep Çetin (eds.), (İstanbul: Es Yayınları, 2007), p. 321

from. Moreover, as the French case, they learn everything about the theoretical and artistic background of cinema, and they recognize the main cinematic movements in there. Thus it is so natural to be seen so much commonalities between two segments (Young Cinema and the *Sinematek* after 1968) in terms of their cinematic perceptions. For instance both of them support a new cinema other than *Yeşilçam* while the Young Cinema Group continues this anti-*Yeşilçamist* stance more revolutionary after the detachment from the movement. According to Veysel Atayman this point is the most distinctive feature of the movement from the foundation. He says that since the members of the movement don't want any kind of capitalist fund to make their movies, and they repudiate the presence of Şakir Eczacıbaşı in the foundation, they decide to separate themselves from it. In this statement, it won't be wrong to say that the more revolutionary sect departs from the *Sinematek* and continues its way in a more radical manner. As to Atayman, in first times of the separation and the publication of *Young Cinema*, a radical detachment from the foundation doesn't appear. Indeed, since Onat Kutlar is the person who is respected and liked by the movement, two sections continue their relations until 1969, after the Third Hisar Movie Competition when the rigorous debates are lived between the Young Cinema Group and the Boğaziçi Film Institution and the *Sinematek* intellectuals³⁴ which I will mention later.

In spite of the fact that the relations become so dreadful in 1970s which is also seen clearly in the *Young Cinema* after the 8th volume dealing with the specific events in this Hisar Competition and the points of discussions, the Young Cinema Group has an undeniable background inheriting from *Sinematek* in terms of the cinematic perception. Lastly, it is necessary to say that Hakkı Başgüney reveals the political tendency of the members in the foundation which is more inclined to *Türkiye İşçi Partisi* (Turkish Labour Party) (TİP) and mentions that Onat Kutlar's participation of the Solidarity Night with Chile organized by TİP.³⁵ As we look at the years when two cinematic milieus emerge, *Sinematek* in 1965 when TİP strengthens its political position by obtaining a political success in the elections; and Young Cinema Group in 1968 when the supporters of *Milli Demokratik Devrim* (National Democratic Revolution) (MDD) idea increases its power and gradually enhances the majority in *Dev- Genç* foundation, it can be possible to comprehend the relatively more radical stance of the Young Cinema Group. Ahmet Soner's statements and some articles in the *Young Cinema* also show that the Group is more closed to MDD's revolution thesis, also explaining

³⁴ Interview with Veysel Atayman having made in June 14, 2010

³⁵ Hakkı Başgüney, *Türk Sinematek Derneği: Türkiye'de Sinema ve Politik Tartışma*, (İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2009), p. 83

its more revolutionary discourse in terms of accepting the cinema as a part of ‘political activity’ on the road to revolution. (like using cinema as a tool of serving for revolution and the secondary importance of the aesthetic values of the cinema in comparison to the revolutionary intentions). The relations of the movement with the MDD idea will be analyzed in the last chapter by consulting some articles in the *Young Cinema*.

I.3. The Young Cinema Group is on the Stage

A. Brief History

The other cinematographic development in 1960s Turkey whose journal is also this thesis’ object to analyze, The Young Cinema Group appears in October, 1968 by defining its characteristics and objectives in the announcement published with the Journal whose name is the same as movement’s itself. The aims of the Group indicated in that announcement are primarily to create a new, independent, people-oriented and revolutionary cinema by transforming and refusing all the ways of the previous cinematic developments, especially dominated by the institution of *Yeşilçam* Cinema followed up until that time. This important movement appears in a highly politicized atmosphere shaped by the leftist-socialist divisions based on their theories on the socialist-type revolution; and students and workers’ movements along with their clashes with the right-oriented movements. Moreover the movies of the directors in Young Cinema Group who are also the active members of socialist movements reflect the second half of 1960s historical context by recording the strikes, movements, demonstrations, clashes etc. with the aim of witnessing every kind of political event in that period. This attitude leads us also one of the most significant characteristic of the Group which is the scenes of those movies recorded from the real events are short. In this manner it can be said that, thanks to the *Sinematek*’s activities, the Group is influenced from the contemporary and former cinematic movements in the first time carrying the camera to the streets from the enclosed places for capturing real and lively scenes in order to approach the realism in cinema (especially studios) like Italian *Neo Realismo* (Neo-realism) and *Nouvelle Vogue*.

The short-film concept can't be examined by isolating the Young Cinema Group from the cinematic developments revolving around itself. Short-Film concept or practice is developed as a new means of making film by the cinematic milieu including the foundation of *Sinematek* (established with the aim of theorizing and improving the *Anti-Yesilcam* language in Turkish cinema in 1965) in 1960s Turkey. For instance, Onat Kutlar , the founder of *Sinematek*, supported the short film idea in his article called '*Türk Sineması için Alan Araştırmaları*' (The Inquiry for the Genre of Turkish Cinema) by stressing its independent feature detached from every kind of institutionalized and traditional cinematic studies and claiming that it was only the way of making an independent film.³⁶ Practically, the birth of short film corresponds to the competitions on the short film organized by The Cinema Club of Robert College (*Robert Koleji Sinema Kulübü*) every year since 1967. This competition, called Hisar Short Film Competition (*Hisar Kısa Film Yarışmaları*) aimed at 'rescuing Turkish Cinema from the permanent Turkish cinema culture.'³⁷ According to the *Yeni Cinema* (New Cinema) which is the official journal of the *Sinematek*, this competition is so significant in promoting young, amateur directors and helping in the development of a new generation which will create a new cinema in the future.³⁸ About this organization Yakup Barokas also says that the Young Film Makers can find an opportunity to present their movies to the audiences, albeit a very limited amount and they has a chance to make people hear their voice at the first time.³⁹ A year after the first Hisar Competition in 1967, the group who has already met in the *Sinematek* since its establishment in 1965 and shares the similar ideas in political and cinematic manner comes together and founds the organization. Before this establishment, Yakup Barokas, one of the members, mentions two trials of founding such an organization like the Young Cinema Group called *Onaltıncılar* (The Sixteenths) and *Tanık Sinema Topluluğu* (The Witness Cinema Community) (TST) which couldn't be successful to be continued:

The establishment of *Sinematek* provided the people who want to make cinema to come together at first. However, most of those people did not have any money enough to make a short movie, nor they had any reason to do that. It is necessary to try on organizing because it was understood that they were obliged to help each other and stick together. They would make studies on cinema, each member would make at least three movies for a year, and the foundation would provide camera and the other technical instruments. At first, people were interested in it. However, TST was

³⁶ Onat Kutlar, "Ulusal Türk Sineması için Alan Araştırmaları 3: Kısa Filmin İçeriği ve Yapısal Sorunları" *Yeni Sinema*, (June – July 1968) Vol: 19 -20

³⁷ Ahmet Soner, "Tarihçe" *Belgesel Sinema*, (Spring – Summer 2003) Vol: 3, p. 43

³⁸ Sungu Çapan, "Hisar Yarışmasının ardından", *Yeni Sinema*, (July, 1967) Vol. 8, p. 1

³⁹ Yakup Barokas, "Yeni Bir Aşamaya Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) Vol: 3, p. 11

stillborn child. Even though they had economic facilities – the dues enhanced by 40 members and the cameras given to them- , it is not possible to envisage that a kind of organization consisted of people who were deprived of a real consensus and pursue personal interests would live.⁴⁰

The Young Film Makers accomplish to establish the organization being like Barokas defines above and it can endure until the 1971 Coup. Indeed the movement disappears as a result of the political atmosphere after March 12, 1971 by publishing their last journal volume in April 1971 (only 18 days after the coup).⁴¹ Until that time, even though it is established in Istanbul and the *Young Cinema* is published and distributed from there, after a while it unites with a group of people in Ankara and Eskişehir. Various presentations and panel discussions are organized in there. Muammer Özer writes a short history about what the Young Film Makers in Eskişehir have done since it is established in the April of 1969 in the 10th volume of the *Young Cinema*. According to this article, the members who are also workers make short movies for the factory they work in, some of them send so many articles to the local newspapers like *Sakarya* and *Emek* (Labour), and they initiate some courses like amateur photography and cinema.⁴² The Ankara branch is also so active in arranging organizations, presentations in the *Ankara Devrimci Gençlik Tiyatrosu* (Ankara Revolutionary Theatre for Youths).

B. Political Context:

The domestic political context of the second part of 1968, in which the Group emerges is so brisk relating to the ideological and personal conflicts inside the leftist environment. The ongoing ideological debates between ‘Socialist Revolutionists’ represented by Turkish Labor Party (*Türkiye İşçi Partisi*) and National Democratic Revolutionists (*Milli Demokratik Devrim*) primarily supported by Mihri Belli, Doğu Perinçek etc. gradually increased. The ideological distinction becomes a concrete conflict especially in General Congresses (*Genel Kurultaylar*) of The Federation of Ideas Societies (*Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonu*). In July 1968, TİP’s part of the federation makes a coup on General Administrative Council (*Genel Yönetim Kurulu*) led by Doğu Perinçek established in the second congress of FKF (March, 68). This unexpected coup and then the decision of FKF’s detachment from Revolutionary

⁴⁰ İbid.

⁴¹ Ahmet Soner, “Tarihçe”, *Belgesel Sinema*, (Spring – Summer 2003) Vol: 3, p. 43

⁴² Muammer Özer, “Eskişehirli Genç Sinemacıların Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını”, *Genç Sinema*, (November 1969) Vol:10, p.3

Powers Union (*Devrimci Güç Birliđi*) (Dev-Güç) render the gradually strengthened supporters of MDD more brisk.⁴³ The event is ensued by the rally against the arrival of American 6th Fleet to Istanbul in July, 20 and the establishment of Revolutionary Student Union (*Devrimci Öğrenci Birliđi*) by the leader, Deniz Gezmiş in October, 1968.⁴⁴ Until the third Congress in January, 1969 which the supporters of MDD prevail over the TİP's fraction, the idea of MDD continues getting strength.

This period doesn't witness only the disagreements between the supporters of MDD's revolutionary thesis and those of TİP's one, but also within the Labor Party itself. The main actors of this dispute are Sadun Aren and Mehmet Ali Aybar the prevalent reason of which is stated from the Aybar's statement: *Gülyüzlü Sosyalizm* (Socialism with Smiling Face) or *Hürriyetçi Sosyalizm* (Liberal Socialism) claimed in 1966 Fatih TİP Congress meaning that socialism should be adapted to Turkish peculiar conditions.⁴⁵ According to Sadun Aren, this idea emerges in summer 1968 after Aybar isn't satisfied with the result of the senate elections in June, 1968 and intends to raise the vote potential for the future elections in 1969.⁴⁶ Aren refuses Aybar's statement by suggesting that it is a deviation from the Marxist theory about the law of progress in human society.⁴⁷ This conflict leads Aren and his four friends to submit an edict to the Presidency of Central Executive Committee (*Merkez Yürütme Kurulu Başkanlığı*) in October, 16 1968. This edict primarily includes the opposition against the Aybar's dominance or personal authority over the Party, the necessity of compatibility to general socialist principles and law of progress and the support of democratization in Party's administration etc. Aybar's reaction against the edict is so rigorous that he insists GYK of dismissing Aybar's fraction, in spite of being unsuccessful.⁴⁸

C. The frictions in the Third Hisar Movie Competition:

Although these two developments (the foundation of *Sinematek* and Hisar Competitions) make directors come together and establish their own group, the conflicts

⁴³ Ali Yıldırım, *FKF Dev-Genç Tarihi: 1965 – 1971 Belgelerle Bir Dönemin Serüveni*, (İstanbul: Doruk Yayıncılık, 2008), p. 198

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 221

⁴⁵ Çetin Yetkin, *Türkiye'de Soldaki Bölünmeler: Tartışmalar, Nedenler, Çözüm Önerileri (1960 – 1970)*, (Ankara: Toplum Yayınevi, 1970), pp. 32-35

⁴⁶ Sadun Aren, *TİP Olayı 1961 – 1971*, (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1993), pp. 127 - 129

⁴⁷ Çetin Yetkin, *Türkiye'de Soldaki Bölünmeler: Tartışmalar, Nedenler, Çözüm Önerileri (1960 – 1970)*, (Ankara: Toplum Yayınevi, 1970), p. 33-34

⁴⁸ Sadun Aren, *TİP Olayı 1961 – 1971*, (İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1993), p. 129

among two parts (*Sinematek* and Robert College on the one side and Young Cinema Group on the other) became apparent especially after the third competition in June 1969. The 8th volume is only allocated to the discussions and specific events in this competition. Since the main points of those discussions are very important to understand the Young Cinema Group's cinematic perception and outlook to the cinematic milieu around, it is necessary to mention those debates, evenly the frictions.

As far as we learn from the article of Jak Şalom, the Young Cinema Group hasn't been satisfied with some praxis of Robert Collage Cinema Club in the Hisar competitions since the organization begins, in August 1967, making the Group decide to repudiate the third one in case of continuing those applications in the first time they come together in October, 1968. Among the reasons propelling the Group to take this kind of decision are retreating to give the first prize to Artun Yeres' movie *Çirkin Ares* (Ugly Ares) being found so excessive 'anti-imperialist' and the institutions of bestowing those awards are from capitalist companies like Shell. Those attitudes also trigger the idea of the Group that the competition is being organized and conducted by the conditionings of imperialist powers. Thus Şalom also contributes that seeing that the members understand the third organization being conducted in the same way, they decide to protest the competition by making discussions and preparing and distributing edicts.⁴⁹ Incidentally, the adoption of delivering the edict as a means of fulfilling their activities is akin to the leftist students and workers one, demonstrating their revolutionary practices. From those edicts and some counter-edicts by the Hisar wing, it can be deducted some important points:

At first, it is learned that the competition is organized by the sponsorship of Shell - financing the awards again and is started with the movie of Metin Erksan called *Kuyu* (Well) the movie produced within the *Yeşilçam* system which is the collaborator of imperialist powers. The other point is that the profile of the juries consisted of the people who don't deal with cinema doesn't seem that they are able to give the prizes to the deserved people. Moreover, the members reveal that the movies which can pass the first eliminations are not chasing rainbows, ambiguous, and using abstractionism in order to make some artistic trials like bourgeoisie directors and intellectuals isolated from the people. What's more, they choose those kinds of movies at the expense of the ones addressing some social problems and having revolutionary character. According to those headings extracted from all edicts of the

⁴⁹ Jak Şalom, "Genç Sinemacılar Neden Hisar'a Karşı Çıktılar ya da Her Seçim Siyasaldır", **Genç Sinema**, (July, 1969) Vol:8, p. 9

movement distributed every days of the competition in front of the cinema theater, the competition makes its choice to be a part of imperialist and capitalist powers. By the movies they choose and the companies they collaborate with, they serve for the interests of the dominant powers. The other conclusion from those is that, very relevantly to the first, the competition doesn't reach the lower classes or the majority of people; instead they address a very limited sect of the society which is understood from the class origin of the jury and the content of the movies. ⁵⁰

In case of grasping the counter-edicts coming from the Robert College wing, we encounter those statements:

Under the current conditions of the Turkish Revolutionist Art and without realizing revolutionist cinema Young Film Makers who have not conducted any proper study and stick to the cliché slogans while trying to damage the effort by a small cinema club arouse suspicion.

Likely, we also recommend similar associations not to consider themselves as the only representatives of "Revolutionary Turkish Art" which causes them to ignore the efforts for art made before them.

By considering where money is used rather than where it came, the Club dealt with this issue and tried to terminate the instruments of any kind that will cause pressure from outside. If we will talk about the effects of imperialism, we need to reveal the mass which created this competition and the people, associations, and tactics who tried to cease, comminute and set at odds these efforts.⁵¹

In those excerpts, it can be possible to make some interpretations: at first this cinema group accuses the Young Cinema Group as being a 'factionist' within the alternative film makers trying to initiate some organizations in order to generate and improve the new cinematic endeavors against the *Yeşilçam* and the dominant powers. By refusing those initiations, the Group tries to separate the unity of new film makers, thus intending to weaken the counterforce against imperialists which make them strengthen more. Here, two wings allege themselves supporting imperialism in different ways which is the popular discourse using in leftist discussions. The other accusation is related to the inability of the Group in making movies and propounding theoretic underpinnings of their cinematic perception unlike the College's practices. This is also accepted by the members of the Group itself, yet they legitimize that ineffectiveness by putting forward the lack of economic opportunities whilst being optimist about accomplishing to make in the future. The explanations about this matter

⁵⁰ "Hisar Günlüğü", *Genç Sinema*, (July, 1969) Vol:8, pp. 2 - 7

⁵¹ *ibid* p. 7

will be discussed in the third chapter. According to the statement about indifference in the origins of economic sources, the Young Cinema's stance seems to be logical as we remember that the reason behind the Young Film Maker's detachment from the *Sinematek*. As it will be explained in the second chapter, the movement refuses all kinds of sources depended on the capitalist-imperialist base of society. So, this last statement of College is not accepted by the Young Cinema milieu.

D. The Complete Detachment from *Sinematek*:

Although the complete detachment is appeared in summer of 1969, the Young Cinema has already started to criticize the shortcomings and faults of the foundation. The reasons of the dissident position gradually adopted by the members of the Group are various. At first, the foundation becomes only fulfilling the record keeping function and ignores the other activities like movie presentations and discussions, if so it is only addressed to attract main class – bourgeoisie. Secondly, it doesn't make discounts for the entrance of the foundation to the labor class as it does to the teachers and the wives of the foundation's members. The other is the prohibition of selling the *Young Cinema* in front of the theaters in which the foundation arranges presentation or organization by the managers coming after Onat Kutlar.⁵²

The relationships that cut off in 1969 are replaced by considerable frustrations. The most important one occurs at the end of 1970s when *Sinematek* arranges a collective presentation of so called 'American Underground Cinema' perceived by the Young Film Makers as a product of American Imperialism because those movies are produced in collaboration with the 'the Center of American News' (*Amerikan Haberler Merkezi*). In front of the building in which the organization happens, the members of the Group publish an edict that says "Damn American Imperialism and *Sinematek* Union that acted as the minion of it in this case."⁵³ This is ensued by the articles including opposite quarrels. Onat Kutlar writes an article called '*İşe Saygı*' (Respect for Work) stating that the quality of movies presented in the '*Devrimci Sinema Şenliği*' are so inferior that it can deteriorate the eyes and the movies should be perceived as the products of art by the Young Film Makers yet they don't have any

⁵² Yakup Barokas, "Yeni Bir Aşamaya Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol: 5, p. 10

⁵³ Adnan Ufuk, "Türkiye'de Devrimci Sinema Tartışmaları – 2: Genç Sinema", *Görüntü*, (Spring – 1996) Vol: 5, p. 19

responsibility to conceive this.⁵⁴ The response of the movement called ‘*Onatgiller’e Cevabımızdır*’ (Our Respond To Onat Family) would be as rigorous as ‘*İşe Saygı*’

E. An Independent Festival: *Devrimci Sinema Şenliği*:

Devrimci Sinema Şenliği which Onat Kutlar mentions is the film festival organized by the Young Cinema independently. It announces this arrangement in the third Hisar Movie Competition while explaining its complete detachment from all activities which would be organized by Robert College and *Sinematek*. Ahmet Soner talks about this festival occurred in May, 1970 in our conversation:

Devrimci Sinema Şenliği is arranged in 1970. The movie presentations organized in two theaters (*Gümüşsuyu İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi* (Gümüşsuyu Istanbul technical University) and *Aksaray Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası Salonları* (The Sitting Rooms of Turkish Teachers Union)) last four days between 22 – 25th May. One day after it is gone to Ankara and it is continued three days and nights more in the Çankaya saloon of *Ankara Birlik Tiyatrosu* (Ankara Union Theatre). There is no jury in the festival. The audiences select their favorites through questionnaires. The movies are presented in *Türkiye Öğretmenler Sendikası* (Teachers Union in Turkey) of Antalya again in 4 June and they are carried to Mersin and Adana.⁵⁵

I.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, it is intended to present the international and domestic developments influencing the process of the Young Cinema Group’s emergence and its cinematic understanding of 1960s. This analysis is derived from the susceptibility of the cinematic developments to the politic and artistic ones. As it is talked about before, the 1960s cinematic improvements in the world and Turkey include two main characteristics that are the detachment from the existing cinematic works and opposition against the overwhelming capitalist- imperialist system. This tendency also leads them to perceive cinema in a more realistic manner, paving the way for carrying the cameras to the streets to capture lively scenes which begins after Second World War and get its peak with *Nouvelle Vague*, Dziga Vertov Group and various initiations under the name of the Third Cinema .

⁵⁴ Onat Kutlar, “İşe Saygı”, *Yenigün*, (19 November 1970), Cinema Page

⁵⁵ Interview with Ahmet Soner having made in June 24, 2010

The degree of those two attitudes is not the same and very changeable. For instance, as we compare the American New Hollywood and *Nouvelle Vogue*, or the Europe and the Third World Countries, we can see the difference with regards to the degree of this tendency. More generally, the Third World Cinema or Third Cinema possesses more radical position by obtaining rigorous discourse of anti-imperialism and anti-current cinematic works; and articulating a fundamental demand of establishing a revolutionary cinema as a part of revolutionary culture. Moreover, they see their country as underdeveloped and exploited by the imperialist powers unlike the European ones and see the cinema as a means of using against the imperialist powers in order to remove underdevelopment by creating a revolutionary culture other than imperialist one. The representatives of this cinema also give more importance to benefit from national and authentic elements in their products so as to generate this kind of cinema. Moreover, they believe to convert the profile of the audiences by rendering them more active by making them think about the movie or propelling them to debate the movies in discussion panels so on and so forth. Finally they give the artform of the movies as secondary importance for the sake of the revolutionary function of them. The fact that all those features about the Third World Cinema can be seen more or less in the Young Cinema Group as well which it will be mentioned more clearly in the next chapters by looking at the articles of the *Young Cinema* and analyzing the discourses they use in there can be interpreted that a domestic movement is very exposed to its international counterparts. We encounter the references of the writers to the *Nouvelle Vogue* and Third World Cinema, demonstrating how the members of the Group perceive those cinematic developments. Yet, this closed relationship doesn't mean that it is a sole imitation of the Third World Cinema, instead it is nourished from the others like *Nouvelle Vogue* and Dziga Vertov Group in terms of especially making the movies in the streets and recording the screens from real life.

Apart from the cinematic developments, it can be constructed a parallel between the nature of the political atmosphere and the Group's perception on cinema. The discussions and frictions between the cinema groups occur at the same time with the leftist conflictions and debates as the case between National Cinema and *Sinematek* or Young Cinema Group and Hisar. It can be said that the majority of the Young Cinema considering the year it emerges, adopts its political position to the MDD thesis of revolution as mentioning in the articles and conversations I made, and this choice leads to stress more on 'activism' and the function of cinema in those activities for attaining the revolution. This tendency also connects with adopting a more rigorous discourse on anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism, resulting in

refusing all kinds of economic funds coming from capitalist class and detaching itself from the other cinematic works both from *Sinematek* (because of Eczacıbaşı's economic support) and Hisar Competitions (because of Shell's support). By this way, the Young Cinema Group (and also the Journal) adopts a more rigorous discourse like its Third World counterparts in terms of its degree to two main features of 'detachment' from the existing cinematic works and 'opposition' against the current political and economic system.

II. 'ANTI-YESILCAM' STANCE OF THE YOUNG CINEMA GROUP

Yeşilçam is a metonym for the Turkish film industry, similar to Hollywood in the United States, and Pinewood in the United Kingdom. The name of *Yeşilçam* is given to the Turkish cinema industry because many actors, directors, crew members and studios were located in *Yeşilçam* Street in the Beyoğlu district of Istanbul. This monopoly of cinema reaches its peak during the 1950s-1970s, when it produces 250-350 films annually. After 1970s, *Yeşilçam* experiences a considerable decline due to the spread of TV sets in Turkey. As we look back the second half of 1960s when the industry is in its heyday, the members of Young Cinema Group define themselves as a civil and radical detachment from this monopoly of Turkish Cinema, and this stance is one of the indications depicting them as representatives of a revolutionary movement not only in cinematic but also a political sense.

When we look at the articles in the *Young Cinema* and the content or the name of their movies, they give us very significant evidence about their political, social and economic perceptions on 1960s Turkey. They are influenced by 1960s leftist ideological debates, political fractions and they also attend the movements of leftist students and workers. This strong engagement in political life is reflected in all their examinations on *Yeşilçam* and in all statements about their opposition against this system. Therefore, this *Anti- Yeşilçamist* character of the group not only helps us understand how they perceive the current cinematographic order, but also the international and domestic political context of late 1960s in which they lived. In addition, they all use socialist terminology while they discuss what *Yeşilçam* is, how it works, which kind of films produced and how those films affect the audience. That's why, in this chapter, it will be consulted some important socialist concepts while mentioning the Young Cinema's perception on this dominant industry and –very relevantly- the existing political and socio-economic structure. By doing this, it is aimed to

show how Young Cinema Group is influenced by the conflicts and discussions among the leftist group and how they adopt leftist terminology in order to examine the *Yeşilçam* system and their opposition against it.

The concepts used by the group are also comprised of subtitles in the chapter namely ‘infrastructure – superstructure’, ‘class’, anti – feudalism’, ‘anti – capitalism’ and lastly ‘anti – imperialism’. Those concepts are also bolstered by the idea of ‘underdevelopment’ especially in analyzing the potential influence of movies on the people. It is important to indicate that all socialist concepts are connected with the negative impacts of movies on the ordinary people, simply because they strongly criticize the *Yeşilçams*’ movies for not reaching or representing the majority of people basically composed of workers, laborers and small bourgeoisie. Thus most authors try to understand why *Yeşilçam* is so detached from people and find the answers through the socialist way of thinking that is economic determinism. This also enhances considerable background information for understanding the perception of the group about the means of reaching the masses which will be discussed later. Moreover like all leftist fractions in Turkey, all members see Turkey as an ‘underdeveloped’ country possessing a pre-capitalist economy, and thus a dependent state exploited by imperialist powers in all spheres, primarily economy, then politics and culture. Because of this point of view, they don’t see *Yeşilçam* as a unique, domestic industry isolated from imperial penetration. In contrary, according to them, *Yeşilçam* is a sole representation of current cinematic order conducted by capitalist and imperialist economy. That’s why, in the last part, imperialist cinema imported from dominant powers is included in relation to anti – imperialism. *Yeşilçam* is the domestic comprador of imperialism and its presence is totally dependent on this.

II.1. Infrastructure – Superstructure Debate

Infrastructure and superstructure is the scheme being used not only by Marxists in explaining the human society but also by the Young Cinema milieu in formulizing their resistance against the institution of *Yeşilçam*. The pioneers of the Group adopt this concept in order to define their theoretical framework of the *Yeşilçam* analysis. According to this concept, the units of a society’s superstructure, mainly ideology, law, government, culture and art, are shaped by its economic base including relations of production like employer-employee work conditions, the technical division of labor, and property relations. The members of

Young Cinema support that since it is the most contemporary branch of art, the cinema itself is also a sole reflection of the society's economic base. Furthermore according to them, *Yeşilçam*, as the dominant cinematic institution of Turkey, is constructed upon the base of Turkish society shaped by capitalist mode of production. Tanju Akerson, one of the authors in *Young Cinema*, supports this claim stating that the super-structural functions of cinema industry like the essence, content, artform and ideology of recorded movies are conducted by dominant economic system that is capitalism.⁵⁶ Indeed, this infrastructure – superstructure relationship embraced by the Group also determines the perception of these revolutionary directors and authors towards the content and structure of the movies recorded by *Yeşilçam*. In addition to this, it is possible to see the statements in terms of connecting the effects of the *Yeşilçam*'s movies on the people, and the means of establishing a new cinematic order other than *Yeşilçam* with these Marxist terms.

Almost all members of the Group adopts the claim that the content and artform of the movies created by *Yeşilçam* Industry indicates that this dominant sector is very much influenced by the infrastructure of the society from which it emanates alike other super-structural units. In this part, I would like to examine only the members' claim on the content (or essence) of the movie and its connection with infrastructure-superstructure scheme, whereas the other dimension, artform of the movie, will be discussed the next chapter. The Group generally suggests that the problems issued in the *Yeşilçam*'s movies don't reflect the socioeconomic realities and the solutions proposed by the directors for those matters are not related to the economic base of the society. Because of this reason, the movies of *Yeşilçam* are very detached from people who experience the real social and economic problems. Since the social and economic problems are totally derived from the infrastructure of the society, directors should seek for the solution only by analyzing and contemplating how the economy of the society defining the base works and how it affects the social domain. With respect to this, Veysel Atayman states that:

If it is considered the reality that a concrete conflict and solution could only be emerged out of the base and determined the essence and place of the current established cinematic order, we can understand why all cinemas of underdeveloped countries should be detached from people, intensive exploited masses and we can define the place of a new cinema ignoring and developing against this order.

⁵⁶ Tanju Akerson, "Sinemada Barış İçinde Beraber Yaşamaya Hayır", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 2, p.

The cinema event generally appears in advanced capitalist countries in which the bourgeois class is dominant and it is revolving around some super-structural events and concepts which is predominant in those countries except one or two particular ones. Those events and concepts are well beyond the real problems of masses.”⁵⁷

Besides this, in another issue of the journal, Veysel Atayman connects this function of the cinema (reflection of the societal infrastructure) with poverty and underdevelopment by locating these two concepts into the infrastructure of the society. According to him, the population of the society consists of two groups: the majority -exploited/laborer and the minority -consumer – exploiting one rising above the former. The economic base is shaped by this main contradiction of the society leading the poverty among the majority of people and finally economic depression. This economic problem also influences the superstructure and its elements including cinematic sector. In other words, the contradiction emerged on the infrastructure of the society conditions depression and poverty affecting Turkish dominant cinema sector in the way it perceives and issues social realities. Moreover, as a natural consequence of underdevelopment of a country, the exploited mass is not able to reach the scientific and objective solution of their economic depression sprung from the contradiction between classes. By this way, Turkish cinema can propose super-structural phenomena as a cause and effect of the societal economic pressure. With the conditioning of underdevelopment it could even come up with abstract and irrational concepts considering the solution of the most concrete problems that arise from the economic infrastructure. For instance, the concrete problems are explained with the will of god, religious punishments or destiny by *Yeşilçam*'s directors. With this attitude, they can easily claim that their cinema is able to be analytical for the main socioeconomic matters since people are deprived of the ability to judge and examine them as a direct result of underdevelopment.⁵⁸

Apart from *Yeşilçam*'s tendency to deal with socioeconomic problems, the relationship between infrastructure and superstructure affects the revolutionary directors' perception on the nature of a new cinema and the means of establishing it. The critical point is that all members of the Young Cinema support that since the current cinematic order, *Yeşilçam*, is a reflection of the existing economic base, it is not possible to establish a new one without changing this economic base totally. To put it another way, seeing that the infrastructure of a society that is capitalism can be transformed only through a socialist revolution, a new

⁵⁷ Veysel Atayman, “Devrimci Sinema”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 11

⁵⁸ Veysel Atayman, “1969 Başında Türk Sinemasının Bir Kaç Sorunu”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol. 6, p. 3

cinematic order can be founded after this revolution is achieved. This idea also leads us to connect the Group's perception on the relationship between revolution and cinema and the usage of cinema as a tool in order to attain revolution which will be mentioned in the next chapter. In this part, I try to explain this revolutionary perspective on the basis of infrastructure – superstructure scheme adopted by the members.

All members share the idea that a revolutionary cinema couldn't be accomplished without reflecting the values, ideas and elements of the economic base of the society and without destroying the previous one that is capitalism. This claim renders the group to go hand in hand with socialist revolutionary movements refusing capitalist order and to be willing to establish a socialist one. In the first volume of the journal, Jak Şalom proves this idea by stating that:

The Young Cinema is fighting for transforming the base of the society. It is waging war in order to attain new values in a new economic order and a new civilization which will be established soon. Yes, there won't be any change in the basic conditions of making a film until the radical transformation on the basis of society.⁵⁹

With relevance to this idea, Gaye Petek asks if only refusing the current economic system that is bourgeois order or capitalist order could enhance the 'revolutionism'. In her article she emphasizes that being a revolutionary both in political and artistic domains can only be related to trying to transform the economic base of the society. She adds that:

The significant point is this: To think of new values instead of conventional ones and to establish these values until consolidating an order based upon traditional value-again. It is not being revolutionary to bring a revolutionary cinema in replacement of the one which is the servile of the capitalist order unless the existing pattern and base of the society is converted.⁶⁰

Lastly, this kind of explanation of *Yeşilçam*'s structure and tendency also creates a very oppositional position against all cinematographic initiations which can be perceived as an alternative to *Yeşilçam*. It is so appear to discern that some important works of directors dealing with the social and economic problems of society⁶¹, *Sinematek* and its movie competitions in collaboration with Boğaziçi Film Institution are conceived as being dependent on the current economic order by the Young Cinema Movement.⁶² Apart from the domestic

⁵⁹ Jak Şalom, "Bir", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 8

⁶⁰ Gaye Petek, 'Sanat ve Sanatçı', *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) vol. 3, p. 4

⁶¹ It is called 'Social Realists' by Aslı Daldal: Aslı Daldal, *1960 Darbesi ve Türk Sinemasında Toplumsal Gerçekçilik* (İstanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2005)

⁶² Yakup Barokas, "Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması için Genç Sinema Bir Hareketidir", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol. 6, p. 18

initiations, the directors discuss this infrastructure – superstructure theory by comparing their group with the French ‘*Nouvelle Vogue*’ (French New Wave) which is one of the most significant cinematic movements in the 1960s. In general, although the members of the Young Cinema agree that this movement is artistically very successful, and some of the movies in this genre deal with the matters related to the base of the society, it is not totally detached from the rules of dominant Capitalist system. Its dependence is majorly derived from financial support given by governmental institutions which are one of the super-structural elements of the capitalist base. Yakup Barokas contributes to this claim by saying that a revolutionary cinema is not occurred in France; instead it is only renovated simply because the *Nouvelle Vogue* doesn’t break off its economic linkage with the Capitalist and bourgeoisie institutions. He also suggests that most of the directors in this genre make their movies for American companies demonstrating that the movie-makers benefiting from the super-structural units of the existing order eventually obey this order’s economic rules and gradually become under the influence of imperialism.⁶³

Mete Tanju covers this matter according to a more comparative perspective by stressing the difference between infrastructure of the cinema and the society itself. The perception of Young Cinema towards the cultural and cinematic accumulation which is a component of cinematic infrastructure is going to be grasped in the next chapter. Yet, in this point it is important to demonstrate this controversy he proposes in his article is related to the infrastructure-superstructure pattern. As to him, French Cinema opposes some practices or elements concerning cinematic infrastructure more than those of societal base characterized by Capitalism.⁶⁴ In terms of the elements in cinematic infrastructure, he alludes to mainly classical cinematic forms like editing, visual style and narrative part of the movie. Seeing that the oppositional position of *Nouvelle Vague* is particularly concentrated on the cinematic infrastructure, the movement could find a suitable place in the commercial, capitalist cinematic order easily. In contrast, Young Cinema primarily deals with the economic base and claims that the first mission is to remove the base of the economy, while it doesn’t totally ignore the cinematic infrastructure and attaches less importance to it. Even though this statement shows that he seems to support a socialist revolution, in the sequel of his article he continues with those sayings:

⁶³ *ibid.*

⁶⁴ Mete Tanju, “Devrim Sinemasının Sorunları İçinde Yapıt”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 11

Though, is there any community or organization making movies deal with the problems depended on the economic base of the society? Of course there is. However, those problems are solved successfully and spontaneously; because, in those countries, the laborers, the majority of the society, are in a high position pertaining to the degree of consciousness and their organizations are very powerful as a result of advanced industrialization. Then, those countries which share the imperialist exploitation obtain a strong liberal tradition and bourgeoisie democracy so that they can give intellectual concessions to the laborer class.⁶⁵

II.2. Class-Based Understanding of Yeşilçam

Class-based understanding of *Yeşilçam* which also demonstrates that the members of the Group are influenced by Marxist economic determinism is very significant and common in *Young Cinema* as well as infrastructure-superstructure scheme. In Marxist theory, two basic class divisions prevail in terms of the economic structure in society: the proletariat which is the laborer class selling their own labor, and the bourgeoisie which is the capitalist class possessing the means of production. They share the same idea, because of their political stance, with the members of the TİP and the supporters of MDD ruling *Dev-Genç* foundation: the dominant social classes who possess the means of production in capitalist system are imperialist powers, comprador bourgeoisie and feudal landlords. The members of the Group claim that the conduct of *Yeşilçam*'s economy, alike other economic sectors in country, is under the auspices of these classes, leading that those dominant classes determine the rules of this monopoly. On the other hand, the disadvantageous classes exploited by those consumer dominant powers are laborers and workers and cinema, more specifically *Yeşilçam* is a tool of exploiting those classes not only in economic way -by taking their money- but also in sentimental one by deceiving and deflecting them and imposing the values of the system in which they are dominant class in order to maintain their advantageous position.

In this respect, it would be better if we start with Osman Ertuğ's claim which is specifically concentrated on the exploitation of lower class in sentimental way. According to Ertuğ, because of the cinemas' influencing power on the people, the imperialist and capitalist cinema supervised by the dominant class is very hazardous for lower class. He defines Turkey, like other revolutionary movements, as a country in which imperialism settles and the government is the collaborator of overwhelming capitalist and imperialist powers and the

⁶⁵ *ibid.*

laborer class has not attain its political awareness and class consciousness yet. Moreover, he claims that the condition of underdevelopment both in economic and social manner paves the way for influencing the ordinary people who are economically disadvantageous position by exploiting their feelings and hopes towards changing their class status:

The audience who sees that the protagonists on the scene accomplish the things which they can't overcome in their own life is satisfied with assuming that those things are accomplished by themselves. The poor girl's wedding to handsome and affluent guy or vice versa makes the ordinary people being satisfied with it because thanks to the cinema scenes, they can reach the upper class in which they can't advance. In other words, they learn a new means of changing their class status through the cinema, yet in reality there isn't anything valid they learn: they admire the lifestyle of dominant class by dealing with the problems of this class members and becoming happy and sad with them or they turn away from the richness which they can't obtain and they gain the virtue of being happy with their economic situation, and the accuracy of living with the conviction of modesty and fate. In fact, there is not a gaining there. Consequently, the winners of this process are *Yeşilçam* (comprador class) and imperialism (dominant class), and the losers are always working class.⁶⁶

In one of his articles called '*Sanat ve Sanatçı Üstüne Bir Taslak*' (A Draft on Art and Artist) Enis Rıza, one of the members of the Group, covers the *Yeşilçam*'s influence on lower class by emphasizing the 'public art', its difference with the art under the auspices of dominant class and its alienation from the people who should make this art come alive. Before arguing those issues, he analyses the close relationship between the types of society and the art by counting those types based on the relations of production⁶⁷ According to him, the critical point is that after passing from the communal/ primitive society to the other types of it (slavery, feudal, capitalist and socialist), the class distinction emerges leading the class struggles which shapes and determines the historical progress. From this analysis deriving from the historical determinism of Marxist theory, he reaches the argument of the alienation of art from the people. To him, in primitive societies the art itself is a communal and unique tool produced and used by the people, whereas in other types of societies it is separated into two parts: one is the art under the control of bourgeoisie which doesn't reach the majority composed of workers and labor class; and only for its own entertainment; the other is public art representing the society's language, customs, traditions and peoples hopes, yearnings,

⁶⁶ Osman Ertuğ, "Sinemanın Gücü", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 25

⁶⁷ Enis Rıza Sakızlı, "Sanat ve Sanatçı Üstüne Bir Taslak" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 14

"Tarihsel gelişim içinde üretim ilişkilerine bağlı olarak başlıca beş toplum çeşidi görünür: ilkel toplum, köleci toplum, feodal toplum, kapitalist toplum, sosyalist toplum. (yalnız ilkel toplumdan feodal topluma geçişin tek yolu köleci toplum değildir.) bunun gibi sosyo-ekonomik kuruluş çeşitlerinde, o toplumlara bağlı olarak sanatın da öz ve biçimi değişir"

pains etc.⁶⁸ Yet, the former exerts its dominance over the latter and causes to alienate people from their own art that is public art intentionally in order to maintain its own class' and imperialism' interests. That's why this art, he means *Yeşilçam* and its sub-groups, to which the people are deviated deals with intangible and superstitious issues like religion, mysticism etc. and persuades ordinary people that the happiness only depends on supernatural forces making them more passive and subservient.⁶⁹

However, this order in which the capitalist classes exploit the lower class in sentimental and capitalist way and they render the majority more passive and submissive by using the influencing power of cinema doesn't last forever. Some of authors in *Young Cinema* propose significant prescriptions for rescuing from this unfair system. For instance, according to Veysel Atayman, the art and literature which possess more extensive and direct communicational facilities gradually becomes a destination for lower class who are exploited by the bourgeoisie and imperialist class in order to attain their will of independency. In other words, the art and literature is a full-fledged tool for ordinary people detached and alienated from themselves in order to articulate their dreams of independency when their interests contradicts with the interests of ruling class. Eventually, this gains the art itself another function which is a political instrument for making the dreams of disadvantageous class come true.⁷⁰ Engin Ayça also emphasizes the similar process as Veysel Atayman with more positive feelings:

A definite class is dominant in Turkish Society and the rules of this class are valid in there. Those rules provide maintaining the system established by dominant class and enable only a minority to handle with cinema. Moreover they want this minority not to cross the borders drawn by the dominant class. And besides, they don't let the directors do, in contrast restrict them inside the border.

Since the interests of the majority in a society were contradicted with those of dominant class, a movement towards transformation of the current order has begun. This is the inevitable contradiction of the nature. Alike most of the countries, Turkey is in this process and also this revolutionary process is intended to be terminated, deviated and corrupted. This is like the last fluttering of the lion who is about to die.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Enis Rıza Sakızlı, "Sanat ve Sanatçı Üstüne Bir Taslak", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 14

⁶⁹ İbid. p. 15

⁷⁰ Veysel Atayman, "Genç Sinema'nın Yarını", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1969) vol. 9, p. 9.

⁷¹ Engin Ayça, "Sinema ile Uğraşmak 3", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol. 6, p. 23

II.3. Anti-Feudal Stance of the *Young Cinema*

Although it is not emphasized by the *Young Cinema* like anti- imperialism and anti-capitalism, some articles include the opposition against feudalism and its direct representatives in the cinema sector. As the leftist statements acclaimed by all factions, Young Cinema members think that imperialism also uses the most conventional and reactionary powers which are feudal landlords in order to strengthen its dominance over the region and maintain the order it established. Young Cinema Group also supports that there are also representatives of feudalism who are the compradors of imperial ideology in cinema sector. As to some authors in the *Young Cinema* those representatives are the owners of cinema theaters and importers of foreign movies, especially American Films, and they work in collaboration with imperialist powers. There are some instances enabling us to discern this emphasis on anti-feudalism.

In the 10th volume of the *Young Cinema*, with a caption that '*Sinema Ađalarına Sesleniyorum*', Mehmet Yalçinkaya writes a declaration to the owners of the cinema theaters upon their boycott for increasing the price of the tickets per movies. He asserts that even though those people complain about the low price of the foreign movies, this is not the case. In this text, he gives a brief history of the emergence of those landlords beginning with 1948 when the municipality of Istanbul starts to take 20% of the revenues as a tax by the people who presents Turkish films, and 40% by the people who shows foreign films. This leads a very amount of increase in producing Turkish movies by the people who discern that it is very profitable. On the other hand, upon the rise in the number of domestic productions, these lords who import foreign, especially American, films think how to be in advantageous position in this sector. In 1958, firstly they submit 425 kuruş as the price of showing the movie to the municipality yet it is decided to define this number as 300 which is the current price today. Moreover, because of the right to obtain extra money from the municipality in case of applying more sessions than the standard number, those landlords tend to shorten the duration of the movies. After a definite time, they enlarge the sector by opening new theaters to raise more money. On the day when this announcement is published and the boycott has been continuing for three days, a receipt was hanged on the gates of the theaters which present foreign movies stating that the price of one ticket is distributed into municipality in 40%,

importer as 25 % and the owner of the theatre as 35 %. As to him and his story, seeing that the importer and owner of the cinema theatre is the same person, the revenue getting from one ticket is dreadfully high making them greedier. In the same volume, besides Yalçınkaya, the movement also publishes an announcement not to go the theaters possessed by that comprador class working in collaboration with imperialist powers.⁷²

Enis Rıza connects the anti-feudalist perspective with anti-imperialist one by claiming those feudal lords are the most traditional classes going hand in hand with dominant imperialist powers and this close relationship influences the content and values of *Yeşilçam*. For him, Turkey, on one hand contains the feudal remains in its territories and it is under the hegemony of imperialism led by America pursuing its exploitation over the country. This exploitation is maintained by working in collaboration with the feudal landlords in order to corrupt the Turkish national identity and culture. More importantly, we can understand the presence of those feudal remains by analyzing its reflection on the superstructure: the feudal elements in superstructure are mystic beliefs and reactionism.⁷³

II.4. Anti – Capitalist Perception of the *Young Cinema*

Since capitalism and imperialism are intertwined processes, the opposition of the Group against capitalism process is generally articulated with an anti-imperialist discourse, visa versa. Many writers quote Lenin's statement that imperialism is a world system, the last stage of capitalism and adopt the Marxist-Leninist view of imperialism primarily addressing the economic rather than military or political (though these are related) dominance of main countries over others called underdeveloped countries. Thus, alike other leftist factions this economic dominance could be exerted over the underdeveloped countries including Turkey by the conduct of capitalist rules and practices. This perception and the jargon of anti-capitalism and anti-imperialism are generally seen in the articles of the *Young Cinema*. It is not obscure to see various articles about the economic analysis of *Yeşilçam* or its connection with imperialism, capitalism, and even feudalism.

⁷² Mehmet Yalçınkaya, "Sinema Ağalarına Sesleniyorum", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) vol. 10, p. 4 - 5

⁷³ Enis Rıza Sakızlı, "Sanat ve Sanatçı Üstüne Bir Taslak", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 14 - 15

As I stated before, the view that the current cinematic order, *Yeşilçam* is a sole reflection of its societal base characterized by capitalism is supported by *Young Cinema*. Some authors like Mete Tanju takes one step further from the idea of *Yeşilçam*'s derivation from economic base by stressing the close relationship between art and economy.. For him the fact that cinema is the most involved art with economy renders it a capitalist sphere of economic activity. For this reason, as the other economic activities are under the control of capitalist rules, the main object of this activity is to obtain profit; the movies produced by this system are perceived as 'commodity'; and the film production is dependent on objective supply-and-demand principle.⁷⁴ As we look at this statement, cinema seems to be a part of Capitalist economy, so *Yeşilçam*'s movie makers, producers and the owners of cinema theaters are mainly concentrated on the elements and values on which this kind of economy impose them. By departing from this idea, Mehmet Gönenç emphasizes the contradiction emerging between the personal interests of people in *Yeşilçam* system for obtaining more profits and the societal feature of the cinema itself:

The cinema as a product of the Capitalist stage is conditioned according to the systems' own modes of production. This brings about that the producers intend to retrieve money more than he invested for a film by attracting people to the cinema theatres with the psychosis of entertainment. Therefore, the cinema is on one hand social in terms of influencing the masses, and personal because of its dependency on the producer and his intentions for profit. Until this time, this main controversy of cinema has been happening. The servant-directors, some cinematic schemes (relating to essence and form) always used by those directors and a classical audience type unconsciously addicted to the dark theatres are the natural results of this main controversy.⁷⁵

In this respect, we encounter the effects of cinema conducted by capitalist economy on the people again. As it is discussed before, the majority of people composed of workers and laborer classes become submissive and passive during they see *Yeşilçam*'s movies in view of the fact that the movies don't reflect the main socioeconomic problems related to the economic base of the society; they linger people by proposing superstructural concepts like religion etc.; and showing a virtual way of changing their disadvantaged class status through the movies etc. In this passage, Mehmet Gönenç contributes one more dimension to those effects. He intends to claim that the *Yeşilçam*'s producers ignore the cinemas' societal dimension like mobilizing people by generating public consciousness about the social realities

⁷⁴ Mete Tanju, "Devrim Sinemasının Sorunları İçinde Yapıt", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol. 12, p. 10

⁷⁵ Mehmet Gönenç, "Özgür Bir Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 15

and problems in order for obtaining as more profit as possible by showing only its entertainment feature to people. Artun Yeres' argument also seems to support this claim:

As for our cinema, it is under the monopoly of the people chasing for pleasant profits. The producers and the importers of movies impede people – intentionally or unintentionally- attaining a definite level of qualified atmosphere. Those men who perceives the movies only a commodity and measures a movies' success only according to its potential of profit blinds the sentiments and opinions of people and exploits their money as well.⁷⁶

II.5. Anti- Imperialist Character of the *Young Cinema*

It won't be wrong if it is claimed that anti – imperialism is the most dominant statement among the Marxist concepts asserted by the members of the Group in explaining the structure and conduct of *Yeşilçam* order. Obviously, all authors and directors keep their antagonistic stance against imperialism and its capitalist stage in which they live in their articles, movies and mottos. Because of this political stance, the authors try to examine the penetration of imperialist powers into the cinema, evenly the dominance over the whole cinema sector; the dependence of cinema industry on foreign markets especially American; the influence of the imperialist movies economically, ideologically and sentimentally on the people. Significantly, the members share the perception of Turkey as *an underdeveloped country* economically depended on imperialist powers. In order to understand the anti – imperialist stance of the Group it could be better to grasp some statements of authors about 'imperialism'.

Mete Tanju defines the imperialism as 'unlimited and impersonal capital' objecting to reach the highest surplus value by concealing itself.⁷⁷ Faruk Atasoy determines the most distinct feature of imperialism as seeking for new markets for obtaining this surplus value. Both of them are agree with that cinema sector is an available market for providing this value making this type of art commercial. Besides being an appealing sphere for obtaining profits from imperialist powers, the cinema sector is a very suitable tool for cultural imperialism thanks to its strength of mobilizing people:

⁷⁶ Artun Yeres, "Genç Sinema'nın Konumu", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 3, p. 10

⁷⁷ Mete Tanju, "Devrim Sinemasının Sorunları İçinde Yapıt", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 10

With respect to the imperialist economic sphere of influence, Yorgo Bozis investigates the relation of imperialism in Turkey with the domestic cinema sector in the light of three imperialist methods of exploitation which is being implemented. The first way of this dominant power is related to making foreign trades with this underdeveloped, or pre-capitalist, country. According to him, this way of exploitation can be done in two directions: one is exporting its own films to Turkey and second is selling raw materials and technical equipments to Turkish local cinema sector. He claims that Turkey imports more than 450 foreign movies in one year. For him, the pretext of this unreasonable attitude could be the attempt to show its own people the most qualified and important movies recorded around the world, yet he tries to prove this is not the case. He benefits from the dates in the book of Dr. Özkan Tikveş called '*Sinema Filmlerinin Sansürü*' (The Censors of Motion Pictures) and categorizes the foreign movies received permission for presenting in Turkey from the Istanbul Control Commission between 1951 and 1966 according to their economic and political position in the world context. The result of this study shows the cinematic monopoly of imperialist – capitalist countries on the Turkish markets. In terms of the import of all raw materials and technical equipments, he is not able to support his idea by depending on a reliable data. He could only say that the cost of some materials coming from abroad is 25.5 million Turkish liras in 1967 by looking at *Resmi Gazete* (Official Newspaper) published on 12 December, 1968. In this respect, this second way of being exploited by imperialist powers remains only a claim not being proved. This topic has not been covered or analyzed by other authors other than Bozis.

The second means of imperialism for economically dominating Turkish cinema sector is giving loans and implementing interests for payback of those loans. He reveals the 1968-year program of the '*İkinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*' (The Second 5-Year-Based Development Plan) to bear out his statement. Yet, this numbers showing that Turkey's debts are 98,1 million dollar in terms of the loans and 33,6 in the interests of those loans, are not the indication of the dependence of Turkey on abroad with respect to the cinema domain because it is a general evaluation of Turkish loans and interests for payback, not specifically for domestic cinema sector. The last way of imperialist domination is claimed as leaking surplus value by exporting its own capital by looking at reveals the 1968-year program of the '*İkinci Beş Yıllık Kalkınma Planı*' again. Similar to the previous claim, the assessment that the foreign capital in Turkey is 17.2 million dollar, whereas the profits going abroad is 25,3 could only give some information about the economic situation of Turkey in general, not peculiarly

about the cinema sphere. According to Yorgo Bozis's article, he seems to collect some data about the Turkish Economy and its connection with foreign interests and try to interpret the relationship between imperialism and cinema by looking at that information. Although it is true that all members of the Group see the cinema as a part of capitalist sector and under the dominance of imperialism, it can't be known how much those loans or capital are allocated to Turkish cinema. Yet, this article is important that it tries to examine and prove its anti-imperialist stance based on economic data and numbers.⁷⁸

Faruk Atasoy sheds the light on one of the reason why America expands their movies on the other countries especially after the Second World War by giving a brief historical background. According to him, the American Film Companies remains a lot of movies which couldn't be presented during the Second World War. Therefore, it sends so much film to European Countries, especially Italia, and in the same year it establishes a new unit called Motion-Picture Export Association (MPEA) in order to find new foreign markets and gains so much profit from there. Moreover, in 1950s the monopoly of Hollywood companies is terminated by 'anti - trost' rules and the costs of making a movie is increased, these companies look for new spheres so as to meet these costs. These are acclaimed by Atasoy as the rationale behind the American imperialism in cinema industry and the situation of Turkish one importing about 400 movies from this country. Lastly, he also clarifies the question why Turkish Government doesn't refuse this plethora of imports by referring a speech MPEA's former president, Eric Johnston: 'If a country imposes some limitations on the exports of American movies, we visit that country's minister of finance immediately and tells him that our movies enhance a half of his country's cinema industry and provide so many revenues from the tariffs from the exportation.'⁷⁹ In here, although the financial interests of Turkey is more stressed by Atasoy, this sentence implies the political influence of a country which is economically powerful over the nations by benefitting from the diplomatic channels. Mutlu Parkan also supports the idea of imperialist expansion and its effect on broad spheres:

This supranational network is so powerful and effectual that it acquires armies, governments by extracting funds from the countries it exploits and impoverishes; captures the majority of cinemas and media; and mobilizes all forces in order to narcotize people, eventually it gets the countries made coups like in South America and Greece.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Yorgo Bozis, "Türkiye'de Sinemada Dış Sömürü", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol. 6, p. 6

⁷⁹ Faruk Atasoy, "Sinemada Emperyalizm", *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) vol. 5, p. 3

⁸⁰ Mutlu Parkan, "Yeni Olay", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 2, pp. 13 - 14

This statement embraces another question how imperialism and its forces narcotize people and why they want to do this. This question is also much related to the point Faruk Atasoy and Mete Tanju emphasizes that besides its attracting sphere for being exploited by dominant countries economically; the cinema sector is also a very suitable tool for cultural imperialism thanks to its strength of mobilizing people. As very related to the idea as I discussed in the infrastructure- superstructure and anti-capitalism part, the movies of *Yeşilçam* don't reflect socio- economic problems and their solutions arisen from the base of the society, instead they tend to propose abstract and irrational concepts, like they show the reason and the solution of poverty as a will of God, making people more subservient and passive. Moreover, in order to gain more profits from the movies by attracting people to the cinema theaters, the producers prefer to make movies for entertaining masses, thus people become detached from social and economic problems which they experience and forget their poverty and disadvantaged status in society through cinematic scenes and characters. In addition to these, new ideas were came up with the authors in relation to their stance against imperialism. It also imposes the goodness and perfection of its ideology, and inevitability of its order through its movies, rendering cinema as a very competent part of cultural manipulation of masses. The rationale behind this attitude is to maintain the capitalist order in which it can expand through the countries and exploit them in all aspects (primarily in economic). In this respect, Tanju Akerson identifies this imperialist cinema by his statements:

While the center of cinema, Hollywood in America who waged war against Vietnam, launches its ostentatious productions and movies with colored, opulent cast and a will of breaking world records, it doesn't ignore issue the topic of 'tutelage of civilized west to the primitive Asian people'. For instance, in '*55 Days in Peking*' the fact that it introduces anti – imperialist war of China, as plunder of barbaric Asian People on civilized western people is so usual in this manner. In underdeveloped countries, the media and cinema share the responsibility of making laborer class and small bourgeoisie under the influence of the West and imperialism being unaware of the 'The Third World' Problem. In fact, Turkish people who made the first war of independence in the world clap the achievements of English colonial soldiers in India and grieves like a French Capitalist upon watching the movies issuing '*Dien Bien Phu*' defeat of French legionary forces.'⁸¹

Relating to the ideological imposition of imperialist powers, Veysel Atayman shares the similar thinking with Tanju Akerson by giving Vietnam case as an instance. He states that the imperialist cinema industry counted as one of the most profitable area for investment on one hand produces some unreal stories and characters in the view of its commercial interests;

⁸¹ Tanju Akerson, "Sinemada Barış İçinde Beraber Yaşamaya Hayır", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 2, p. 6

it also tackles keeping its ideology alive and widespread as possible by its monopolies of distribution. Moreover, Hollywood, the production center of Anglo-American imperialism determines its way according to the laws of McCarthy and it introduces people from the axis of Latin America to Japanese Islands through Asia venturing out against American interests as ‘ the secondary people made of mud’ . According to him, in spite of the fact that Hollywood movies include American heroes gaining victory over the Asian territories, in reality, America encounters the strong resistance of Vietnamese people. ⁸²

About the Vietnamese case, Artun Yeres makes a short film called ‘Çirkin Ares’, depicting the attitudes of American soldiers in Vietnam. It is mentioned in *Young Cinema* of the movement as the film covering imperialism with a revolutionary consistency at the first time. Moreover, Üstün Barışta writes a critique about the film in the 5th volume of the Journal. He indicates that the movies scenes are composed of both the photos of Vietnam event and the ‘*Desastres de la Guerra*’ (Disasters of the Battle) which is the collection of photos about the massacre of Napoleon’s occupying forces against Spanish natives. As to him, the scenes are arranged for alluding to an analogy between two cases. Furthermore, towards the end of the movie, the main topic that is the relationship between the Vietnamese case and imperialism itself gradually transforms one between American imperialism and Turkey with a view to notify the audiences that a similar case would be befell on Turkish territories. The last scene (which is also the single live recording) that American soldiers who make practicing for the war directs their guns to the camera and the audiences as well implies this possibility that the director intends to stand out. ⁸³

The other case indicating the propagandist elements of imperialist ideology is related to the most prevalent discourse of Western and capitalist countries in the Cold War era that is ‘anti – communism’. This is discussed by Tanju Akerson in the same article that he gives the Vietnamese case. He points out the political and ideological messages included in some of the Hollywood movies. They find opportunities to spread the idea that ‘capitalism is good, and the laborers shouldn’t unify against it’ with the help of broad distribution facilities around the world. He also asserts that ‘anti-communism’ proposed by capitalist side for protecting and concealing itself from the communist part, consists the ideological framework of some

⁸² Veyssel Atayman, “Uçuruma Sürüklenen Otomobil”, *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) vol. 4, p. 13

⁸³ Üstün Barışta, “Sevgili Çirkin Ares”, *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) vol. 5, p. 8 - 9

definite movies. For instance, the imperialist cinema led by Hollywood introduces the warriors of the Third World as ‘illegal bandits’ or ‘communist agents’.⁸⁴

The 9th volume of the *Young Cinema* points out a very important case in the manner of imperialist propaganda on the Turkish territories. According to the announcement of the *Young Cinema*, the authors protest against the movie of the *Dubious Patriots (Paralı Askerler)* which is going to record in Turkey. The reason of their opposition is that they see the movie as a product of imperialist propaganda and an inaccurate representation of Turkish War of Independence according to the imperialist interests, whilst the journal doesn’t mention the content of the scenario. According to the *Young Cinema* this movie is not opposed only by the movement but also all the media because a character in the movie is represented as Mustafa Kemal, while the producers refuse that the character is not Mustafa Kemal, but a general whose name is Muzaffer Kayhan. Upon the public aggression against this film crew, they take 300 governmental forces, albeit the government isn’t aware of this support, as supporters in order to continue the recording process. As to the Journal this movie is not only the indicator of ideological propaganda of imperialism but also an economic exploitation of Turkish cast and technical laborers so as to obtain profit by paying less salary with comparison to the amount of work they do. At last, the members proclaim to continue their protest until the recording stops by reminding an event in the War of Independence:

We won’t get rid of asserting that the government shares the profit of the movie as long as the recording is not stopped. And we are going to fight against those mercenary soldiers until throwing them to the sea as it is done 47 years ago in Izmir.⁸⁵

It won’t be wrong to say that this reference to War of Independence is another sign bearing out the movement uses the discourse of the leftist movement’s. Those movements wage war against imperialism in general and capitalism making the country more dependent and subordinated to the dominant powers in order to be an independent country. All of leftist factions cite their desire to obtain a kind of independency like after the ‘War of Independence’ between 1919 and 1922 and they define their war against imperialism in which they are included as ‘the Second War of Independence’. Finally, according to the members of the Group, the war should be conducted in two branches: at first they should wage war in order to transform dominant economic system that is imperialism and its last stage, capitalism which also shapes the economic base of the society, and second, they should fight against the

⁸⁴ Tanju Akerson, “Sinemada Barış İçinde Beraber Yaşamaya Hayır”, *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 2, p. 7

⁸⁵ “‘Paralı Askerler’ Filmi Üstüne Bildiri”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 9, p. 3

imperialism of cinema in general (led by America) and its local collaborator, *Yeşilçam*. Although, this revolutionary perspective will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, it would be better to end this part with a quote of Gaye Petek considering these two branches of fight fulfilled by the movement. As we see in there, Gaye Petek reflects the idea of the movement very clearly that the anti-imperialist war in general is more important than the war against its representatives in cinema, making the cinema art the guns and the members of Young Cinema soldiers:

The art imperialism is a reality, because the doors of our bourgeoisie and capitalist society are completely open to the imperialism. The Young Cinema opposes imperialism in art, so they should fight against imperialism in broad sphere at first. It will resist against this system with its 'witness receiver' and its presence. Since other reality is that the current cinematic order exploits Turkish people, The Young Cinema should prepare people to say 'no' to imperialism and show that they shouldn't be exploited (...) Its gun is movies it records against *Yeşilçam* order yet it shouldn't forget one reality: today there is an imperialism in general which is more important than the imperialism in cinema. It can contribute the war only by resisting against this.⁸⁶

II.6. Conclusion

In the light of this information, the Young Cinema's perception on *Yeşilçam* can be described more densely and briefly according to the socialist terminology and outlook which is adopted by the 1960's contemporary leftist movements: At first, it is the dominant cinema sector in Turkey the economy of which is determined by capitalist rules and practices. This feature of the industry is the indication that it is a sole reflection of values and principles derived from the economic base of the society which is shaped by capitalism, the last stage of imperialism. Secondly, since it is one of the superstructural institutions closely depended on the economic base, it is under the auspices of the dominant classes who control the means of capitalist production and benefits from capitalist economy. In other words these classes composed of imperialist powers and its compradors such as bourgeoisie and governmental bodies determines all the means of distribution of the movies and all issues the movies deals with. Besides capitalist classes, the feudal forces or so called landlords such as the owners of cinema theaters are also the compradors of imperialism. On the other hand, the majority

⁸⁶ Gaye Petek, "Sinemacı (Görevi Karşısında ve Onun İçinde)", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 9, p. 11

comprises mainly workers, laborers and small bourgeoisie exploited economically and sentimentally by these dominant classes through capitalist economy and its representative in cinema, *Yeşilçam*. Finally, because it is conducted by capitalist rules, this dominant industry is depended economically on imperialist powers who do not only see the cinema sector as an economic market in order to extract profits, but also an available domain for cultural and ideological manipulation of society. Moreover, the fact that *Yeşilçam* is the monopoly of the cinema sector in an underdeveloped country that has pre-capitalist elements paves the way for imperialist penetration into the *Yeşilçam* both in economic and ideological manner.

This Socialist outlook on the structure and praxis of *Yeşilçam* determines the framework of the discussions in the *Young Cinema* that is the relationship between *Yeşilçam* and the people. In their articles, the authors try to analyze how the features of *Yeşilçam* that I talked about above affect the content of the movies and their influence on people. At first, the main contradiction between exploiting classes and exploited classes is obviously seen in the movies which don't deal with socio-economic problems sprung from the economic base of the society. Apart from these there are some movies issued those kinds of problems, like Social Realists, which propose superstructural and metaphysical concepts like religion or supranatural forces as solutions for those problems, making people more subservient and rendering *Yeşilçam* movies so detached from the masses. Secondly, because the cinema sector is seen as a suitable area to obtain profits, the imperialist forces and their capitalist compradors like bourgeoisie are mostly concentrated on the entertaining function of the cinema in order to appeal more people to the cinema theaters. By this way, they prevent people from informing social realities through cinema by ignoring its social function in terms of mass mobilization. Although neglecting the social function of the cinema, they realize the propagandist feature of it by using this sector as a tool for imposing the goodness of their ideology with the aim of maintaining the capitalist – imperialist order from which they benefit from. All of those are the reasons behind the intentions of the movement towards reaching the people through the cinema which will be talked about the third chapter talking about the characteristics of the 'revolutionary cinema'.

The resistance against *Yeşilçam* also entails another dimension which is closely related to the rationale and the means of a future revolution discussed by the members of Young Cinema. This revolution should be accomplished against two branches: firstly against imperialism and capitalism in general and secondly the existing cinema industry which is the representative of the system in particular. Since *Yeşilçam* is a superstructural element of the

societal base and this is designed by Capitalist – Imperialist – Feudal version of economy, a new cinema could only be accomplished through the total removal of Capitalism, Imperialism and Feudalism emerged on the base. Therefore, the fight against the current socio- economic and political system should go hand in hand with the struggle against the existing cinema, *Yeşilçam*, making cinema as a tool of attaining revolution. In other words the anti – *Yeşilçamist* stance requires the collection of three ideologies called anti – imperialism, anti – capitalism and anti – feudalism in order to define itself. Those are the outlines of the revolutionary perception of the movement which will be discussed in next chapters as well.

At last, *Young Cinema* gives us sufficient information about how the authors understand the overwhelming cinematic milieu and why they refuse this order. Indeed, the members try to examine their opponent position within the framework of the socialist view. However, the *Young Cinema* doesn't include so much critical analysis on the movies produced by *Yeşilçam* in order to strengthen their arguments and make adequate movies representing their counteractive stance against the dominant order. Moreover, it won't be wrong to claim that all of these explanations seem to have considerable features to bear out that the *Young Cinema* is influenced the political debates and movements of the Turkish leftist wing. Yet, this information is not enough to clarify the degree of this engagement to the political atmosphere of 1960s Turkey and to determine the political position of the Group among various political fractions. Those questions are also postponed to next chapters to discuss.

III. ORGANIZATION

The counteractive stance of Young Cinema Group against the prevailing cinema order, *Yeşilçam* requires a new platform in order to create a new genre of film and discuss the opportunities for generating it. As it is discussed in the previous chapter, the members refuse *Yeşilçam* because this is a superstructural element of the capitalist base and thus its movies are the products of dominant classes like bourgeoisie relating to their economic interests. To these revolutionary directors, this kind of new platform could only be accomplished by constituting an ‘organization’:

This kind of establishment requiring a great deal of economic preconditions leaves Young Cinema directors in the middle of confrontation with which is so difficult to handle: the forces opposed by the directors compose the economic base to which those revolutionists bound unintentionally and inevitably. Since the doors of material opportunities closed for those people are located on their roads, they increase their experimental products very hardly. In this case, the only expedient way for them is organizational solidarity.⁸⁷

What’s more, for them the journal of the Group, *Young Cinema* was only an initial stage for education and unification of the revolutionary directors, which also precipitates the establishment process of this organization.⁸⁸ This thinking is most likely coming from the current leftist discussions stressing the necessity of organization on the road to revolution in terms of unifying revolutionary powers against capitalism and imperialism.

Üstün Barışta is the one of the writers and directors who mostly concentrates on the issue of organization. Since the publication of the first volume, he writes various articles about the Groups’ perception on organization in terms of the reasons of establishing an

⁸⁷ Mate Tanju, “Genç Sinemacı”, *Belgesel Sinema*, 2003, vol. 11, p. 6

⁸⁸ “Genç Sinema’dan”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 1

organization and the aims and structure of it as well. Thus, it is important to place most of his statements about the topic in this chapter. For instance he emphasizes the inevitability of constituting an organizational structure by referring to its political significance in the 1960s political conjuncture:

The ideas and doctrines initially having adopted and developed in intellectual sphere is also appeared in the movement very rapidly within the recent conditions. Actually, they find themselves in the movement. Today, the communities supporting different perceptions are usually promulgating their ideas in many areas and streets. The apparent importance and necessity of organization in this intellectual rivalry stands out today. As a matter of fact, our broad history clearly shows that all personal endeavors, albeit of their powerfulness, were inadequate if they don't constitute any organization. This is the case today. Therefore, there is not any other way other than being organized.'⁸⁹

III.1. The Emphasis on Solidarity:

The main rationale behind establishing organization is the solidarity among the individuals. Since the war must be waged against the imperialist – capitalist system in general and its cinematic collaborators in *Yeşilçam*, this fight can only be successful if the members of the Group unite their powers under a single unit and support and closely bound each other in mainly economic and political matters. The Group basically defines the organization as the solidarity of the members isolated from their individual interests by behaving like a single body against the outside.

The formation of a new cinema necessitates, specifically in the beginning stage of the organization, an extraordinary solidarity. This also springs from the obligation for resisting the system we are in. The new cinema can't occur spontaneously in our country. We should thwart even the natural development. Moreover, the cinematic initiation emerged alone and the young directors who are unaware of each other can't create a cinema serving for revolution, because there is neither any cultural accumulation in serious manner, nor the sufficiency of material conditions in our country.

If the Young Cinema director doesn't engage in a organic union and say 'I only make my movie, the others are out of my concern', he will be exposed to present only in a few places as a result of some coincidences making the product ineffective albeit of having an influencing potential. A real Young Cinema director must engage in a kind

⁸⁹ Üstün Barışta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 4

of solidarity in order to enforce the opportunities of presenting and conveying his movies to the ordinary people.⁹⁰

Apart from the necessity of solidarity, the requirements of establishing this kind of solidarity demanded from people are also another important point in this manner. In the first issue of the journal, it is claimed that the journal itself could enhance the people carrying the similar intentions and perceptions about the cinema and the political system come together. In the next volume, Üstün Barışta suggests that the solidarity started to be constituted by the people who have politic and artistic minimum commonalities. These commonalities are cited as the belief in a new cinema other than *Yeşilçam* in artistic manner; and a new politic and economic order other than capitalism and imperialism. The discussion about the political and revolutionary perspectives of the Group is the issue of the next chapter, yet, in here, it is necessary to talk about what are the Groups' minimum expectations from its members for constituting an organization. As it is seemed in the journal and the conversations with Ahmet Soner and Veysel Atayman, there are not any concrete and detailed prerequisites for the members in order to participate in the organization. For instance, in artistic manner, as I talked about before, the members don't have any consensus about the artistic theory of the movies they want to make. Although the majority of them comes from *Sinematek* and sees lots of movies from various types like French *Nouvelle Vogue*, Latin American Cinema etc., they don't want to adopt one type of cinema completely in their movies; instead they want to generate their own cinema. In political manner, it is true that relating to the date it is established in which *Türkiye İşçi Partisi* (TİP) lose its strength relatively to the *Milli Demokratik Devrim* fraction and becomes obliged to surrender the ruling power of *Dev- Genç* to the people from *Milli Demokratik Devrim* (MDD), (in November 1968), the Group sees itself more closed to the MDD in general. Yet, the minimum prerequisite is not defined according to whether the person supports MDD or not. Instead, supporting the leftist wing and revolution against the current capitalist and imperialist system seems to be adequate to engage in organizational solidarity.

⁹⁰ Üstün Savaşta, "Ekonomik Örgütlenmeye Doğru-2", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 7

III.2. Economic Function of Organization:

As far as it is understood from the articles, the most significant function of the idea on organization is economic. This main function could be examined by consulting two types of explanations with relevance to the author's claims. The first explanation is referring to the 'ultimate aim of the Group for constituting an organization' which is to form a new cinematic structure which has different economic rules and new facilities in terms of making and distributing their movies. It won't be wrong that this idea could be connected to the infrastructure – superstructure outlook of the Group as discussed in the previous chapter. As it is talked about, seeing that *Yeşilçam* is a superstructural element solely representing its base that is capitalism, a new cinematic system requires total removal of current economic system shaping the base of the society. Thus the process of eliminating *Yeşilçam* and constituting a new one is to the process of attaining economic organization itself. To put it another way, economic organization is the upper step to which the Group would gradually reach when the conduct of its economy in producing, presenting and disseminating the movies is shaped by new system ensuing capitalism that is socialism.

This main aim pointing out the final period of the Group embraces the other explanation of the organization idea. This refers to the process of attaining this 'economic organization' ideal which contains the basic question: if the accessing of the economic organization includes the radical detachment from *Yeşilçam* System and total removal of it, how can the members make their own movies independently from overwhelming economic conditions or imperialist-capitalist rules? In terms of this, since the first issue of the journal, it has been claimed that the basic function of this organization should be economic for providing directors financial support in order to record their films independently from the Turkish dominant cinema sector. Young Cinema directors see themselves under very dreadful conditions economically. They claimed that they, as revolutionary and independent moviemakers, are pressurized by the overwhelming cinema sector operated by capitalist ideology and economy. Making a film being not consistent with *Yeşilçam*'s cinematic perspective could only be possible by the fact that directors themselves can afford all expenditures (all materials, artists, actors and workers etc.). In the first volume of the journal, he stresses the inevitability of meeting all expenditures of recording a film in order to create

some movies based on personal creativity and artistic freedom and also detached from *Yeşilçam* mechanism. What's more this impossibility in terms of economic sources is also seemed apparently in the domain of short film, because this is a new type for Turkish Cinema. According to him, the Young Cinema Directors and short film makers are very dreadful conditions economically and the generated movies are made from the director's own funds. In this article he looks the future of this matter in a very pessimist perspective by saying that those kinds of revolutionary directors couldn't obtain any opportunity without their own endeavors in a long time.⁹¹

With respect to this, although he suggests the indispensability of private endeavors for making movies, in the third volume of the journal, Üstün Barışta emphasizes the necessity of refraining from the private/ independent initiatives without any organizational structure:

The personal revolutionary endeavors, even in the artificial sphere, have very limited and short term strength on today and in the future. Although the products of those attempts have really artistic quality, these kinds of initiatives are very weak and can be stated as self-satisfaction against a very broad and powerful cinema mechanism – the international and domestic cinema mechanism- such as the distribution praxis of imperialist – capitalist cinema. Is the awaiting of short or long movies emerged out of private initiatives and attained artistic maturity for ensuing film competitions and a few invitations from the social associations after having presented in a few competitions or cinema theaters a solution with respect to the problems of a new cinema and Young Cinema Directors?

The answer of this kind of question leads us the focusing point of the necessity for or inessentiality of establishing an organization⁹²

In addition to Barışta, Yakup Barokas also covers this matter by defining those kinds of private initiatives as 'hobby' and suggesting that these limited numbers of movies – he is concentrated on 'short movies' - couldn't create a 'cinema' order:

The misunderstanding is coming from this: the production of short movies – whether they are made with revolutionary ideas- will be nothing more than a 'hobby' if the necessary solutions for the problems of cinematic infrastructure in order to form a new cinema are not fulfilled. The directors can make one or two short movies but can't make the third only by a few *kuruş* they collected before. (...) Because, a cinema developed outside the dominant economic rules and isolated from the labor classes – I mention 'class cinema' here – is deprived of the facilities for leading itself a respected cinema and it won't be able to go beyond being a 'hobby'.⁹³

⁹¹ Üstün Barışta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 5

⁹² Üstün Barışta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) vol. 3, p. 2

⁹³ Yakup Barokas, "Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması için Genç Sinema Bir Hareketir", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 21

This situation is also the reason why the directors are not able to record so many films up to now. In the same issue, it is stated that the revolutionary moviemaker who couldn't create any artificial product because of economic difficulties may recede from the cinema or wait for new opportunities to continue his business. The present situation is very clear for Bariřta: The directors who couldn't find any financial opportunities to make movies get rid of trying and drift to other sectors for earning money. Yet, this 'new film' must generate its products very quickly and perpetually in order to complete its 'accumulation and upbringing' process.⁹⁴ This 'accumulation and upbringing' process will be talked about later. Now, it would be better to discuss the solutions of economic problems in the organizational structure in order to increase the number of revolutionary movies and keep the young directors in the cinema domain. In this point, our question should be what kinds of solutions could be generated if the conditions do not permit revolutionary directors to make movies unless they afford all expenditures by themselves and in addition it is not effectual and harmful to produce movies independently from an organizational structure against the dominant cinema system. The first solution is also coming from Üstün Bariřta. As to him, small private initiatives must be united under an organizational structure for providing economic funds to directors and increasing the productivity of movie-making on the road to the final economic organization:

The necessity for the Organization of the Young Cinema could be laid on the foundation of economic structure. This is the basic reason behind the productivity and cinematic fulfillment of the Young Cinema Directors. Securing an order for production, albeit it could be limited in the first times, could be very helpful for standing up of the Group which is crawling now. Collecting all of individual, scattered and small in size economic resources together under an organizational structure will be planting the seeds. This kind of economic organization will attain a regular level being operated by recognized economic rules with the rise of the directors' awareness and the development of new opportunities.⁹⁵

Beside the unification of all economic sources under the umbrella of organization, another solution in order to find necessary funds for the directors is proposed by Osman Ertuğ in the 10th volume of the journal. According to him, the other fund can be provided by some financial aid from revolutionary institutions. Since their aim making more realist and revolutionary movies representing the labor class' socioeconomic problems would be so

⁹⁴ Üstün Bariřta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 5 - 6

⁹⁵ Üstün Bariřta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 2, p. 2

helpful for the ultimate object of those kinds of institutions with respect to spread the revolutionary ideas throughout the workers and laborers.⁹⁶

At last, it is better to add other economic intention of the Group relating to establishing an organization beside producing more movies and finding a regular economic source in order to do that: buying a movie player. Since it is mentioned before, the aim of making movies is to present those to ordinary people composed mostly of workers and laborers, it can be so practical to obtain a mobile machine for using it in various places such as schools, guilds, labor unions, coffee houses and streets. Thus revolutionary directors should organize economically and provide an economic fund to buy it. In the 5th volume of the *Young Cinema*, Yakup Barokas articulates this demand (February, 1969)⁹⁷ and this suggestion can be fulfilled in March, 1970 as mentioned in the 12th volume of the Journal. In this volume, *Young Cinema* announces that it is able to buy a player only at the expense of the cost of two volumes: ‘In this period, by thinking that it is more beneficial to get a 16 mm player than to publish the journal and we skip two volumes with a view to buy it.’⁹⁸

III.3. The Emphasis on Activism

As to the *Young Cinema*, until attaining a full-fledged economic organization, directors should struggle against two interrelated domains: existing cinematic system (*Yeşilçam*) and existing political system to which *Yeşilçam* clings (capitalism and imperialism). In the view of their economic materialist perception of *Yeşilçam* reflecting the capitalist and imperialist base of the society, the struggle against imperialism and capitalism also means the struggle with *Yeşilçam* itself. According to them the means of this struggle could only be ‘activism’.⁹⁹ The activism of directors both in political and cinematic environment, against *Yeşilçam*, is recording their films taken from the real demonstrations by the leftist students, intellectuals and workers. Politically yet, the recording is not enough for serving the revolutionary process of the society; moreover, if they demonstrate those short films as an alternative genre of cinema to people who obtain a revolutionary potential such as

⁹⁶ Osman Ertuğ, “Genç Sinemacı Filmini Nasıl yapıyor?”, *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1969) vol. 11, p. 11

⁹⁷ Yakup Barokas, “Yeni Bir Aşamaya Doğru”, *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) vol. 5, pp. 11 - 12

⁹⁸ “Genç Sinema’dan”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 1

⁹⁹ Üstün Barışta, “Örgütlenmeye Doğru”, *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) vol. 3, p. 2

workers, students and if they promote them to mobilize and engage in revolutionary groups, the Young Cinema Directors will fulfill the responsibility of activism in political manner, against capitalism and imperialism:

The economic organization which should be the eventual target of the organization postponed to later in accordance with advancing step by step. A rush attitude in this manner could complicate the conditions more than before. First of all, at least in this crawling period it is required to determine an accurate line of the movement in both artistic and political manner. The manifesto published in the first volume of the journal unveiled this certain stance. Now, only thing to do is continuing the cinema activism which Turkish Society hasn't experienced before. This will be the first examination and experience of the Young Cinema. The minimum requirements of cinematic instruments like camera and player and the lack of economic funds to afford those will make the existing conditions more difficult. Young Cinema should raise to public opinion by its activism. Making movies, presenting these to the people, criticizing Turkish cinema and raise people's consciousness by their journal and the other publications should be the main issues of their activisms.¹⁰⁰

Departing from the main activities of the Group on the road to economic organization, namely mobilizing people by recording movies, presenting those to people and distributing *Young Cinema* and the other journals, the most adopted ones are the first and the second in comparison to the third one that is increasing consciousness of the people by the means of the journals. The reason of this is that they support the propagandist and educational function of the movies than the texts which couldn't be understood by the most part of the society because of illiteracy. Moreover, It can be claimed that, according to the Group, a full-fledged economic organization operated by different economic rules and practices other than by the capitalist ones could only be accomplished after the radical transformation of the existing economic system that is capitalism dominating the base of the society. Moreover, the unique way of this transformation is a revolution removing capitalist and imperialist impacts and feudal remnants of the society and establishing socialist rules of economy and superstructural institutions. In this manner, the Group connects the process of attaining a complete 'economic organization' and 'socialist revolution' to which they serve by recording and presenting revolutionary movies. This topic will be talked about in the next chapter under the headline of the relationship between revolution and cinema. So it is better to postpone this matter to the forth chapter for analyzing in detail.

¹⁰⁰ Üstün Savaşta, "Ekonomik Örgütlenmeye Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1969) vol. 11, pp. 5 - 6

III.4. The Artistic Function of Organization:

The fact that the most important and adopted means of the Group's revolutionary activism is recording movies and reaching people by them brings about many discussions in artistic sphere inside the group. As it is mentioned before, since according to the Group the fight should be fulfilled both against imperialism – capitalism and *Yeşilçam* together, 'the activism against those' concentrated on revolutionary movies' production and presentation should also be perceived and performed both in artistic and politic sphere. Seeing that the politic one was briefly explained above and will be analyzed in the ensuing chapter, this part will contain some artistic discussions in relation to the 'activism' consideration of the Group by consulting with some captions: 'detaching from amateurism', 'the relationship between theory and practice', 'the inquiry of a new artistic style'.

'Detaching from amateurism' which is closely related to the way of directors' activism against *Yeşilçam* in artificial manner is one of the points that Üstün Barışta highlights in his article '*Ekonomik Örgütlenmeye Doğru*'.¹⁰¹ Since the directors object to record movies as much as possible for serving and precipitating the revolution process of the country, it can't be expected high-qualified and technically perfect films from the directors. Apart from the willingness of the directors to produce more movies for revolution, as I mentioned before, the economic circumstances, mainly the lack of economic funds independently from *Yeşilçam* tend the directors to make artistically and technically simple films. An author writing the article with the pseudonym of 'İbrahim Bergman' in the *Young Cinema*, this situation is a positive thing for reaching people because of its simple language very differently from some directors using abstractions in their movies making the movie more complicated for the people to understand:

In all branches of art, the amateurs are so powerful that they could direct the future of the society because cinema is the most effective type of art in affecting people. Thus, the amateur cinema in Turkey aims at creating the future of society (...)

In those circumstances, we as amateur directors, should use cinema which is the most effective branch of art in social manner relating to the high proportion of people it addresses, its inexpensiveness and easiness for presenting people as good as it gets(...) So our duty is to

¹⁰¹ Ibid. p. 2

make movies concerning the peoples' problems in a language that ordinary people could easily understand and to present those movies to them' ¹⁰²

According to the articles, more commonly, the form of this amateur cinema is decided as 'short movie' which is a new form of cinema emerging in the second half of 1960s and includes a revolutionary potential against the *Yeşilçam* System. In fact, many articles support short movies and some of the directors perform some experiments in this kind of movie. Among those Mutlu Parkan's *66* and Artus Yeres's *Çirkin Ares* is analyzed in the journal in a manner of supporting those kinds of endeavors. For instance, in the critics of *Çirkin Ares* by Üstün Barışta, before he starts his analysis about the movie he suggests that in the initial stage towards the economic organization, amateurism should be granted not only by the Group itself but also the critics outside it. According to him, when it is analyzed the short movie which has emerged very recently with its products, the thing which shouldn't be neglected is that these movies have not completed their artistic evolution and they are the products of the directors being in their growth and trial period. Yet, this situation also shouldn't prevent the authors to criticize those movies and reveal their deficiencies in artistic and technical manner. The other point to regard that those critics should be 'constructive' and ought to motivate the revolutionary directors in order to advance their cinematic language. ¹⁰³

It is obvious to see that the short movie or the amateurism is not a permanent form for the Group, instead it is a temporary type helping the directors with a view to improve their cinematic ability and to attain the ultimate form which would characterize the Group. In his another article, Üstün Barışta stands out the danger of the amateurism in case of being used so long and being internalized by the directors, although he looks the amateurism matter more positively by identifying it as a way of freedom in the cinematic creation period:

Young cinema should protect its amateurism for a while as it is completely outside of the commercial domain. It must do its own experiences by being detached from all conditionings of professionalism, adopting a great sense of freedom isolating from the external structural and formal limitations during a definite time. Amateurism is only a beginning step for the young directors and is only valid in the period before the organization. A Young Cinema Director should espouse a critical stance against this amateur attitude of the Group even in this period. Because he can encounter a trap about this attitude: the establishment of the sense of amateurism. A kind of cinema in which the sense of amateurism is permeated eventually transforms 'the cinema of self-fulfillment'

¹⁰² İbrahim Bergman, "Sanat Olayı ve Halk", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 2, p. 9

¹⁰³ Üstün Barışta, "Sevgili Çirkin Ares", *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) vol. 5, p. 8

As we see in this excerpt, Barışta supports that the amateurism can be acceptable and also necessary in the first steps in advancing the organization, yet he also points out the perils of the case in which this cinematic attitude becomes permeated among the directors. Even though the members generally think that the first thing to do is to make more films until reaching a full-fledged economic organization without so much preoccupation with artistic and economic concerns, they also give equal importance to the artistic dimension of the movies as the quantity of them. For this reason, they see the sense of amateurism a temporary thing until the Group would find and adopt its own type and artform of the movies. Tanju Akerson shares a similar idea with Barışta by criticizing Onat Kutlar's perception on the short movie issue:

In his article of '*Ulusal Türk Sineması için Alan Araştırmaları*', Onat Kutlar talks about the presence of a sphere for the rise of the national cinema and suggests that the remedy is the 'short film' itself. Undoubtedly, in the beginning and also because of some financial problems, short movies would be made. However, this observation which is absolutely true at first glance renders the short movie the purpose itself it should be reached. However the main problem is the cinema in general instead of short movie in particular. If it is tended to make this kind of differentiation in cinema, a kind of division of labor that we don't want to be in like 'they (*Yeşilçam*) can make feature-length films, and we can make short one''¹⁰⁴

As to those ideas, the fact that they give equal importance to the artistic dimension of the movies as its content and quantity, and the amateur cinema or short movie is a temporary stage for the organization process of the Group leads us the other issue that is 'the relationship between theory and practice'. According to the members the artform or theory is emanated from practice meaning that the artform will shape gradually related to the movies recorded by directors in the organizational process. There are so many articles supporting this idea. Üstün Barışta giving a specific emphasis on this matter by stating 'the dynamic of aesthetic':

The aesthetic level is constantly in transformation and improvement, and needs this. If this improvement and transformation case is not taken into consideration by the artist, some aesthetic fixations could emerge. The history of art demonstrates a lot of instances about the strata of those fixations in aesthetic level). The most important reason of this fixation is the deprivation of experimental studies in the cinematic sphere.¹⁰⁵

This practice-based consideration of the art formation is also derived from the Group's refusal stance against *Yeşilçam*. Totally repudiating the *Yeşilçam* system and its products, the

¹⁰⁴ Yakup Barokas, "Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması İçin Genç Sinema Bir Hareketidir", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 20

¹⁰⁵ Üstün Barışta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 5

members of the Group claim that they have not a cinematic history deserving to be considered. In other words they totally ignore the cinematic works made until now, and start to make cinema from scratch. Therefore, according to them the former cinematic developments don't have anything in cinema to transfer for the process of Young Cinema's aesthetic formation:

We are entitled to all former bedraggled and fusty values and instead of this to bring our own values in the process of revolution. Is it possible to attain this target only by criticizing or reveal the 'bad'? Our future claims would be deprived of a fulcrum if we don't put our own products against it.¹⁰⁶

The problems are many. The Young Cinema director will solve those by their activisms. He covers the theory and practice as indivisible parts, he refuses bigoted opinions, he is influenced from his environment but at the same time he tries to influence it and he dispenses with all nonsense, thus benefiting from the broad legacy of all human culture freely instead of the leavings from conventional art in his country. He doesn't have anything to lose. Yes he is not easy-going. Yet his face is towards the future. He prepares tomorrow by his steadfast conviction and 'activism' and his movies.¹⁰⁷

If we put forth the situation for consideration by this way, the aforementioned cinema detaches from consumption cinema abruptly and becomes a brand new event. A cinema from scratch. Time shows how it will be and in what degree it will come true.¹⁰⁸

Lastly, the radical stance against the cinematic past is not only seen in Young Cinema Group. The Group is also affected by the contemporary developments in Latin America or 'the Third World Cinema' especially in this manner. This is clearly discerned in one of the articles Engin Ayça writes. He also supports the radical detachment from the *Yeşilçam* system and history by referring a writing of G. Rocha, a Brazilian Director about the cinema of his country. As to the quotation from this director, 'the new cinema starts its each movie from the scratch. During they do that, they venture out a very dangerous experience... they create the cinema with new tensions, interpretations, rhythms and a different poem, at the same time they learn, approach theory and practice each other in parallel and they reformulate theory after the each practice.'¹⁰⁹

The fact that the members of Young Cinema don't admit the cinematic legacy of their precedents orients them to create their own cinematic history by making their own movies and forming a new genre, peculiar to the Group itself. This leads us another issue called 'cultural

¹⁰⁶ Algin Saydar "Devrim için Sinemanın Gereği", *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) vol. 3, p. 14

¹⁰⁷ Jak Şalom, "Bir", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 8

¹⁰⁸ Engin Ayça, "Sinema ile Uğraşmak 3", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol. 6, p. 23

¹⁰⁹ Engin Ayça, "Sinemayı Yeniden İcadetmek 1", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) vol. 1, p. 14

accumulation or forming the cinematic base' which is closely related to the importance of 'the Group's activism' in making movies as much as possible. Besides serving for revolutionary process of society in political and artistic manner and attaining a new cinematic language and form, the *Young Cinema* supports the priority of practice over the theory in the initial times of organization because those practices relating to recording movies provide the cultural accumulation of Turkish Cinema which also strengthens the cinematic infrastructure of the country. Here, the societal base characterized by capitalism and imperialism shouldn't be confused with the cinematic base of a country which should be comprised of a considerable amount of artistically valued movies, the significant theoretical experiments or cinematic groups etc. *Young Cinema* claims that Turkish Cinema is deprived of this kind of substantial base because the dominance of *Yeşilçam* prevents this. Thus they see themselves entitled to create the cinematic base of the society by their cinematic practices. Üstün Barışta also stresses this point:

(...) In a while, let's think that the revolutionary movie makers obtain an adequate and permanent financial fund from a definite source in order to make their movies, the political power looks everything in a tolerant manner. Is the problem solved? Never. There is one more problem, not independent from the economic and political ones, whose solution is handled in a longer time: the cultural accumulation problem with its every dimension This is basically and directly an evolutionary problem considering the cinematic base, or a self-help problem). It's as follows:

For instance, today, it could be talked about a tradition of Turkish Poetry to which the revolutionary poetry could lean but let's talk about this kind of Turkish cinema tradition seriously...: The history of corruption in this branch of art which hasn't ever been established its language yet for 50 years! Yet, the (economic - capitalist) base heads towards like that, we can't expect any other thing in a branch of art closely connected to this base(...) Then, what the thing to do in this matter? By beginning one step beyond the scratch, (because it can't be ignored some sources, accumulations, data from which we can benefit and whose connection with the cinema is distant and indirect, although the analysis about them has not been done or if so not adequate) we can establish a cinematic language. Furthermore, to find the aesthetic values of lively features and psychology rooted in the sentiments, mentality and attitudes of Anatolian people and to develop authentic examples of revolutionary cinema by using those values.¹¹⁰

In this passage, Barışta contributes the argument that the cinema today has not a considerable history and a legacy inheriting from its precedents by emphasizing the traditional values of Anatolian culture and its potential contributions to the Turkish cinema. In this manner, the *Young Cinema* differentiates itself from the *Sinematek* milieu orienting

¹¹⁰ Üstün Barışta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru - 2", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, pp. 11 - 12

themselves only to the western culture and approaching The National Cinema supporting that Turkish Cinema should be concentrated on its own authentic and historical values. The discussions about how to use traditional values to the cinematic sphere is the matter of the next chapter considering the nature of the future 'revolutionary cinema'. Thus it is better to pass another issue about the last artistic function of the organization idea: 'a new cinematic inquiry'

The new cinematic structure inquiry is a whole for the Young Cinema Group. This phenomenon extends from the perspective of the camera, from the selection of the camera lenses to the artist management; from a specific artist and playing method to the acquisition of a new lightening and a new photo pattern; and to the relationship between the line of dramatic structure and that of receiver's motion. The young directors gradually give more importance to those inquiries in their products and engage into the structure inquiries more consciously during the period before the economic organization.¹¹¹

This issue also bolsters the idea of the artform gradually developing from the practice of the Group in terms of making movies until attaining the full-fledged economic organization. Although the Group seems to support those kinds of researches about the artistic matter of the movies, in the process that the Group lives, we can't come across so many inquiries in the ensuing volumes of the journal. Some reasons could be given to the absence of adequate discussions about the new, possible structure of the movies such as the short period of time in which the Group could live, the lack of material or economic sources so on and so forth. Another question could be asked in this point: in spite of their ideas and hopes about recording more movies in order to reach a high artistic and economic level in cinematic area, what could be the reasons of their failure of productivity? To put it another way, why can't these revolutionary directors put forward so much movies as they claim in the first volumes of the *Young Cinema*?

The deficiency in making more movies is also criticized by Turkish cinematic milieu especially after the third Hisar Movie Competition in which the disputations reach its peak. According to the main groups such as *Sinematek* and Boğaziçi Film Institution, although criticizing the short movie initiatives and competitions made by them, the Young Cinema Group hasn't produced so many movies since it claimed the hopes and intentions about it in the first volumes of the Journal. Indeed, as we look at the other volumes of the *Young Cinema*

¹¹¹ Üstün Barışta, "Örgütlenmeye Doğru 2", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) vol. 2, p. 4

and the number of movies it records, there are not efficient numbers of productions fulfilling its aims towards economic organization. The Group proposes some considerable reasons to accomplish it. According to Ahmet Soner, the directors haven't got so adequate economic funds and facilities for making movies as much as they want. For instance, they have to take the technical materials from the *Sinematek* (when they have a closed and intertwined relationship with the institution).¹¹²

Üstün Barışta also suggests this economic matter as a pretext of this unproductiveness upon the critics coming out of the Group. For him, the cinema must be done with a considerable amount of capital unlike the other branches of art. Thus, waiting constant and positive movies from the Young Cinema could be enhanced by establishing economic and artistic solidarity with it. It is necessary because there is not any capital for investing the revolutionary cinema except the revolutionary institutions and individuals. However, they don't lose their hope in developing their economic and technical facilities to handle it. Osman Ertuğ is the other author to give the economic problems about this matter:

Especially after the events in the third Hisar Short Film Competition, it is said and written some statements like 'make movies rather than speaking' by some cinematic environment. Yes, some of us couldn't reach the opportunity for recording movies. Yet, it is not about the proposed reasons, only the lack of money. Meanwhile, the directors who can't record held the ones who is able to make. Some of us also recorded and developed but they couldn't find the money for press. Nevertheless, some others finished their films. The other reason the movie making process is halted is that The Young Cinema Directors were concentrated on documenting the political events because the successive events had emerged in that period.¹¹³

However this reason of deficiency in making movies is not completely accepted by all directors in the Group. In my oral history study with Veysel Atayman, he is not agreeing with the economic explanations of the unproductiveness. According to him, the Group especially Istanbul part of it, sees so much films as examples of the most significant cinematic Groups like *French Nouvelle Vogue* and Latin America's Third World Cinema etc. and after the presentations, they debate the movie for hours. Those activities of Young Cinema milieu render the cinema the reality itself meaning that the cinema becomes a majority part of their life. The scenes from the actual events are very realistic; they are fascinated by the cinematic world. Yet, although those movies derive from real life and represent the reality itself, the stories are based on individuals, are deeply analyzing their psychology and their perceptions

¹¹² Interview with Ahmet Soner having made in June 24, 2010

¹¹³ Osman Ertuğ, "Genç Sinemacı Filmini Nasıl Yapıyor?", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) vol. 10, p. 8

towards the outside world. According to him, the problem starts with the idea of ‘social and political function of the movies’ raised and became dominant among the revolutionary directors simply because the directors of the Group can’t find the proper elements reflecting sociopolitical realities and serving revolutionary function of the movies. In other words they can’t unite the cinematic reality which they perceived from the movies issuing individuals and the sociopolitical dimensions of a possible revolutionary cinema. This statement is not competent with the evolutionary idea of the artistic maturity is gradually emanated from the practice.¹¹⁴ This shows us that not all of members embrace the priority of practice and activism rather than the cinematic discussions revolving around the artform of the movies. Atayman claims that the Istanbul part of the Group like Tanju Akerson, Mustafa Irgat, Mehmet Gönenç and Hüseyin Tüzün is more engaged with theoretical debates about new structure of the upcoming cinema than the Ankara part.¹¹⁵ Despite the presence of a subgroup in the Group gives more importance to the artistic dimension of the cinema, it is obvious to contemplate that the general tendency of the *Young Cinema* is to create a peculiar artform of the movies recorded by the members of the Group through making movies as much as possible in the process of reaching the economic organization.

The other thing which can be regarded as one of the reasons of unproductiveness is the censorship mechanism performed against the movies of Young Cinema. The Group gives a very broad place to this matter and it tries to examine this system relating to the socialist perspective as they do in analyzing *Yeşilçam*. According to them, the censorship mechanism is also the super structural institution of the capitalist base and depended on a decree leaning on *Polis Vazife ve Salahiyet Kanunu*. (The Law on Duties and Competence of the Police) The members of the censorship council established according to this decree are the representatives of dominant ruling classes such as National Educational Ministry, Tourism Ministry, Turkish General Staff, and Ministry of Internal Affairs who doesn’t engage in cinematic sphere and don’t know anything about this branch of art. Moreover this decree is not in accordance with the Constitution supporting the fundamental rights and freedom and the articles of it are very ambiguous and available for arbitrary decisions.¹¹⁶ This unlimited competence of censorship council influenced by political powers provides dominant classes to banish the movies having a warning feature against the interests of themselves easily, impeding the revolutionary directors to make a considerable number of movies.

¹¹⁴ Interview with Veysel Atayman having made in June 14, 2010

¹¹⁵ *ibid.*

¹¹⁶ Faruk Atasoy, “Sinema ve Sansür”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol. 6, p. 9 - 10

There are some cases which could be regarded as the examples of those limitations of censorship mechanism on the recording and presenting process of the revolutionary movies. In the 6th volume of the *Young Cinema*, Ahmet Soner talks about his movie called *Asayiş Berkemal* (The Public Order is Perfect) (it was presented in the Second Hisar Competition). According to this story, after the competition he sends the copy of the movie to the council as it hasn't been recorded yet and then it was refused by the council because the copy is not a good quality and can deteriorate the ability of people's eyes (according to article 8). Then he sends another good copy to the council, but this time it was rejected due to its propagandist character which can lead damage to the national regime.¹¹⁷

Osman Ertuğ also points out the censorship matter by stating 'recording permission' as a very restrictive function on the Group in making movies. According to him, the recording permission can be obtained by *Merkez Film Kontrol Komisyonu* (The Central Movie Control Commission) in three ways: firstly, the director sends the scenario before the recording and if he gets the approval from the council, he can record, secondly he can get 'the certificate of recording actuality movies' after a long process from the council and thirdly he can be allowed to record on some restricted conditions stipulated by the council. According to these restrictions, the directors shouldn't impose the class consciousness to laborer class, criticize the imperialism of America which is the allied country of Turkey and its collaborators, show the students' – peasants' groups, boycotts, meetings, strikes and land occupations so on and so forth.¹¹⁸

III.5. Conclusion:

This chapter tries to interpret what the Young Cinema Milieu conceives the organization issue with relevance to their revolutionary and radical stance against the current social and political order and the dominant cinema mechanism prevailing in the country from where it develops. Their ultimate aim to reach a full-fledged economic organization providing the members to create their artificial products independently from economic and ideological restrictions of the existing system is going hand in hand with their Socialist perception of the

¹¹⁷ Ahmet Soner, "Sansürün Yılan Hikayesi", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) vol. 6, p. 11 - 12

¹¹⁸ Osman Ertuğ, "Dikkat Sansür Var (!)", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) vol. 12, p. 12 - 13

current societal and cinematic structure as it is discussed in the previous chapter. According to the Group, this ultimate aim of economic organization can only be accomplished with the complete removal of capitalism and imperialism which is the base of *Yeşilçam* dominating all facilities in terms of presentation, distribution and production of the cinematic works, meaning that the process of the socialist revolution is akin to that of attaining economic organization. Thus the Group has two-sided functions: a revolution both in political sphere and in artistic sphere.

Influencing from the revolutionary groups and fractions prevailing in the second half of the 1960s Turkey, the *Young Cinema* sees the 'activism' for accomplishing the two-headed revolutionary intention. The Group and the Journal determine what the most significant means of activism in cinematic sphere and in political one: movies. In political revolutionary process, the Group serves its revolutionary function to record movies as much as possible and reaches the labor and worker class with those movies in order to spread the revolutionary ideas and mobilize them with the help of these products. In artistic domain, the revolution comes with the movies as well. Besides their political aims, the members give equal importance to the artistic development of the Group, whereas they don't have any common thinking about what the technical and artistic features of their cinema should be. This is explained the majority of the Group by the priority of practice (making movies) over the theory of art, meaning that the peculiar artistic structure of the Group can only be composed gradually by producing the movies as much as they can. This special emphasis on activism and practice along with the lack of economic sources also pave the way for overestimating amateurism in terms of the artistic quality of the movies they make. All in all, thereby making more movies and reaching a peculiar artform of the Group (by the development of the inquiry for cinematic structure), the *Young Cinema* becomes more effective in the cinematic milieu compared to *Yeşilçam* until this dominant cinema mechanism is demolished along with the political and economic system on which it depends.

Since the Group wages war against the *Yeşilçam* System and the capitalist system it leans on, it is not possible to get economic support from capitalist funds and dominant institutions. This make the members of the Group become organized for collecting their economic sources under the umbrella of a single unit in order to be detached from capitalist economic dominance over the process of movie-making. This idea also provide the pretext of their inability to reach the amount of the movies which they intent to make. Various reasons cited in the *Young Cinema* and conversations, show that the members think that the

unproductiveness is a very significant problem on the road to attaining a full-fledged organization, thus caring about the practice and activism in terms of making movies and discussing the reasons of this ineffectiveness. Despite it seems that the inferior economic conditions are the dominant one among the reasons, the other ones that are the censorship mechanism and the inability of uniting socioeconomic elements and individualism under the structure of the revolutionary movies. Apart from the reasons, they are also aware of the difficult economic circumstances in which they live for attaining and establishing a new cinematic order having a different mechanism of distribution, presentation and production and operating with distinctive rules of economy other than capitalism. Because of this awareness, they claim that a long process is necessary for establishing a stable organization and they couldn't have anticipated that the Group was not able to live more than three years which is so short for this kind of organization they intend to reach.

IV. REVOLUTION AND CINEMA

IV.1. The Relationship between Cinema and Revolution

This last chapter covers the main debates of *Young Cinema* developed from the relationship between cinema and revolution. This issue is stated in almost every volume of the journal by the members of the group. This chapter includes main discussions mainly how they define the role and place of the cinema in the process of revolution, which functions the cinema may perform in revolutionary groups and demonstrations, how a revolutionary cinema should be, what the responsibilities of a revolutionary artist are. Moreover, at the last part of the chapter, by departing from the argument that this Group defines itself revolutionary not only in artistic but also in political sense, it will be analyzed which part of the prevalent leftist theory of revolution it supports and finds more suitable for establishing a kind of revolutionary cinema which the *Young Cinema* wants to attain.

The endeavors of revolutionary Young Cinema Directors are not one-sided. While he is waging war along with the Turkish Laborers for the revolution, he also endeavors to *Yeşilçam* which is a component of the current order. The Young Cinema Director is entitled to endeavor with this system which is against the revolution and the art. Thus, the established order would transform when the revolutionary endeavor is resulted in triumph, just as dashes against *Yeşilçam* also would empower the revolutionary endeavors. Because, *Yeşilçam* system is nothing more than a part of established social, economic and political orders.¹¹⁹

Before starting to analyze those issues, departing from this claim articulated by Faruk Atasoy, it will be better to remind what it is mentioned in previous chapters that the *Young Cinema*'s perception of revolution has two branches which are also very interrelated and interdependent, these are: at first, to revolutionize the capitalist and imperialist system and its

¹¹⁹ Faruk Atasoy, "Silah Başına", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 3, p. 7

representatives in the country by establishing socialist one instead along with the second one that is to eliminate the current cinematic system being one of the superstructural elements of the capitalist base of the society. The only way to remove this system and establish a new cinema genre and mechanism in lieu of it is to transform the capitalist – economic base of the society leading that the processes of those two branches of revolution are the same. This perception is also the main rationale behind how the *Young Cinema* conceives the relationship between the revolution and cinema. It will be useful to start with Jak Şalom’s statement in this point:

The creation of a new cinema is inextricably dependent on the complete transformation of the societal structure of the country. Therefore, the cinema which the revolutionary director will be made is a political cinema. His mission is to support the political war towards the revolution with its movies. He will accept this mission strictly and irreversibly. His movies will be ‘the activity for independency’ at first and a ‘movie’ then. The Young Cinema director will perceive the art as a revolution.¹²⁰

This excerpt from Jak Şalom also draws a basic outline of what it will be discussed: the political nature of cinema, the priority of revolution in political sense over the cinematic one and the serving function of the cinema for the revolutionary process. At first, it will be better to begin with the closed correlation between politics and cinema backed up by the Group. Şalom suggests that the new cinema could only be established along with the elimination of the existing structure of the society shaped by capitalism and imperialism making the cinema a very political branch of art. Mehmet Gönenç also supports this idea by connection it with the ‘underdevelopment’ of a society. According to him, in case that it is analyzed thoroughly, the fight against the existing system is political in the underdeveloped countries like Turkey. In the article, in spite of the fact that he doesn’t elaborate the connection between cinema and underdevelopment, we can easily understand what he means that because of the country’s underdevelopment paving the way for the capitalist - imperialist powers dominance over the cinematic domain, the dependency of the existing cinematic system (or the collaborator cinema) on those powers can only be removed by totally transforming the societal base. In this revolutionary process, cinema wins a political dimension.¹²¹

Another claim is related to the refusal of the idea that the artistic cinema and political cinema are separated branches of cinema. According to Tanju Akerson, the claim that art

¹²⁰ Jak Şalom, “Bir”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 8

¹²¹ Mehmet Gönenç “Özgür Bir Sinema”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 15

must be isolated from politics and they are distinct domains is only a fallacy alleged by the dominant bourgeoisie class serving for imperialist and capitalist powers who want to alienate people from the social and political realities by their ambiguous films embellished with some irrelevant artforms so as to keep the existing system going and maintain their overwhelming position in the capitalist order.¹²² Engin Ayça also advocates this claim by stating that:

Today, all cultures, all literatures and all branches of art are the possessions of one defined class and pursue a defined political stance. ‘making art for art’ or a dominant art out of political art is not presence in reality. The literature and art of the laborer class are one of the parts of all their revolutionary activities. As Lenin says that: ‘is a small screw of a small wheel’¹²³

The Group’s tendency of perceiving the cinematic domain as a political branch of art leads looking it as a political instrument especially in the process of revolution. In other words, for them the cinema is one of types of activisms against capitalism and imperialism like meetings, demonstrations, edicts, announcements so on and so forth:

This is the calling for all revolutionary directors. Turkey is in the Second War of National Independency today. The war of Turkish people is related to the opposition against a ‘secret invasion’ which hasn’t become concrete in the country and collaborator bourgeoisie. So naturally, the weapons of this endeavor will be various. Cinema is also one of those weapons using for the revolution.¹²⁴

According to Engin Ayça, this cinema, as a weapon of attaining revolution, is the ‘activist cinema’. For him, since a country can only be transformed by the ‘activism’, all the artistic endeavors performed in the country must be activist. More specifically, the *Young Cinema*’s focusing point, cinema should take part in the political activity by the members of the Group. For instance, performing an activism through their recorded movies comprised of some ‘slogans’ in order to mobilize people is very important in the revolutionary process. In this point, he paves the way for a new topic for discussion: ‘the cinema serving for revolution’ which is able to analyze the problems of society and show them apparently, to demonstrate the clashing groups or classes, and to try on eliminating those forces. This type of cinema should only fight for a society in which the humans could live independently, elusively and without being exploited by the dominant powers.¹²⁵

¹²² Tanju Akerson, “Sinemada Barış İçinde Beraber Yaşamaya Hayır”, *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 2, p. 6

¹²³ Engin Ayça, “Sinema ile Uğraşmak”, *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 3, p. 8

¹²⁴ Faruk Atasoy, “Silah Başına”, *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 3, p. 7

¹²⁵ Engin Ayça, “Sinemayı Yeniden İcat Etmek”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 13 - 14

The most of the articles about the relationship between revolution and cinema emphasize this function of the cinema in the highly politicized atmosphere of the country. If cinema is one of the tools for reaching the revolution, the initial feature of it is serving this significant target. Thus, the directors making those kinds of movies should be aware of the feature and place of their movies in the revolutionary activities. So, relating to this function of the cinema, the authors reveal what the Young Cinema directors should do in order to make the cinema as a serving unit for revolution. Algin Saydar's and Jak Şalom's expression can be a suitable starting point in this manner:

Our intention is not to prevent the world from changing us, instead to change the world. We are not 'alone', yet majority. The reality is the obligation of analyzing our movies relating to the fact that it will contribute the revolutionary process while being exposed to the revolution itself. Our movies are the weapon directed to the heart of the corrupted bourgeoisie's suggestion that 'That's the film'. And our movies are the weapon directed towards the so known tricks of decadent capitalism. Every action tending to shot the capitalist and snatcher order is necessary for the revolution.¹²⁶

The Young Cinema Director will answer the questions addressed to him and will say that 'Yes, the cinema is a weapon.' He will provide all materials for recording a movie by using all of facilities he has, he will be ready every time for making the activity 'immortal' and after fulfilling those he will present this movie all possible areas where is out of accustomed order and the streets as well. He will say: 'the all I know is the movies. I am fighting for an independent and free cinema. For now, this cinema will be 'activist cinema' if it is looked at in a concrete perspective simply because it must serve the revolution.¹²⁷

This statement also shows us some tips about the main cinematic activism of the Group in the general political activity for revolution. The movies of the directors who are also the members of socialist groups record the strikes, movements, demonstrations, clashes etc. in which they also take part actively with the aim of witnessing every kind of political event in that period. Moreover, they try to present those movies in the areas as much as possible in order to spread the ideas and feelings of the revolution. This two-footed feature of the activity which is peculiar to Young Cinema Group characterizes the cinematic activity for serving the revolution. Very similarly, Jak Şalom says that the Young Cinema directors record movies about the strikers , revolutionary students but those movies are not only qualified as their documentary feature but also contributory function to infusing revolutionary consciousness to people, making the Group the propulsive power of revolution.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ Algin Saydar, "Devrim İçin Sinemanın Gereği", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol. 6, p. 14

¹²⁷ Jak Şalom, "Bir", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 9

¹²⁸ *ibid.*

This second foot of the function (presenting to people) also leads us to the idea of the Group related to reaching people as much as possible by the movies which will be talked about later. In this part, it is useful to give place to the discussions of the authors about the Group's function of witnessing every events relating to the revolutionary stage. For instance Üstün Barışta defines the eyes witnessing the revolutionary events as the most objective eye looking at history:

Today, the members of the Young Cinema positioning them both in intellectual and actual sphere can only generate and lay the powerful foundations of a new cinema in the revolutionary activities. The documentary movies which the members made or will make will play the most significant role in establishing this kind of foundation. All strikes, meetings, anti-revolutionary plans, attacks should be determined by the eye of the camera regardless of its dangers. The eye of Young Cinema director should be that of camera which the most objective eye in history is.¹²⁹

Very relatively, Altan Yalçın gives those activists in cinematic milieu a name: 'guerillas of the war'. According to him, the activity the directors of the Young Cinema strive to accomplish is the war which will give its products in the luminous days of the future and those directors are the guerillas of this war. He continues that: "They will walk with their cameras in their hands and film cassettes that they could hardly buy. When the conservatives are planning an action in Taksim, the members of the Young Cinema Group are there with their guns/cameras. When workers at a factory are at a strike for their rights, the members of the Group are there. When the mine workers are shot in a mine, the Young Cinema director is there. When the villagers seize the land that they deserve, the members of the Young Cinema will be observant there."¹³⁰

Along with supporting the witnessing function of the Young Cinema directors, Gaye Petek also stresses that the director shouldn't only record the revolutionary events outside the political activities as an observer, but also he should be in the event itself very actively making him very political and engaged in the process of revolution. She states that:

The Young Cinema directors will resist the imperialism with his 'witness receiver'. He will show the people that they shouldn't be exploited and he will prepare them against imperialism. With his receiver, the director will detect the rallies, the activities of his friends and the laborer class, and those people's crush under the fist of imperialism; and he will present those recordings to strikers, warriors and event to people escaping from the activity in cities, work places etc. From now on, if there are

¹²⁹ Üstün Barışta, "Genç Sinema'nın Tarihsel Sorumluluğu", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol. 6, p. 15

¹³⁰ Altan Yalçın, "Sinemaların Gerillaları", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol. 6, p. 19

two members of Young Cinema in an activity, one will use the receiver to record the events while other one is in the activity before the receiver.’¹³¹

Besides the witnessing the revolutionary activities through recording lively events and presenting those recordings to the people in order to spread the revolutionary feelings and ideas, Yakup Barokas covers the functions of the Group in a broader sphere. He emphasizes that the short films, or documentaries recorded by the members can’t be the intention directly, instead it can be the instrument for achieving socialist revolution. He also adds some other activities of the Group like accumulation of documents, distributing edicts in proper times, publishing journal, organizing movie festivals, establishing own laboratory and short –movie archive, making explanatory speeches in demonstrations, presenting *Yeşilçam* and imperialist movies besides the revolutionary ones and criticizing those while presenting them.¹³² Among those, some of them especially publishing *Young Cinema*, organizing festivals (only one in 1970) and distributing the edicts are fulfilled successfully by the Group itself. More importantly, the main function of recording the important events is performed and some of them is presented in the *Devrimci Film Şenliği* like *Kanlı Pazar* (The Bloody Sunday), *Gerze Tütün Mitingi* (The Tobacco demonstration in Gerze), *29 Nisan* (The 29th of April), and *10 Haziran* (The 10th of June). Those movies are not only presented in the festival and also in some revolutionary institutions like in *Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu* (The Confederation of Revolutionary Labour Unions) (DİSK) or in *Devrim İçin Hareket Tiyatrosu* (The Theatre of Movement for Revolution) so on and so forth.¹³³

Serving for the socialist revolution by mainly recording the lively screens from the political and reactionary activities in which they also take part actively and presenting those to the ordinary people so as to extend the revolutionary atmosphere to the other parts of the country is the most significant ‘historical responsibility’ for the members in the Young Cinema Group. Üstün Barışta talks about this kind of responsibility very apparently:

The dynamic of revolution develops very quickly. The seventh art should also have a very intense place in this dynamic. In the revolutionist activity, the cameras of the Young Cinema Group members should carry this historical development with its all details to the future. This is the historical responsibility of the real cinema in our country.¹³⁴

¹³¹ Gaye Petek, “Sinemacı (Görevi Karşısında ve Onun İçinde)”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1969) Vol. 9, p. 11

¹³² Yakup Barokas, “Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması İçin Genç Sinema Bir Harektir”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol. 12, p. 24

¹³³ “Genç Sinema’dan”, *Genç Sinema*, (May, 1969) Vol. 7, p. 2

¹³⁴ Üstün Barışta, “Genç Sinema’nın Tarihsel Sorumluluğu”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol. 6, p. 15

This idea or emphasis of responsibility is a natural outcome of Marxist Determinism claiming that the societies' historic progress is determined and dependent on concrete and certain laws. In this theory, the process of capitalism is ensued by the socialism which will be established after the elimination of capitalist order (by a socialist revolution). Moreover, performing political activities serving for precipitating the process of this transformation contains a historic significance and responsibility which the members of Young Cinema are entitled to fulfill. Mutlu Parkan connects this idea by stressing the political strength of cinema on affecting and mobilizing people in accordance with the revolutionary ideology and sentiments which the revolutionists intend to spread throughout the country:

Because of its popularity and its strength of influencing people and also its facilities it contains, the cinema is actually contemporary branch of art. The supporters of Young Cinema should put a full-stop to here! Because at this point, the film makers become distinct from the other artists. The pan of responsibility of balance overrides more in the art of cinema: 'revolutionary responsibility'.

(...) the film maker, especially Young Film Maker must give the actual meaning to the cinema which has been used for desensitizing people and as a means of propaganda and imposition by imperialist powers for years. In the same time, this will also mean burdening the historical responsibility for Young Film Maker. We are burdening the responsibility which the former film makers haven't made up till now.¹³⁵

'Exile – one day hopelessness is replaced by a exiled resistance-. That day, every "record" is an incarnate responsibility; maybe an incarnation that makes the responsibility bigger.¹³⁶

Complying with Mustafa Irgat the recordings from the real events, demonstrations, meetings etc make the historical responsibilities of all activists like students, laborers etc. become visible, letting the directors to show people isolated from this revolutionary enthusiasm how the revolutionaries fulfill their responsibility and persuade them to share this with others, thus bringing about the growth in this spirit of responsibility. Mehmet Göneç also supports this idea by pointing out the cinema's function of mobilizing people through accessing them by their movies. According to him the anti-thesis including the class distinctions, created by the dominant and ruler class itself should be developed on the way to the historical progress in both aesthetic and politic way which is the main duty of the Young

¹³⁵ Mutlu Parkan, "Genç ve Sorumluluğu", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1 p. 7

¹³⁶ Mustafa Irgat, "Sinemaya Doğru", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 2, p. 5

Cinema Group. The means of this is to make movies revealing this anti-thesis very clearly and present them to the people.¹³⁷

This political activism is not only beneficial for the development of revolutionary progress but also of Young Cinema Group. As I talked about in the previous chapter, the artistic and theoretical studies would be gradually improved by making movies as much as possible as an ingredient part of revolutionary activities. As we turn back to two sided intentions of the Group which is to formation of a new cinema and a new type of society having socialist values, making more movies could serve for revolution in both domains; one is a new social, economic and political formation and a new cinematic order which is the superstructure of the socialist base. Artun Yeres's argument will be so explanatory in this point:

The Young Cinema is also generated in this activity. It detects social events regardless of its material and moral deficiency. The members complete their movies by contributing his revolutionary interpretations to those visual recordings / documents. In case of succeeding this, the Young Cinema will have fulfilled his historical duty.'

In this point, we are encountering a significant question: if those cinematic works relating to recording movies have two-sided intentions, which side has priority? The revolution in political sense? Or in artistic sense? To put it in another way, to transform the societal structure from capitalism to socialism? Or to establish a new cinema? As we can remember from the second chapter (*Anti-Yeşilçam* Stance of the Group), since the cinema is the reflection of its societal base shaped by the dominant economic system, a new cinema reflecting new values and new means of production and distribution can't be generated unless the base is transformed through a revolution according to those new values and means. Thus, since the creation of new cinema become dependent on the success of revolution, the aim of attaining revolution providing the removal of old system and establishing new one gains its priority over that of creating a new cinema. This idea is adopted by the Group in general. For instance, Gaye Petek uncovers this radical stance in the first volume of the *Young Cinema* and continues with the fifth volume:

Although we used the words of 'revolution' and 'cinema' side by side, the priority is at revolution. The revolution roots in the basis of our ideas. As for cinema, it is revolving around the revolution. The trajectory is revolution.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ Mehmet Gönenç, "Sinemayı Halka Götürmek", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 2, p. 15

¹³⁸ Gaye Petek, "Devrim ve Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 6

‘Political Cinema which is our intention is only one element of our war. Although this cinema doesn’t create the activity itself alone, it can take place in one activity in general. As a matter of fact, revolutionary cinema doesn’t mean revolution alone and won’t be.’¹³⁹

Very relatively, this idea also means that the cinema is not the revolution itself completely; instead, it is a competent part of the whole revolutionary process. The reason is that cinema instrument is not able to accomplish the process of whole transformation; instead, it can evoke the relative ideas and sensitivity towards the revolution by presenting the movies they made to the people. Moreover, the art, in general and the cinema in particular can be a guide to establish a new society after attaining revolution. Engin Ayça analyses this explanation considering the cinemas’ inadequacy to change the system completely through revolution in his article:

If a man who has decided to make movies opposes to the system in which he lives, he will struggle for transforming this system with the limitations of the laws. Is this possible? Will he be able to succeed this? He cans struggle, yet he can’t transform the system completely. Because, this transformation can occur if some other powers engage in the process dominantly. For now, the cinema could help those powers to be aware of that they are real powers to change the society. Therefore, this man will exhibit the strategy of his cinema within this perspective and make his movies by taking it into consideration.¹⁴⁰

In fact, the political activisms of the second half of the 1960s Turkey like student demonstrations, rallies and meetings performed in collaboration with the labor and worker class has always a significant aim that is to mobilize and raise awareness of those classes which carry the real potential of power in transforming the society, yet need to become aware of this potential. Engin Ayça also tries to stress the function of cinema, as one component part of those activities; pertaining to rendering the transformative powers such as worker and laborer class become more conscious about their revolutionary significance and potential, making this branch of art the servant of revolution like other components of political activisms.

¹³⁹ Gaye Petek, “Etkin Bir Seyirci Aramak”, *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol. 5, p. 4 - 5

¹⁴⁰ Engin Ayça, “Sinema İle Uğraşmak – 2”, *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol. 5, p. 7

IV.2. Revolutionary Cinema

After analyzing how Young Cinema Group describes the relationship between cinema and revolution mainly its emphasis on the priority of revolution over the cinematic developments and the instrumentality of cinema for attaining revolution, it is necessary to ask how the members of the Group define the main features of a revolutionary cinema which they hope to establish along with the establishment of new values after accomplishing the revolution. As I talked about the previous chapters, there are not so many theoretical debates about the artform and content of a new cinema which will be generated in replacement of the dominant *Yeşilçam* system, simply because the members believe that the technical, artistic and theoretical features of the revolutionary cinema will and should be developed gradually by producing the movies, as a part of revolutionary activity, as much as possible concurrently with the political activities intending for the revolution. Yet, according to Veysel Atayman, a great deal of people inside the Group generally in Istanbul part like Mehmet Gönenç, Mustafa Irgat, Hüseyin Tüzün, Tanju Akerson and himself immerse themselves into thinking and debating about the theory of this new cinema.¹⁴¹ The interests of those members and some others are also reflected in the *Young Cinema* albeit it is not adequate to define the artistic structure of this new cinema anticipated by this revolutionary group.

Furthermore we should remember the idea of amateurism which was talked about in ‘organization’ chapter. In that part, the directors discuss the necessity of amateurism in making their movies because of the economic deficiencies, technical nescience and the lack of a considerable cinematic history for inheriting the former cinematic experiences. This support of amateurism is not a permanent thing for the members believing that a new artform peculiar to the Group would be generated by making the movies as much as possible until the socialist revolution is attained. Thus the short movies and the recordings from the real events and political groups are conceived as ‘amateur cinema’ by the Group and should be improved. The discussions which I will reveal below are related to the artform of the ‘improved cinema’ which would gradually be created and be gained its maturity during the all revolutionary process. It seems to be contradicted with the idea that the artform and theory of the new

¹⁴¹ Interview with Veysel Atayman having made in June 14, 2010

cinema would be developed from more practice in making movies. However, on one hand these theoretic discussions, albeit of their inadequacy, also reveal that some those kinds of studies about how the structure of revolutionary cinema should be constructed are started to be debated in the *Young Cinema*, and they believe the importance of ‘practice’. This feature can also be the explanation of the inadequacy of the members in participating theoretical and artistic dimension of the cinema apart from its instrumentality for the revolution.

In this part it will be examined those theories, explanations and discussions by focusing on four titles which are respectively ‘The Definition of Revolutionary Cinema’, ‘The Essence and Artform Unity’, ‘Approaching the People’ and ‘The Traditional Values as a Source’.

A. The Definition of Revolutionary Cinema by the *Young Cinema*

In this manner it will be better to start with the explanations of the members demonstrating what they understand from the term of revolutionary cinema. Firstly, Veysel Atayman conceives the revolutionary cinema as the cinema which contradicts the established order, intends to conduct a tangible relationship with masses and emerges with its passion of freedom. He also adds that this cinema would place itself against the existing cinema order having collaboration with today’s political and economic system and would be a real revolutionary or national cinema in terms of its mode of dealing with and seeking for solutions about the social problems.¹⁴² The reason of using both national and revolutionary cinema as the same is the belief that, like every other revolutionists, the existing cinema which is under the dominance of imperialist powers and their collaborators and is conducting with capitalist-imperialist economy is not independent, thus not national. Furthermore, it can be said that the usage of ‘national cinema’ is more common in the Group because of the influence coming from Mihri Belli who uses ‘National Culture’ in his speeches and articles. This interrelation will try to be talked about at the end of this chapter.

In this statement, in terms of the revolutionary cinema, Veysel Atayman focuses on its separate entity independent from the existing cinema system which is *Yeşilçam*, as it was cited before. The main reason of this independency is related to its revolutionary position against the current political and economic system, capitalism–imperialism, and its superstructural

¹⁴² Veysel Atayman, “Devrimci Sinema”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 11

element of *Yeşilçam*, tending the Group to establish a detached organization which conducting with a different economic funds and adopting distinct means of producing, distributing and making movies. Besides its independency from *Yeşilçam* and the system it represents, a revolutionary cinema should deal with social and economic problems in a different way from the one that existing cinematic works pursue. Mutlu Parkan's statement is more explanatory in this manner:

There are some assertions propounded that the movies representing some revolutionary events like the worker's movements or student boycotts are perceived as revolutionary, yet the remaining ones dealing with some other problems are not. The fact that the most important thing is the revolutionary outlook over the events is being forgotten. If a cinema maker doesn't come up with a new outlook or a revolutionary perspective over the topic he handles with in his movie, this movie can be very far from being a revolutionary regardless of the revolutionary features of the topic covered by himself. On the other hand, some events which don't have a revolutionary quality could be interpreted by the cinema maker in a revolutionary perspective.¹⁴³

According to Parkan, the topics are not so important for determining a cinema as revolutionary, instead the mode of covering this topic identifies the cinematic works whether revolutionary or not. In other words, the directors should deal with the event in a revolutionary perspective regardless of the revolutionary content of the movie. For explaining how this revolutionary perspective can be created it will be better to consult with Faruk Atasoy's claims:

With the images of a villager that works on land under the sun or a laborer that works in front of a boiler, a cinema maker can just turn to the realities. We cannot obtain anything by showing a Group from their lives to the mass of laborers. Those kinds of films can lead to sympathy demonstrations with a great deal of applause among the elite class in cities.

In the films that a film maker produces, in addition to these realities, the film maker should focus on the real reasons behind these realities and deliver these to the audience. The aim must be to face the clashes and problems beyond the realities and accelerate the formation process and motivating people to take an action. While doing all these in the films produced, the existence of the effort that is spent for the power of laborers must be proved through direct or indirect reflections.¹⁴⁴

Faruk Atasoy shares the same idea with the Group suggesting that the problems issued in the *Yeşilçam*'s movies (especially some social – realistic movies like *Susuz Yaz*, *Otobüs Yolcuları....*) don't reflect the socioeconomic realities and the solutions proposed by the directors for those matters are not related to the main contradictions derived from economic

¹⁴³ Mutlu Parkan, "Çeşitleme", *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol. 4, p. 8 - 9

¹⁴⁴ Faruk Atasoy, "Silah Başına", *Genç Sinema*, (December 1968) Vol.3 p. 7

base of the society. Because of this reason, the movies of *Yeşilçam* are very detached from people who experience the real social and economic problems and are not able to mobilize and create awareness among the masses. Since the social and economic problems are totally emerged out of the main contradictions which are derived from the capitalist base of the society like class distinctions, poverty so on and so forth, directors should seek for the solution only by analyzing and contemplating how the economy of the society defining the base works and how it affects the social domain. By this way, the movies gain its significant dimension in terms of prompting the masses towards the revolution and precipitating the process of making them conscious of their potential revolutionary power.

Lastly, Mete Tanju covers the same matter within the framework of a documentary movie by emphasizing the distinction between analyzing and detecting an event constituting the main issue of the movie:

The documentarist of the exploitative cinema is only detecting the events. Generally, he is only contended with looking his matter from the outside, and revealing it according to the detached and static structuralism. He disrupts the compulsory relations between the events in such a manner of providing the reinforcement of the system, or maintenance of it. Thus the product emerges as independent from the material reality. (...) Whereas, Young Film Maker is not contended with only detecting the event. He must contribute his interpretations to the event detected. Hence, he goes into the core of relationships. He invents the dynamic elements in those. (...) He gives importance to causality and continuity as a natural requirement of it in his artistic products. (...) This means that the main importance in perceiving the reality is understanding the dynamic of those relations. In short, for Young Film Maker, only identification of the realities is not enough, instead he detects the realities with their real relations and completes those with his interpretations.¹⁴⁵

In conclusion, according to the members, I won't be wrong to say that the revolutionary cinema is not about the topic covered by the directors, yet the important element for a movie to be a revolutionary is the mode of analyzing the topic. If an issue, whether it contains revolutionary content or not, is handled in a revolutionary outlook, the movie will fulfill its function for revolution. This revolutionary mode of analyzing the issue, especially the socioeconomic problems in the country is closely related to examining it by revealing its reasons derived from main contradictions coming out of economic base of the society instead of only demonstrating the problem without giving any solutions depended on the societal base and only contending with the determination of the problem itself. If this is accomplished by

¹⁴⁵ Mete Tanju, "Genç Sinemacı ve Belgesel Film", *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1969) Vol. 11, p. 3

the directors, and if that cinematic analysis reaching people is handled in this way, the movies can provide to increase the awareness of people and enhance mass mobilization.

B. Approaching To People

Seeing that the initial function of the revolutionary directors is to serve for revolutionizing the society, the main target group of their cinema discussed above is the majority of people exploited by the dominant and comprador class with a view to spreading the ideas of revolution and inoculating the sense of it. In other words, the Group realizes that its movies the main object of which is to increase the revolutionary consciousness and to trigger mass mobilization become pointless in case that they are not reached to the people composed of worker and laborer class. This strong belief of the Group make the ‘people’ dimension one of the main components for creating the revolutionary cinema. Indeed, Ibrahim Bergman stresses the importance of this dimension for the art in general by those words:

The most important element in the art formation is the ‘people’. The works of art which are not able to approach people or are refused by them can’t rescue from molding, and thus they can’t be regarded as an ‘art’. In contrast, it is real that an artistic event can increase its artistic value according to the number of people embracing it.¹⁴⁶

More specifically, Gaye Petek reveals the closed relation between the revolutionary cinema and the ‘people’ dimension:

When could a cinema be ‘revolutionary’? It is not only with the movie’s topic but also with its direction and the audiences to whom it addresses. A revolutionary cinema addresses to the masses that will make the revolution. At first to laborers and peasants. This levies the burden of responsibility to directors. The film maker is an artworker, so creator; director, he establishes an opportunity of unification between the audience and the work of art.¹⁴⁷

In this manner, we should talk about the possible means of providing the unification of the artwork and the masses in her article. Yet, she will give the answer this question in the same article and the ensuing one called ‘*Etkin Bir Seyirci Aramak*’ (Searching for An Active Audience) related to changing the role of audiences while seeing the movie. According to her, the habitual behaviors of the audiences while seeing the movie should be removed. For instance, they should be rescued from being a ‘consumer’ by creating the ‘active audience type’. This means that the audience should be able to mobilize through the movie and only demonstrating people their exploitation is not enough for providing this mass mobilization.

¹⁴⁶ Ibrahim Bergman, “Sanat Olayı ve Halk”, *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 2, p. 9

¹⁴⁷ Gaye Petek, “Sanat ve Sinema”, *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 3, p. 5

Instead, the members could make the movies showing the people the means of revolution and resistance.¹⁴⁸

As to remember the second chapter, discussing the counteractive position against *Yeşilçam* by benefitting from Marxist terminology, the existing cinematic system is conducted according to the capitalist – imperialist economic and ideological aims which also determine the attitudes of the audiences. It is important to remember briefly the main claims of the *Young Cinema* about the relationship between the cinema and the people in the *Yeşilçam* system. At first, the movies contents the main contradiction between exploiting classes and exploited classes which don't deal with socio-economic problems sprung from the economic base of the society. Some movies issues those kinds of problems, like Social Realists, yet they propose superstructural and metaphysical concepts like religion or supranatural forces as solutions for those problems, making people more subservient and rendering *Yeşilçam* movies so detached from the masses. Secondly, since the cinema sector is seen as a suitable domain to extract profits, the imperialist forces and their capitalist compradors are focused solely on the entertaining function of the cinema in order to appeal more people to the cinema theaters. By this way, they prevent people from informing social realities through cinema by ignoring its social function in terms of mass mobilization. Although neglecting the social function of the cinema, they discern the propagandist feature of it by using this sector as a tool for imposing the goodness of their ideology with the aim of maintaining the capitalist – imperialist order from which they benefit from.

Mehmet Gönenç calls this type of cinema which is endemic to the existing system as 'the Opium Cinema'. After claiming that the cinema is the unique branch of art enhancing the comprador class to contact with the masses, he supports that this connection could only be established by rendering the audiences less aware of the problems occurring in their country and less conscious of their revolutionary potential power. He emphasizes this dreadful relation between the imperialist cinema and the people as saying that 'the masses in the dark theaters should always be stayed in the dark for the dominant powers, and this succeeded'¹⁴⁹ Ömer Pekmez also stresses imperialist- capitalist class' abuse of this unique domain for the people's entertainment according to its economic and ideological intention:

Cinema is the cheapest and longest in duration of the activity means for the entertainment of people who have a limited budget. Apart from the cities, the cinema is the only place to which the people come in their spare time in almost all towns of

¹⁴⁸ Gaye Petek, "Sanat ve Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 3, p. 5 and "Etkin Bir Seyirci Aramak" *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol. 5, p. 5

¹⁴⁹ Mehmet Gönenç, "Sinemayı Halka Götürmek", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol. 2, p. 15

Anatolia. If you ask to people who don't have anything to do or unemployed, who is the old and young; the students who skip school the most favorite activity to enjoy, the answer will certainly be 'going to the cinema'. Especially as to the young people, the cinema is the home for 'killing the time', thus the owners of the cinema theaters, producers and business managers who know the ways of gaining money very well fairly exploit people.¹⁵⁰

Yet, it claimed that since the cinema is the place in which the majority of people gather to entertain and spend their free time, the bourgeoisie seeks for the ways of exploiting their money (as Ömer Pekmez) and of keeping them so passive while seeing the movie in order not to be aware of the social realities and the basic contradictions in society (Mehmet Gönenç), some members don't think that the cinema affects people so much in the way these members claim due to the inadequacy of cinema for reaching people. In other words, the cinema doesn't exist in most of the regions in Anatolia, so naturally the imperialist cinema can't have exploited those people who also have real revolutionary potential, letting the *Young Cinema* to think of approaching those regions with its cinema.

Yorgo Bozis tries to show some statistical data in order to demonstrate the very detached relationship between cinema and the people especially living in the rural areas. He gives the place to a column of *Milliyet* newspaper based on *Devlet İstatistik Endüstüsü's* (The State Institute of Statistics) (DIE) numbers in 1961. According to it, 86% of the 14.000 villages haven't met the movies and cinema theaters before. Furthermore, in the cities which have cinematic theaters, the DIE defines some numbers relating to the number of household and the average expenditures of cultural activities. According to those numbers the 26% of the households who have a high income make the 80 % of those expenditures, on the contrary the 54% of the households composed of limited amount of income can only make 7,2% of the expenditures. These numbers also show that the majority of people having a low income (they are lower class – workers, laborers- and lower middle class) can't spend their money to cultural activities and the most of the dominant classes can benefit from this facility. All two data is interpreted by Bozis that the cinema hasn't reach the majority carrying potential for being revolutionary audiences and cinema should approach those people before imperialism's attempt.¹⁵¹

Apart from Bozis, Engin Ayça tries to explain so many people haven't met the cinema before based on the data of Nijat Özön's *Türk Sinema Tarihi*. According to those information of the statistics in 1963, the 2/3 of the population of the country lives in the villages and the 3.427.038 towns and nooks whose population is under the 5000 out of 3.511.748 hasn't

¹⁵⁰ Ömer Pekmez, "Sansür Sorunu", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol. 6, p. 8

¹⁵¹ Yorgo Bozis, "Emekçiler ve Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol. 10, p. 6 - 8

electricity yet meaning that the facilities in those regions are not available for establishing a cinema theater. Moreover, if it is realized that the national income per person is 2.655 lira, and the number of tickets per individual is 2,3 in a year, only a small group of people who is the minority of the country can see the movies demonstrating that the dominant class majorly consists the audiences of the cinema and majority is deprived of these activities. For Ayça, the objects must be the conveying of the revolutionary movies which they make and by this way making those people who haven't see the cinema before the audiences of revolutionary cinema. He also adds that: 'So, the real audiences of the revolutionary movies are the classes who will make the revolution.' Moreover, he also compromises the other film makers like Gaye Petek and Mehmet Gönenç ignoring the inadequacy of cinema to reach the people in terms of rescuing the people from being the consumer of movies and creating an active audience prototype thinking, contemplating the social problems and the reasons / solutions related to the base of the society and participating in the revolutionary process very actively.

152

The concern of making them active elements of the revolution by reaching the people through the movies drives the members of the Group to the language and form of the movies that they will make. These discussions will be cited below, yet it is better to finish the sentences of Gaye Petek in her article '*Sinemacı (Görevi Karşısında ve Onun İçinde)*' (Movie Maker: Against His Duty and Inside It) in order to prepare us for the other dimensions (the content, the essence and artform unity and the source of traditional values).

The way of creating 'the Cinema of People' is to make 'comprehensible' movies instead of the intellectual ones only addressing to the small 'intellectual' group. The problems experienced by the people should be criticized in the eyes and perception of people. Film makers should refrain from 'abstract art' because it is impossible to think and form a kind of abstract and surrealistic movies in such a underdeveloped country like Turkey. Furthermore, this is not compatible with the language and activity of the cinema. Are not there any folk tales, poems, songs in Turkey? Were the inequality, wars, exploiters and the exploited erased from Turkey and the world? Lets come to the 'presentation' manner: I will suggest a method: we can arrange small range of presentations and activities for small communities in any kind of places like cafes, gardens, streets. If it is demanded an entrance pay to the people, it should

¹⁵² Engin Ayça, "Sinema ile Uğraşmak - 3", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969), Vol. 6, p. 22

be very low in price so as to arrange new ones. Furthermore, we should make conversations, explanations and discussions after the movies.¹⁵³

Indeed, some endeavors about the arrangement these kinds of presentations is performed by the Group with a view to approaching the people. As we remember that, in the introduction of the 12th volume, the Group announces that it is able to buy a player only at the expense of the cost of two volumes for using it in various places such as schools, guilds, labor unions, coffee houses and streets.: ‘In this period, by thinking that it is more beneficial to get a 16 mm player than to publish the journal and we skip two volumes with a view to buy it.’¹⁵⁴ Yet before that, the Group also mentions its activities organized in various places in the 7th volume. Among some of those activities, firstly, the presentation of *Asayiş Berkemal* of Ahmet Soner in Aslan Turgutlu Village, Halkalı in 15 September 1968; the presentation of *Çirkin Ares* of Artun Yeres in many forums in *Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi* (the Middle East Technical University) after the burning of the Komer’s¹⁵⁵ car along with the announcement of Mutlu Parkan stating that ‘the Young Cinema supports the students’; the usage of Artun Yeres’ movie called *Onlar Ki* as a background for the theater play *Grev* (Strike) in *Devrimci Hareket Tiyatrosu* (Revolutionary Movement Theatre); and the other presentations in *Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Sinema Kulübü* (The Cinema Club of Black Sea Technical University), *Türkiye İşçi Partisi Beşiktaş İlçesi Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonu* (The Federation of Ideas Societies in Turkish Labour Party Branch Office of Beşiktaş), *Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu* (The Federation of Revolutionary Labour Unions), *Lastik –İş Sendikası* (Lastik-İş Union), *Milli Demokratik Devrim Derneği* in Ankara and İstanbul so on and so forth.¹⁵⁶

All those activities and the places of presentation show that the Group tries to approach the main powers of revolution mainly laborer and worker class, also revolutionary students and the organizations they take part in order to fulfill its revolutionary function by presenting its movies composed of revolutionary ideas and feelings in such a manner that people could understand and digest the social problems, inequalities etc and their

¹⁵³ Gaye Petek, “Sinemacı (Görevi Karşısında ve Onun İçinde)”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1969) Vol. 9, p. 12

¹⁵⁴ “Genç Sinema’dan”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol. 12, p.1

¹⁵⁵ Robert Komer was the ambassador of Turkey in 1968 in the same time of being appointed as the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in the Jimmy carter administration. Komer has left a special mark in Turkish history: in the beginning of his tenure his car was set on fire by a group of students in [Middle East Technical University](http://www.middleeasttechnical.edu.tr/).

<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Default.aspx?aType=GaleriHaber&Date=11.10.2008&ArticleID=902742&PAGE=16>

¹⁵⁶ “Genç Sinema’dan”, *Genç Sinema*, (May, 1969) Vol.7, p. 2

responsibilities to remove those. More importantly, as we look at the places and foundations in which they present their movies, it is not clear the political position of the Group in the ideological leftist political fractions. The variety of the parties like *Türkiye İşçi Partisi*, or the foundations like *Dev-Genç* in which the Group arranges its presentations can be interpreted as the fact that the Group tries to find opportunities to present their movies to the revolutionary powers as much as possible regardless of their ideological positions. This tendency is also revealing us some clues about the political inclinations of the Group which will be talked about later.

C. The Unity of Essence and Form

The fact that the Group supports the priority of revolution and the usage of cinema as a way of attaining the revolution which it is intended does not mean that they ignore the artistic dimension of this domain. In one of the articles of Mutlu Parkan, he cites one of Mao's claim which is very clear to understand that they give equal importance to artistic nature of the cinema besides its political functions: 'No matter how politically progressive, the art works whose artistic value is not complete lack power.'¹⁵⁷As we talked about before, the members believe the peculiar artform of the Young Cinema would be generated with the cultural and cinematic accumulation by making movies as much as possible. Although the tendency to the structure of the movies is not defined in a certain way, some theoretical inclinations have begun since the first volumes of the *Young Cinema*. Among those, the idea of 'the unity of essence and form' is so visible. According to themselves, there is no clear cut distinction between the essence (or content) and the form of the movie and they occur together in it. In this manner, the Group refuses its some counterparts outside the country. For instance, the members criticize the movies of French *Nouvelle Vague* due to the claim that the artform of the movie determines the content of the movie, whereas they, especially Istanbul part see the main instances of this French Movement in collective presentations of *Sinematek*. In spite of the fact that they feel themselves more closed to Latin American Cinema or the Cinema of the Third World, they admit that their cinematic perception is influenced by 1968's French cinema especially in the artform of the movies. For instance, in Tanju Akerson's critical article about Mutlu Parkan's movie called '66', he emphasizes this influence considering the artform of the movie:

The cinematic language used by Mutlu Parkan is more inclined to the *Nouvelle Vague*'s relating to its artform. Looking at the indoor and outdoor, evaluation of

¹⁵⁷ Mutlu Parkan, "Çeşitleme", *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol. 4, p. 9

plastic material, fragmentation, the camera Groups and the linkages in plan carry the characteristics of this Group. The ‘phraseology’ of *Nouvelle Vague* was usually a starting point for the film makers of The Third World Countries in creating their ‘new cinema’ In this manner, it can be admissible that the artform of the movie includes the many features of *Nouvelle Vague*. (or this can be perceived as something positive on the condition that it stays as a starting point at the trial period of film makers)¹⁵⁸

This statement also reveals that since Akerson looks this short movie, *66* as a product of the Young Cinema Group in the process of improving their cinematic language on the road to revolution, thus he doesn’t perceive the *Nouvelle Vague*’s influence as a negative thing for the movie’s artform in this temporary process. Because the Group in general looks their domestic cinematic history as very irrelevant and there is nothing to inherit from the previous works of Turkish Cinema, also legitimizing that they try some artistic forms of its foreign counterparts until attaining its specific genre composed of peculiar characteristics.

As it is discussed before, since the Group identifies itself with the revolutionary process, the members of it define the content of this ‘forthcoming new cinema’ with relevance to this significant function. It is better to use the words of essence and content as the same meaning in this part as the members do in the *Young Cinema*. In the same article of Parkan as mentioned above, he expresses the content of the Group’s movies should be related to revolution because it defines its choice according to being a revolutionary force against the existing system:

Young Film Maker has done its choice: so he is revolutionist. In a way, this is a commitment and all the commitments except this one can be a dash against his artistic creativity.’ The artistic products which he will present with his revolutionary personality and artistic creativeness should be free for its detachment from every kind of dogmatism and bigotry.¹⁵⁹

Engin Ayça also talks about the emergence of the movies’ content ‘within’ the revolution. He asserts that the Group would make movies for rendering the audiences of revolutionary cinema active and making them awake. In this point, the concerning matter of the Group should be the content of the movies which not only means the topic, but also the essence and ideology, or altogether. The revolutionary cinema doesn’t occur out of revolutionary forces, instead is generated and developed with them. According to him if it is expressed that this formation is the content of the movie, the so called cinema goes out of the cinema of consumption and becomes something new. In other words he defines Young Cinema as the cinema which will be created with its all elements.¹⁶⁰ Unlike Parkan, this

¹⁵⁸ Tanju Akerson, “Genç Sinema’da 1 No’lu Durak – Mutlu Parkan’ın 66’sı”, *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol. 4, p. 12

¹⁵⁹ Mutlu Parkan, “Çeşitleme”, *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol. 4, p. 9

¹⁶⁰ Engin Ayça, “Sinema ile Uğraşmak - 3”, *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969), Vol. 6, p. 23

formation of the content is not a choice for Ayça, this is a must in order to make a new cinema. Because, according to him, all traditional languages of expression are deprived of express what is going on today and become obsolete and ineffective against the artistic and poetical power of language that is owned by the resistant and rebellious young generation. A new cinema should be isolated from all elements of former types of expression or the language of exploitation, disdainfulness and mystification.

The question arising from those statements is how the revolutionary essence or content of the movie affect the artform. As it is mentioned above, the members don't support the kinds of cinematic works whose form defines the main characteristic of the movie and the whose essence changes according to the form like French *Nouvelle Vogue* and instead they believe the artform and the essence are very interrelated and inseparable parts of the movie. The articles of the Journal cite this interdependency. Engin Ayça is one of the examples of those:

The discussions about the essence and artform are only 'nonsense' for Young Cinema. It doesn't separate those elements each other. The emerging artistic product is the unity of those: The unity of the revolutionary essence and the most suitable artistic style for this essence'¹⁶¹

In this manner, Yakup Barokas' theory called 'Simple Cinema' is so significant. According to him, the simplicity, also the artform of the cinema, is derived from the main dimension that is the movie's revolutionary essence as very relevantly the statements cited above. In terms of its revolutionary essence, at first the movie doesn't have such an aim to desensitize people and conceal the core realities in society like the cinema of imperialism. The voice and scene editing possess a unique intention that is to strengthen the revolutionary essence of the movie and equip it with new dimensions. It doesn't give any place to some artistic tricks which are the products of the Western cinema and does only incline to artistic features and implications in case of contributing the essence of the movie. This provides for the movie to be understandable, thus increasing the worker – laborer class' consciousness about the social-political problems and their potential power which has a historic significance in terms of transforming the current system. In this point he supports the documentaries as a genre of art. He claims that "I do not say that people should just make documentary films but it will be appropriate to ornament films with documentary features in terms of providing cogency. By using fiction and interpreting the documents, this image can be achieved."¹⁶²

¹⁶¹ Engin Ayça, "Sinemayı Yeniden İcat Etmek", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1 p. 14

¹⁶² Yakup Barokas, "Basit Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol. 10, p. 12

In his other article, Yakup Barokas tries to expound the interconnectedness and interdependence of the essence and form by giving three types of movies. The source of this classification is not defined in the *Young Cinema*, letting us interpret that this categorization is determined by him. Those types are basically ‘*Hamur Filmler*’ (Dough Movies), ‘*Sanat Filmleri*’ (Art Movies) and ‘*Siyasi Filmler*’. (Political Movies) *Hamur Filmler* consists of the movies dealing with the essence and features of individuals, their bourgeoisie habits. This type of movies shouldn’t be confused with the imperialistic movies and its domestic collaborators like *Yeşilçam* movies concerning with metaphysical and psychological topics in that *Hamur Filmler* issue those topics with relevance to their social values and analyze their social background. It reveals the deterioration and corruption of the existing system indirectly. He gives some examples about those kinds of movies like Artun Yeres’ *Beyoğlu 68* and Passolini’s *Mama Roma* Secondly, *Siyasi Filmler* deals with significant sociopolitical events with their reasons and results. He also compares this type of movies with *Protesto Filmleri* (Protest Movies) which only criticizing the events by stating that *Siyasi Filmler* aim to stimulate people unlike to other one rendering its audiences more passive. The third type which is *Sanat Filmi* only focuses on the artistic form of the movie regardless of its revolutionary content or essence.

According to the explanations of three categories, it can be said that the genre of movie the Group intends to establish is more inclined to *Siyasi Filmler* and *Hamur Filmi*. It is closed to Political Movies, because it has a revolutionary stance against the existing social system and objects to mobilize and stimulate people. It is also closed to *Hamur Filmi*, because, especially some of the Group’s ‘*Kurmaca*’ (Fictional) Movies like Mutlu Parkan’s *66* it deals with the two men’s own personal and inner depression and its social background. This can be combined with Veysel Atayman’s statement proclaimed when he propounded as a reason of the Group’s ineffectiveness¹⁶³ to make considerable amount of movies in the conversation that the members couldn’t find an effective way to embrace an effective genre to unite the cinema’s dual function considering its reflection of the characters’ individual problems shaped within the sociopolitical context and its engagement in the political and social matters. Atayman’s argument is seemed comprehensible if we look at the limited number of movies having produced.

¹⁶³ Interview with Veysel Atayman having made in June 14, 2010

D. Traditional Values as a Source

The fact that the *Young Cinema* refuses the former cinematic works in general except a few movies and they see nothing to take over from its past doesn't mean that they don't seek for some alternative sources for benefiting their new cinema which they intend to create. As Mete Tanju claims that, the starting point to begin the formation of this new cinema is one step beyond the zero. Because it can't be ignored some sources, accumulations, data from which the Group can benefit and whose connection with the cinema is distant and indirect, although the analysis about them has not been done or if so not adequate. Furthermore, the members should find the aesthetic values of lively features and psychology rooted in the sentiments, mentality and attitudes of Anatolian people and develops authentic examples of revolutionary cinema by using those values.¹⁶⁴ The sublimation of the conventional values is generally seen and the usage of those in the cinematic works by making a contemporary analysis which hasn't been done before is usually supported by the members.

This tendency to local, traditional and authentic values of Turkish people is also one of the departing points from the *Sinematek* embracing the Western cultural tradition and believing that Turkey should be a part of Western Culture. This position makes *Sinematek* to incline to adopt the Western aesthetic values for attaining a full-fledged universal cinema which has an important place in the world cinema. Yet, although *Young Cinema* doesn't ignore the Western cinematic values totally (if we remember the critic of the film '66', some artistic forms can be adopted from the Western cinema especially *Nouvelle Vogue* in the developmental stage), they are more concentrated on adopting the traditional values of Anatolian people in their cinematic domain. It is important to say that, *Sinematek* doesn't neglect the Anatolian culture. Indeed, as Hakkı Başgüney, this group intends to enhance the rise of those values to the stage of universal values.¹⁶⁵ In this manner, it won't be wrong to say that the ultimate aim of *Sinematek* with relevance to making the Turkish Cinema as a universal cinema including Western cultural values cannot be seen in the *Young Cinema* stressing the locality and traditionalism. In fact, there are some extremist stance against the Western culture in the Young Cinema Group like Ahmet Soner refusing the European Cinema totally and supporting more concentration to peculiar Turkish Culture with its art and literature in creation of the new cinema:

Turkish story writing is a nebulous source for Young Film Makers. There are at least nine or ten thousand stories that need to be revised. Hüseyin Rahmi, Ömer Seyfeddin,

¹⁶⁴ Mete Tanju, "Devrim Sinemasının Sorunları İçinde Yapıt", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol. 12, p. 12

¹⁶⁵ Hakkı Başgüney, *Türk Sinematek Derneği: Türkiye'de Sinema ve Politik Tartışma*, (İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2009), p. 125

Memduh Şevket, Sadri Ertem, Yaşar Kemal, Muzaffer Buyrukçu, Fakir Baykurt, Tarık Dursun K., Mahmut Makal and the others. They are all purely untouched and undiscovered treasures. Moreover, all these writers address to five to fifteen thousand people. However, the power of cinema is more effective and much more. We can leave everything behind as we have this kind of source in our hand. We should not be interested in the West no matter what is happening there!¹⁶⁶

Apart from its distinctive perspective from the *Sinematek*, this sublimation of Anatolian values also bolsters the counteractive position of the Group against the former and today's cinematic works under the auspices of *Yeşilçam*. It accuses the *Yeşilçam* of not engaging the Anatolian values and culture in their cinematic works and not letting Anatolian people to take part in these works actively. Yakup Barokas and Enis Rıza cover this matter in their articles:

Cultural imperialism, a very common phenomenon, does not want artists to reach masses, in other words to make the masses effective in art. It does not want that because then the tricks will be ruined. Trends are made up, cubism, surrealism, new Groups in cinema. Most people do not understand Godard. Economical relationships ease this as well: Of course, the artists should sell its art work. Most of the time, it's the conditioned appreciation by the city people that shed the light and leads the artists. They do not want Yunus Emre and Pir Sultan Abdal to be talked about.¹⁶⁷

(...)On the other side, there is always a folk art that develops on its own gradually: a voice that delivers the longings, hopes, pain that is formed by the language, the traditions and customs of the community. However, the art that powerful class created has an alienation effect on folk art¹⁶⁸

IV.3. Conclusion: An Evaluation

This part is allocated to a debate with relevance to the previous one: which leftist fractions' 'revolutionary culture' thesis is more compatible with the *Young Cinema* Journal and the Group and thus which leftist part/fraction/or party's 'revolution thesis' is more suitable for establishing a kind of revolutionary cinema which the Group wants to attain. In this issue the conversations with Veysel Atayman and Ahmet Soner and the articles from both the directors of the Group and the leading actors of political fractions are benefitted. Before discussing that, it is useful to mention the 'revolution theses' from the TİP and from the supporters of MDD fraction asserted in the second half of 1960s Turkey.

¹⁶⁶ Ahmet Soner, "İlk Yazı", *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 12

¹⁶⁷ Yakup Barokas, "Basit Sinema", *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol. 10, p. 11

¹⁶⁸ Enis Rıza, "Sanat ve Sanatçı Üstüne Bir Taslak", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol. 12, p.14

According to TİP, the socialism is a problem about the transformation of the contradictions between classes in favor of Labor Class, so the problem is related to ‘class’. Since socialism is the ideology of this class, the revolutionary activity should be fulfilled with the labor class pioneering. Moreover this activity is akin to the struggle against both capitalism and imperialism. Because the complete independency can be accomplished with economic independency resulting from the removal of capitalist forces. Turkey lost its independency again after the elimination of imperialist powers (but the capitalism remained) in the Turkish War of Independence because there wasn’t the transformation form capitalism to socialism. This case also shows that the elimination of capitalism (also called socialist revolution) and imperialism should go hand in hand. The other significant point is that this socialist revolution should be through a transformation in a democratic way that is the parliament.¹⁶⁹

According to supporters of MDD, Turkey is not in the stage of fulfilling a socialist revolution. Its feudal and semi-dependent structure prevents it from doing that. Thus, it must be performed in anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle. The first problem is to enhance democratic freedom and independency. It would be passed to socialism only after reaching this stage. Anti-imperialist struggle necessitates that revolutionary activity would be national. For this reason the anti-imperialist struggle should include not only the labor class but also the other ‘national’ powers. There must be an alliance established between the classes. Furthermore, it doesn’t support the parliamentary way of accomplishing revolution, instead this alliance or unity must capture the political power.¹⁷⁰

As I talked about before, the general political inclination of the Group is towards the MDD’s one. It could be understood from some articles in the *Young Cinema* criticizing some discourses of TİP and adopting some of MDDs one. At first, it can be suitable to reveal Veysel Atayman and Yakup Barokas’ statements emphasizing his position against TİP.

The attitude of generalist representatives of illiberalness, which does not hesitate to claim that they are indirectly beneficial for the revolutionary action while accusing Young Cinema of appropriating the revolutionary action, is closer to the attitude of political associations which hope to realize a revolution through a parliamentary way

¹⁶⁹ Çetin Yetkin, *Türkiye’de Soldaki Bölünmeler: Tartışmalar, Nedenler, Çözüm Önerileri (1960 – 1970)*, (Ankara: Toplum Yayınevi, 1970), pp. 16 -17

¹⁷⁰ Ibid. p. 19

and expects to pursue revolutionism that they try to take from us by a competition in solid bourgeoisie culture.¹⁷¹

Why simple cinema? For reaching the masses. So it will be asked: “Will everybody make a film?” We do not have editing benches. Even when we have those, everybody cannot make a film. Did you put a camera in the callous hands of a worker, and show him good films? Did you let him read some books? So? Yet, the thing is even among the most revolutionists ones there are some who have the wish to disdain workers in them. (...) Is not it right? Of course *Sinematek* member bourgeois know Russian, Hungarian and Czech Republic films very well. They disdain the workers as workers cannot know a lot about cinema have higher education and read a book; still the bourgeois yells: ‘village workers to the Assembly’.¹⁷²

As two statements, both of them include criticizing the *Hisar* and *Sinematek*'s attitudes for approaching the bourgeoisie class and detaching from the people and the revolutionary process. As I mentioned in the first chapter, the *Cinemteque* foundation tends to support TİP's ideas and also Onat Kutlar takes part in TİP's organizations. In these statements, there is a tendency from the Young Cinema to identify its opposition to these cinematic milieus as their political choice. Moreover, it also makes an analogy between those groups detachment from the people and the revolutionary activities, and their supporting party accused of being far from the masses and ignoring the labor class which contains a real potential to attain the revolution. This can be perceived as an indicator of the Group's opponent stance against the TİP. In terms of the detachment from the people, the Group adopts an attitude that is closer to ordinary people's attitude and supports a broad front against the dominant powers consisting not only from the laborers and also the other forces of small-bourgeoisie as especially the intellectuals:

There is no place such a category of intellectuals composing of artists and film makers in the sphere of ‘activity cinema’. An intellectual, as Guevara says that, ‘should commit suicide’, interfere in the people, exploited worker, laborer classes. Our independence war is the war of our laborer class.¹⁷³

The revolutionary person sharing the responsibility of generating a new cinema with Young Film Makers who are mainly laborers, audiences and intellectuals should address their opinions and critics to the economic problems. Waiting for the creation of a new cinema from the Young Film Maker is the right of all ours.¹⁷⁴

The other point helping us to connect the MDD thesis and the Group can be related to the ‘cultural revolution theses of Mihri Belli and ‘*Sınıfsal Sinema*’ article of Yakup Barokas. For instance, if we look at two texts containing the statements of Mihri Belli, one of the most

¹⁷¹ Veysel Atayman, “Genç Sinema'nın Yarını”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 9, p. 8

¹⁷² Yakup Barokas, “Basit Sinema”, *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol. 10, pp. 11 -12

¹⁷³ Engin Ayça, “Sinemayı Yeniden İcat Etmek”, *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol. 1, p. 14

¹⁷⁴ Üstün Savaşta, “Ekonomik Örgütlenmeye Doğru”, *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1969) Vol. 11, p. 5

important figure in MDD fraction about his thesis on ‘national revolutionary culture’, we could find very similarities with the claims of Young Cinema. It could be meaningful to show the connection between these texts (‘Revolutionary National Culture’ (*Ulusal Devrimci Kültür*) published in *Ankara Birliđi Dergisi* (Ankara Union Journal) in January, 1970 and his speech in the first ‘Revolutionary Cinema Festival’ (*Devrimci Film Şenliđi*) published in *Young Cinema* in June 1970) and an article written by Yakup Barokas and published in *Young Cinema*’s 12th volume in May 1970:

At first Belli argues that the economic base of society determines the culture as a part of superstructure similar to the Young Cinema Group and he defines the existing culture with two terms: ‘imperialist culture’ and ‘semi-feudal culture’. Moreover, he propounds a very relative thesis on cultural revolutionary thesis corresponding to his *Milli Demokratik Devrim* thesis including basically, the all anti-imperialist and anti-feudalist powers in the country should unite by establishing a ‘national front’ with worker class’ leadership (composed by proletariat, laborer part, small-bourgeoisie) in order to demolish imperialist and feudal society and attain *Milli Demokratik Devrim* which is the only way to adjust the social, political and economic conditions for reaching socialist revolution. In other words, MDD is the step for passing from the dependent society surrounded by imperialist and its comprador representatives (comprador bourgeoisie and feudal landlords) to full-independent or socialist one. According to him, a ‘National Revolutionary Culture’ should be composed by proletarian revolutionary culture and ‘Small-Bourgeoisie Transformational Culture’ (*Küçük Burjuvazi Dönüşümcü Kültürü*) so this culture can only be composed of the collaboration of these cultures with the pioneering of the proletariat. More importantly, this is the culture of the ‘National Democratic’ society rather than ‘National Culture with Socialist Content’ (*Sosyalist Muhtevalı Ulusal Kültür*) which is attained only after socialist revolution.¹⁷⁵

Secondly, in Yakup Barokas article, we encounter a new term: ‘Class Cinema’ (*Sınıfsal Sinema*): a cinema which issues all social realities including worker class and peasants real problems in the light of scientific socialism, because it is based on the proletarian pioneering. The fact that this cinema is about the problems of those classes makes this cinema a ‘class cinema’. The question is if this cinema can be defined as the part of ‘National Revolutionary Cinema’ and this leads us to claim that the Young Cinema completely supports Belli’s revolutionary thesis. In this situation, this Barokas’ sentence

¹⁷⁵ Mihri Belli, “Ulusal Devrimci Kültür”, in *Yazılar 1965 – 1970*, (Ankara: Sol Yayınları, 1970), p. 347.

provides us some hints indicating that it can't be possible to support this idea completely: 'Other than that, the forthcoming step of our revolution process will be whether 'National Democratic Revolution' or 'Socialist Revolution', since both of them is fulfilled by the proletarian pioneering, this future revolutionary cinema must cover both of problems suffered from peasantry proletariat and worker class'.¹⁷⁶ With reference to this sentence, the support of Yakup Barokas for Mihri Belli's thesis is not clear. To put it another way, the Group is not able to internalize the MDD's perception on cultural revolution and the place of cinema in there and it doesn't examine how the national-small bourgeoisie element is included in this movies, meaning that they are incapable of adopting the cultural thesis of MDD to their 'National Culture with Socialist Content'. Or they don't come up with any ideas about how they shape their cinema to 'National Democratic' society and the ensuing step, 'National Culture with Socialist Content'.

If this case is connected to the argument what I mentioned above that the Group isn't selective in the places of presenting their movies and they prefer to present them in the variety of the foundations from *Türkiye İşçi Partisi*, *Dev-Genç* so on and so forth. Can these questions be asked? Can we interpret that the Group tries to find opportunities to present their movies to the revolutionary powers as much as possible regardless of their ideological positions? If so is this contradicted with the argument that the cinema's first function is to serve for the revolution? Veysel Atayman answers this question that although the majority of members choose to be MDD because this theory stresses on 'activism' more and mobilizes the youth more than the TİP does, yet they don't internalize this partiality or embrace as their inextricable identity as examining how the ideas of MDD about culture can be adopted to the way of establishing cinema which they anticipate.¹⁷⁷

As a consequence, from all examinations about the relationship between revolution and cinema made in this chapter, it can't be refused that the Group and *Young Cinema* embraces the idea of the cinema as serving for revolution in a very strict manner. Various articles discuss the possible functions of the cinematic instrument to use in favor of the revolutionary process. The directors discuss the nature of cinema relating to influence and inform people, and propel them to the revolutionary activities. In order to persuade people, they adopt the realistic works of their significant counterparts in the world like *Nouvelle*

¹⁷⁶ Yakup Barokas, "Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması için Genç Sinema Bir Hareketir", *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol. 12, p. 25

¹⁷⁷ Interview with Veysel Atayman having made in June 14, 2010

Vogue and *Italian Neo-Realismo* in terms of carrying the camera to the streets, recording the lively scenes as a witness what is going on there, and presenting those works to the people. They also debate how a revolutionary cinema should be by supporting the inclusion of national and traditional values, a comprehensive language and a more socialist content. On the other hand, we don't see this kind of liveliness in the discussions of their political engagement and the possible reflections of its culture thesis on their means of generating 'revolutionary cinema'.

CONCLUSION

As it is seen in the beginning of this study, 1960 encounters some significant artistic movements having a significant characteristic that they affect their other counterparts and simultaneously they are influenced by them. In addition to that interrelation between different cinematic developments, each of them takes their shape very dependently on the political and social context in which they emerge. French *Nouvelle Vogue* is one of the most prominent instances demonstrating a cinematic movement can't be examined independently from the 1968 leftist political movements organized against the existing order. Furthermore, The Third World Cinema presents us an important case bearing out our interpretation about the interconnectedness of the cinematic developments emerging in the same time. It is possible to see distinctive traces of French Cinema on the Third World like emphasizing active audience prototype and a realistic cinematic perspective, although this cinema of underdevelopment criticizes it as remaining an integral part of the system which it opposes by benefitting from the economic funds of capitalist institutions and locating itself in the capitalist market. Moreover, the movements also connect to their predecessors by inheriting their cinematic tradition in the construction of their peculiar cinematic perception and language. Yet, this may not always be the case especially in highly politicized societies or times like 1960s. In this manner, the dual situation that we stated comes on the stage that is the tendency of the cinematic movements that they oppose against the existing sociopolitical system dominated by the overwhelming ideology, in 1960s this is imperialism, and at the same time they become detached from its cinematic past or the current cinematic order which it has been preeminent for years, in this case this is Hollywood or its representatives in localities. Furthermore the degree of this dual attitude of the movements can be capricious in peculiar examples. In the 1960s, with relevance to this degree, *Third World Cinema* indicates a rigorous discourse in both manners, on the other hand *Nouvelle Vogue* adopts a more

moderate position in the manner of opposition and detachment, yet it seems more radical than American new movie makers.

If we adapt this analogy to the Turkish case, Young Cinema appears in a similar environment to the international one. Its birth is coincided with the highly politicized era including the youth movements, the debates of leftist political fractions, the power struggles inside the *Dev- Genç* and *Türkiye İşçi Partisi*, the university invasions, demonstrations so on and so forth. In this political context, it emerges more radically than Social Realists or even *Sinematek* by supporting a complete detachment from all facilities that the capitalist market or institutions offer and all the works that *Yeşilçam* has fulfilled up to now, and establishing a stronger relationship between revolution and cinema as its Third Cinema counterparts. This study has tried to scrutinize both its counteractive position against the *Yeşilçam* (in the second chapter) and its revolution-based cinematic perception (in the fourth chapter) by analyzing the articles in *The Young Cinema* and in some places consulting with the ideas of the members with whom I made Oral History. Moreover, this dual feature or this dual struggle (both against the political system and cinematic system) of the Group also necessitates a strong organizational structure which was also discussed in the third chapter. The study is mostly concentrated on the discourses of the directors and the authors of the Group in their articles, intending to understand how they perceive the world in which they live and how they place their cinematic outlook in this world.

Because of the high degree of opposition against the system, the Anti-*Yeşilçamist* stance of the group is bolstered by the socialist terminology and understanding by explaining the *Yeşilçam*'s structure with reference to socialist materialism. For instance they see the cinema, more specifically *Yeşilçam*, as a superstructural element of the society's capitalist-imperialist base and reflecting all values of this dominant order, bringing about the idea that a new cinema can only be established after the removal of this base. This dimension is also in harmony with this strong anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism, giving the priority of the intentions to the revolution rather than cinema. The class-based understanding including that the today's cinema is under the auspices of the dominant classes, bourgeoisie, is also the other Socialist perception which the movement benefits from in analyzing *Yeşilçam*. The idea that the possessor of the means of production (in our case is cinema) is also the arbiter of all superstructural elements including cinema, rendering this type of art very isolated from people and preventing Turkish Cinema from attaining the 'People's Cinema'.

This dominance also creates the arbitrary attitudes of the imperialist classes to spread its ideology and to determine the content of the movies leading us the dynamics of the relationship between *Yeşilçam* Cinema and the people. In their articles, the authors try to analyze how the features of *Yeşilçam* that I talked about in the second chapter influence the content of the movies and their influence on people. Firstly class distinctions which create the main contradiction between exploiting classes and exploited classes sprung from the economic base of the society are not intended to be issued in the movies which don't deal with socio-economic problems. Apart from these there are some movies issued those kinds of problems, like Social Realists, which propose superstructural and metaphysical concepts like religion or supernatural forces as solutions for those problems, making people more subservient and rendering *Yeşilçam* movies so isolated from the masses. This connects the cinematic perceptions of the dominant classes as the only sphere for obtaining profits; making them be more concentrated on the entertaining function of it. This prevents people from informing social realities through cinema by ignoring its social function in terms of mass mobilization.

This complete detachment also necessitates a new means and platform of making movies, which the members see as constituting an organization. This organization, as to the Young Cinema Group, contains significant functions not only in economic manner but also in artistic one. According to them, the economic organization is the eventual stage for the Group when they reach a new platform for distributing, producing and presenting their movies which can only be possible to remove the dominance of the existing system with the elimination of capitalist base or the removal of all imperialist and capitalist traces in the country. In this manner, the intention of establishing economic organization unites with the aim of attaining revolution. Thus, since reaching economic organization can only be accomplished by engaging in the political activisms as much as possible on the road to attain socialism, the importance of 'activism' and 'practice' is perceived by the Group in a very strict manner. This also reduces the significance of theoretical and artistic studies in favor of attaining revolution by making more practice. Yet this doesn't mean that they ignore the artistic dimension for the cinema totally. Instead, the idea that making practice, also being akin to serving for revolution, also generates the aesthetic maturity of the movies becomes in harmony with the argument that making movies and presenting them to the people is the sole responsibility of the Group for accomplishing revolution.

In terms of the relationship between revolution and cinema made in this fourth chapter, it can't be refused that the Young Cinema embraces the idea of the cinema as serving for revolution in a very strict manner. The directors seek for the means and natures of creating a revolutionary cinema and discuss how the characteristics of this kind of cinema should be. The directors discuss the nature of cinema relating to influence and inform people, and propel them to the revolutionary activities which are also perceived as a historic responsibility of the directors. In order to persuade people, they adopt the realistic works of their significant counterparts in the world like *Nouvelle Vogue* and *Italian Neo-Realismo* in terms of carrying the camera to the streets, recording the lively scenes as a witness what is going on there, and presenting those works to the people. Thus it also connects with the intention of *Dziga Vertov* and *Third Cinema Group* objecting to render the people especially worker and labor class become more active audiences and be rescued from the passive habits which imperialist powers impose to them. Moreover we can see various articles about the inclusion of national and traditional values, a comprehensive language and a more socialist content in establishing such a revolutionary cinema.

An Evaluation: Heterogeneity or Homogeneity?

After the brief recovering of the statements of Young Cinema Group as reflected in the Journal, it is necessary to finish this study by making some evaluations about the homogeneity of this Group. This evaluation springs from this basic question: Do all members embrace all of those statements made in the Journal? Or are there any contradictions between the members about the specific issues? We can start trying to answer those questions with mentioning political positions of the members. It can be said that we don't see a kind of liveliness in the discussions of their political engagement and the possible reflections of its culture thesis on their means of generating 'revolutionary cinema'. Even though, the majority of the Group prefers to be in the same position with the supporters of MDD's revolution thesis, some of the articles reflect the opponent position against the TIP with the critic of *Sinematek*, there are not any discussions about what they understand from the revolutionary culture and the presence of cinema in this culture. Moreover, the ambiguous stance of choosing the places in presenting their movies (as mentioned in the fourth chapter) according to the political positions of the leftist fractions also becomes meaningful in this manner. Yet, this situation doesn't prevent those people to overestimate the initial aim of attaining

revolution, meaning that although they want to establish socialism through the revolution, and use the cinema as an instrument for attaining revolution, they don't prefer to internalize the MDD's revolutionary thesis or TIP's Socialist Revolution thesis and adapt them to their cinematic understandings. To put another way, it is possible to interpret that the Group possesses a heterogeneous characteristic in terms of its political position, because the members don't compromise a single leftist ideology, contradicting the Group's idea that the aim of reaching revolution overbears that of accomplishing revolutionary cinema and this kind of cinema can only be established after the revolution is attained.

The other question debated in this study is related to the Group's ineffectiveness with regards to the number of productions which it created. This matter is also criticized by the cinematic milieus especially during the Group's confrontation with *Sinematek* and Robert College. This deficiency is also seemed as contradicting with the statements claimed in the articles of *Young Cinema* pointing out the necessity of practice (very importantly making so much movies) for reaching a full-fledged organization and attaining revolution. After the 8th volume of *The Young Cinema*, the members try to explain the natural reasons of this situation which are mainly the lack of economic funds and the censorship problem. It should be admitted that an initiation which is utterly detached itself from the dominant economic networks possibly encounters various problems in finding new economic sources independently from capitalist-imperialist one to produce its movies, new- alternative networks to distribute and present them, and new means to reach those movies to people. It is also true that those difficulties need a considerable amount of time to be overcome. However, in this point it should be asked the validity and degree of the Group's opposition against the capital of dominant powers in making its movies. Apart from the strong position reflected in the *Young Cinema*, Veysel Atayman's statements are so significant in this matter. According to him, some members including himself didn't adopt the argument to use capitalist funds for making the revolutionary movies so strictly as reflected in the Journal. He claims that some directors like Tanju Akerson, Hüseyin Tüzün, Mehmet Gönenç and Mustafa Irgat give more importance to making movies, thus they don't care so much about the origin of the capital like other members of the Group. This also makes us put a question mark over the statements of the *Young Cinema* related to the superiority of revolution over cinema and practice over theory. All in all, it won't be wrong to suggest that the dominant statements accepted and adopted by the majority of the Group, and reflected in the *Young Cinema* doesn't mean that all members share the same idea with the Group without a fail.

Finally, we should remember the matter if this Group can be regarded as a movement or not. As to turn back Enis Rıza's statements this initiation is not a hobby, instead it has a counteractive position against the current cinema system and this stance is tried to bolster by new, authentic concepts and ideas. Furthermore, because of its refusal to all economic relations of the dominant cinema sector, it strives for initiating its own structure conducting with different modes of producing, making and distributing their movies. Moreover it tries to make its own movies reflecting its cinematic and political perceptions notwithstanding the limited number of outputs due to the lack of time for completing its upbringing and maturity process. In addition to those, the Group causes to bring so many directors, professors and cinema critics who would influence Turkish cinematic milieu with their works. As to my consideration those deeds and features are quite enough for regarding that this Group can be a movement. Moreover as we look at the short biographies of the members, there are so many important movie-makers, cinematic critics and academicians. However some significant matters make this opinion doubtful. At first as I mentioned in the introduction part, although this development brings about the emergence of creative and successful people, these endeavors aren't accomplished within the same group, instead they remain as private initiations. Furthermore, as it is discussed in the previous paragraph, all members don't seem to compromise in all issues they discuss in the *Young Cinema*, overshadowing the tendency to entitle the Young Cinema as a movement. All in all, it seems to be possible to suggest that Young Movie Makers (*Genç Sinemacılar*) emerges with a claim of becoming a movement, yet their group can't become being referred to a movement in Turkish cinematic literature and this study as well.

Whether it a movement or not, this cinematic development is very significant in various manners. Firstly, it is an indicator of the interconnectedness and interrelation of contemporary cinematic movements along with its detachment to the international and domestic political atmosphere. Moreover, it represents the most rigorous detachment, albeit not in the first time, from the current and previous cinematic works in relation to its opponent stance against the imperial and capitalist order. The members also accomplish to establish the first revolutionary organization in which the people share more or less similar intentions and ideas about the cinema. Although lots of the members of the Group retreat from the cinematic sphere after the Coup, this Group bequeaths a significant legacy to the ensuing studies especially in the documentary area. Furthermore, Prof. Dr. Mutlu Parkan and Oğuz Onaran in the Faculties of Communication, Veysel Atayman as a critic of the journals, Ahmet Soner, in

the *Mezopotamya Kültür Merkezi* (Mesopotamia Cultural Centre), *Nazım Kültürevi* (Nazim Culture Home) and Enis Rıza, in *Belgesel Sinemacılar Birliği* (The Association of Documentary Filmmakers in Turkey) continue to transform this legacy to the other generations.

APPENDIX I: TRANSCRIPTS OF ORAL HISTORY STUDIES

I

Interviewer's name: CENK CENGİZ

Informant's name: VEYSEL ATAYMAN

Date: 14.06.2010

Place: The Garden of *Nazım Hikmet Kültür Merkezi* (Nazım Hikmet Cultural Centre), Kadıköy

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Şimdi Genç Sinema o anlamda iki gruptu bu bağlamda, o anlamda sana yazdığım isim verdiğim kişiler yani işte Mehmet Gönenç o rahmetli oldu o sene oldu arkadan Mustafa Irgat nereden akciğer kanserinden galiba öldü. Daha bir kaç kişi daha var Enis o bizim aramızda o zaman yoktu. Ankara grubu zaten

CENK CENGİZ: Siz İstanbul'da mı kuruldunuz?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: İstanbul grubu tabi. Ondan sonra Ahmet Soner o bu grubun dışındaydı. Eğer orada bir dört kişi sayacak olursak bir tanesi Tanju Akerson bir de işte oralarda yine Hüseyin Tüzün yani aslında doğrudan gazeteye dergiye belki yansımaması gerek.

CENK CENGİZ: Hüseyin Tüzün'ün hiç makalesini görmedim.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Doğru ama şeyde çevirileri vardır Sinematek dergisinde, Yeni Sinema'da, broşürlerde. O zaman Hüseyin şeyde çalışıyordu zaten Goethe enstitüsünde çalışıyordu. Özellikle bize kitap takviyesi basımından çok yararı vardı. Demek ki işte Mustafa Irgat, Hüseyin Tüzün, Mehmet Gönenç, Tanju Akerson ve o çevreye yakın Tanju'nun o zaman evlenmişlerdi galiba Fatma Akerson bizim sonradan iki üç tane evlilik yapan Süheyla Hanım'ın kızı. Yani böyle bir ekip gibi orası yani o dışındaydı Sinematek'in, faaliyetin içinde doğrudan değil ama esas bizim o dışardaki buluşmalarımız üniversitedeki buluşmalarımız öyle ekip gibi bir şeydi. Yani orada dediğim sorun ortaya çıktı. Yani 66 – 67'ye geldiği vakit epey biraz kültürel birikimi olan çoğu zaten kolejden Robert Koleji o da

oraya yansıyordu tabi yani Robert Kolej benim tanıdığım değilse bile diyelim ki Tanju,nun tanıdığı onun değilse onun tanıdığı bir bütündü orası dolayısıyla oradan gelen etkilerle aslında bir kültürel böyle demin Ali'nin dediği gibi daha çok böyle yoz demeyim ama batı kültürünün biraz da rafine tarafının peşinde olan anlamaya çalışan seçmeye çalışan bu bağlamda hemen işte Marksist adını koyamıyacağımız daha çok böyle kültürel birikimle artırılmaya çalışan hatta biraz ingiliz ekolünün de etkisinde olan sinemada da Fransız ekolünün etkisinde olan bir grup vardı esasında Sinematek'te. Dolayısıyla Sinematek'te şeyi düşün Jak Şalom'u düşün.. Onat Kutlar.. Şu anda aklıma gelen isimler işte Şakir Eczacıbaşı zaten destek veren.. Atilla Dorsay O da Fransız ekolü ayağı düşünce.. ki Onat'ın zaten düşünce anlamında beslenmemizde müthiş etkisi vardır. Şimdi dolayısıyla orada demek ki böyle bir dönem gereği zaten sol rüzgarının estiği yerde yine de böyle biz solcuyuz diye ortaya çıkmasına gerek olmayan ama kültür nedir ne değildir üniversitede öğrendikleriyle yetinmeyip (çoğu filolojiden zaten) onun dışında kültürün araçlarına adeta saldıran biribirmi besleyen bir ekip oluştu Sinematek'te. Dolayısıyla mekan Sinematekten çok beyoğlundaki meyhanelerdi, birahanelerdi. İşte şimdi oraya gidiyorsun hayran bir şekilde Godard'ın bir filmi konuşmaya çalışıyorlar. Zaten orada da altyazılı olmadığı için filmlerin çoğu anlayanlar sana bir şey anlatıyor düşünebiliyor musun Passollini geliyor hatırlıyorum 'Konuşan Karga'yı seyrediyoruz ulen ne diyor bu herif kim anladı birileri anladı deli gibi Passolini konuşuyorsun. Bütün bunlar bugünkünden çok fazla bir kere neredeyse o görüntüleri içiyorsun kare kare içmeye çalışıyorsun başka türlü yakalamam mümkün değil. Etrafında bir tür o yönetmenden bu yönetmene böyle bir nasıl söyleyim sadece kavramı değil o dünyanın içine girip yaşama gibi. O filmlerin içine girip yaşamak zorundasın sana geçmesi için.. Oraya girdiğin anda belkide bu konuşmanın en önemli cümlesi çünkü ayırt edici oluyor bu cümle gerçeklikle film arasındaki sinema arasındaki çizgi flulaşıyor. Şimdi burada olduğu gibi bir filmi saatlerce konuşuyoruz.. Godard'ın solcu olduğundan da bahsetmiyoruz ama bizim için sağcılık solculuktan çok hakiki doğru dürüst bir sinema meselesi vardı o da orada. Fransız poetik şiirsel gerçekçiliği tam böyle kuram olarak bilinmiyor ama o farkları da görüyoruz oralarda yani Fransız sinemada Truffaut'un farkını görüyorsun, Godard'a dönüp bakıyorsun farklı bir takım başka şeyler farklı. Kaç tane seyrettik bilmiyorum ama bence herşeyden evvel kaliteli bir sinema var. Tam da Fransız sineması Yeni Dalga'yla birlikte atlamalı kurguyu mecburen paraları yok heriflerin şerit bittiği için kısa kısa çekiyorlar. Atlamalı kurgu dış mekan felan derken bir şey oluşuyor orada bugünkü gibi onları dönüp okuyacağımız bir şeyimiz yok, dönüp okuma imkanımız yok. Sen ne kadar Fransızca biliyorsan benden daha iyi seyredemediğin için ya da yatkınlığın varsa x yönetmene bana anlatıyorsun. Ondan sonra ben sana bir şey tespit ediyorum dolayısıyla filmi yaşıyoruz. Film yaşadığın için de tam da o anlamda o yaşayan halin kendisi bir gerçeklik oluyor. O filmlerin ne anlattığı felan hikaye orada sette belki 1930'larda setin arkasında yaptığı kavgayı da hatırlıyor onu anlatıyor oradan girdim buradan çıktım diye bir gerçeklik bu bütünüyle bir gerçeklik. Kubrick'in herifleri bir öldürmediği kalıyor onlar da oynuyorlar sonra benim bunu bilmem önemli filmi izlerken .Şimdi filmin bir parçası değil mi bu bir dünya var orada gerçeklik dünyası o gerçeklik dünyasının içinde dışarda da bir gerçeklik var. Ben eğer içip sabaha kadar onu konuşuyorsam bu bir gerçeklik film üzerine konuşmuyoruz filmi yaşıyoruz. Dolayısıyla aradaki çizgi kalkıyor, ister istemez ortaya yavaş yavaş sinemanın politik görevi çıkmaya başladığı andan itibaren de aslında bizim çelişkimiz ortaya çıkmaya başlıyor.

CENK CENGİZ: Hımmm

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Sinemanın toplumsal bir görevi olması gerekiyor. Onu da sürekli sosyolojiden, yaşanan günün olaylarından, sol bir kıvılcığa yaşıyor. Sanatın bir görevi olması lazım, kendi bireysel hayatımızı keyiflendireceğimiz ya da acılarımıza, yaşamadığımız aşklarımıza paralel bir takım öyküler bulup alıp gideceğimiz bir şey değil yanı pat diye araya sanat ve ideoloji meselesi çıkıyor kaba deyişle. Ama onun ortaya çıkışı belkide tam da sinemayla Türkiyede diyelim ya da Türkiye dışında sinemayla ilişkisi olan diyelim ki öteki dünyayla, öteki insanlarla, öteki ekiplerle sanki bu tarafın arasındaki farklılığı işaret eden bir şey oluyor ideoloji. Ya biz solcuyuz bunlar değil orada da film kopuyor tabi şimdi neden? Neredeyse sineması olmayan bir ülkede sen bir taraftan hayran hayran batı sineması seyrediyorsun ki geçmişteki bazı örneklerle bugün ulaşamayacağımızı düşünüyorum kim ne derse desin yani. O sinemayı görüyorsun dönüyorsun bu ne Türkiye’de yapılan diyorsun. Arada biraz biraz ‘Kızılırmak, Karakoyun’ felan üstadın işi burada biraz farklı diyorsun, alıp onu bir kenara çekmeye çalışıyorsun bu sefer. Dolayısıyla ideolojik bir şey hem bizim kendimizi belirlememiz için bizi zorluyor, biz kendimizi o ideolojik olanın sanatı nasıl tanımladığına bakarak biz kendimiz neye nasıl baktığımızı anlamak zorunda kalıyoruz. Şimdi ne oluyor dolayısıyla ortaya çıkan çok önemli bir şey benim sana yazdığım buydu. Demek ki bir tür gerçeklikle sinema arasındaki ilişki kültürle arasındaki ilişkiyi adeta silmiş hafif de entellektüel havası içindeki bir ekip birden kendini solcu olmaya böyle çekilmiş, rüzgar oraya çekiyor çünkü, hissettiği anda o ideoloji denen şeyde ki biz bu sinemaya olan düşkünlüğümüzü ya da bu arayışımı felan biz topluma karşı filmin görevi dediğimiz şeyi nereye koyabiliriz gibi bir sorun gittikçe öne çıkmaya başlıyor. Oraya çıktığı vakit bu sefer işte daha çok doğrudan doğruya toplumsal diyelimki toplumu değiştirme görevi işte o zaman İşçi Parti’sinden ayrılmış Denizler vs. onların tezlerinden beslenmiş olan Sinematek gibi bir grup oluşuyor ve bir araya geliyor. Ne oluyor geldiği anda böyle aynı ideolojiyi takip ediyoruz demekle birlikte dışarıdan görünmese bile iki belki üç tane kesin birbirinden böyle farklı demeyim ama birbirini tamamlayan diyeyim hadi bir tablo oluşuyor. Entel olmaya doğru yönelmiş bir çekirdek bunun içinde Kuzgun Acar yani dolaylı şeyler var her gün şöyle beraberiz Ece Ayhan felan bunları da unutmayalım. O zamanki Genç Sinema oraya yazı yazanlarla felan ilgili bir şey değil. Ece Ayhan’la her gün konuşup dururuz, Ece bize şiir anlatır bilmem ne Kuzgun Acar öyle. Düşün şimdi çevreyi düşün tanıyorsan bilmiyorum Kuzgunlar, Eceler, Onatlar ondan sonra bu arada sembolik bir şey ama bence anlamlı bir şey Yılmaz Güney Umut filminin gösterilerinde birine Sinematek’e çağırıyoruz ben orada Yılmaz Güney’in ne kadar çekingen, utangaç, kırmızı bir yüzle dolaştığını görüyorum çünkü anlattığım şeyin fakında adam yani bir ucu Robert Kolej’e dayanan bir ucu Yeni Dalgaya dayanan bilmemne farkında öyle bir ekibin orada olduğundan. Onat’tan, Kuzgun Acar’dan, Sezer Tansu’dan böyle bir çevreden oluşan bir tür kültürel birikimi iyi kötü batıdan beslenmiş ya da Sezer gibi diyelim ki Osmanlı kültürüne çok önem veren felan böyle insanların bir araya geldiği karmakarışık bir şey ve burada birde ideoloji bizi birleştiriyor, sol gibi bir şey ama solculuğu nasış tarif edeceğimizi kimse bilmiyor.

CENK CENGİZ: Çünkü ne sol birleşiyor insanları ne sinema, hiç bir şey birleştirmiyor.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Şu birleştiriyor sanatın dolayısıyla kültürün toplumsal görevi olduğunu unutmamak gerekir cümlesi birleştiriyor.

CENK CENGİZ: Evet

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Ama o görevin nasıl yapılacağı konusunda herkesin kafası karmakarışık. Yani şimdi Serseri Aşıklar toplumsal bir sinema mı? Hayır, e ne yapacağız şimdi? 'Julie and Jimm'i ne yapacağız? 'Kızılırmak Karakayou'un karşısında biz onun nesini konuşabileceğiz? Böyle bir sıkıntı, kafanın kenarında tuttuğun bir şey bu. Dolayısıyla biz Türkiye'de var olan sinemaya hoşgörüyü yaklaşmak durumundayız. Muhattap olmadığımız Yeşilçam var onu yok sayıyoruz ama bu tarafta Yılmaz Güney çıkıyor, ona sahip çıkıyoruz. Ama neye sahip çıktığımızın da tam farkında değiliz. Söylenmemiş ama kendi aramızdaki konuşmalardan, bakışmalarından Umut çok iyi film di çıkıyordu. Ben 'Modern Zamanlar'da üç sayı evvel Yılmaz Güney'le ilgili bir yazı yazdım, çok da gönülden gelen bir yazıydı hakikaten o. Sistemin sinemasına benzemeyen bir şey vardı ama ne kadarı natüralist ne kadarı ekspresyonist Umut filminin onları konuşacak halimiz de yok orada. Tam da böyle bir açmazın içindeydik Genç Sinemanın esas film yapabilecek çekirdek kadrosunu olarak. Sağdan soldan çekildiğin vakit hiç bir proje gerçekleştiremessin. Bugün için de söylüyorum, yaparsın 'Üç Maymun'u ne olacak? Derme çatma bir hikaye kurarsın atarsın ortaya ne olacak? Tam da o kendi kültürünü kapadığın anda bu anlamda film araçsallaşılıyor. Gerçekliğin içinde bir gerçeklik olarak yaşadık sinemayı. Gerçekliği yaşamak, içine girebilmeyi önemli olan... Biz sinemayı da kullanamıyoruz zaten film yapamayacak hale geldiğimizi anladığımızda kullandık. O gün ne ise bugün de aynı şey. Ya bu adamlar işte batı sinemasının hayranı çünkü Ulusal Sinemacılarının yaptığı şey buydu bunlar batı sinemacısı diye suçluyorlardı. Peki siz 'Gurbet Kuşları'nı niye uyarlıyorsunuz?

CENK CENGİZ: İşte o zaman da şöyle açıklanıyor sanırım, Aslı Hanım'ın bir tezi vardı belki okumuşsunuzdur. 65 öncesi Halit Refiğ'i, Ertem Görenç, Metin Erksan Toplumsal Gerçekçilik diye kendi içlerinde bir akım oluşturmuşlar, Ulusal Sinemadan çok farklı. Mesela 'Gurbet Kuşları' oraya giriyormuş batının kalıplarını kullanarak sınıfsal farklılıklarını batının algılayışında anlatarak, Halit Bey'in kendisi böyle açıklıyor. 65'ten sonra da bizde zaten sınıf diye bir şey yoktu diyerek kendi önceki filmlerini çok daha farklı değerlendirmeye başlıyor. Ve böyle bir dönüş yaşıyor. Sinematek ve Genç Sinema bu yönden ayrılıyordu sanki. Hem Genç Sinema hem Ulusal Sinema kendimizi üçüncü dünya ülkesi olarak görüyordu. Hedefleri de daha kendi değerlerimizle geliştirmeyi. Sinematek sanki olayı batılılaşmak olarak algılıyordu.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Şimdi şöyle arayışların parçası olarak evet ama o tartışmalar aslında Ulusal Sinema için bir mazaret. Temel sorun şu bizde mesela arkadaşlar der binlerce film seyrettin senaryo yaz bize diye. Tarihseliği var onun onun içinden çekip alamassın. Amerikanın en önemli gangsteri hakkında 32 tane film çekilmiş. Tarihsel olarak gangstere bakış sürekli takla atıp geliyor. Nasıl yapacağız? Homoseksüelliği neden anlatmıyorsun? O nedenle bugünkü kimlik sorunlarına geldik. 52'de yapılmış filmi orasına burasını budayıp alıyorsun. Bir yanılma var, samimiyetsizlik var. Ulusal Sinema üzerine en ağır yazıyı ben yazdım.

CENK CENGİZ: O zaman tekrar Genç Sinema'ya dönersek, dergisinde biraz Marksist terminolojiyle yaklaşmış Yeşilçam'a.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Evet, Yeşilçam'ın bakmadığı bir yerden baktıklarını söylüyorlar. Yeşilçam'da zengin kötü yoksul iyi bu ikilem üzerine sabah akşam film yapıyorlar ama aslında Yeşilçam kendisinin de farkında değil hali yokki ama farkında oldukları şeyler de var 'Kamelyalı Kadın'ı atıyorum mesela uyarlıyorsun Ölmeyen Aşk'ı uyarlıyorsun ama oradaki gerçekliği yakalayamıyorsun, aralarındaki ilişki yok. Burada biri biriyle evleniyor öbürü verem oluyor. Orada Tarihsellik var sınıf farklılıkları var. Yıllarca adını koyamadılar, Yılmaz geldi adını koydu. Yılmaz öfkenin tehdidin gözüne döndü sonrada. Umutsuzluğun gözüdür Yılmaz'ın bakışlarında o umutsuzluğu kendiliğinden yakalarsın. Ama işte bütün bunlar birleştiği vakit şu ortaya çıkıyor. Ulusal Sinema sanıldığıının aksine bizim o çekirdeğin kesinlikle barışık olduğu bir şey değildi. Tam tersi kendi aramızda alay ediyorduk hatta bir gün Metin Erksan ile Alman Konsolosluğu'nun arkasında Cennet Bahçesi diye bir çok büyük toplandığımız bir yer vardı hala açık mı bilmiyorum, oturup bir sürü şey konuşmuştuk. Genç Sinema'nın İstanbul çekirdeği sürekl, bu meseleleri tartışıyordu ama dergiye yansımıyordu çünkü kendi karar verebileceğimiz bir şey değildi. Gidip gidip evde kitap okuyorduk mecburen, sinema okuyorsun, kitap okuyorsun bugünkü gibi internet yok. Gramsci adını duymamıştık düşünebiliyor musun? Althusser daha zaten yazmamıştı yazacağını halimize bak şimdi ne Althusser var ne Gramsci. Böyle bir zavallığın hali içinde yinede batı sinemasının içindeki şeyi cımbızla toplamaya çalışıyorsun. Ötekilerse ukalalıkla biz Ulusal Sinemamızı yapacağız deyip duruyorlar. Yazışmalar, konuşmalar onlara gidiyor muydu bilmiyorum ama biz ne söylesek, Çiçek Pasajı'nda tartışsak konu buydu ama birikimimiz bunları bir yere koyacak halde değildi. Ulusal Sinema kendini meşrulaştırmak adına hem Türkiye'nin alt yapısını çok iyi biliyormuş, ona hesap veriyormuş gibi hem de batı sineması değilmiş gibi hem de bize özgür bir sinemaymış gibi, yaptıkları şey ortada. Dolayısıyla bugün ortaya çıkan Ulusal Sinemanın devamı ya da Yücel Çakmak'ın yaptığı dini sinema bak islami sinema diye bir şey çıktı

CENK CENGİZ: Evet 70'lerden sonra

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: İslami sinema Evrensel sinema kitaplığında çıktı, islami sinemaya ait çok güzel bir yazı vardır bulabilirsen tavsiye ederim, işine yarayabilir. İslam ve Sinema galiba kitabın adı. Din ve Sinema ya da kitabın adı. Demek ki dediğim Genç Sinema'dan kenardan kalma insanlar neydi felan diye soruldu zaten bugün olan memnuniyetsizliğin, eksikliğin belirtisi zaten. Tam da sinemaya olan büyük saygının, sanata duyulan büyük saygının ve toplumun da sanata saygılı olması gerektiği ile ilişkili bir şey.

CENK CENGİZ: Ve bunu birleştirememek aslında

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Birleşmez

CENK CENGİZ: Gerçekliği yaşayıp hem de ideolojik bir araç olarak kullanamamak

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Özet cümlesi sanata saygılı olacaksın, sanat insana saygılı olacak, sanat topluma saygılı olacak ve bu işi kapitalizm üzerinden yapacaksın, arada sermaye olacak, para denen pislik araya girmiş olacak, var mı böyle bir şey dünyada?

CENK CENGİZ: Peki şu ana kadar söylediğiniz şeyde daha çok Sinematek içinden gelen bir söylem var peki ama ayrılma noktaları da varmış onlar çok mu yüzeysel sizin için?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Yüzeysel, yani ayrılma noktaları şöyle pratiğe geçmiş ayrılma noktaları değil tam da esas sorunların ne olduğunu anladıktan sonra, ilk darbeden sonra okumaya daha çok fırsat bulup tartışmalarda anlamaya çalıştık neyin ne olduğunu. Bakın zaten 75 76'da iş yeniden alevlendi, uçlara felan gitti o arada Köroğlu projesi hazırlıyorduk. Yaşar Kemal'in Köroğlu efsanesi var mıydı bilmiyorum ulusal bir devrimci sinema nasıl olur diye konuşuluyordu ama yine sermaye sorunu vardı. Yılmaz Güney'e gidicektik yine bu projede de. Oralarda mutlaka o çarpmalar, ayrışmalar yaşıyacaktık. Sinema pratiğe dökülmediki, yapardık Köroğlu'nu çatışmalar çıkardı, bugüne kadar konuşulurdu ama sana kim yaptırarak ki? Ama bugün bana sorarsan iyi ki hiç bir şey yapmamış diyorum. Genç Sinema kökleri Sinematek'te olan bir şey, batı hareketi değil ama sinemayı öğrenme yeri... Ama Genç Sinema bunu söylemişti. Sinema topluma hizmet etmek zorunda.

CENK CENGİZ: O zaman siz, Fransız Yeni Dalgası'nın insana hizmet ettiğini ancak topluma hizmet etmekte biraz zorluk yaşadığını söylüyorsunuz.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: İnsana şöyle hizmet ediyordu, dediğim dönemde zaten varoluşçuluğun, Sartre dönemindeyiz düşünsene, Varoluşçuluğun etkisi çok büyük. Ben sana söylüyorum zaten ekibin ayrışma tarzı yaşama farklılığında. Varoluşçuluk partisi... dinlenen şeyler plaklar falan Türkiye'de aklına gelmeyecek ileri düzeyde plaklar. Müthiş entellektüel bir parti. Robert Kolej ağırlıklı bir parti. Tam da o. İngiliz entellektüelleri, Virginia Woolf mesela, sürekli ağızlarda olan biri, arada bir sürü var, mesela Oscar Wilde, Şakir zaten Wilde ve Bernard Shaw hayranı sonra çevirdi zaten kitabını Eczacıbaşı, yani varoluşçuluk var şeyin içinde. Bizim oradaki çelişkimiz de zaten o ortam içinde toplumculuğun kendini arayabilmesinin gerginliği içinde yaşama stresiydi. Kaç yerden bel bağlanıyor, biraz bu taraftan geliyor, Ankara, hatırlıyorum Özgentürk'tü galiba, bir gösteriye katılmışım lisede, bu ne falan demiştim dev adam böyle, onun muydu hatırlamıyorum, emekle ilgili bir sürü şey falan çoğu sinemayla alakası olmayan bir sürü şeyler, yani böyle bakıyorduk bazı şeylere. Dolayısıyla çok şey çıkabilir bu laflardan, ama ne işine yarar bilmiyorum.

CENK CENGİZ: Genç Sinemanın kendi başına bir hareket olması.. Ya da Sinematek'ten hangi konularda ayrılıyor? Genç Sinemayı Sinematek'ten ayıran kendi başına özellikleri nelerdir?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Bana yok gibi geliyor, şöyle birşey, Eczacıbaşı'nın arkasında olduğu, sermayenin arkasında olduğu bir kurum. Yani o ayrımı sen zaten biçimsel yapmak zorundasın. Tam da o nedenle yani çok da dikkat edilen birşey bu. Onat'tan falan gelen fikirler bunlar. Sinematekten hiçbir şekilde organik olarak ayrı olan birşey değil. Sinematek'in herşeyini kullandığımız gibi zaten kim geliyorsa oraya onlar var orda. Yani ece ayhan'ın oraya birşey yazmaması ece ayhan'ın konuşmadığı anlamına gelmiyor ki. Ama onlar bile bile

kendilerini işte buralarda tutuyorlar onlar Sinematek olarak tutuyorlar, Genç Sinema da bunun içinde, sermaye olan, Şakir makir var, şakir neden bir lira vermiyordu Genç Sinema dergisi çıksın diye, niye hiçkimse gidip şakir'den para istemedi?

CENK CENGİZ: Sermayeden kendilerini ayrı tutmak, yani çıkış noktası bu mu?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Evet.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama Sinematek de yine sizinki gibi o kapitalist altyapıdan çıkmayı savunmuyor muydu? Ama aslında yaptıkları şey o değildi?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Hayır nasıl yapsın, zaten Sinematek sana sinemanın kültürünü sunarak zaten senin sinemayı nasıl kullanabileceğin konusunda sana bilgi veren bir alan. Sinemanın içindeki sancıları da sana gösteren bir alan. Fransız Yeni Dalga'yı üç sayı evvel yaptık zaten yeni zamanlarda. Yeni Dalganın kendisi de kendisinden önceki Fransız sinemasıyla olan bir hesaplaşma. Yani auteur sinema meselesi ortaya çıktığı vakit, sinema benim kalemdir, yönetmen kalemdir diyen şeyle ondan önceki Fransız sineması zaten uçurum, o da ona zaten büyük bir tepki, Truffaut'nun bildirisi var, dergilerinde bazin'in bastığı Truffaut'nun çıkış yazısı var Yeni Dalganın. O zaman yeni çıkmıştı, madde madde adam programını anlatıyor. Oradaki Fransız sinemasına karşı. O sinema politik nedenlerle önemli bir sinema. Godard sineması geleneksel sinemaya inanılmaz bir başkaldırı. Hayatın kendisini müthiş yansıtıyor, varoluşçu. Ulusal Sinemanın bize saldırması bundan. Aslında karşı koyan Sinematek, Genç Sinema değil. Ayrılan birşey yok ama biçimde ayrılmak zorundasın çünkü gidip şakire biz dergi çıkarıyoruz şakir bey falan dese benim hesabıma yazın diyecek durumdaydı. Niye bir lira alınmadı da kendi paraları ile zorla çıkarıldı? Çünkü Enis gibi dışarıdan Anadolu'dan yavaşça buraya ilgi duyanlar da, mutlu da vardı, şimdi orda bize destek verenlerle aradaki mesafeyi de bilinçli mi yoksa biraz daha sezgisel mi böyle koruma gibi birşey var. Yani onun için, sonra Sinematek de ayrı dergi çıkarıyordu zaten. Yeni sinema. Bir sürü çeviri yapıyordu mesele genç alman sineması dergisinin yazılarını ben çevirdim. Sinematek dergisi, yeni sinema, Berk vardı hüseyin vardı çevirileri yapan, o kadar iç içe ki ayırman mümkün değil.

CENK CENGİZ: Ancak daha sonra bazı özel olaylar olmuş hani Sinematek'in önünde bir bildiri dağıtılmış, Amerikan Konsolosu'ndan filmler alınmış sanırım, ya da işte Shell şeyin sponsorluğunu yapmış, bunların hepsi biçimsel, hani ayırım olmuş zaten bunun nedeni olarak bunlar sunulmuş gibi geldi bana.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Yani ikinci şeyde, ben orda, kafam çok karıştı benim. Zaten oradan tepkiler geliyor iye Boğaziçi'ndeki ikinci yarışmaya protestoya dönüldüğü vakit, benim sezgisel sadece hani böyle sınırları çizilmiş, teoriden gelip pratiğe de yansımış bir sinema anlayışı açılıyormuş gibi birşey oldu ben orada soğumaya başladım. Çünkü artık sadece politika konuşuluyordu.

CENK CENGİZ: Sizce neden Genç Sinema o gün dönen devrimci tartışmalardan birisini benimsemedi, madem öncelik devrimdi? Mesela Mihri Belli'nin şöyle bir tezi var, ilk önce Milli Demokratik Devrim yapacağız, ülkenin emperyalist etkilerden temizlenmesi gerekiyor,

sonra kapitalizmi yıkarak sosyalizme geçeceğiz. Ve ulusal devrim yapıldıktan sonra bir Ulusal Sinema olacaktır diyor. Başka bir yazı var adını şimdi hatırlamıyorum, devrim olacak ve nasılsa proleterya öncülüğünde olacağı için, biz zaten proleterya sineması yapacağız. Yani öncelikli devrim sosyalist devrim de olsa ulusal devrim de olsa önceliğimiz proleterya olacak. Böyle kaygan birşey var aslında tam kesin birşey yok. Hani biraz daha kesin olarak benimsemesi gerekmiyor mu, öncelikle devrimse ve devrim daha sonra sinemaya yansıtacaksa?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Şimdi bak, bugünkü mantıkla baktığın vakit öyle ama Artun'un çok güzel söylediği gibi Boğaziçindeki toplantıda, ya zaten öyle bir soru yok ki, olmakta olan birşeyin içinde ne yapacağını düşünüyorsun, bu kadar basit. O havanın içinden olmasan bugün ne söylesen gülünç gelir o vakit... yoksa dediğim gibi niye Sinematekle dergi çıkarmasın ki Genç Sinema? Ama tablo o. Bir yerde o sermayeden ayrılma ihtiyacını onat'ın da duyması, en azından biçimsel olarak bunu vurgulamamızı istemesinden bunlar oluyor.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama Onat Bey hiçbir zaman Genç Sinemanın içinde olmadı?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Gözükmedi, bir tane yazısını bulamazsın.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama hem kendi ayırlaştırdı hem de

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Hiçbir yere geçmedi onlar hep durduğu yerdeydi. Ama reel olan birşey var, ondan sonra 70'ler olunca da İstanbul Reklama geçti, büyük işler yaptılar, 'yine bu kapağın altındadır' diyen Onat'tır, bulan Onat'tır. Hatta biz de çalışalım diye gittik bizi dehledi. Mehmet Gönenç'le gittik, yahu bitti bu iş daha 71 darbesi olmuş, 74'te, onat biz de başlayalım dediler bir kenarından, boşver size yar olmaz dedi... Şimdi orada artık şey, onat şeye inanmış, solun külüstürlüğüne ki bir sürü sol vadı külüstürü belirsizdi. Solda bir cehalet her zaman oldu o anlamda. Bugün yaşadığımız o değil mi solun yaşadığı bir cehalet meselesi var. Çok iyi birikimler de olmuştu solda, o günden bugüne orada da müthiş şeyler yazılar, Praxis dergisi falan, ama görüyorsun o Praxis dergisi bile burada entel bir kadronun üst bir kadronun birbiriyle konuştuğu bir dergiye döndü. Yani oradan kalkıp Praxis dergisinin işçiye mişçiye dönecek hali yok ... yok yani öyle birşey. Yani bunlar temel sorunlar. Yani geldiğimiz nokta dediğim gibi biçimsel bir ayırım Genç Sinema dergisinin çıkması. Sinematek de hemen sonra kendi dergisinin çıkardı. Burada kabaca ya da böyle devrimci yazı, yani devrimi doğrudan ... sermayeye karşı çıkma meselesi, Shell'in ne işi var, bu uçağın ne işi var deyince sinematel de mecburen ... ondan sonra darbe geldi zaten.

CENK CENGİZ: Yani şöyle belki özetleyebiliriz. Bir tanesi sermayeden uzak durma olarak, ilk önce böyle ayırlaşıyor, sonra biçimsel olarak Genç Sinema dergisi çıkarak ayrılıyor. Bir de bu politik tartışmalar...

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Bu ikincisi sonra. Genç Sinema dergisi daha bu tartışmalardan önce başladı.

CENK CENGİZ: Öyle mi?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Genç Sinema tam da o noktada çıkmaya başladı. Yani, evet, yetmişte başladı, 69'un hemen sonrasında başladı, yetmişte Genç Sinema, ama o zaman Sinematek'in dergisi vardı, Hisar Yarışmaları falan orada çıktı 68de.

CENK CENGİZ: Yani daha ilk sayılar çıktığı zaman Sinematek'le bir ayrışma yoktu?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: yoktu. İç içeydi. İlk sayılar çıkarken de zaten İkinci Hisar Yarışmasına gösterilen tepkiyle ayrışma başladı. Ama dediğim gibi, Genç Sinemanın çekirdek zemini de İstanbul kadrosu, İstanbuldaki elit, yabancı dil bilen, o zamanın biraz tırnak içinde 'hafif aydın'ı sayılacak, batı kültürü ile haşır neşir olan kadro zaten o iki şey arasında sıkışıp kalmış birşey. O yüzden böyle küt diye sermaye deyince falan burası sıkıştı kaldı. Ondan sonra darbeye kadar öyle ne oluyor ne bitiyorla gitti ilişki. Ondan sonra da zaten şeyler çekildi tabii 'Kanlı Pazar'lar çekildi. Almanya'dan bir herifler geldi SBF'ye (bir şirket ismi) filmler verdi beş altı tane kadar buralarda. Yani bitme değil, bitme değil ama o an bir durma, yani 'Kanlı Pazar'la şeyi verirken artık darbe olmuştu, nerede, beyoğlunda, tepebaşı'nda bir yerde alman SBF (bir şirket ismi) ne verdim ben filmleri bana verdiler götürdüm. Ondan sonra, baya korkuyla falan gittik böyle, arkamıza bakarak çünkü darbe olmuş 71 darbesi olmuş. 72ydi galiba ben filmleri verdim adama sonra da alamadık geri yani ondan sonra. Ordan hatırlıyorum, sanki daha çok pratiğe doğru, belge filmi çekmeye doğru işte Enisler mEnisler falan çıkmaya başlamışlardı dolayısıyla zaten teorik birşey, o 69'daki ikinci gösteri, Boğaziçi yarışmasında gösterilen, bunlar sermaye tepkisi orda bir dondu. Sinematek de işlevsizleşmeye başladı, dışarıda kalmaya başladı.

CENK CENGİZ: ama zaten, ben şeyi anlayamadım pek, zaten dergi çıktıktan sonra siz zaten sermaye karşıtı duruş orda sergilemişsiniz. Zaten bunun başlamış olması gerekiyor, ayrılaşma, ama aynı zamanda da Sinematek'in imkanlarını kullanıyorsunuz.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: E tabii biz orada biz orada Sinematek gençliği olarak oradayız, Yılmaz Güney'in 'Umut'u yaptığı yıl kaç, 71'ler, 72'de biz Sinematek'te bu filmi seyrediyosak toplantısını yapıyorsak.

CENK CENGİZ: Hala var bağınız yani Sinematek'le?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Olur mu biz sonra bir çok film seyrettik orda.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama, dergilerde okuyorum çok karşı çıkış var, bu şeylerden sonra işte Hisar filmleri, çok büyük bir çıkış var sanki ezeli düşmanınızmış gibi. Öyle yansıtmış...

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: ama benim öyle bir yazım olduğunu bilmiyorum. Ben öyle birşey yazmadım.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama sanırım bu işin biraz sinema tarafıyla ilgilenenler Sinematek'e çok daha yakınmış,

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Tabii, aynen.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama politik anlamda, daha çok ayrılar, daha çok politikaya önem veren insanlar Sinematek'le tamamen kopmuşlar.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Ben sana dahasını söyleyeyim, darbeden biraz evvel, 71 darbesinden birkaç gün evvel, son sayıyı çıkarıyorduk,

CENK CENGİZ: Proleter Devrimci Aydınlik olayı diyorsunuz... biraz anlattı Ahmet bey.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Ahmet, dergiye öyle bir de yazı gelmiş ki..., Tanju Akerson beni arıyor, dergi de benim adıma çıkıyor, neden o ara üç dört ay ben aldım derginin sorumlu yöneticiliğini, bu öyle bir yazı ki dedi hepimizi toplayacaklar. Anlatabildim mi? Hatta biz aramızda... Ahmet'e de söyledim ben. Ulan ne yapıyor bu adamlar, ... toplarlar, nitekim ben 76'da üniversiteye girdim, bir türlü benim kağıtlarım gelmiyor, o zamanki 76'da, şeye üniversiteye girdim, atamam ... Genç Sinema dergisinden dolayı dava açılmış, böyle sayfalarca falan işte ertelenmiş, iyi mi? Ahmet'in o yazısı çıksa içerdeyiz, on sene sekiz sene içerdeyiz. Bir de böyle birşey yani orada ulan ne oluyor filan dedim. Anlatabiliyor muyum, tam da o. Bu yazıyı değiştirdik çıkardık mı kardık orda zaten şey başladı, sanki bizleri bu tarafa çeken çekiyor falan, orada ortalarda, lan devrimcilik tamam da devrim de olmadı, devrim yerine karşı devrim oldu, şimdi naapacaz? Ona rağmen işte Beyoğlu'nda meyoğlunda senaryolara falan devam ederken tam da orada işte politik tendans şeye döndü işte nasıl söyleyeyim, ya pratiğe falan dönelim havaları başladı, zaten oralarda birşeyler yazıldı çizildi ama değeri yok. Yani aslında Sinematek'ten de o kopuş aslında Sinematek kendini nereye koyacağını şaşırmıştı, hem devrimci kanatı destekliyor, hem düşün, Sinematek, belli organik bir bağ var arada, şimdi düşün Şakir dedi bana başımı belaya sokacaksın anlatabiliyormuyum o 69'la 71 arası, 71 buçuk arası çok önemli. Ayrışma kopma hep oralarda. Herhalde Şakir Onat' aşey dedi, yahu ne yapıyor onlar dedi, o zaman dergi zaten tamamen Sinematek dışında bir hale geldi. Orda da Suat bıraktı zaten arkasını o son iki sayının. Ne yapayım? Tanımıyosun ki, Enis'i tanımıyorum, Enis oraya bir yazı koyacak, Çayan'larla ilgili mesela, ne yapacağız? Merkez kaybolmuş. Yani hep kendimiz, ben diyorum ki ana merkez ana çekim hep Sinematek'in kendisi oldu, onatlar, ondan sonra ayrılırken tabii onat monat hepsi ayrıldılar ve her zaman da onat'la daha yakındık, Atilla, Mehmet, Onat'la beraberdik...

CENK CENGİZ: Bu çekirdek kadro saydığımız...

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Bunlara da bir sürü kolejden arkadaşlar tabii,

CENK CENGİZ: Ama Atilla Dorsay yoktu?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Olsun tabii o dediğim ekibin etrafındaydı. Robert kolej ekibinin içinde.

CENK CENGİZ: Peki bu politik tarafta olanlar daha çok kimlerdi?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Ya onların aslında orada politik...

CENK CENGİZ: Mesela siz bir devrimci hareket üyesi değildiniz öyle değil mi?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Hayır. Mehmet değildi, Hüseyin değildi, yani bizim ekip değildi.

CENK CENGİZ: Ankara ayağı sanırım daha çok, işte Enis bey, ..

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Tabi tabi işte onu diyorum.

CENK CENGİZ: Ahmet Soner de sizdendi.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: yani Ahmet arada bir yerde işte Ulusal Sinemayla, arada bir yerde, Ahmet için birşey söyleyemeyeceğim. Bize mesafeli durduğunu biliyorum çünü entel tipler falan diye baktığından eminim Ahmeti'n bize. Onu da söyleyeyim. Yani ortada bir robert kolej, alman koleji, saint benoit şeyi var, ekibi var, her zaman ... O çıbanı gömmesi lazım, bu kesin. Vicdan gibi birşey, sinemanın vicdanı oydu, bak orada devrimin vicdanı burada sinemanın vicdanı, sinemanın vicdanıyla devrimin vicdanı buluşamadı. Genç Sinema, sinemanın vicdanıyla devrimin politikanın vicdanının böyle dönüp karıştığı bir yer. Ben diyorum o cümleyi yazarsan ... sinemanın vicdanı o tarafa ait, istanbul kadrosuna.

CENK CENGİZ: Ankara ayağı da daha çok politik vicdan...

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Bugün mütevazi bir şekilde ne kadar teorik şey varsa bana yollamaları aslında onun bir devamı gibi, bir sürü film, sinema dergisi ... doğru yanlış ama yani üç tane çeviri bilmem ne o derlemeler dolayısıyla, yani şöyle söyleyebilirim, Genç Sinemanın bana bıraktığı film yapamadıysa görev oydu benim için, aynen söylüyorum, siyaset, politik kuramı çok iyi öğrenip sinema kuramını çok iyi öğrenebilmek. Derdim o. Nereden geliyor? Oradan gelen birşey bu. Hatta kendimi suçlu bile hissediyorum bugün hayatta olmayan arkadaşlar adına. Hani tam da o yani Artun'la... bütün kitaplarına sözler yazdım bilmem ne, onun taşıyıcısı gibi birşey oldum yani oradaki teorik şeyi devam ettirmek benim üzerime düştü. Ama o oydu zaten burada olan şey oydu.

CENK CENGİZ: Öz-biçim birlikteliği konusunda da birtakım makaleler yazmışsınız Genç Sinema'da. İşte öz daha çok biçimi belirler, öyle formülize ediyorsunuz hatta, a b c olayı, neydi o tam olarak?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Ya işte orda şeyi gösteriyor onları niye seviyorum, kültürel oradaki filolojiden bilmem nereden edindiğimiz bilgileri uyarılama güdüsü bu başka birşey değil. Ama bir dert var. Devrimci sinema yapacağız ama özne biçim ne filan gibi Lukacs'tan gelen tartışma. Tam da 76'da Lukacs'i yaptığım vakit tam da o öz biçim bilmemne meseleleri. Yani diyeceğim, çok net çıkan ortaya, istanbul kadrosu teorik olarak sinemanın ne olduğu estetik olarak ne olduğu meselesi içinde kıvranıp duran, bu tarafta da şey, yarın devrim oluyor siyasi yerinizi belirleyinle olan birşey ve Sinematek'te bir araya gelmesi bu şeyin. Bu kasırganın orda buluşması.

CENK CENGİZ: Bu Genç Sinema'nın ilk sayısında bu çekirdek kadro dışında Ankara ayağı da başlamıştı değil mi? İlk sayıdan itibaren mi yoksa biraz daha...

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Yani konuşuluyordu, yazılar, film gönderiliyordu filan, ancak gönderiliyordu ama ...

CENK CENGİZ: Ankara ayağıyla bağlantıyı nasıl sağladınız?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: İşte onu sağlayan ben değilim. Onu Üstün Barışta sağladı, o birden girdi araya ama yani, ... onu da konuşamadık, Üstün oturuyordu işte sonra darbe olunca Boğaziçi'nde zengin ideolojisi diye dersler vermeye başladı. Ondan sonra üç sayı dört sayı dergi çıkarttı, sonra bir çeviri yaptı, tamamıyla entellektüel şeye doğru kayd, renk ve sinema, sinemada renk, hemen 70den sonra işte, 72, 73, 74 arası. 73'de zaten 74'de koptu. Mutlular gitti, onlar gitti. Yılmaz Güney'e o projeyi sunamadık o gitti.

CENK CENGİZ: Kimler var mesela Tanju Akerson ne yapmıştı?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Amerika'ya gitti.

CENK CENGİZ: Sinema okumak için falan mı?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Caz dinlemeye gitti.

CENK CENGİZ: Hüseyin Tüzün?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Hüseyin o da birşeyler çekti parça parça onları bir araya getiremedi, ondan sonra hüseyin isviçreye gitti türkçe bölümünde ders verdi.

CENK CENGİZ: Mustafa Irgat?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Irgat zaten Ece Ayhan'la ayrı bir ekip gibi, şiire verdiler kendilerini Ece'yle beraber. Irgat önemli, dolu bir çocuktur. Gönenç de, 74ten sonra onat'a gitti biz burada çalışalım diye, bu sermaye işi dedi, de gülüyoruz artık, darbeler olmuş elimizde ayağımızda beş kuruş yok, lan dedik bu dünya da böyle bir dünya dedik, çekildik, Mehmet de ondan sonra çekildi hayattan. Hayattan çekildi film seyretmeye başladı. Sekiz sene oluyor öleli.

CENK CENGİZ: Yani filme devam eden sanırım Enis Bey var siz varsınız.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Yani sinemaya devam eden teorik olarak falan, sonra biz Osman Altuğ'la geçtik, bir de sinemaya devam eden esas Artun Yeres, dört beş tane Yeşilçam filmi yaptı. Serüven filmleri falan. Kendine özgüydü Artun'un yaptıkları bir de artun o şeyleri yaptı tabi, çok güzel sekiz on tane onlar sende var mı bilmiyorum ressamlardan hareket ederek dizi yaptı. O dizi çok iyidir ya.

CENK CENGİZ: Siz nerede öğretim görevlisisiniz?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Ben İstanbul Üniversitesi Almanca mütercim tercümanlık

CENK CENGİZ: Ha, öyle mi? Sinema konusunda değil yani

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Bir kaç teklif geldi öyle çocukların sinema sevmesini sağlayacakmışım para alıp

CENK CENGİZ: Senaryo yazmayı düşünmediniz mi?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Çok var.

CENK CENGİZ: Ha, var mı? Filme çekmeyi hiç düşündünüz mü?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Bir şeyi bir akım haline getiremediğin sürece fazla içinde takla atmanın anlamı yok bence. Onun için de genç arkadaşlara bişeyler yapın ama ne yaptığınızı bilin diyorum. Benim küçük oğlan var senin yaşlarında üniversite felan sevmiyor gitti açıköğretime, sinema konusunda zıpkın gibi. Bu yıllarca devam etmesi gereken bir süreç, şurada konuşuyor olmamız bile mikrobu taşımak ve yaymak için bence önemli. Belki film bir yerde unutulup gidebilir ama sen gidip birileriyle konuşacaksın belki, mikrobu yayabildiğimiz anda birşeyler olacak. İnsan rüyaya yatmadan hiç bir şey olmaz. Uyandığın vakit çok kötü olur dünya. ... politik sinemacı değil dedim, bence şey uyanma sineması o. Birey uyanıyor ve karşısındaki Politik mekanizmanın ne olduğunu görüyor ve itaat ediyor. Mekanizmanın dışlarına çarpıyorsun, çarptığın anda kaybediyorsun. Uyandın mı belaya çarparsın. Nerede uyanıyorsun Şili’de uyanıyorsun Amerika’nın ne olduğuna. Uyanmak çok önemli bir konu.

CENK CENGİZ: o zaman Genç Sinema uyuyan, ben yazacağım bunu. Böyle bitirebilirim hatta.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Bence bitir, Genç Sinema uyuma sineması.

CENK CENGİZ: Aslında halkın uyuduğunu düşünüyorlar Yeşilçam filmleriyle ama uyuyan kendisi.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Kafka’da da vardır, kalktığın anda böcek olduğunu görürsün. Uyanmak belanın başladığı noktadır.

CENK CENGİZ: Mekanizmaya çarpar ve bunun nihai sonucu her zaman itaat midir?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: İmhadır, imha olursun. Ya içinde olucaksın ya imha. Çok namusluysan kendini öldürürsün. Mekanizma öyle bir mekanizma ki pessimiz orada zaten. Demokrasi faşizm olabilir her anda uyandığın anda bu ne biçim demokrasi diyebilirsin. Hukuk dersin hukuka benzemediğini görürsün. İsyen bir uyanmadır aslında.

CENK CENGİZ: Mesela Alman Sürrealistleri sineması de bir uyanma sineması mıydı? Birinci dünya Savaşı’ndan çıkılıyor ve o hayata bir isyan var.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Gözünü açtığında çarptığın mekanizmayı anlayamıyorsun aslında, sen kavrayamıyorsun seni yutan mekanizmayı, şato, dağlar, böceklik. Kafka’da çok ünlüdür o cümle bunları yazacak ömrüm olacak mı bilmiyorum, Kafka der ki şatoya çok düşkünüm ama sen daha şatoyu tanımıyorsun der adam. Sen şatoyu bilmiyorsun gibi kötü bir çeviridir ama değildir. Sen diyorsun Sabancıyı bitireceğim ben diyorum ki sen daha sabancıyı tanımıyorsun.Sermayeyi tanımıyorsun.

CENK CENGİZ: Tanımak nedir peki orada? Uyumak mı uyanmak mı?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Romanın uyandırması lazım, kurtuluşu göstermesi lazım

CENK CENGİZ: Kurtuluşu göstermek de aslında uyumaktır teorik olarak baktığımızda

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: İkinci bir uyuma olabilir, tehlikeli bir sınır.

CENK CENGİZ: Genç Sinemanın ayrılması da bir uyanma aslında ama devrim gelecek şöyle deđitireceđiz demekten bir uyuma.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Uyandıđını sanma hali de olabilir.

CENK CENGİZ: O dönemin sol tartışmalarına da bakarsak işçi sınıfı ile emekçiler birleşiyor ama tablo o kadar pozitif deđil ki. İşçi sınıfı siz söylediniz demin uyuyorlarmış.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Peki uyumanın dışında bir yer var mı? Mecburen uyuyorsun çünkü rüya yapan bir rüzgar esiyor.

CENK CENGİZ: Evet

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Tatlı bir meltem esiyor, uyutuyor seni

CENK CENGİZ: 71 uyanma o zaman direkt bir darbeyele

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Kafka'da adam bir uyanıyor böcek. Mekanizma seni orada tutuyor, şakır şakır çarklarının içine alıp parça parça ediyor. Faşizm illa ki politik bir hal deđil ki.

CENK CENGİZ: Yazı ne zaman çıkacak?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Çıkmış olması lazım olmadı ben sana yollarım.

CENK CENGİZ: Benim servise yetişmem lazım ama tezimi size şöyle anlatayım, yollayacağım da zaten. Ben tezimi üç bölüme ayırdım. İlk kısımda Genç Sinema'nın gelişim süreci, hangi politik ve sanatsal ortamda ortaya çıkmıştır şeklinde. Kendi içerisinde ayrışmalar nelerdir ve işte ne bileyim kimlere karşı çıkmıştır. Bu konuştuđumuz süreci biraz anlatacađım. İkinci kısmı yazdım, anti yeşilçam duruşunu anlatıyorum ve bunun politik teorilerle beslenmesi işte sınıf farklılıkları, anti emperyalizm, anti feodalizm gibi teorilerle yeşilçama tanımlamaları ve karşı çıkmaları gibi. Üçüncü kısımda ise karşı iseniz ne açıdan örgütlenme gibi. Dördüncü de devrim ve sinemanın ilişkisi ve devrimci sinema nasıl olmalıdır. Böyle bir toparlama yaptım. Siz ne düşünürsünüz?

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: Umarım konuşmalarımızı oturtabilirsin bunların içine. Bu kaydı da alabilir miyim?

CENK CENGİZ: Tabi, CD şeklinde yollarım size.

II

Interviewer's name: CENK CENGİZ

Informant's name: AHMET SONER

Date: 24.06.2010

Place: The Meeting Room of *VTR Araştırma Yapım Yönetim* (VTR Film Directing Research & Production), Teşvikiye

CENK CENGİZ: Nereden başlayalım istersiniz?

AHMET SONER: Nereden istersen.

CENK CENGİZ: Tamam, o zaman hareketin gelişimini biraz konusalım isterseniz. Nasıl ortaya çıktı? Nasıl bir ortamda ortaya çıktı? Ve içinde ayrılaşmalar var mıydı? Çünkü Sinematek'e de karşı çıkılmıştı belli bir dönem sonra. Hisar Kısa Filmleri'ne de karşı çıkılmıştı. Onun dışında birtakım toplumsal temalı filmler yapıldı, hem Susuz Yaz gibi hem daha farklı, toplumsal temalı akımında birleşiyor şimdi onlar ama işte Halif Refiğ'in filmleri gibi, onlara karşı da bir duruş vardı. Ve kendi içerisinde birtakım ayrışmalar var sanırım. Ankara Ayağı ve İstanbul ayağı gibi. Enis Bey ile biraz onu konuştuk. Bu gelişimi biraz sizden alırsam sevinirim.

AHMET SONER: Simdi Robert Kolej'in yarışma açması ile hareketlendi. Bugüne kadar kısa film ya da belgesel bu gibi seylere kimsenin önem verdiği yoktu. Zaten bakarsanız kurumlarda oluşmuştu bu. Sebahattin Eyüboğlu, İstanbul'da üniversite bünyesinde bir film merkezi gibi bir şey kurduydum. Her yaz gidip film yapıyorlardı öğrencilerle birlikte filan. Onun dışında da belgesel yapan yoktu. Sinemaların sözde filmde önce belgesel göstermesi diye bir yasa var yönetmelikte sözde ama bu uygulanmazdı. Bu ADS diye habercilik yapan bir ajansın filmleri gösterilirdi. Ne olurdu o filmlerde, Başbakan suraya gitti, cumhurbaşkanı buradan geldi, bilmem şah geldi, bilmem kim gitti, sah geldii gibi kısa 5 dakikalık bir şey. Ondan sonra da haftanın önemli bir futbol maçının, işte 35 mm ile çekiyorlardı. Sinemalarda sadece o ADS'nin haberleri gösterilirdi. Onun dışında bir şey yoktu. Bu kolejin açtığı yarışma hem bir ödül de vardı ortada söz konusu, 2500 lira gibi bir şey. 2500 lira ile bayagi bir film yapabilirsin, uzun film değil tabii, kısa filmler, yarım saatlik filan. Bu harekete getirdi gençleri iste. Sinema yapmak isteyen gençler birtakım kendi ceplerinden, babalarının parasıyla sunla bunla birtakım küçük imkanlarla hazırlandılar hemen bu yarışmaya katılmaya falan. Böylece bir iki yıl devam eden bu şey sayesinde bir hareketlenme oldu gençler arasında. Zaten daha önce Kulup sinema 17 kurulmuştu . Akademi'yi Sami Şekeroğlu kurmuştu. Oralara gidip geliyorduk. Ardından 65'te Sinematek kuruldu. Oraya da devam eder olduk. Bir sinema kültürü Türkiye'de görme şansımızın olmadığı filmlere ulaşma şeyimiz oldu bu sayede. O da tabii insanın dünyasını genişletiyor, yapacağı sinemanın birtakım seylerini bulabiliyor, Godard izliyor, Olson Welles izliyor , Latin Amerika sineması izliyor. Bu ufku açıyor insanların. Sadece Hollywood olmadığını dünyada, Eisenstein'ları bile hep oralarda izledik çünkü biz. Giderek işte ben de birşeyler yapmaya giriştim. Ben o zaman Atıf Yılmaz'ın asistanlığını yapıyordum, ikinci asistan. 1500 lira para alıyordum bir filmde. O 1500 lirayı olduğu gibi negatife yatırdım. 10 tane 16'lık, 30 mlik, 10 tane sey aldım kutu, 300

m. 300 m de 30 dakika eder 16'lık hesabıma göre. 30 dakikalık malzeme ile de 10 dakikalık bir film yapılır diye düşünüyordum. 67 yılıydı, 66'da başlamıştı ilk şey. Artun Yeres falan katılmıştı o sene.

CENK CENGİZ: Çirkin Ares'in olduğu sene mi?

AHMET SONER: Evet, evet. Artun Yeres, Sezer Tansu filan, bunlar ödül almışlardı. Biz ikinci yıla hazırlanıyoruz tabii. Öyle bir örnek de gördük önümüzde. Ben aslında Sabahattin Ali'nin 'Fırar' adlı bir öyküsü vardır, onu çekmek istiyordum ama o yıl İstanbul'a hic kar yağmadı, karda çekmek istiyorum. Kar yağmayınca da Samim Kocagöz'ün bir öyküsünü şey yaptım, işte kendisine mektup yazdım, iznini aldık filan. İşte öyle 10 dakikalık bir Tenek diye bir öyküsü var Sami Kocagöz'ün. Erdal Özyağcılar, o zaman konservatuarda öğrenciydi, arkadaşımızdı. Gel dedik sen oyna başrol falan filan. Öyle de bir macera oldu. Neyse katıldık, bayağı 16'lık, 8'lik kabul ediyorlardı, 35'lik de kabul ediyorlardı. Mutlu Parkan, mesela, 35'lik bir film ile katılmıştı. Biz 16'lık yapmıştık. 8'lik yapanlar vardı, 8 mm falan. Beğenildi film aslında, yazılar da çıktı iyi, Onat Kutlar, Sungu Çapan, Ali Gevgilli gibi o zamanın... Yani 10 dakikalık bir film çekiyorsun, birtakım eleştirmenler yazı yazıyorlar. Tamam değerlendirme filmler hakkında...kendileri de çok iyi biliyorlar... İnsanın hoşuna gidiyor böyle şeyler, ama ödül vermediler o yıl. Ödüle değer şey bulamadık gibi bir sey vardı bazı ukala jurilerin. Elde olan ne ise ver işte kötünün iyisi, ...Yok ukalalık, öyle şey yok falan gibi. Evet bazı kusurlar oluyordu, çünkü profesyonel bir şey değilsin. Kamera zor buluyorsun. O kurgulu kameralar, şurda var işte Bolex bir tane mesela. Kuruyorsun böyle, o kurgu ne kadar sürüyor biliyor musun? 45 sn. 45 saniyeden filan uzun çekemezsin, zaten o 45'in son 10 saniyesini de sayma, o giderek zemberek gevşediği için pek sağlıklı bir şey sayılmaz. Bir o şartlar, bir de işte banyosu, baskısı, bir sürü laboratuvar işlemleri var. O zaman 16'lık profesyonel bir şey olmadığı için yüz veren de yoktu, dönüp bakan. Jonny diye bir fotoğrafçı vardı, o yıkıyordu bizim götürdüğümüz filmleri falan. Baskıda hatalar oluyordu, çizgiler, şunlar, bunlar. Kusurluydu filmler aslında. Ama işte orada tanışma fırsatı oldu. Bu film yapan insanlar bir araya geldiler, tanıştılar birbirleriyle. Sıkıntıları da ortak, Türkiye'de o zaman, Türkiye'de değil, İstanbul'da 3 tane 16'lık kamera var, düşünebiliyor musun? Herkes kuyruğa giriyor, onları alabilmek için. 2 gün alacak da film çekecek diye. Bir araya gelirsek hiç değilse malzememizi de ortaya koyarız, birlikte kullanırız her şeyi. Kiminde çip vardır lambası vardır 2-3 tane, kiminde kurgu aleti vardır falan filan diye düşünerekten hem, hem de zaten böyle sinema yapmak isteyen genç insanlar politik de insanlar bunlar, 68'e doğru gidiliyor çünkü. 67 senesinden bahsediyorum ama gençlik o kadar hareketli ki mitingler, yürüyüşler, şunlar bunlar, işgaller, boykotlar, üniversite işgalleri falan hep o dönemde yapılıyor. Biz de onların içindeydik hep zaten. Br araya gelme şeyi biraz da böyle bir şey. Okuyoruz ediyoruz, tartışıyoruz sol konuları. O dönem İşçi Partisi'nden başka bir şey yoktu ortada. Herkes Mehmet Ali Aybar'ı destekliyor. Ama arkasından muhalefetler başladı. Behice Boran'lar muhalefet etti. Aybar Çekoslovakya olayında biraz açık verdi. Yüklendiler müklemler alacağı ettiler onu. Bu arada Mihri Belli tekrar palazlandı İşçi Partisi'nde taraftar topladı, partiyi ele geçirme hesapları yapıyordu bir kongrede. Hesapları tutmayınca, Mihri de gençlere yöneldi, Yusuf'lara Mahirlere falan filan. Bayağı şeydi. Yani bu eski tüfekler etkiliyorlardı gençleri o zaman, Hikmet Kıvılcımlı etkiliyordu bir yandan, yazdığı kitaplarla filan. Herkes

okuyordu. Dev-Genç seminerleri veriyordu. Dev-Genç'lere seminerler veriyordu, o yaşlı başlı adam. Kutuplaşmalar biraz böyle. İşçi Partisi önce, herkes partili militan, İsmet Özeller, herkes İşçi Partisi'ne koşuyor. Biz de seçimlerde gidip gözlemci, sandıkta başında bekliyorduk parti temsilcisi gibi. O dönem 66-67 böyle hareket oldu. Milletvekili vardı şeyin.

CENK CENGİZ: Fikir Kulüpleri Federasyonunda mıydınız aynı zamanda?

AHMET SONER: Yok üniversite ile işim olmadı benim. Ben üniversiteye gitmedim ama hep teknik üniversiteydim, öbür şeydeydim, Beyazıt'taydım, arkadaşlarımız ordaydı çünkü. Ben filmlerde asistanlık filan yapıyordum, çünkü anladım ki bir sinema okulu yok o sırada. Yurtdışına da bizi, peder muhasebeci, basit bir memur, nasıl beni dışarıda okutacak, o şansımız da yok. Mecburen usta-çırak ilişkisinden bu işi öğreneceksin diye düşünüp Atıf Yılmaz'la çalışmaya başlamıştım zaten. Ama şanslı arkadaşlarımız oldu yani. Üstün Barışta, Engin Ayça gibi arkadaşlar İtalya'da okuyup geldiler. Onlar da bizim gruptaydı çünkü. Bayağı Üstün toparlamaya çalıştı, Artun bir taraftan.

CENK CENGİZ: Siz Sinematek'teydiniz aynı zamanda...

AHMET SONER: Tabii... Onat Kutlar destekliyordu bir yandan. Yeşilçam'a karşı böyle bir grup oluşsun istiyordu. Yeşilçam dışında alternatif bir sinemacılar grubu oluşsun istiyordu. Umudu da vardı çocuklardan, bizden yani. Başta tabii bu dergiyi çıkarmaya karar verdik. nasıl duyuracağız sesimizi ya da düşüncelerimizi, film yapamadığımızı göre. Uzun film yapamıyoruz, kısa uyduruk şeyler yapıyoruz. Zaten olaylardan, kaçmaktan, kovalamaktan vakit yok. Sokakta o kadar çok şey oluyor ki. Ölümler başladı bu sefer Taylan Özgürler şunlar bunlar arka arkaya gelmeye başladı. Hep onları cenazeleri çekmeye başladık. Belgesel sokağa indi kamera, bu olayların içinde kamera oldu. Daha sonra DISK'le anlastık, DISK'in bütün grevlerini çekmeye başladık. Bayağı aktiftik. Ustelik alternatif bir sey yaratmaya çalışıyorduk. Sinema salonlarının dışında nerelerde gösteri yapabiliriz gibi. İşte dernekler, ondan sonra kooperatifler, birtakım işçi kuruluşları, sendikalar, üniversiteler, üniversite öğrenci birlikleri. Ve biz bir taraftan da film gösteriyorduk. Mesela işte, Eisenstein'in Potemkin Zırhlısı, Gorki'nin Ana üçlemesini, Benim Üniversitelerim, Çocukluğum falan üçleme, üç film vardı. Onları Sovyetler elçiliğinden filan alabiliyorduk rahat.

AHMET SONER: Kendi istediğimiz filmleri yapmaya zaman bulamıyorduk aslında. Zaten kaynak da yoktu, nereden bulacaksın şimdi.

CENK CENGİZ: Peki bu ama bu aynı zamanda devrime hizmet etme amacı da taşıyordu.

AHMET SONER: Evet, bir suru kuruluşlar bizi destekliyordu. Genel seyi söyleyeyim demin saydığım. İşçi Partisi'nden sonra, Milli demokratik devrim'den yana olduk biz ağırlıklı olarak. Yine içimizde bir iki TKP'li vardı sesini çıkarmayan veya İşçi partili vardı ama genellikle Mihri'ci olduk biz bir dönem. Sonra Mihri'den ayrıldı gruplar, gençler artık Mihri'yi dinlemez oldular. Mahirler, Yusuf Küpeliler filan ayrı bir grup olarak ayrıldılar. Zaten o dönemde de bütün dergiler kapatıldı, olaylar başlamıştı, adam kacirmalar, banka soymalar, falan filan...

CENK CENGİZ: Peki Doğu Perinçek taraftarı var mıydı?

AHMET SONER: Doğu Perinçek de başta hep o İşçi Partisi'ne muhalif grubun içindeydi, sonra ayrıldı. Mihri abi ile birlikte, Aydınlık'ı filan çıkardılar. Sonra o aydın adam? birden Maocu oldu. Yani Maocu var mıydı bilmiyorum. Bir iki tane mutlaka vardır. Ben bütün o sol gruplara eşit mesafede bakıyordum. Tercih ettiğim şeyler vardı, doktorcuları daha çok tutuyordum, Mihri ağabeyi tutuyordum filan. Vedat Türkali'yi severdim, tutardım, beraber iş yapmışlığımız var. Yani böyle bir durumdu. Doğu Perinçek de İşçi-Köylü gazetesini çıkarmaya başladığında benden fotoroman istedi. Ben de o ilk çektiğim filmin fotoğraflarından fotoroman yapıp vermiştim. Rastlarsan İşçi-Köylü gazetesine, ilk 3-4 sayısında yayınlanmıştı o Teneke filminin fotoromanı. Siyasi sey boyleydi, ama işte sonra dergi çıkaramaz hale geldik 12 Mart'tan sonra. Eeee rrup da dağıldı. Oturduğumuz böyle Aksaray'da, pardon Galatasaray'da 11 odalı bir ev vardı, orada herkesin yeri orasıydı. Alet edavat edinmeye de başlamıştık. Aslında bu darbe biraz da bize karşı yapılmış gibi de oldu. Yani baştan hiçbir şeyimiz yoktu aslında. Neden sonra işte ortaklaşa, herkes biraz elini cebine attı falan filan. Bir 16'lık gösterici alalım dedik, projeksiyon makinesi. Öyle bir gösterici olmazsa, nasıl bu kadar gösteri yaparsın sendikalara, üniversitelere falan gidip. O gösterici şarttı. Uydurma Sinematek'in makinesi ile yapıyorduk daha önce çünkü, portatif taşıyorduk maşıyorduk. Sonra bir kamera edindik 16'lık, Doğu alman kamera. Arkasından bir kurgu yapacak, şuradaki şey gibi, kollu böyle çevirmeli ekranı olan bir şey edindik. Arkasından, Matipo, 16'lık baskı yapacak bir alet edindik bir yerlerden. Bizim bu gruplaştığımızı gören insanlar da, zaten ellerindeki seyleri veriyorlardı. ... mesela, iki tane kamerası vardı 8'lik. Al dedi bunları siz kullanın, duruyor orada falan gibi. Böyle şeyler de oluyordu dışarıdan, bir takım alet edavat geliyordu. Biz de o Galatasaray'daki yeri tuttuk 1000 liraya, orada kalmaya başladık, kocaman 11 odalı yer çünkü orası. Orada toplanıyordu herkes, işte dergileri orada çıkarıyorduk falan filan. Ama fazla sürmedi işte. Arkasından orası basıldı. Bizi arıyorlardı marıyorlardı. Ben gittim Yılmaz Güney ile çalışmaya başladım 'Acı', 'Ağıt' o zaman işte Nevşehir'e gittik de kurtulduk sıkı yönetim belasından. Elrom'un öldürülüşü zaman bütün aramalar yapıldı İstanbul'da bütün evler arandı filan. O vartaları böylece atlatmış olduk ama dönünce yakalandık başka bir olay yüzünden. Yine aranan, Ankara'dan biri, Ulaş'ın arkadaşı Cengiz diye bir çocuk bizim evde bulundu. O yüzden bizi de tekrar aldılar içeri. Neyse o uzun hikaye. Yani grup dağılmak zorunda kaldı. Ben sahip çıktım malzemeye. Çekilmiş ne kadar film varsa, tabii şahısların çektiği filmler kendilerinin filmi, onlar aldılar kendi filmlerini ama ortak malımız olan yani bu mitingler, cenazeler, yürüyüşler, şunlar bunlar, grevler mirevler hep bende kaldı. 10 sene falan ben bunları sakladım. Sonra birgun eski arkadaşlar toplanmışlar, demişler ki biz o malzemeyi şey yapalım, TKP'ye verelim. Hızlanmıştı 74'ten sonra, Türkiye'de TKP'liler bayağı bir çoğunluk haline gelmişlerdi. Öyle dediler, ben dedim vermem. Maden-İş'e verelim diyorlardı, Maden-İş TKP'lilerin yönetimindeydi. Niye vermiyorsun, vermem dedim. DISK'e veririm. DISK'in genel başkanı da amcamdı, Abdullah Baştürk. Niyetim işte vereyim, sonra ben istediğim zaman.... Olur mu hiç şaka yapıyorum. Neyse sonunda kabul ettiler. Baktılar ki vermicem. Tamam, DISK'e vereceğiz dediler. Topladık birgün 3 kişi 4 kişi, bir arabaya atladık. Doldurduk bütün o filmleri. Aletleri de koyduk tabi, yani hepsini DISK bir film merkezi kursun, çünkü biz dağılmışız artık. Şahsen benim el koymaya da hakkım yok o malzemeye. Hepsini götürdük Fehmi Işıklar vardı orada o zaman, teslim ettik. Bir protokol de imzaladık karşılıklı falan filan.

CENK CENGİZ: Ne zaman oluyor tam olarak?

AHMET SONER: 12 Eylül'den önce. 1980 yılının sonlarında teslim ettik arkasından. Yok, Eylül'den biraz önce, belki Mayıs'ta falan teslim ettik. Şeyini göremedik hiç yani. Tamamen el konuldu o malzemeye, aleyhimize kullanıldı, sonra televizyonda gördüm bazı bizim çektiğimiz belgeselleri. İşte 12 Eylül'e nasıl gelindi, komunistler neler yaptı? Metin Toker bir program yapıyordu televizyona, orada aleyhte kullanıyordu bizim çektiklerimizi falan. Biz o sıra bir şey yaptık, Kanlı Pazar diye, şubatta şeye karşı, 6. Filoya karşı yapılan bir haftalık bir şey vardı, bir haftalık protesto, çeşitli gösteriler. Sonra Pazar günü de bir yürüyüş Bayezit'tan başladı, Taksim'e kadar gelindi, çok kalabalıktı. Onu da çektik tamamını falan. Bu protesto haftasını böyle bir bağladık yani. O Protesto haftası Kanlı Pazar'da üç kişi öldü, Taksim'de o gün. Saldırdılar sakallı sarıklı birtakım adamlar, Düzce'den getirilmiş. O olayı üç kamera ile çekmiştik, 3 tane 16'lık kamera ile. ...Kuzgun Acar, Engin Akça ve ben kullanıyorduk. 2 tane de 8'lik kamera vardı. Üstün Barış, ile Ömer Tuncer kullanıyorlardı. Yani 5 kamera ile o olayı çekmiştik biz. Sonra ben birleştirdim, Kuzgun ve Engin'inin de iznini alıp, böyle 50 dakikalık bir film oldu o şey ve o günlerde Türkiye'de elimizden alacaklar biliyoruz. Yurtdışına çıkarmayı başardık sonunda, bir işçiye verip, izne gelen bir işçiye verip yurtdışına gönderdik. Yurtdışında çok gösterilmiş o film, duyuyorduk işte, Fransa'da, bimm nerede, İsviçre'de, Almanya'da, şurada burada. İzleyenler anlatıyorlardı. Avrupa Türk Öğrenci Birliği vardı o zaman, ATÖB, federasyon, ATÖB gösteriyordu, onlar da Doğu Perinçek taraftarıydı. Yıldırım tahir filan, isimlerini hatırlıyorum, Ömer bir tanesi. Ama demek ki yönetim onlardaymış. Onlar bu işin parçasını topladılar. O şeye hala erişemedim ben. O zamandan beri ne zaman yurtdışına gitsem, o demin saydığım isimleri arıyorum, soruyorum ne oldu. "Valla arşiv Cengiz'deydi, Cengiz yaptı bilmem ne," hala elimize geçmiş değil. Olsa aslında hoş bir şey olacak hem, bir şey gösteremiyoruz, Genç Sinema diyoruz, ortada hiç görüntü yok. Ayrıca yine teknik üniversite, Harun Karadeniz başkandı o zaman. Gerze'de dedi bir bütün mitingi yapacağız, gelip çeker misin, Çekerim dedim. Gittim çektim, o 20 dakikalık bir belgeseldi. O da yok mesela ortalıkta. Bu hep DISK'e verdığımız seylerin arasındaydı.

CENK CENGİZ: Demek ki 70'ten sonra imha olmadı, 80'den sonra imha oldu.

AHMET SONER: Tabii, ben sakladım hepsini 80'e kadar. Ama işte arkadaşlar böyle deyince, onların sayesinde böyle gitmiş oldu, karşı tarafın eline geçti. Olduğu gibi TRT'ye götürmüşler askeriye bastığı zaman orayı. Bütün fotoğraf arşivini, filmlerini, ne bulduysa, hepsini TRT'ye vermişler, TRT de işte aleyhte program yapılınsın diye, Kenan Paşa'nın emri ile. Öyle bir macera, Genç sinema macerası.

CENK CENGİZ: Sinematek ile nasıl bir kopuş..?

AHMET SONER: Haaah Sinematek ile aslında baştan dedim ya Onat, baştan sayıyordum. Ece Ayhan da o zaman şeyde çalışıyordu, Sinematek'te çalışıyordu. Ece de çok destekliyordu bizi. Onat da destekliyordu. Hatta biz işte film çekiyorduk. Biten kutuları Onat'a veriyorduk, Onat cebine koyuyordu. İşte üzerimizde bulunmasın, böyle kuryelik de yapıyordu bize. Çok destekliyordu.

CENK CENGİZ: Stüdyo...?

AHMET SONER: Yoo hayır, Sinematik'in stüdyosu filan yok. Sadece prodüksiyon aletleri var. Onları kullanıyorduk filan. Kurgu yapabiliyorduk Sinematek'te yani. Onun dışında bir şey yapılamıyordu. Sonra dergiyi de orada çıkarıyorduk. Dağıtımı da orada yapıyorduk, adresler yazılıyor, katlanıyor, postaneye gönderiliyor falan filan. Yani böyle 7-8 sayı hep Sinematek çevresindeydi. Sonra bir ara Sinematek kongresi yaklaşıyordu. Biz dedik üye olalım.

CENK CENGİZ: Haa üye değilsiniz o zaman?

AHMET SONER: Şimdi üyesin ama asıl üye olman lazım. Yönetim kurulu istediklerini asıl üye yapıyor, onlar şeye katılıyor. Yani Dernekler Yasası o kadar kendine.... bir şey ki başa geçen bir daha asla düşmez, çünkü sen tayin ediyorsun seni seçecek olanları, sen de seni seçmeyecek adamı almıyorsun o üyelerin içine. O zaman anladık ki bizim hiçbirimizi almadılar. Yani çekindiler. Bu adamlar gelir, ele geçirirler burayı gibilerinden. İşte bu bir şey oldu bize. Şakir'in Çiftliği mi burası, Eczacıbaşı'nın başladık atıp tutmaya. Onat da ne yapsın arada kaldı. Aşağı tükürse sakal, yukarısı bıyık. Biraz sertleşti yani aramız, ilişkilerimiz falan filan mesafeli oldu. Biz de taşı tarağı topladık, ayrıldık. İşte yer tuttuk dediğim gibi Galatasaray'da. Bu iyi de oldu, göbekbağının olmaması lazım hiçbir kurumla. Sen ayrıca onların maşası da değilsin, seni kullanamaz edemez. Onat tabi kavgalıydı o zaman bütün Yeşilçamlılarla, yanına çekeceği insan arıyordu. Bağımsızlardan işte bir tek Ömer Kavur olsun Yılmaz Güney filan Sinematek'e yakın duruyordu. Onun dışındaki bütün öbür yönetmenlerin hepsi karşıya geçmişti neredeyse.

CENK CENGİZ: Tanık Sinema Topluluğu diye bir şey?

AHMET SONER: O bizden önce, ama yürümemişti. Öyle bir girişimde bulunmuşlar, ama yürütememişler. Onaltıcılar diye bir şey de duydum. Onlar yazılıdılar birtakım kaynaklarda ama yürümedi 2 kişi 3 kişi. Jak Şalom gibi bazı girişimci arkadaşlar vardı, onların kurmak istedikleri şeylerdi. Sonra işte biz genç sinemayı kurunca, guru diye hepsi bizim yanımıza geldi. Yaklaşık 40 kişi filandık, işte demin diyordum. Mutlu aslında İstanbul'daydı, Kabataş Lisesi'ni filan bitirmişti. Ankara'ya gidince Basın Yayın'a, Mutlu da Ankara şubemiz oldu bizim. Ankara'da dergiyi Mutlu'ya gönderiyorduk, Mutlu dağıtımını yapıyordu. Mutlu da tek başına yapamayacağına göre Enis'i buldu Hacettepe'den, zaten aynı evde oturuyorlarmış o dönem Bahçelievler'de, Enis de tabii ilgilendi bu işle falan. Yani, onuncu sayıdan falan itibaren Enes de dahil oldu şeye. Enes, Ortadoğu'dan birtakım arkadaşlar buldu Selami, Murat falan, 3-4 kişi falan, yani biz Ankara'da da, önce İstanbul'da yaptık, Şenlik diye bir şey, gösteriler, teknik üniversitede ve .TÖSK... Aksaray'da

CENK CENGİZ: Bu devrimci sinema şenliği mi?

AHMET SONER: Ha

CENK CENGİZ: Yetmişlerde olan

AHMET SONER: Önce Teknik üniversitede gösteriyorduk. Aynı filmleri öğleden sonra da, akşam da şeyde TÖSK'de gösteriyorduk. Günde iki kere gösteriyorduk. 3 gün falan sürüyordu o filmlerin gösterilmesi. Sonra Ankara'ya gittik tekrarladık falan. Oradan Antalya,

Adana madana, Mersin, gittik üç kişi, Enis de vardı. Böyle bir turne gibi bir şey de yaptık. Filmlerimizi sergiledik en azından. İşte bu şenlik yapacağız, Devrim Sineması Şenliği diye bayağı, herkese dedik, herkes bir film yapsın işte böyle birtakım meselelerle ilgili kısa film de olabilir, konulu film de olabilir belgesel olabilir falan. Bayağı bir film göstermiştik. 3 gün sürdüğüne göre, demek ki yaklaşık 4-4,5 saat gösterilecek filmimiz varmış, 8'lik 16'lık. Böyle de bir maceramız oldu. Bir kere yapabildik bu şenliği, dergi de kapandı, arkası gelmedi.

CENK CENGİZ: Peki bu Sinematek'in, o zamanları söylemek için, Amerikan emperyalizmine hizmet ettiği, onun filmlerini gösterdiği, herhalde bir haber merkez varmış.

AHMET SONER: İşte bir ara gerçekten Amerikan Konsolosluğu'dan gidip birtakım Amerikan kısa filmleri aldılar bunlar. Aslında deneysel filmler, Amerikan Devrimci sineması gibi yutturmaya çalışıyorlar bir çeşit allayıp pullayıp. Tabii biz onu ifşa etmek için bildiriler yazdık ve dağıttık kapılarda mapılarda Sinematek üyelerine müyelerine. O zaman da bir sertleşme oldu Onat ile aramızda. Ben aslında Onat'ı çok severdim, o da beni severdi. Sonra da düzeldi aramız tabii sonraki yıllarda. Anladık birbirimizi karşılıklı. En son şeyi de ben çektim, Onat'ın ölümünden herhalde 24 saat önce Onat'la uzun bir çekim yaptım, 1 saatlik filan. İşte anlattırdık her şeyi, Yılmaz Güney, Sinematek dönemini falan filan. Sinematek'le de böyle oldu. Sonra Onat'tan sonra zaten bir daha ilişkimiz olmadı Sinematek'le. Hiç de şey yapmadık. Yani çağırırlarsa gideriz, bir açikoturum yapacak, panel yapacak, çağırırlarsa, Vecdi Sayar falan çağırıldı, birkaç kere gittim, onun dışında da bir şeyimiz olmadı.

CENK CENGİZ:Peki bu Hisar yarışmalarında da hani bildiri dağıtmıştınız.

AHMET SONER: Hisar'da da, evet, öyle bir şey yaptılar ki Metin Aksan'ın Kuyu filmi ile açılış yapmaya falan kalktılar, birtakım şeyler gördük, yani terslikler, yakıştıramadık bu şeye. Sonra ödülü Shell'in vermesi, bu benzin tekeli, ona da karşı çıkıyorduk. Yani bu demek ki nerelere kadar dayanıyor ucu? Öyle bir ödüle karşı protesto

CENK CENGİZ: Sinematek mi destekliyordu Hisar filmlerini?

AHMET SONER: Yani niye desteklemesin? İlk defa yapılıyor Türkiye'de kısa film. Şimdi kaç tane var. 15-20 tane yarışma var. Bankalar mankalar herkes yapıyor. Yani bu bir ilkti tabii ki herkes destekliyordu. Herkes de film yapıp katılmaya çalışıyordu, bir şeyler kazanmaya, oradan gelecek para ile yeni bir film yapmak gibi. Bu hoş bir şey, ödül verilmesi de hoş bir şey tabii ama Kolej kendisi veremez mi? Sponsor bulur, bir şey bulur yani Shell olması şart değil. Yani biz biraz bu bildirilerle onları da kızdırdık, onlar da kesildi arkası yani yapmadılar bir daha.

CENK CENGİZ: Peki yani o dönemde yalnız mı kaldık diyorsunuz Genç Sinemacılar olarak?

AHMET SONER: Yani işte biz de alternatif olarak, o şenliği biz onun için gösteriyoruz. Yarışma değil, yarışmalı değil ama halk oylaması yapılıyordu. Öyle kağıtlar dağıtıyorduk herkese, en beğendiğiniz filmleri yazın gibi. Zaten işte oradan çıkan sonucu yayınlıyorduk. İşte şu filmler en çok beğenildi gibi. O tip bir şeye dönüştürmekti aslında niyetimiz bunu ama işte ancak bir kere, bir yıl yapabildik. Arkası sonra gelmedi. Şimdi düşünüyorum tabii o şartlarda 8'lik, 16'lık malzeme bulmak zor, pahalı, bu video sistemi falan olsaydı bu kadar iş

demokratikleşti artık, ucuzladı, yani şimdi cebine kim elini atsa 50 lira çıkarır, 50 liraya da gider 10 tane kaset alır. Düşünebiliyor musun 10 saat ya da 5 saatlik malzemen var elinde yani istediğin filmi çekersin, uzun film çekersin. Bugün niye yapılmıyor böyle bir şey? Bizden sonra bir tekrarı da olmadı bu, böyle bir grup topluluk oluşsak da tekrar bir araya gelip film yapacak dayanışma yok tabii. Yani gençlik öyle yetiştirildi, Turgut Özal Gençliği diyorum ben onlara işte, her gemisini kurtaran kaptan, her koyun kendi bacağından asılır felsefesi ile yetiştikleri için. Şimdi bir öneri yapıyorum bir kooperatif kuralım, bu genç sinemacılar bir araya gelelim falan filan diye. Kaç yıl önce yaptım, daha bu Dervişler, Zeki Demirembukuz, Nuri Bilgeçeliler daha ilk filmlerini yaptıkları zamanlar. Yeşim Ustaoglu falan hepsine yaptık bu öneriyi. A çok güzel falan filan dediler. Yani aslında bir araya gelinse hem yazılan senaryolar tartışılabilir edilse. Şimdi şey gibi saklıyor insanlar yazdıklarını, aman çalınır edilir diye. Kimse, ondan başka hiçkimse bilmiyor. Ertesi gün filme başlayacak adam, görüyorsun sokakta, naber yapıyorsun, hiçbir şey söylemiyor, yarın filme başlıcam demiyor, düşünebiliyor musun?

CENK CENGİZ: Daha bireysel

AHMET SONER: Bu kadar birbirlerinden.. ama son dönemde malzeme en azından, Nuri Bilgeçelinin işte ses şeyi var, Zeki kullanıyor onu, Semih Kaplanoğlu kullanıyor, yani böyle bir aralarında, yakın arkadaşlar arasında böyle bir şey var ama bir kurum yok demin dediğim anlamda hem o şeyleri tartışacak hem hangisini öne alalım, önce bunu çekelim, sonra bunu çekelim, sonra bunu, bir dayanışma içinde daha da iyi şeyler çıkar diye düşünüyorum hem de tartışılan şeyler... Şimdi Semih Kaplanoğlu'nun filmini seyrediyorsun, baştan hani senaryosunu verse, baştan eleştireceksin adamın yaptıklarını, ama filmi görünce eleştiriyorsun. O da hoş bir şey değil. Bir tek Yeşim Ustaoglu hatırlıyorum, Güneşe Yolculuk'un senaryosunu veriydi, sevdiği, güvendiği birkaç kişiye biz de yaptığımız eleştirilerimizi, sonra yeniden yazdı. Böyle bir dayanışmadan yanayım ben. Böyle oluşur bir topluluk, bir hareket daha doğrusu ama şimdi belki bu Özcan Alper filan gibi bizim yetiştirdiğimiz çocuklar var Hüseyin Karabey, Özden Alper, Kazım Öz, bunlar hep bizim atölyeden çıkan çocuklar. Başkaları da var, ilk filmlerini yapacak. Belki bunlar bir araya gelir, bizim yıllardır anlattıklarımız, hep öğütlediğimiz, bunlardı. Şimdi öyle bir hareket görüyorum. Ortaköy'de filmlerini göstermeye başladılar. İnan var, Özcan var, Pelin var. Hüseyin Karabey, bir araya gelmiş gibi görünüyorlar. 8-10 kişi, Derviş de var aralarında.

CENK CENGİZ: Sizin atölyeden çıkan dediğiniz..

AHMET SONER: 94'te ilk başladık atölye biz yapmaya. İlk IMKB'nin bodrumunda başladık, Hüseyin Kuzu ile. İşte oraya gelen çocuklar bunlar, Özcan, Hüseyin, Kazım Öz, hep oradan çıkan çocuklar, Özkan..

CENK CENGİZ: Şimdi, Genç sinemaya geri dönersek, aslında, demiştiniz hani, imkansızlıklardan dolayı sadece devrim görüntülerini çekiyorduk.

AHMET SONER: Devrimin değil, hareket mi oldu ki?

CENK CENGİZ: Devrim derken....

AHMET SONER: Toplumsal olaylar diyelim: grevler, yuruyusler, cenazeler, bilmem neler, her türlü sokağa yansıyan hareket.

CENK CENGİZ: Şimdi mesela dergilere baktığımız zaman, aslında bu bir amaç, devrime giden yolda bir amaç. Bunu insanlara, halka göstereceğiz bu görüntüleri, onları harekete katacağız, onları bilinçlendireceğiz gibi bir görev var. Bu aslında bir devrim düşüncesi baktığımız zaman ama siz teknik imkansızlıklar gibi söylediniz aslında amacınız daha sanatsal filmler mi yapmaktı?

AHMET SONER: Yani hepimizin vardı birtakım senaryoları, çekmek istediğimiz uzun filmler, yapmak istiyorduk elbette ama fırsat bulamadık. Bir de dediğim gibi koşturmaca, her gün bir şeyler oluyordu türkiye’de; istikrar yok bir şey yok. Para bulamıyorsun, bugunku gibi değil ortam. Bugun sponsorlar var. O zaman hiç ciddiye alan yoktu sinemayı. İşte biz bir tek DISK’e gittik, anlattık derdimizi de, işte sizin grevlerinizi biz çekeriz, siz bize sadece negatif şey yapın gibilerden. O da bir sponsorluk sayılır, ortaya sonuçta bir şey çıkıyor, bir belgesel olarak kalıyor, 68 Grundig Grevi, şu grev, bu grev..

CENK CENGİZ: Peki o zaman öncelikli amacınız aslında devrim mi oluyor? Baktığımız zaman şöyle bir yargı var, hepsi--çoğu yazarda, genç sinemacılar yönetmelerinde: Altyapı değişmedikçe, çünkü sinema, Yeşilçam, kapitalist altyapının, ekonomik altyapının bir üst yapısı aslında. Altyapı değişmedikçe Yeşilçam da değişmeyecek. Yeşilçam’daki sinema sistemi değişmeyecek. O yüzden altyapıyı değiştirmemiz gerekir. Bunun için de devrim yapmamız gerekir. Şimdi o zaman Genç sinemanın öncelikli amacı devrim miydi yoksa sinemada devrim miydi?

AHMET SONER: Sinemada devrim. Biz şimdi militan değiliz, silah alıp şey yapacak değiliz. Biz ancak bu olayları takip ederiz, izleriz, çekeriz, kitlelere gösteririz. Bizim düşüncemiz buydu.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama onun için de görüşünüz sonuçta altyapı değişmeli. Toplumun düzeni değişmeli, yeni bir sisteme geçilmeli. Mesela Gaye Hanım hep şey diyordu yazılarındaAHMET SONER: öncelikli amacımız her zaman devrimdir, sinema ikinci plandadır; çünkü toplum yapısı değişince sinema da değişecektir. İlk önce devrime hizmet etmeli, devrime hizmet etmek için de bu hareketleri çekmeliyiz, bu yürüyüşleri, cenazeleri çekmeliyiz, bunları halka göstermeliyiz ki devrime bir hizmette bulunmalıyız gibi bir düşüncesi var. Ben bunun tüm Genç sinemanın benimsediği bir şey olduğunu düşündüm ama

AHMET SONER: Yani bazı arkadaşlar benimsiyordu tabii. Yani şey olan arkadaşlarımız da vardı, Dev-Genç üyesi arkadaşlar da vardı. Onlar daha farklıydı tabii, onlar Dev-Genç’ci ne de olsa. Sinema ikinci planda olabilir onlar için. Ama ben öyle değildim yani. Ben veya başka bazı arkadaşlar sinemaya daha çok öncelik tanıyorduk, ağırlık tanıyorduk. İşte o sıralar çok, Glauber Rocha gibi Latin Amerika’da bizim şey yapmak istediğimiz sinemaya yakın filmler yapılıyordu. Niyetimiz biraz da o Latin Amerika sinemacıları gibi olmaktı. Onlar da öyle örgütlendiler ettiler ama bizim ömrü uzun sürmedi, 2,5 yıl falan sürdü topu topu herhalde.

CENK CENGİZ: Peki sinemaya daha çok önem veren isimler kimlerdi, hatırlıyor musunuz?

AHMET SONER: Veysel Atayman da öyleydi. Mutlu Parkan da öyleydi. Biz daha çok sinemaya... Artun da öyleydi. Artun Yeres, rahmetli.

CENK CENGİZ: O zaten sonra hareketten ayrılmıştı diye hatırlıyorum.

AHMET SONER: Ha bir ara Altan Artun ve Tanju Akerson ayrıldılar. Sonra bizim uzaklaştırdıklarımız oldu yani, Mustafa Irgat, Mehmet Gönenç gibileri de biz uzaklaştırdık.

CENK CENGİZ: Neden? Neden peki?

AHMET SONER: Onlar biraz meyhane takımıydı. Akşam saati gelince vakt-i keramet geldi diyorlardı... giden takımdı. Öyle şeyler oldu yani, yaşandı.

CENK CENGİZ: Peki Dev-Genç'liler de var demiştiniz. Biraz aslında onlara geçelim isterseniz.

AHMET SONER: Enis falan tabii Dev-Genç'liydi.

CENK CENGİZ: Onun dışında hatırlıyor musunuz kimler vardı?

AHMET SONER: Ankara grubu, Ortadoğu'daki çocuklar, Selamiler filan da tabii Dev-Genç'liydi.

CENK CENGİZ: Yani demek ki İstanbul grubu biraz daha bu işin sinemasında, Ankara grubu daha devrim...

AHMET SONER: Evet onlar biraz daha hareketin içinden geliyorlardı.

C. Gaye hanım da o zaman öyle o zaman

AHMET SONER: Gaye bir değişik. Bir ayağı Paris'teydi, zaman zaman görürdük Gaye'yi. Bakma sen, yazıları bile belki Paris'ten gönderiyordur. Bir toplantıda hatırlamıyorum, Gaye'nin de olduğu bir toplantı yaptığımızı hiç hatırlamıyorum. Çekirdek bir kadromuz vardı: Üstün, ben, Mutlu, Artun, Ertuğ, Veysel, işte bunlardan oluşurdu. En çok koşturan bizlerdik zaten. Ortalıkta görünen de bizlerdik. Diğerleri destekliyordu. Bazılar, çalışan arkadaşlar vardı, onlar tabii bütün zamanlarını ayıramıyorlardı, onları ayırmak lazım şeyden, ama yürekleri bizimleydi. Yazı yazıyorlardı, bildiri imzalıyorlardı, bir şey göndersek altına atıyorlardı imzalarını. Giderek işte böyle kırk kişiye yakın bir şey oluştu sonunda. Tiyatrocusu da vardı içinde. Bir de kozmopolit bir yapıydı. Ermeni, Rum, Yahudi, Kürt vardı aramızda. Kimse kimseye sen Ermeni'sin, sen Rumsun demezdi.

CENK CENGİZ: Yorgo bey mesela.

AHMET SONER: Tabii, Yorgo, Yakup, Jacques, Artun, Sami vardı. Neyse işte böyle bir macera yaşadık.

CENK CENGİZ: Kendi içinizde peki ayrılaşmanın nedenlerini ne olarak söylersiniz, Genç Sinema içerisindeki ? Belli böyle klasik anlamda ayrılaşma var mıydı yoksa kişisel mi?

AHMET SONER: Şimdi şöyle bir şey, biz turneye çıktığımızda dergiyle uğraşamadık tabii. İstanbul'dan sonra Ankara, Antalya, Mersin, Adana falan, böyle bir 15 gün filan uzak kaldık. Bu arada İstanbul'daki arkadaşlar dergiyi çıkarmışlar hemen. O güne kadar Devrimci Sinema Dergisi yazardı Genç Sinemanın altında onlar Proletar Devrimcisi yazmışlar. Bu bir şey oldu bizim için, biz çok bozulduk buna. İstanbul'a gelir gelmez de hemen bir toplantı yaptık. O yapan arkadaşları uzaklaştırdık aktif görevden, bir daha sen dergi çıkartmayacaksın, dergiyi biz çıkaracağız diye. Dergiye el koyduk

CENK CENGİZ: Onların amacı proleter devrimci sinema yapmak

AHMET SONER: Yani, bu kadar 30-40 kişilik bir topluluğa hiç sormadan, danışmadan, sanki biz yokuz ortada, nasıl böyle bir şeye karar verirsin. Bu bir saygısızlıktır en azından, yapılmaması gereken bir şey. Nitekim bir tek o sayı öyle çıktı, ondan sonraki sayıda ben artık devrimci lafını da kaldırdım. Kırmızı ile Genç Sinema yaptık. Ondan sonraki şeyler kırmızı olarak Genç Sinema.

CENK CENGİZ: Zaten ondan sonra 3 sayı falan çıktı.

AHMET SONER: Evet, üç sayı çıktı herhalde. Böyle bir şey yaşandı. Kadrolar, yönetici kadrolar değişti diyelim biz buna. Üç kişilik bir şey yaptık. Başkan maşkan değil de, üç kişilik bir yürütme kurulu gibi bir şey oluşturduk.

CENK CENGİZ: Kimlerdi onlar?

AHMET SONER: Herhalde o zaman Tanju, ben ve Ertuğ el koyduk. Bizden sonra da bir darbe daha oldu. Yakup ve Yorgo darbe yaptılar bize karşı. Bir dönem de onlar dergi çıkardı. Herhalde son dönem o oldu.

CENK CENGİZ: Sizin üç kişilik yönetim kadronuz, bu Devrimci Sinema Şenliğin'den önceki, yani başından beri olan..

AHMET SONER: yok sonraki

CENK CENGİZ: ha sonraki

AHMET SONER: Daha önceki aslında başında Üstün ve Artun ilk sayılarda ve Ece de ayrdım ediyorlardı onlara. O üçü daha çok dergiyle ilgilenen onlardı.

CENK CENGİZ: Sonra siz dönünce, siz daha çok ilgilendiniz.

AHMET SONER: Yok, sonra ben fiilen başladım matbaaya. Çünkü Üstün de Artun da reklam ajansında çalışıyorlardı. Fazla vakitleri yoktu. Ben üstlendim derginin şeyini. Sanıyorum, 4.-5. Sayıdan sonra hep ben çıkardım dergiyi, son sayılara kadar. En sonunda da Yakup ve Yorgo çıkardılar, 2-3 sayı herhalde.

CENK CENGİZ: Hmm, anladım.

AHMET SONER: Yani uzun süre ben çıkardım.

CENK CENGİZ: Peki dergiyi Proleter Devrimci herhalde bir sayı çıktı, Proleter Devrimci olarak?

AHMET SONER: O da biz yokken. Üstün Barışta'nın yaptığı bir işti o.

CENK CENGİZ: Sonra çıktı mı Üstün Barışta dergiden?

AHMET SONER: Üstüne el çektirdik zaten. Zaten askere falan gitmişti. Askerlik yapıyordu falan. Uzak kaldı bu işlerden. Hala uzak, selam bile vermiyor Üstün nedense. Böyle bir kırgınlığı var. Mesela konuşmaz, o Eskişehirliilerin yaptığı film için de aradılar, ben konuşmam demiş, reddetmiş. Halbuki anlatmalı insan bildiğini, bu şeye kalacak, önümüzdeki bizden sonraki nesillere, bir belge olarak bulunmalı aslında. Anılarını yaz o zaman dedim ben de, madem konuşmuyorsun. Yaz bir şey kenara koy.

CENK CENGİZ: O zaman bir de örgütlenmeye dönelim. Üstün bey örgütlenme konusunda çok şey yazmıştı dergide. Örgütlenme konusunu Üstün Bey üstlenmiş aslında. Hatta bir yerde Üstün Savaşta yazmıştı.

AHMET SONER: İşte askere gidince Savaşta oldu, ismini kullanamıyor ya, takma isim kullanmak zorunda. Öyle bir şey olduydu, espri.

CENK CENGİZ: İşte bu sanatsal ve politik, askeri müşterekler taşıyan insanlar bir araya gelmişti Genç Sinemada. Şimdi amacımız ekonomik örgütlenmeye doğrudur. Şuanki örgütlenme daha çok politik bir örgütlenme. Bu politik müşterekler devrimci görüşle mi alakalı, sadece devrimci olması ile mi alakalı?

AHMET SONER: İlk sayıdaki bildiri çok açıktır. O bildiride bütün söylemek istediklerimizi söyledik bu konuda. Sinema alanında da diğer alanda da, yani politik alanda.

CENK CENGİZ: Politik alanda işte sadece...

AHMET SONER: Zaten onu imzalayan insanlar demek ki aynı görüşler demektir. Bizden sonra katılanlara da obildiriyi hep gösteriyorduk, yani işte bizim manifestomuz bu, manifesto denir ona. Bu manifestoyu kabul ediyorsan gel gibilerden. Kimse de hayır demedi. Çok da şeydi. Onat'ın da çok katkısı olmuştu o manifesteyo, Ece'nin de, Artun'un da. bayağı Üzerinde çalışılmış bir metindir o.

CENK CENGİZ: Tamam. O zaman bu politik angajmanları biraz konuşalım isterseniz. Herkes MDB'ci, yani çoğu insan.

AHMET SONER: Yani genellikle kimse itiraz etmediğine ve ayrılmadığına göre

CENK CENGİZ: Siz MDB'ci olarak mı tanımlıyorsunuz kendinizi?

AHMET SONER: Evet,

CENK CENGİZ: Yani bütün bir topluluk olarak?

AHMET SONER: Yani o zaman Mihri Belli'yi çağırdık, geldi adam

CENK CENGİZ: Evet, konuşmuş.

AHMET SONER: Geldi, konuşma yaptı.O çevrenin insanları daha çok, Ahmet Say olsun, Vahap Erdoğan, sudur budur, Muzaffer Erdost, hep onları ilişkili olduğumuz insanlar. Onlar da kendi hareketlerinin sinemacıları olarak görüyorlardı bizi. Öyle bir anlaşma vardı sanki aramızda.

CENK CENGİZ: Ama Mihri Belli'nin tezine baktığımız zaman ilk önceki aşama Milli Demokratik aşama, sadece emperyalizmi ortadan kaldıracaklar ama ikinci aşama bütün emperyalizm baskısı ortadan kalkacak, kapitalizmi yıkacağız, bu da bir süreç gerektiriyor. Milli Demokratik Devrim aşamasında mı bu devrimci sinemayı kurma amacınız vardı tam olarak...

AHMET SONER: Daha önce

CENK CENGİZ: Daha önce?

AHMET SONER: Sonradan biz daha politize olduk. İlk sayılara bakarsanız öyle pek fazla politik şey yoktur ama sonraki sayılarda Mao Zedung'un bile vardır yazısı, daha politik şeyler vardır veya bizim yazdıklarımız da oldu. Baştan film eleştirisi, Yeşilçam'daki filmleri eleştiriyorduk, bu tip şeyler, daha çok sinema ağırlıklı şeyler vardı, manifesto hariç. Giderek, ama Türkiye'nin durumu da o hale geldi. Giderek politikleşti Türkiye'de ortam. Biz de ister istemez, onun dışında kalamayacağımıza göre biz de o hale geldik. Ve son kapanmadan önce sanıyorum işte, Dev-Genç'in toplantılarına falan gidiyorlardı arkadaşlar. Üstün ile Ertuğ gittiler bir ara, toplantılara katıldılar, görevler aldılar. Ne görevlerse, adam saklama görevi mesela, arananlara yer bulmak, ilkin kendi evlerine olsun başka evlerde olsun, bu tip şeyler yapılan işler. O yüzden biz Mihri Belli'den de demek ki ayrılmış olduk o dönem. Daha Mahirlerin yakınındaydık. Mahir, Ertuğrul Tüpcü, Yusuf Küpeli, onlar beraber. Ama sonra 12 Mart'tan sonra, TKP'li olanlar da çıktı aramızdan. O gelen arkadaşlar niye Maden-İş'e vermeye şey yapıyorlardı, TKP sempatizanıydılar, ondan. Öyle düşünüyorduk. Ben hiç TKP yanlısı olmadım. Hep belli bir mesafe ile, çünkü Laz İsmail'in geçmişini bildiğimiz için, ne kötülükler yaptığını, Dr. Hikmet Kıvılcımlı'ya, Nazım Hikmet'e, herkese yani, kendisi hariç. Tek başına, tek adam, tanrı gibi oldu, ama işte bayağı bir kitle şeyine ulaştılar. En son 77 1 Mayıs'ında İHDler, İGDler kadınları, o erkekleri, çocukları, hepsini, çok büyük gruplar toparlayabiliyorlardı. Bir taraftan o sendikanın, DISK, Maden-İş vasıtasıyla diğer sendikalara da sızıyorlardı. İşçi sınıfı ile de bir bağ kurmuşlardı. Ama arkasından da 12 Eylül geldi bu sefer de. İşte aslında bir şey yapmayı da düşünmedik. 74'te ortalık tekrar eski duruma döndü. Af çıktı, millet bırakıldı. Dergiler yeniden çıkmaya başladı. Eski bütün fraksiyonlar yeniden bu alana döküldü. Yine Doğu Perinçekler, maocular bölük bölük, enver hocacılar çıktı bilmem ne. Daha da çeşitlendi gruplar. O dönemde bizim arkadaşlar da, üç sinema dergisi birden çıktı mesela, üçünde de bizim çocuklar vardı. Ben hiçbirine katılmadım. Bir çağdaş sinema cardı, Üstün, Yakup falan, Yorgo da vardı mesela o grupta. Bir, Atilla dorsay da sonradan katıldı ama, Engin Ayça ile Nezih Coş'un çıkardığı, Engin Ayça da bizim gruptan, sonra ayrılanlardan tabii, bir de Çağdaş Sinema bir de Erol Bayraktar'ın çıkardığı bir dergi var, orada da Mustafa İrgat falan vardı, yazılar yazıyorlardı. Erdem Kıral vardı falan. Ben

hiçbirine de bulaşmadım. Partiler ve sınıflar üstü kaldım. Kendi işimize bakıyorduk işte, sinema çalışmaları, senaryolar şunlar bunlarla uğraşıyorduk

CENK CENGİZ: Şu anda peki bu temsilciler neler yapıyor? Siz anlattınız, Enis Bey'i biliyorum.

AHMET SONER: Bizden başka kimse kalmadı. Veysel, daha çok kitap işlerine girişti, yazı yazıyor, kitap derliyor, derlemeler yapıyor, çeviriler yapıyor. Artun bir tek şey yapıyordu, o da evvelki yıl öldü. Sinemada sebat edenlerden biriydi, sinema yapmaya çalışanlardan. Diğerleri yapmıyor sinema, hiçbiri yapmıyor bildiğim kadarıyla.

CENK CENGİZ: Hepsi ayrıldı, mesela avukatlık yapan...

AHMET SONER: Evet, avukatlık yapan zaten o zamanlar öğrenciydi, Yakup, şimdi avukatlık yapıyor. Bazen uçakta falan karşılaşıyoruz... havaalanında... Yorgo gitti yurtdışına, o da öldü, Yunanistan'a gitti, son yıllarını orada geçirdi. Yani ölenler de öldü Altan Küçükyağın öldü. Mustafa Irgat da öldü, Mehmet Gönenç de. Demin dedim ya tasviye ettiğimiz kişiler, akşamcılar, onlar alkolden gittiler tabii.

CENK CENGİZ: Gaye Hanım, hakkında haberim yok dedi Enis Bey ama sizin...?

AHMET SONER: Benim de yok. Jacques'tan da hiç haber alamıyorum. Geliyor mu gidiyor mu? Yazları mazları geliyorlardır tatili geçirmeye ama o da hiç aramıyor eski arkadaşlarını. Benim görüştüğüm 8-10 kişi var topu topu. O da yine aynı belgesel BSB'nin içindeyiz ondan. Sinema... Bir de, haa, öyle dostlarımız var, onlarla devam ettiriyoruz ilişkimizi. Ümit ahçı vardı bizim kurgucumuz, Tanju Kutlar var, o da bizden sonra Yeni Sinema'dan sonra TRT'ye girdi, TRT'de belgeseller çekti, 10-15 tane belgesel yaptı, şimdi o da emekli oldu. O uğraştı ama televizyonculuk yaptı Tanju. Biz yeşilçam'a senaryolar yazdık uzun süre. Yani benim kadar şey sürdüren bu işi, atölyelerle matölyelerle, o eski havayı tekrar hiç değilse, biz başaramadık, bizden sonrakiler bu işi başarsınlar diye kendimizi o gençlere vakfettik. Sadece İstanbul'da değil. Nazım Kültür'de de yaptım atölye ben, Mezopotamya Kültür'de de yaptım, Eğitim-sen'de yaptım, Diyarbakır'da da üstüste 4 sene 5 sene atölye yaptık. Diyarbakır'da da çok iyi bir şey yetişti. Bakıyorum BSB'nin katologuna, aa bizim kızlar. Hatice film yapmış, öbürü Meryem film yapmış, Naile yapmış. Orada, Diyarbakır'da, 24 tane öğrencimiz vardı. En iyi atölyelerden biri de orada oldu aslında. Her atölyenin sonunda da 3 tane veya 4 tane film yapıyorduk. Herkes o dönem içinde bir şeyler çiziktiriyordu, sonra oturup seçim yapıyorduk. Kendi öyküsü dışında başka öykülere oy veriyordu. En fazla oy olan üç tanesi çekiyorduk. Çok da iyi filmler çıktı oradan. Çek çek, görmüşsündür belki surların iki yakası, bir tür belge

CENK CENGİZ: Bu uzun metrajlı mı?

AHMET SONER: Yok yok kısa, bunlar 10 dakikalık 20 dakikalık filmler.

CENK CENGİZ: Bunun dışında TRT'ye giden oldu mu sizden?

AHMET SONER: TRT, işte 1 kişi dedim ya, Tanju TRT'ye gitti bir tek.Oradan da emekli oldu. Başka yok TRT'ye giden.

CENK CENGİZ: Aslında benim bu kadar soracaklarım. Sizin aklınıza bir şey geliyor mu?

AHMET SONER: Yoo. Sonradan hatırlarsan yeniden sorabilirsin. Ya telefonla ya tekrar görüşürüz.

CENK CENGİZ: Sizin e-mail adresiniz var mi?

AHMET SONER: Yok.

CENK CENGİZ: Telefonla, tamam. O zaman, Mihri Belli tarafındaydınız biraz. Onun bir yazısı vardı. Yazısında şey diyor, bir ..emperyalist.. sanat vardır, bu emperyalist sanatın ortadan kalkması için, bir kere zaten onun ortadan kalkması lazım. Altyapı-üstyapı meselesi. Şimdi o aşamaya kadar, ulusal miilli demokratik devrim aşamasından sonra, daha çok milli bir sinema kurulmalı. Simdi sizinki ile biraz uyuşmuyor sanki. Milli sinema kurulursa, daha ulusal bir sinema kuruluyor.

AHMET SONER: Mihri abi genel tezini bu alana da uyguluyordu. O biraz inandırıcı olmayabilir her zaman. Milli Sinema deyince, o zaman herkes, kendini şey zanneden, faşist olmayan, faşistler dışındaki herkes, burjuvaziyi de katacağın işin içine, o zaman Şakir Eczacıbaşı da dahil olur bunun içine, o da milli burjuvazi, öyle bir düşüncesi vardı.

CENK CENGİZ: Acaba ortak düşünce proleterya olduğu için mi?

AHMET SONER: Ama bu adamlar ne zaman yandaş olduklar ki? Mihri abi kağıt üzerinde böyle bir şey geliştirdi. Bak bakalım var mi içinde bir tane bizim kapitalistlerden şunlardan, bunlardan yani hareketi destekleyen?

CENK CENGİZ: Teorik düzeyde olan bir şey

AHMET SONER: Teorik. Zaten işçi görünce kaçıyor herkes. Memur bile uzak durur.

CENK CENGİZ: Biraz işte o konuda ayrışıyor sanırım hareket. Şimdi siz daha çok sinemaya önem vermişsiniz, ama işte çok daha devrimsel açıdan bakan var harekete. Altyapı değişmesi lazım, o yüzden sinema da değişmesi lazım. Altyapı değişecekse, önce devrim olması lazım. O zaman bu devrim aşaması hangi devrim aşaması? Demokratik devrim aşaması mı sonraki sosyalist devrim aşaması mı?

AHMET SONER: Çok tartışılıyor o zaman İşçi Partililerle şeylerin ayrışması buna dayanıyor zaten. Ama sadece o da değil. Sonra işte bu maocular çıktı, başka şeyler söylemeye başladı, Mao'nun uygulamasını aynen uygulamaya kalktılar Türkiye'de. Enver hocacılar çıktı, onlar başka tarafa çekmeye başladılar. Kıvılcımlı'nın tezleri de farklıydı o dönem.

CENK CENGİZ: Devrimci sinema burada nerede duruyor? Kafanızdaki devrimci sinema hangi döneme tekabül ediyor?. Böyle bir tartışma yapılmamış sanırım?

AHMET SONER: Yapılmadı, o zaman, zaman da olmadı. Daha çok sinemanın şey yönleri, estetik falan gibi tarafları ile ilgili de fazla çalışma yapamadık aslında. Ama dediğim gibi sadece o Sinematek'te izlediğimiz filmlerden, farklı filmlerden, küçük ülkelerden, üçüncü dünyadan, Afrika'dan, Asya'dan, Japonya'dan gelen şeyler ile biz düşünmeye başlıyorduk. Çünkü Türk sineması belli, belli kalıplar içinde dönüp duran bir şey. Zaman zaman bir iki film çıkıyordu her yıl doğru dürüst, o da yani iyi film yaptığı söylenen Metin Aksan bile son zamanlarında Kuyu gibi, birtakım saçmalıklar, bir adam, bir kadını 3 kere dağa kaldırıyor. Olacak şey mi, gazete haberinden böyle bir şey yapıyor, antika işler. Sonra tabii Halit Refiğ, vaktiyle “Yeşilçam bir bataklaktır, kurutulması gerekir” diyen bir adam, sonradan tam bir savunucusu oldu bu işin, Fethullah Gülen'e film yapmaya kadar düştü, son filmi Fethullah karşıladı masraflarını.

CENK CENGİZ: Hangi filmiydi son filmi?

AHMET SONER: Köpekler. İşte bizim sinemacılarımız böyle. Ben Atıf Yılmaz'ı tercih ettim. Atıf Yılmaz, hiçbir zaman öyle keskin bir yanı olmayan bir adamdır, hayata hep böyle iyi tarafından bakan, iyimser, diğerleri gibi sert değil. Memduh Ün de öyle serttir. Dediğim dedik, vurdu mu masaya yumruğunu, tamam onun dediği olacak, başka şey yok. Sonra Yılmaz Güney ile çalıştım, o da öyle. Bu sahneyi nasıl çekelim diye herkese sorardı sette, daha böyle demokratik insanlar... Onları tercih ettim. Vedat Türkali ile çalıştım. Sevdiğim insanlarla çalıştım. Tabii, Yılmaz Güney'den söz etmek gerekir. Bize en yakın gördüğümüz insan oydu tabii ki. Biz dergi çıkardığımız dönem Umut'u çekmişti. Ondan önce Seyidhan'ı çekmişti, bir yıl önce. Sonra çıktuktan sonra aıla, bizi topladı, bütün genç sinemacıları. Gittik yazıhanesine, yapmak istediklerini anlattı bize, içeride düşünmüş taşınmış uzun uzun, 2,5 yıl yattı çünkü. İşte dedi Antalya'da bir stüdyo kuracağız, kısa filmler yapacağız, kendi dağıtım şirketimizi kuracağız bu sinemacılarla, bu dağıtımcılarla çalışmayacağız, kendi sinemalarımız olacak her yerde. Böyle ütöpik de bir şey ama çok da güçlüydü yani. Yılmaz Güney dedin mi teslim, adam senrayosuz menaryosuz yapımcı teslim alıyordu. Böyle bir gücü vardı adamın. Kaç para istese veriyorlardı.

CENK CENGİZ: Bu gücü oyunculuktan mı aldı, tanınmasından mı aldı?

AHMET SONER: Oyunculuktan tabii, sevilmesinden. Yüzünü herkes seviyor, o kadar taraftarı var sağcısı-solcusu. Ama o olayda bunun taraf olduğunu öğrenen sağcılar, çünkü Mahirleri evinde saklayan adam taraftır, poliste ve askerde taraftar olan sevenler biraz uzak durmaya başladı Yılmaz Güney'e, faşistler artık Yılmaz Güney sevmez oldular, Cüneyt Arkın'a yazıldılar, o kendi ideolojilerine daha uygun geliyor, Malkaçoğlu falan. İşte Yılmaz Güney'in böyle şeyleri vardı, ama onun da ömrü vefa etmedi. Hepimize film çektirecekti, kendi de kısa film çekmeyi düşünüyordu, düşünebiliyor musun? Ve o filmleri de kendi dağıtım ağında dolaşıma sokmayı düşünüyordu. Kısa film 20 dakika deyip geçme. 4 tanesini eklersin ucuca, al sana bir şey işte, gösteri, bir seferlik film. Yürümedi o iş de.

CENK CENGİZ: Siz de bu dağıtım olanaklarını Yılmaz Güney'de bulabilecektmişsiniz aslında, hani yürütseymişsiniz.

AHMET SONER: Yani evet.

CENK CENGİZ: Yeşilçam sisteminden farklı olarak.

AHMET SONER: Onun dışında düşünüyordu her şeyi. Odur bizi çeken tarafı, çünkü o da sistemi tamamen karşısına almıştı. O da iyice politikleşmişti. İçeri girerken, Mahirlerle, Mahirler demek MDDci demektir, Mihri Belli, Mihri'den yana, ama içeride okuya okuya önce Maocu, sonra enver hocacı bir şey oldu, öyle de bir şey var. Yurtdışına çıktığı zaman, solu bir araya toparlamaya çok çalıştı, ama dediler sen oyuncusun, sen ne karışıyorsun bu işlere, bütün o solun yurtdışındaki mülteci liderler hiç ciddiye almadılar, bir araya getiremedi hiçkimseyi. Ondan belki de genç yaşta öldü. Bir şeyi yapmak istersin, başaramayınca, başarısızlık, giderek kötüler. İyimser bir şey olman lazım hayatta kalabilmen için. Yapmak istediği hiçbir şeyi başaramadı. O kadar da projesi vardı, çekmek istediği filmler vardı, hiçbirini yapamadı, bir tek Duvar'dan başka.

CENK CENGİZ: O zaman Genç sinemacılar için şunu diyebiliriz. 70ler kadar, 60larda o politik hareket o kadar ayrılaşmadı, sol hareket. Bir MDD tarafı vardı. MDD içinde belki bir Doğu Perinçek- Mihri Belli ayrışması. Burada genel anlamda MDD tarafı var, ama tam olarak sanırım onun içerisinde bir ayrılaşma yok, MDD tarafını destekliyorsunuz, ama sinemayı buna nasıl uyduracağımız konusunda çok bir düşünceniz yok. Sadece devrimci sinema yapacağız, Yeşilçam'dan farklı bir sinema yapacağız diyorsunuz ve MDD içinde de çok biz Mahirciyiz ya da biz Mihri Belliciyiz, çok o teorik tartışmalara girilmemiş sanırım. Böyle bir şey var.

AHMET SONER: Evet, girilmedi ama işte bazı arkadaşlar ilişkiler kurdular onlarla. Benim de demek ki çevrem hep onlarla doluymuş ki, aynı davadan, o 256 sanıklı Parti-Cephe davası vardır, Yılmaz Güney de oradadır, Murat Belge de oradadır, ben de oradayım. O Mahir Çayan Ulaş Bardakçı'ların, 1. ve 2. sanığı kovduğu davadır o.

CENK CENGİZ: Ne zaman oluyordu bu?

AHMET SONER: Bu 71 sonrası. Biz 72'de alındık, Yılmaz Güney de 72'de, herhalde ben gözaltı sürem bittiği gün zaten, gazeteyi aldım baktım, Yılmaz Güney tutuklandı, gözaltına alındı yazıyordu. O zaman belli olmuştu bizim de tarafımız ama...

CENK CENGİZ: Zaten hareket bitti.

AHMET SONER: Hareket bitti, dergi çıkaramıyorsun, bir sesini çıkaramıyorsun, yazıp çizemiyorsun, ne yapacaksın. Gizli örgütlenme artık, yeraltı.

CENK CENGİZ: Doğu Perinçek, yine aslında Mahir Çayan ile benzer şeyler söylüyordu, askerlerin ve milli burjuvanın mı önderliğini daha çok istiyordu?

AHMET SONER: Bir ara da işte... Asker dediğimiz yani genç subaylar ya da öğrenciler, harb okulu öğrencileri. Herkes oraya... ya da onlar şeydi, çok okuyorlardı, doktorcu çok şey vardı genç, harp okulunda veya genç teğmen, yeni teğmen olmuş. Mahir'in durumunda bir sürü insan vardı. Tabii ki Doğu Perinçek,

CENK CENGİZ: Doğu Perinçek bunu savunuyordu değil mi, daha çok asker önderliği..

AHMET SONER: İşçi-Köylü okuyan, onun, Halkın Sesi falan okuyan subaylar veya işte herkes bir yerlere yazılmıştı. Ve o zaman işte ordu-gençlik elele, yani böyle ordu ile gençlik bir araya gelecek, çünkü artık işçiden, köylüden bir şey yok, hareket de bitti. İşçi-Köylü diye gazete çıkarıyor ama işçi- köylü ile ilişkisi yok, hep öğrenciler.

CENK CENGİZ: Mihri Belli de mi böyle diyordu? Ama o hala işçi-köylü önderliği diyordu.

AHMET SONER: Ama Mihri abide de vardır, asker-genç ... Yurtsever ordu.

CENK CENGİZ: Çok da farklı değildi o zaman.

AHMET SONER: Doktor da aynı şekilde. Yani herkes ordudan da bir umut bekliyordu. 27 Mayısı yapan bir ordu vardı zaten geçmişlerinde. O yüzde ordu da bir güçtü, önemli bir güçtü. O yüzden sanıkların arasında bir sürü insan sonradan askeriyyeden atıldı, emekli edildi, mağdur oldular, bir sürü öğrenci de, harp okulu öğrencisi de. Teğmenler... Yüzbaşıya kadar çıkmıştı. Mahirlerin grubunda yüzbaşı vardı. Üsteğmen, yüzbaşı... Daha çok havacılar daha ilerici oluyor nedense, havacılar, sonra denizciler, en son karacılar. Çoğu hava teğmeniydi, hava harp okulundandı falan filan . Evet böyle dönemler yaşandı.

CENK CENGİZ: O zaman aralarında çok fark yok Doğu Perinçek ile Mihri Belli'nin?

AHMET SONER: Ama şey görünüyor, işte yani ortada olan güçler bunlar. Kimse harekete getiremiyor proleteryaı. Bir kazan fabrikası buldu Doğu Perinçek, İstanbul'da. İşte soktu birtakım insanları oraya. Bunlar da öğrenciydi, allah bilir. İşte işçi olarak girdiler fabrikaya. Orada bir grev yapabildiler. Yani kaç kişilik? 40 kişi mi 50 kişinin çalıştığı fabrika, ufacık bir yer, proleterya dedikleri onlar. Sonra o dergileri okuduğumuz zaman görüyorduk, Halkın Kurtuluşu çıkıyordu, Deniz Gezmiş yanlısı. Bir tek onlar vardı. Levent'te bir fırın bulmuşlar, orada grev yapmışlar. Sloganlar yazmışlar duvarlara. 5 kişi çalışıyor falan filan. Gittim ben de, okuyunca birşey zannettim. Gençlik,işçiler falan filan var... Tın tın, hiçbir şey. Bunu yazan yazmış işte. Bilmem kim şöyle diyor, adama soruyorum böyle mi dedin, Yoo.... Dininde, namazında, niyazında oruç tutan adamlar bunlar. Ama böyle şişirip mişirip devrim yapacak hale getiriyorlar. Fırın devrimi. Komikti bir yandan herşey tabii. Bulamayınca proleterya. Şimdi İstanbul'da 15-16 Haziran oldu. Biz o zaman Ankara'daydık. Ankara'da da öğrenciler hemen sanayi Çarşısı'na gittiler. Yok nerede bulacaklar işçiyi, fabrika yok ortalıkta, bir şey yok. Sanayi Çarşısı'na gittiler, dayak yediler. İstanbul'da işçiler yürüyor,hareket, hadi hep beraber yürüyelim filan dediler, kışkırtıcı öğrenciler filan. Dayak yediler geldiler. Bir de tutuklandılar üstelik, Enis de aralarında. Anlattı mı bunu?

CENK CENGİZ: Yok, bunu anlatmadı.

AHMET SONER: Ben yoktum, ben gitmemiştim.

CENK CENGİZ: Bu, 12-13 Haziran...

AHMET SONER: 15-16 Haziran. İstanbul'da tabii büyük yürüyüşler oldu. Köprüleri açtılar, karşıya geçmesin diye, tanlar kesti yolu bilmem ne. Asker ateş edemedi tabii, barikatları açtı. O kadar kalabalık, sel gibi geliyor, Gebze'den geliyorlar, bilmem nereden geliyorlar.

CENK CENGİZ: Daha çok gençlik hareketi, gençlik

AHMET SONER: Ama o DISK'in düzenlediği bir şeydi. O yasalarla oynamaya kalktı, Sendikalar Yasası ile hükümet. DISK de sokağa döktü herkesi.

CENK CENGİZ: Siz de DISK tarafına daha çok yakındınız?

AHMET SONER: Tabii, bütün o DISK'in grevleri mirevleri çekmiştik, 1970-71 senelerinde

CENK CENGİZ: O zaman hareketin TIP'le hiç alakası yoktu, çünkü TIP, zaten ayrılaşmalar başlamıştı, bu MDD ve TIP'çiler arasında. Siz tamamen MDD'ci olarak çıktınız. Böyle de bir durum var.

AHMET SONER: Evet, evet.

CENK CENGİZ: Hareket içinde TIP'e yakın olan var mıydı?

AHMET SONER: Yok. TIP biraz geride kalmış gibi oluyordu. Aştı bu şeyler onu. Hem düşünce olarak teorik olarak, sonradan gelenler. Sonra gençlik de aynı şekilde. Mahir'in de yazdığı kitaplar da..., biliyorsun

CENK CENGİZ: hı-hım

AHMET SONER: Mahir de teorisyen olarak kendi şeyini yazdı.

CENK CENGİZ: Dev-Genç'li olan kimler vardı? Enis bey var. Başka hatırladığınız var mı?

AHMET SONER: Ankarada'ki gençler, Ortadoğu'lu, onlar Dev-Gençli

CENK CENGİZ: Enis Bey'in arkadaşları

AHMET SONER: İstanbul'da var mıydı, şimdi hatırlayamıyorum.

C. İstanbul'dakiler devrimci hareketlere katılıyorlar ama belli bir şey yok değil mi, bir yere üye değiller

AHMET SONER: Şimdi biz her tarafa koşturuyorduk. Mesela doktorcular, İşsizlik ve Pahalılıkla Savaş Mücadele Derneği gibi dernekler kurdular, İstanbul'da, Ankara'da, her yerde, bütün Türkiye'de.

CENK CENGİZ: Doktorcular dediğiniz...?

AHMET SONER: Dr. Hikmet Kıvılcımlı

CENK CENGİZ: Haaaa

AHMET SONER: Yani işte onun gidip derneğinde de film gösteriyorduk, Mihri Belli'nin kurduğu derneklerde de film gösteriyorduk. İşçi Partisi çağırsa, İşçi Partisi'ne de gösterirdik. Öyle bir şeyimiz yoktu bizim, herkese gidiyorduk. DISK'te yapıyorduk gösteriler, DISK'in Merter'deki yerinde

CENK CENGİZ: Ama Ankara, sanırım, biraz daha sempatizan...

AHMET SONER: Ankara evet, daha çok öğrenci hareketine daha yakındı.

CENK CENGİZ: O yüzden dergide çok yansımamış sanırım bu şeyler, ayrımlar

AHMET SONER: Ankara'da öğrenciler yazın birtakım yerlere giderlerdi, tütün işçilerini örgütlemeye, fındık işçilerini örgütlemeye Giresun'a, şuraya buraya, Samsun'a. Oraya, Ankara'dan gidenlerin kamera filan doldururduk 8'lik mekizlik, öyle çekilmiş şeyler de var elimizde.

CENK CENGİZ: Elimizde derken şimdi yok herhalde

AHMET SONER: Yok, o zaman göstermiştik bir kısmını şenlikte

CENK CENGİZ: Tamam, bu kadar. Yani zamanınızı aldım

AHMET SONER: Yok canım eğlence oldu.

APPENDIX II: BIOGRAPHIES OF THE MEMBERS

TANJU AKERSON: Robert College Alumnus. While one of the leading people of Sinematek Association, he signed the statement of Genc Sinema and began to write for Genc Sinema Journal. He quitted directing after Genc Sinema. At present, he is a journalist in the USA, while simultaneoulsy writing novels and stories. Among his works are *Missouri Savas Gemisi* ve *100 Büyük Gün: Çağlar Boyunca Toplumlari Sarsan*. He was married to Ela Guntekin, the daughter of Resat Nuri Guntekin, for a short time in the 1970s.

ÜMİT AŞÇI: He is an alumnus of Galatasaray High School. He worked as film editor for Genc Sinema. He worked for a long time both for Genc Sinema and Türk Haber Ajansı (Turkish News Agency)

FARUK ATASOY: Alumnus of Political Sciences Faculty at Ankara University. He went into advertising after Genc Sinema. He began his professional life as a copywriter in Manajans Thompson in 1974 and ultimately became the general manager of the agency. With the idea of starting his own business, he founded Birikim Advertising Agency.

VEYSEL ATAYMAN: He was born on 26.08.1941 in Istanbul. He studied German Language and Literature and Philosophy at Faculty of Letters at Istanbul University. He is a faculty member at the department of Translation and Interpreting at the same university. After Genc Sinema, he penned a great number of essays and critiques, along with a wide range of translations, on philosophy, popular science, cinema and literature. Among his works are his essays in newspapers and journals such as 25. Kare and Evrensel, his book *Şiddetin Mitolojisi* (The Mythology of Violence). He is the executive editor of Don Kişot publishing house and the editor for world classics at Bordo Siyah publishing house. He is also a member of the editorial council of *Modern Zamanlar (Modern Times)*, a cinema journal the headquarter of which is in Antalya.

ENGİN AYÇA He was born in Edremit in 1941. He graduated from Galatasaray High School. He studied on cinema and directing at Instituto Superiore Dell Opinione Publica and Centro Sperimentale Di Cinematografia in Rome. From 1970 to 1974, he worked in Foto Film Center at Istanbul University. He was an assistant in Yilmaz Güney's film "Arkadaş." With

Atilla Dorsay and Nezh Çoşkun, he published 7. Sanat, a cinema journal. He started to work for TRT in 1974 and from 1974 to 1986, he, as a director, shot several documentaries, films and cultural programs. He quitted his job at TRT in 1987 and directed the film "Bez Bebek." In 1990, he shot the film "Soğuktu ve Yağmur Çiseliyordu." He did some translations and penned some essays on cinema for various journals and newspapers. He has translated two books on cinema: Ayzenştayn'ın Ders Notları ve Sinemanın 100 Yılı. He is a lecturer in the Institute of Cinema and TV at Mimar Sinan University and writing theoretical works on cinema.

ÜSTÜN BARIŞTA: After graduating from Galatasaray High School, he went to Italy and completed his studies, first, at Roma Social Sciences University and, later, at Centro Cinematografia di Roma, one of the leading cinema schools in the world. When he returned to Turkey, he wrote for Genç Sinema and, later, for Çağdaş Sinema. After 1970s, Barışta decided on directing advertisements and shot many successful advertisements. He lectured on History of Cinema and Aesthetics of Film at Boğazici University and among some of his famous and successful students are Derviş Zaim, Nuri Bilge Ceylan and Ezel Akay. Today, along with individual coaching, he generally works as a consultant and director for special advertisement campaigns and shoots corporate introductory films. He is married to Pakize Barışta.

YAKUP BAROKAS: He was born in 1961. He graduated from the department of Law at Istanbul University. After Genç Sinema, he did not pursue a career in cinema and instead worked as a lawyer. He is a journalist and writer. He is the executive director of Şalom Gazetesi, a weekly newspaper for Jews of Turkey.

YORGO BOZIS: He did not shoot films after Genç Sinema. He worked on cinema on a theoretical level. He worked as an accountant and interpreter. He lived in Greece all his life and died there.

OSMAN ERTUĞ: He is an alumnus of state conservatoire at Istanbul University. After Genç Sinema, he worked as an actor in advertisements, series, theatre and cabaret. He was a player in the cabaret of Metin Akpınar and Zeki Alasya. He appeared in advertisement films for a long time.

MUSTAFA IRGAT: He was born in Istanbul in 1950. He is the son of the writer Mina Urgan and Cahit Irgat and the brother of actress Zeynep Irgat. After Genç Sinema, he decided on literature and poetry. His first poem was published in *Yeni Dergi* in 1971. Among his works,

Ait'siz Kimlik Kitabı (1993), a poetry book and *Duhuldeki Deney* (1995), a compilation of essays on cinema are important. His poetry book, *Ait'siz Kimlik Kitabı* won the Arıburnu Şiir prize in 1995. Mustafa Irgat died on 03.03.1995 in Istanbul.

MUAMMER ÖZER: Director, producer, scriptwriter. He was born in Bilecik in 1945. Being the son of a railway worker, Muammer Özer had to quit his studies after secondary school due to financial problems. He attended acting classes in City Theatres of Eskisehir Municipality. During his military service, he began to shoot experimental short films and advertising films. He gave lectures on cinema free of charge at Eskisehir Public Education Center. He began his professional life as a short film director in 1967. After Genç Sinema, he went to Germany in the early 1970s. Working for several years in Germany, Özer studied cinema in Finland for five years. He moved to Sweden in 1977. He took part in one film as an actor and cinematographer. His film, Kara Sevdalı Bulut was censored due to its critical attitude towards tortures during September 12. Shooting documentaries as well after 1981, Özer received several national and international prizes.

OĞUZ ONARAN: He was born in Izmir in 1935. He completed his undergraduate studies at the department of Law at Ankara University. He became a research assistant at the department of Public Administration at Faculty of Political Sciences Ankara University. He received his PhD in 1966 and became an associate professor in 1970. He was jailed for a short while during 12 Mart events. He was the head of the department of Administrative Sciences at the Faculty of Social Sciences. He offered lectures on psychology of management and management of stuff while he was at the Faculty of Social Sciences. He was the dean of the Faculty of Communication at Ankara University between the years 1999-2002. He retired in 2002. He acted as counselor of Minister of Culture (in the subcommittee of intellectual and industrial property rights) in specialization commissions of development plans prepared under the auspices of DPT. He was at the advisory board of TMMOB Public Administration Symposium. He was the president of World Mass Communication Research Foundation which organized Ankara International film festival. He earned the Bilge Olgac Merit Award in Uçan Süpürge International Women's Films Festival in 2006. He still acts as the counselor of these two festivals. He offered lectures on film analysis and history of cinema at Ugur Mumcu Araştırmacı Gazetecilik Vakfı. He offers lectures on film analysis at the Faculty of Fine Arts and Music at ODTU. He plays piano and gives chamber music concerts.

Prod. Dr. MUTLU PARKAN: He was born in Istanbul in 1948. He attended Austria High School and Kabatas High School. He completed his studies at Political Sciences Faculty at Ankara University. He conducted researches on economy, politics, cinema theories and aesthetics of cinema in Paris, Geneva, Berlin. As of 1978, he began to lecture at the department of Cinema and TV at fine Arts Faculty at Dokuz Eylül University, together with Alim Şerif Onaran. His two books are *Brecht's Aesthetics and Cinema* and *Aesthetics of Cinema and*

Godord. After working for various universities, he is a lecturer at Communication Faculty at Beykent University.

ÖMER PEKMEZ: He was born in Afyon in 1946. He came to Istanbul for his undergraduate education as a civil engineer at Yıldız Teknik University. As a consequence of his interest in cinema, he began to work for the newly founded Sinematek Association. He worked for the monthly journal Genc Sinema in 1968 and later for the journal FILM. He founded Nokta Photograph Studio in 1969. Until its closure in 1979, Pekmez worked for Sinematek Association for 16 years, with Şakir Eczacıbaşı and Onat Kutlar, during when he learned about photography and film shooting. He shot several short films. He founded ASA Sanat Haberleri Ajansı (ASA Art News Agency) in 1977. He serviced art news for newspapers. He prepared photo romances for various newspapers such as Kelebek and Saklanbaç for the following six years. He was engaged in documental film shooting and film import for long years. He founded Taksim Sanat Evi (Taksim Art House) in 1979 and Akademi Istanbul Sineması (Academy Istanbul Cinema) in 1997 to broadcast art-based European cinema films. In the 2004-2005 school year, he prepared, with the permission of Ministry of Education, the curriculum for cinema and television for Private Kadikoy Fine Arts High School, the one and only high school cinema and television curriculum, which was approved by council of Education and Morality of Ministry of Education. Fine Arts High Schools in Turkey use the same curriculum. He shot the documentary “Zeytinin Yolculuğu” in 2009

GAYE PETEK: She is the daughter of a prominent pharmacist, Fahrettin Petek, a TSKEP (Turkish Socialist Proletarian Peasant Party) member who had to leave Turkey during DP government in 1950. She completed her studies on literature and sociology at Sorbonne University. After Genc Sinema, she moved to France. She worked in the bureau of Aid to and Adaptation of French Immigrants for ten years. In the 1980s, she was the founder and the president of Elele Association, which aimed to assist Turkish Immigrants living in France on their problems. Her studies on immigration made her almost an expert in France and she was the only Turkish member of Commission of Secularism and High Council of Integration. She was married to Jak Şalom, another member of Genc Sinema for 20 years. Today, they are organizing festivals and various events in France.

ENİS RIZA SAKIZLI: He was born in Ankara in 1948. He attended Galatasaray High School. He followed sociology and philology classes at Hacettepe University. With Genc Sinema group, he started to work on documentary and short film in 1969. He took an interest in theatre during high school years and worked as an apprentice for Vasıf Öngören in his adaptations of epic theatre. He still pursues his interest in theatre as an amateur. His two feature-length symbolic films and two documentaries released abroad in 1972 made a great impact in France, Great Britain and the USA. He was a freelance journalist. He wrote on literature. He offered lectures on photography at Istanbul University. He worked as an instructor in the program of “Production within Education” at Ankara Media Academy. He opened photograph exhibitions in the USA and France. He has made numerous documentaries and newscasts since the 1970s. He occasionally still directs advertising films. He works as a

director and shoots introductory films and documentaries for VTR Arařtırma Yapım Yönetim, which he co-founded with production manager Nalan Sakızlı in 1987. He gave lectures on photography, cinema, documental cinema in various schools, universities and institutions. He is among the founders of Belgesel Sinemacılar Union, which was founded in 1996.

He offers lectures on “Documentary cinema” and “Cinema and Politics” at Faculty of communication at Galatasaray University and Marmara University. He has received many national and international awards for documentary, photography and advertisement. Among Genç Sinema members, he is the most active person who still pursues shooting films and documentaries.

ALGIN SAYDAR: Alumnus of American College. After Genç Sinema, he was no longer interested in cinema, neither on a theoretical level nor a practical level such as directing. He worked for Derman, an association founded in 2002 which aims to improve the linguistic and cultural communication of Turkish and Kurdish speakers in Great Britain, for long years and helped to improve the association.

AHMET SONER: He was born in Uskudar in 1945. He worked with various directors such as Atıf Yılmaz, Lütfü Akad, Vedat Türkali, Yılmaz Güney, Yavuz Özkan, Şerif Gören. He shot his first short film in 1966. He is among the founders of Genç Sinema movement. As a cameraman at Türk Haberler Ajansı, he shot documentaries and newsreels. His story of film named “İstanbul İsgalindedir” was rewarded in a contest organized by Milliyet Sanat Dergisi. Some of his scenarios such as “Hayatım Roman”, “İş İştir” and “Çocukların Dünyası” were turned to television series. His other scenarios such as “Herhangi bir Kadın”, “Tomruk” ve “Derman” were turned into films and directed by Şerif Gören. Almost twenty of his scenarios were turned into films by various directors. His writings on literature and cinema were published in various newspapers and journals. *Akıntıya Karşı* was published in 1995. Adana-Paris, a documentary on Yılmaz Güney, 36 Kitap= 13 Cezaevi, a documentary on İsmail Beşikçi, were displayed in many cities both in Turkey and in Europe. He worked as general secretary of Sine-Sen from October 1998 to May 2000. The third edition of Herkes O’ndan Söz Ediyor has been published. He is a member of Türkiye Yazarlar Sendikası, Sine-Sen (Disk), Belgesel Sinemacılar Birlięi. He is married with one child. He aims to finish his latest documentary named “Köy Enstitüleri.”

JAK ŞALOM: Alumnus of Robert College. After Genç Sinema, he went to France with Gaye Petek. He worked as a general manager and financial controller at French State and Funded Theatres. He remained married to Gaye Petek for twenty years. Today, together with Gaye Petek, he organizes various festivals and events in France.

METE TANJU : TANJU KURTAREL: Alumnus of Robert College. After Genc Sinema, he directed documentaries and fictional films for TRT and retired from TRT. Among his works are the documentary of Sait Faik and Lüzümsüz Adam. He also works as an interpreter.

ÖMER TUNCER: He was born in Bursa in 1946. He worked for Bursa Public House Chamber Theatre from its foundation to its closure (1961 to 1970). He graduated from the department of Philosophy at Faculty of Letters at Istanbul University in 1972. He held several offices (from management to presidency) between the years 1988 and 2000 in Ankara International Film Festival. He worked as Ministry of Culture Cinema Vice General Manager from 1993 to 1996. Repairing an old house in Mudanya, Tuncer opened Sanat Evi in 1996. Due to the lack of official aid and of demand, however, the house had to be closed down. Tuncer is among the founders of Bursa Cinema Association. He still works as a member of the executive board of the same association. He directed the documentaries "Amerikan Filosu" (1969), "Anadolu'da Ayak Sesleri" (1977), "Anadolu Uygarlıkları" (1984) and "Şafağa Atılan İmza" (1996). In 1970, with his film "Amerikan Filosu," Tuncer received the second prize and Special Jury Prize in the 4th Hisar short film Contest. He is the author of *İşte Anadolu* (1993), along with a hundred articles and leaflets on history of culture and cinema.

HÜSEYİN TÜZÜN: He graduated from the department of economics at Istanbul University. After Genc Sinema, he did not do anything related to cinema. He worked as a German interpreter in Datca.

ALTAN YALÇIN: In the 1950s, he was a young member of the documentary crew of Sabahattin Eyuboğlu. He became a member of Genc Sinema. He worked as a photographer and cameraman for Genc Sinema. After Genc Sinema, he shot a documentary named "Halic." He died in the 1970s.

ARTUN YERES: He was born in 1935 and educated in French and Turkish schools. He attended Fine Arts Academy. He started his professional cinema career by working as co-director for ömer Lütfi Akad. He was a member of Istanbul Sinematek Association and Genc sinema. He directed cinema films as well as documentaries. Yeres was awarded Special Jury Prize for his short film "Çirkin Ares" in Istanbul Hisar Short Film Contest in 1968. The following year, he won the first prize for his short film "Onlar Ki" in the same contest. He was awarded the Izmir Film Festival Special Prize for his "Buluşma," adapted from a namesake short story of İnci Aral. Among his prizes are The Best Scenario for his "Dün, bugün, Yarın" in the 32nd Antalya film festival in 1995, the Silver Prize for his short film "Mevsimler" in Tokyo film Festival, Prize of Labour for his contributions to Turkish cinema

in 2005. He has also written various books on cinema, some of which are *Göstermenin Sorumluluđu*, *65 Yönetmenimizden Sinemamız*, *Sakıncalı 100 Film*, *Bir Michelangelo Antonioni Kitabı*, *Bir Luis Bunuel Kitabı* and *Bir Pier Paolo Pasolini Kitabı*

**APPENDIX 3: THE LIST OF THE MOVIES ATTENDED IN THE FIRST *DEVİRİM*
SİNEMASI ŞENLİĞİ IN MAY 26- 28, 1970¹⁷⁸**

DOCUMENTARIES:

- 1- Gerze Tütün Mitingi – 16 mm
- 2- Kanlı Pazar – 16 mm
- 3- Tuslog Olayları – 16 mm
- 4- İstanbul Olayları – 16 mm
- 5- 29 Nisan – 16 mm
- 6- 10 Haziran – 16 mm
- 7- Che Guevera – 16 mm

- 8- Ankara'nın Çöpleri – 8 mm
- 9- Taylan Özgür'ün Cenaze Töreni – 8 mm
- 10- İmran Ökten Yürüyüşü – 8 mm
- 11- Altıncı Filo – 8 mm
- 12- Nallıhan Orman Köylüleri – 8 mm
- 13- Görüntüler 70 – 8 mm 70 olayları ile ilgili
- 14- Suyun Getirdikleri – 8 mm

FICTIONAL FILMS:

- 1- Bir Almanya ki... (Yakup Barokas, 16 mm)
- 2- Kentteki Yabancı (Veysel Atayman, 16 mm)
- 3- Kördüğüm (Muammer Özer, 16 mm)
- 4- Sayım Günü Çakırı da Saydılar (Ahmet Soner, 16 mm)

¹⁷⁸ *Belgesel Sinema*, (Spring - Summer 2003), Vol: 3

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Oral History

Atayman, Veysel on June 14, 2010 in The Garden of *Nazım Hikmet Kültür Merkezi*, Kadıköy

Rıza, Enis on June 12, 2010 in The Meeting Room of *VTR Araştırma Yapım Yönetim*, Teşvikiye

Soner, Ahmet on June 26, 2010 in The Meeting Room of *VTR Araştırma Yapım Yönetim*, Teşvikiye

Periodicals

Belgesel Sinema, Spring – Summer 2003

Genç Sinema October, 1968 – April 1971

Görüntü Spring, 1996

Yeni Sinema, July, 1967

Yenigün, November, 1970

Articles

‘‘Genç Sinema’dan’’. *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

‘‘Genç Sinema’dan’’. *Genç Sinema*, (May, 1969) Vol: 7

‘‘Genç Sinema’dan’’. *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

‘‘Hisar Günlüğü’’. *Genç Sinema*, (July, 1969) Vol:8

‘‘Paralı Askerler’ Filmi Üstüne Bildiri’’. *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 9

Akerson, Tanju. ‘‘Sinemada Barış İçinde Beraber Yaşamaya Hayır’’. *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol:2

Akerson, Tanju. "Genç Sinema'da 1 No'lu Durak – Mutlu Parkan'ın 66'sı." *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol: 4

Atasoy, Faruk. "Silah Başına". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 3,

Atasoy, Faruk. "Sinemada Emperyalizm". *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol: 5

Atasoy, Faruk. "Sinema ve Sansür" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

Atayman, Veysel. "1969 Başında Türk Sinemasının Bir Kaç Sorunu" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

Atayman, Veysel. "Devrimci Sinema" *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

Atayman, Veysel. "Genç Sinema'nın Yarını" *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1969) Vol: 9

Atayman, Veysel. "Uçuruma Sürüklenen Otomobil" *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol: 4

Ayça, Engin. "Sinema ile Uğraşmak - 3" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969), Vol: 6

Ayça, Engin. "Sinema ile Uğraşmak" *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol: 5

Ayça, Engin. "Sinema ile Uğraşmak" *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 3

Ayça, Engin. "Sinema İle Uğraşmak – 2" *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol: 5

Ayça, Engin. "Sinemayı Yeniden İcat Etmek" *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

Barıştta, Üstün. "Genç Sinema'nın Tarihsel Sorumluluğu" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

Barıştta, Üstün. "Örgütlenmeye Doğru" *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) Vol: 3

Barıştta, Üstün. "Örgütlenmeye Doğru" *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 2

Barıştta, Üstün. "Örgütlenmeye Doğru" *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

Barıştta, Üstün. "Sevgili Çirkin Ares", *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol: 5

Barıştta, Üstün. "Genç Sinema'nın Tarihsel Sorumluluğu" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

Barıştta, Üstün. "Örgütlenmeye Doğru – 2" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

Barıştta, Üstün. "Örgütlenmeye Doğru" *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 2

Barıştta, Üstün. "Örgütlenmeye Doğru" *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

Barokas, Yakup. "Basit Sinema" *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol: 10

Barokas, Yakup. "Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması için Genç Sinema Bir Harekttir" *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

Baroas, Yakup. "Yeni Bir Aşamaya Doğru" *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol: 5

Barokas, Yakup. "Devrimci ve ulusal Türk sineması için genç sinema bir harekttir." *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

Barokas, Yakup. Devrimci ve Ulusal Türk Sineması için Genç Sinema Bir Harekttir. *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

Bergman, İbrahim. "Sanat Olayı ve Halk". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 2

Bozis, Yorgo, "Sayılamalara Göre Türk Sineması'nın Ekonomik Durumu". *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol: 4

Bozis, Yorgo. "Türkiye'de Sinemada Dış Sömürü". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

Bozis, Yorgo. "Emekçiler ve Sinema". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol: 10

Çapan, Sungu. "Hisar Yarışmasının ardından". *Yeni Sinema*, (July, 1967) Vol. 8

Ertuğ, Osman. "Sinemanın Gücü". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

Ertuğ, Osman. "Dikkat Sansür Var (!)". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

Ertuğ, Osman. "Genç Sinemacı Filmini Nasıl yapıyor?" *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1969) Vol: 11

Ertuğ, Osman. "Genç Sinemacı Filmini Nasıl Yapıyor?" *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol: 10

Gönenç, Mehmet. "Özgür Bir Sinema". *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

Gönenç, Mehmet. "Sinemayı Halka Götürmek". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 2

Irgat, Mustafa. "Sinemaya Doğru". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 2

Kutlar, Onat. "İşe Saygı". *Yenigün*, (19 November 1970) Cinema Page

Kutlar, Onat. "Ulusal Türk Sineması için Alan Araştırmaları 3: Kısa Filmin İçeriği ve Yapısal Sorunları". *Yeni Sinema*, (June - July 1968) Vol: 19 – 20

Özer, Muammer. "Eskişehirli Genç Sinemacılar'ın Dünü, Bugünü, Yarını". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol: 10

Parkan, Mutlu. "Çeşitleme". *Genç Sinema*, (January, 1969) Vol: 4

Parkan, Mutlu. "Yeni Olay". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 2

Parkan, Mutlu. "Genç ve Sorumluluğu". *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

Pekmez, Ömer. "Sansür Sorunu". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

Petek, Gaye. "Sanat ve Sanatçı". *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) Vol: 3

Petek, Gaye. "Devrim ve Sinema". *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1

Petek, Gaye. "Etkin Bir Seyirci Aramak". *Genç Sinema*, (February, 1969) Vol: 5

Petek, Gaye. "Sanat ve Sinema". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 3

Petek, Gaye. "Sinemacı (Görevi Karşısında ve Onun İçinde)". *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1969) Vol: 9

Sakızlı, Enis Rıza. "Sanat ve Sanatçı Üstüne Bir Taslak". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

Savaşta, Üstün. "Ekonomik Örgütlenmeye Doğru". *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1969) Vol: 11

Savaşta, Üstün. "Ekonomik Örgütlenmeye Doğru-2". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12

- Saydar, Algin. "Devrim İçin Sinemanın Gereği". *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1968) Vol: 3
- Saydar, Algin. "Devrim İçin Sinemanın Gereği". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6
- Soner, Ahmet. "Sansürün Yılan Hikayesi". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6
- Soner, Ahmet. "Tarihçe". *Belgesel Sinema*, (Spring - Summer 2003) Vol: 3
- Soner, Ahmet. "İlk Yazı". *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1
- Şalom, Jak. "Bir". *Genç Sinema*, (October, 1968) Vol: 1
- Tanju, Mete. "Genç Sinemacı". *Belgesel Sinema*, Vol: 11
- Tanju, Mete. "Devrim Sinemasının Sorunları İçinde Yapıt". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1970) Vol: 12
- Tanju, Mete. "Genç Sinemacı ve Belgesel Film". *Genç Sinema*, (December, 1969) Vol: 11
- Ufuk, Adnan. "Türkiye'de Devrimci Sinema Tartışmaları – 2: Genç Sinema". *Görüntü*, (Spring – 1996) Vol: 5
- Yalçın, Altan. "Sinemaların Gerillaları". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6
- Yalçınkaya, Mehmet. "Sinema Ağalarına Sesleniyorum". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1969) Vol: 10
- Yeres, Artun. "Genç Sinema'nın Konumu". *Genç Sinema*, (November, 1968) Vol: 3
- Yeres, Artun. "Genç Sinema'da Anti-Amerikan Gözlem ve Eylem". *Genç Sinema*, (March, 1969) Vol: 6

SECONDARY SOURCES

Books

- Adalı, Bilgin. *Belgesel Sinema : Belgesel Sinemanın Doğuşu, İngiliz Belgesel Okulu ve Türk Belgesel Sineması*. İstanbul : Hil Yayın, 1986.
- Aren, Sadun. *TİP Olayı 1961 – 1971*. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1993.
- Başgüney, Hakkı, *Türk Sinematek Derneği: Türkiye'de Sinema ve Politik Tartışma*. İstanbul: Libra Kitap, 2009.
- Bordwell, David and Thompson, Kristin. *Film History*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.
- Belli, Mihri. *Yazılar 1965 – 1970*. Ankara: Sol Yayınları, 1970.
- Binyıldız, Esra. *Sinemada Akımlar*. İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık, 2002.

Chanan, M. *Twenty-five Years of the New Latin American Cinema*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Coşkun, Esin. *Türk Sinemasında Akım Araştırması*. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları, 2009.

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

Erus, Zeynep Çetin, “Manifestolardan Günümüze Üçüncü Sinema Tartışmaları” in *Üçüncü Sinema ve Üçüncü Dünya Sineması*. Binyıldız, Esra and Erus, Zeynep Çetin (eds.). İstanbul: Es Yayınları, 2007.

Esen, Şükran Kuyucak, “Türkiye’de Üçüncü Sinema” in *Üçüncü Sinema ve Üçüncü Dünya Sineması*, Binyıldız, Esra and Erus, Zeynep Çetin (eds.). İstanbul: Es Yayınları, 2007.

Gabriel Teshome H. *Third Cinema in the Third World: The Aesthetics of Liberation*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1982.

Grant, Tracey. “The Counteractive Rebellion and the Quest for Authenticity”. *Filmography of American History*. New York: Greenwood Press, 2002.

Güçhan, Gülseren. *Toplumsal Gelişme ve Türk Sineması*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 1992.

Film and Theory: An Anthology, Stam, Robert and Miller, Toby (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Hakan, Fikret. *Türk Sinema Tarihi*, İstanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi, 2008.

Hristidis, Şengün Kılıç. *Sinemada Ulusal Tavrı ‘Halit Refiğ Kitabı’*. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2007.

Hayward, Susan. *French National Cinema*. London ; New York : Routledge, 1993

Kabadayı, Lale. “Çin’in Beşinci Kuşak Sinemacıları ve Üçüncü (Dünya) Sinema Estetiği” in *Üçüncü Sinema ve Üçüncü Dünya Sineması*, Binyıldız, Esra and Erus, Zeynep Çetin (eds.). İstanbul: Es Yayınları, 2007.

Kolker, R.P. *A Cinema of Loneliness*. Oxford University Press: New York – Oxford, 1988.

Macbean, James Roy . *Film and Revolution*. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1975.

Maccabe, Colin. *Godard: Images, Sounds, Politics*. London: British Film Institute, 1980.

Monaco, James. *The New Wave*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press, 1981

Nagib, Lucia. *Brazil on Screen: Cinema Novo, New Cinema, Utopia*. London - New York : I.B. Tauris : Distributed by Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Neupert, Richard . *A History of the French New Wave Cinema*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002.

- Özgüç, Agah. *Türk Filmleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Sesam Yayınları, 1998
- Özön, Nijat. *Karagözden Sinemaya, Türk Sineması ve Sorunları*. Ankara: Kitle Yayınları, 1985. Vol: 1.
- Özön, Nijat. *Türk Sineması Kronolojisi*. Ankara : Bilgi Yayınevi, 1968
- Parkinson, David. *History of Film*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1995.
- Refiğ, Halit. *Ulusal Sinema Kavgası*. İstanbul: Hareket Yayınları, 1971.
- The Oxford History of World Cinema*. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Ryan, Michael and Kellner, Douglas. *Camera Politica*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Scognamillo, Giovanni. *Türk Sinema Tarihi : 1867-1997*. İstanbul : Kabalcı Yayınevi, 1998
- Stam, Robert . *Film Theory: An Introduction*. USA: Blackwell Publishers, 2000. p. 95.
- Teksoy, Rekin. *Sinema Tarihi*. İstanbul: Oğlak Yayıncılık, 2005
- Susar, Filiz. *Türkiye'de Belgesel Sinemacılar*. İstanbul : Es Yayınları, 2004
- Wiegand, Chris. *French New Wave*. Harpenden : Pocket Essentials, 2001.
- Yetkin, Çetin, *Türkiye'de Soldaki Bölünmeler: Tartışmalar, Nedenler, Çözüm Önerileri (1960 – 1970)*. Ankara: Toplum Yayınevi, 1970.
- Yıldırım, Ali, *FKF Dev-Genç Tarihi: 1965 – 1971 Belgelerle Bir Dönemin Serüveni*, İstanbul: Doruk Yayıncılık, 2008.
- Yılmaz, Ertan, *1968 ve Sinema*. Ankara: Kitle Yayınları, 1997