# A transboundary cinema : Tunç Okan’s trilogy of im/migration

Luxembourgeus, T.T.E.

## Chapter I

### A Metamorphosis: From Commercial Movie Star to Independent Auteur

Tunç Okan's cinema career is an unusual one. It begins with acting in one of the most productive national commercial cinema industries in the world and stretches all the way to directing as an independent filmmaker in a time when making independent cinema was almost unthinkable. In this chapter, I look at the process that created a pioneer independent *auteur* from a commercial movie star. I will do this by dividing my analysis into three different yet interconnected sections.

In the first section, I provide a general biography of Okan, which will be helpful to contextualise his cinematographic career and offer some useful insights into it. In the following section, I look at the very concept of independent cinema and focus particularly on the independent filmmaking practices within the commercial cinema industry of Turkey, Yeşilçam. In this section, I try to locate Okan's cinema in relation to both independent and Yeşilçam film production practices. The main question of the section is the following: Can Okan be considered as an independent filmmaker, and if so, why? Independent cinema, not necessarily, but quite often, can also be an indication of a personal vision in cinema. For this reason, in the third section, I will explain if Okan can be considered an 'auteur', and if so, on what grounds.

**A Life with Surprising Turns**

Tunç Okan was born Mehmet Celal Kulen in Istanbul on 19 August 1942. Kulen spent most of his childhood attending different schools in different cities in Turkey due to his father's job at the state-owned, now-defunct, textile production company *Sümerbank*. One can speculate that the experience of living in many different places scattered around a big and diverse country like Turkey have helped Okan create nuanced portrayals of his characters and Turkish society in his later career. After continuing his primary and secondary education in different cities, Kulen graduated from Istanbul University as a dentist in 1963.[26] Following his graduation, his life took an unexpected turn for a dentist. This was thanks to Cengiz Batuhan, a cameraman, whom he met during his compulsory military service in Istanbul. In 1965, Batuhan convinced and encouraged Kulen, who was a tall and good-looking man, to apply to an acting competition that was organised by one of the most popular and influential paparazzi-like cinema magazines of the time, *Ses*. The award for the competition was a contract that gave the winner the chance to act in ten feature films and share the leading roles with already established film stars like Tuncel Kurtiz and Türkan Şoray. Kulen was chosen as the cover star of *Ses* magazine and won the competition. At the time, he was only twenty-three years old.[27] Giving actors catchy, easy-to-remember stage names had been one of the long-standing traditions of Yeşilçam. Upon winning the competition, Kulen followed this tradition and chose *Tunç Okan* as his stage name. He was introduced to the public with this new name.

Competitions similar to the one that kick-started Okan's cinema career were not unusual practices at the time; on the contrary, they were common and vital events for Turkey's popular cinema during much of the 1960s and the early 70s. Such competitions, which were often a weird hybrid of beauty, modelling, and acting contests organised by popular cinema magazines and newspapers alike, provided significant help for the in-

dustry in finding new faces out of which they could create star figures. The mainstream popular cinema of Turkey was a cinema that was based on a star system much like Hollywood. During this period, Yeşilçam was producing around 200 films annually. In 1966, this remarkable pace of production placed Turkey at fourth place in the world in terms of production numbers with 229 films, following Japan, India, and Hong Kong.[28] In the 1960s, mainstream cinema was enjoying its golden age; film production and the demand for these films were booming. Television broadcasting, which started in 1968 in the country, was limited to big cities like Istanbul and was not accessible for the majority of the public. Cinema, along with the state-owned and controlled radio, was one of the most popular forms of entertainment for the masses. Finding new faces while continuing to exploit existing stars was a necessity for a popular cinema like Yeşilçam for several reasons. First of all, the movie stars were the biggest cost of film productions during the period. Second, one of the unique characteristics of Yeşilçam was that every film star was associated with a certain type of character. As film critic Engin Ayça noted, no change was tolerated by the loyal audience, not even the slightest change in the dubbing voice of the character.[29] Under this set of conditions, the film industry needed the continuous creation of new star figures, primarily to reduce film production costs, and thus increase the profit, while also preventing the audience from getting bored of the same faces.

Okan made his first appearance as an actor in Ülkü Erakalın's 1965 film *Veda Busesi* (Farewell Kiss) in which he played a leading role with the iconic Turkish actress Türkan Şoray.[30] *Farewell Kiss* was followed by two other films in which Okan appeared in the same year, and ten more in the following year. This very high number of film appearances in a period of less than two years made him famous and placed him among the top five movie stars of the period, together with stars like Ayhan Işık and Yılmaz Güney.[31]

During this period Okan not only worked as an actor, but he also contributed to the 1966 film *Karanlıkta Vuruşanlar* (Fighting in the Dark) as a scriptwriter in which he appeared in one of the leading roles.[32] Despite his contribution to some other films' scripts, just as *Fighting in the Dark*, all thirteen films in which Okan appeared were mediocre commercial films, and none of them deserve further consideration in the context of this study. The same could be said for most of the films produced during the entire Yeşilçam period. I will elaborate on this later in the chapter.

In 1967, just two years after his first film appearance, Okan announced his surprising decision to quit his acting career in Yeşilçam in a highly critical interview that he gave to the then-popular and respected daily newspaper *Milliyet*. In the interview, the actor accused Yeşilçam of being escapist, and of anaesthetising society.

> Turkish cinema today is an entertainment apparatus that is harmful to Turkish society. Every year around 250 films direct society to fighting, robbery, making money without working. These films, with their disgusting exploitation of feelings, anaesthetise people and prevent the Turkish public from understanding the real conditions that they live in. This is one of the worst things that can be done to Turkish society, the majority of which is poor.[33]

Okan's decision to quit his acting career was neither the result of a reflex nor of momentary anger; on the contrary, the decision was the result of many disagreements and disappointments he experienced during his short Yeşilçam career. While Okan was making good money as one of the most famous and important movie stars of the period, he was neither happy nor satisfied with the way in which things were done in Yeşilçam. Less than six months into his acting career, Okan started voicing his disagreements and disillusions with the mainstream cinema. In a short article he wrote for the cinema magazine *Sinema 65*, he

calls the mainstream cinema in Turkey "the underdeveloped cinema of an underdeveloped country".[34] In the article, Okan likens Yeşilçam to a big river in high flow and writes "[p]eople who want to do something, even those who have the power to change things, cannot change the direction of this river, they follow the flow albeit floundering. The flow rests on deeply rooted economic reasons".[35]

Hearing such a critique from a commercial movie star who just started enjoying the glamorous benefits of his fame and stardom may have come as a surprise for some, maybe even more so than his subsequent decision to quit acting at the beginning of a promising career. However, when considered within the context of the country's cinema of the period and the discussions surrounding it, Okan's critique becomes rather less surprising.

The 1960s, especially the mid-60s, were the scene of heated and highly politicised debates about almost all aspects of life in Turkey. This was thanks to the progressive constitution of 1961, which came into force after the coup d'état that overthrew the oppressive right-wing *Demokrat Parti* (Democrat Party) government on 27 May 1960. Though undoubtedly an anti-democratic move, the coup d'état is referred to as a "revolution" by some due to its relatively progressive outcome.[36] Commissioned by the military junta, and put together by a group of respected academics, intellectuals, and experts, the new constitution guaranteed many fundamental democratic rights and freedoms, such as freedom of expression and freedom of association, while restricting the power of the executive branch. Even though it did not bring any direct change to the industry, the new constitution, and the ensuing period provided the cinema with a "suitable spiritual climate", as film scholar Âlim Şerif Onaran noted.[37] This climate certainly affected the cinema and mobilised politicised discussions about it. These discussions soon evolved into groupings with different political leanings and motivations. Okan's critique, which he voiced in the magazine article, is a

product of this sociopolitical atmosphere.

Shortly after quitting his acting career in Yeşilçam, Okan moved to Germany to learn German, and later immigrated to Switzerland, where he continued his education and earned a doctorate in dentistry from the University of Bern in 1980.[38] In 1973, Okan did something unexpected and returned to cinema as an actor in Barbro Karabuda's television film *Barnet* (Baby). The film is an adaptation of a story of the same name by Yaşar Kemal. Made in Sweden, the film is noteworthy because it is the first film in which Okan appeared as an actor since he quit his acting career in 1967.[39] Not long after his reappearance as an actor in *Baby*, Okan returned to cinema as a director with his debut film *Otobüs* (The Bus) in 1974. Based in part on a real-life story that Okan read in a newspaper, the film follows the experiences of nine illegal migrants from rural Turkey who are driven to Sweden in a crumbling bus by their fellow countryman, a human trafficker, with the promise of finding a job. *The Bus* is one of the earliest films that focus on human trafficking from the perspective of the people who are being trafficked. Okan is concurrently the scriptwriter, editor, producer, and one of the leading actors of the film.

Okan's debut film was screened at prestigious film festivals and received several international awards, among which are *The Human Rights Film Festival Award* in Strasbourg, and the *Don Quijote Award* given by the FICC (International Federation of Film Societies). Despite its considerable international success, the film could not be screened in Turkey until 1977 due to a ban imposed on the film by the country's national censorship board with the pretext that it was misrepresenting and humiliating Turkish society. *The Bus* could be screened in the country freely only after the ban was lifted by a court in 1977. Though it was released with only a few copies, the film was screened for almost a year and enjoyed a lot of attention from critics and public alike.[40]

Okan released *The Bus* once more in Turkey in 1984

with a new editing. This new version of the film is 69 minutes long, 15 minutes shorter than the 84 minutes long original version.[41] Okan cited his curiosity to see the reactions of a new generation of audience to the film as his motivation to re-release the film, and stated that the film's topic was much more suitable to the day's sociopolitical atmosphere.[42] Looking retrospectively, the re-release of the film gives an impression of an attempt to remind the audience of Okan, as well as gain a financial leverage for the filmmaker's upcoming film project, *Funny Saturday*, which was already in the pipeline by then.

In 1985, some eleven years after *The Bus*, Okan completed his second film *Drôle de samedi* (Funny Saturday) in Switzerland. It follows interesting, insignificant, and seemingly unconnected events taking place in a small Swiss town, Neuchâtel, from the perspective of a young couple during an ordinary Saturday. Okan stated on several occasions that he considers the film as the continuation of his previous film.[43] He is again concurrently the scriptwriter, editor, and one of the leading actors of the film.

In 1986, Okan appeared in Sinan Çetin's movie *Prenses* (Princess) as one of the leading actors. The film marks an important point in Okan's cinema career as it is his first film appearance under the direction of a director other than himself since his own directing career started in 1974. *Prenses* is also the first movie featuring Okan that is made in Turkey since his decision to quit acting in the commercial cinema industry of the country in 1967. In 1992, Okan completed his third film *Mercedes mon Amour* (The Yellow Mercedes), which follows a Turkish guest worker's dystopian journey from Munich to his hometown in rural Turkey.

Although neither the director nor any film critic has so far referred to these three films as a trilogy, in my opinion, these films are sufficiently unified by their dystopian narratives, themes, and their search of home and identity to constitute a trilogy. In this trilogy, each film corresponds to a different stage

of migration, namely the departure, the (dis)integration, and the return. Okan's debut film corresponds to the first phase of the phenomenon, with its focus on the workers' illegal journey to Sweden; the second film, *Funny Saturday*, corresponds to the phase of (dis)integration; and the third film, *The Yellow Mercedes*, to the phase of return. For this reason, I prefer to call these films the *Trilogy of Im/migration.*

**Independent Cinema**

Independent cinema "does not have one singular [or fixed] definition that applies [to] all cases".[44] Any definition of independent cinema is necessarily contextual, meaning that it is limited to a certain place and time, and valid, therefore, only for this specific place and time. "Certainly, work outside the mainstream industry can signal independent" cinema; however, this does not change the fact that the definition of any *mainstream* cinema itself is necessarily contextual and thus bound to a specific place and period.[45] For this reason, any attempt to define independent cinema should take the dominant local film production structure of the given country or place, and its established practices in a given time, into consideration. Following this principle, I will try to define the independent cinema in Turkey for the period during which Okan entered the industry in relation to the dominant local film production structure of the country, Yeşilçam. In order to be able to comprehend what independent cinema has been in the context of Turkey's cinema, I will start my search by investigating the *dependencies* of the country's mainstream cinema of the period.

Although the history of Turkey's cinema can be traced back to 1896, or possibly to an even earlier date, the popular cinema of the country has a shorter history. The history of Yeşilçam starts with a significant event, to which acclaimed film director and critic Halit Refiğ refers as "the first and only positive thing that the state has ever done for the cinema of the country since the declaration of the Republic".[46] This significant event is a tax reduction made in 1948, favouring local filmmak-

ers against imported films. The tax adjustment turned cinema into a profitable business for the first time in the country's history and opened the way for many new film production companies, directors, and actors to enter the field, which, in turn, transformed individual filmmaking efforts in the country into a complex industry in a relatively short time.

After its independence from the Ottoman Empire, and the subsequent declaration of the Republic, the newly established state of Turkey decided on a cultural policy, which at its core was aiming to modernise and westernise society. To achieve its cultural policy targets, the state established and backed cultural institutions like theatres, operas, and ballets, which the founding fathers of the Republic (they were all men) believed to be the fundamental institutions of Western culture. While establishing and promoting these institutions, the state had never formulated any official cultural policy concerning cinema. Prominent filmmaker Atıf Yılmaz comments on this situation with an interesting anecdote concerning the opera in his hometown Mersin, a south-eastern Mediterranean city. According to Yılmaz, the budget allocated to the opera in the city for the remake of a French opera piece was so big it could not be exhausted if one would fly all those who are interested in opera in the city to Paris, pay their tickets for the original performance, and give them pocket money.[47] Halit Refiğ criticises this now-absurd-looking preference of the newly established regime by pointing out that cinema had been the "illegitimate child" of the Republic, and what it achieved, it did so despite of the state.[48] Until the early 1990s, the only involvement of the state in cinema had been through taxation and censorship. Although it never formulated any cultural policy concerning cinema, the state was quick to establish a highly elaborate taxation and censorship policy to regulate the field. The first censorship regulation of the country was introduced in 1939, and it was heavily inspired by the cinema regulations of Mussolini's fascist Italy. As Onaran points out, the censorship regulation gave the state total control over every

stage of the film production, from script to screen, through its police apparatus.[49] The regulation had been in force until as late as 1986, with only minor changes.[50]

Many of the new film production companies that emerged after the tax regulation were located in a street named Yeşilçam in the Beyoğlu district of Istanbul. In time, the name of the street became synonymous with the popular cinema of the country itself. Yeşilçam was not only a synonym for the country's popular cinema, but it also signified a particular way of film production, distribution, consumption, and a film aesthetic.

Yeşilçam had strong references to Hollywood, not only in its name, which literally means "The Green Pine", but also in its method of production, star system, and classical narrative strategies. Yeşilçam "was modelled on Hollywood. To produce was the principal aim. The star system, the capitalistic mode of production, distribution and exhibition were its trademarks".[51] However, unlike Hollywood, Yeşilçam did not have an established institutionalised studio system with sufficient technical infrastructure and necessary economic capital that could circulate and be reinvested in cinema. Yeşilçam was based on the economic capital of private investors who gathered their capital through different businesses and saw cinema as yet another form of investment. Profits made from the cinema were very rarely reinvested. This meant that the popular cinema of the country—in addition to strict censorship—had to face problems in the areas of finance, technical infrastructure, and distribution to exist and prosper. Under these harsh circumstances, Yeşilçam developed its unique *Bölge İşletmeciliği Sistemi* (Regional Enterprise System) which solved both financing and distribution problems all at once.

According to the *Regional Enterprise System*, which was originally created at the beginning of the 1950s to distribute films around the country, the country was divided into six regions. These regions were then shared between distributors, each representing a film production company. These distributors

would buy the films from the production companies and distribute them to the movie theatres in their respective regions. Production companies were extremely dependent on the income that they would get from the distributors to be able to continue their film productions. In this system, which at first glance does not seem to be any different from other film distribution models, the distributors' mission was unique, as they acted as mediators between the movie theatres and the production companies. Regional distributors, in addition to distributing films and collecting revenues from the movie theatres, were also tasked with monitoring the reactions of the audience and reporting them to their respective production companies. Based on these reactions, distributors ordered tailor-made films to be produced within a specific genre, using specific themes, and featuring specific movie star(s). Production companies, which almost always lacked their own financial capital, did not have a choice but to produce films according to the instructions provided to them by the regional distributors. Because of this unique economic model, filmmakers and film stars of Yeşilçam did not have much cinematographic flexibility and creative freedom. Thanks to the *Regional Enterprise System*, film production in the country boomed in quantity, but the technical and artistic quality of the films failed to follow suit.

Struggling with extremely restrictive production codes, film production companies developed interesting and, at times, strange practical solutions to this system to catch up with the ever-increasing demand of the market. I will provide two examples of these solutions, which I think will give a clear idea of the extent to which these unorthodox practices could reach in film production during this period.

The first example is noted in the memoirs of prominent poet and writer Attila İlhan, who also wrote screenplays for the industry. While visiting one of the major film production companies' office, İlhan notices an unusual chart on a table. Seeing some film names and notes about them in the chart, he asks about them. The answer is surprising: "We are writing down popular scenes of commercially successful films. We are going to

make a film by gathering these scenes together".[52]

The second example is provided by film archivist and critic Agâh Özgüç. Özgüç writes that some filmmakers were shooting more than one film at the same time, using the very same film set and actors. The filmmakers were doing so without informing the actors. Due to the highly fragmented and non-linear production model used in film production to reduce the cost, the actors did not have much of a chance to understand what was going on. While the actors thought that they were acting in one specific film, which they were paid for, they were unknowingly acting in another film as well, obviously without being paid. Noting the incident, Özgüç writes that there were some actors in Yeşilçam who did not know the exact number of films they had performed in.[53]

This was the general condition of the popular cinema to which Okan entered in 1965, and contributed to until his emigration in 1967. Okan left Yeşilçam with a lot of disagreements and disillusions, but this did not change anything in the industry; it continued pursuing business-as-usual. More than 200 films were produced annually during much of the 1960s. New faces and new stars entered the industry almost every day. The cogwheels of Yeşilçam continued to spin ever faster. This went on uninterrupted until the 1970s.

Tight censorship regulations had been one of the most important factors behind the low creative and artistic quality of the films made in Turkey. Filmmakers avoided every possible film topic or cinematographic approach that could cause the film to fail in censorship control. This attitude limited Yeşilçam cinema to family melodramas, usually developing around sexless characters and apolitical love stories. Yeşilçam predominantly produced melodramas, focusing on heterosexual love stories whose characters often belonged to different social classes, yet the notion of class was very vague and apolitical. I will elaborate on this in one of the following chapters.

At the beginning of the 1970s, Yeşilçam started showing

signs of stagnation. Classical family-oriented Yeşilçam consumers, predominantly women and children, stopped going to movie theatres.[54] This sudden change can be explained by a combination of factors, among which were the sharply deteriorating economic conditions, the insecurity of public spaces due to increasing political violence gripping the country during much of the 1970s, and the increased accessibility of television, which gradually covered the entire nation in the 1970s.[55] Television provided a cheaper and safer entertainment alternative for families who were already pressed by political and economic instability, while also providing new visual aesthetics thanks to foreign TV serials and films for an audience that was beginning to get tired of Yeşilçam.[56] The number of film productions in Yeşilçam and the revenue they generated began to decrease. The film industry reacted to the disappearance of the classic Yeşilçam audience by producing sex comedies and erotic films. These films are commonly referred to as "seks filmleri" (sex films), and the period during which they boomed as "seks filmleri furyası" (sex films boom).[57] These often low-quality films were both cheap to produce, since most of them were made using 16 mm cameras, and successful in attracting the male audience to movie theatres. Some of these films, especially those made in the late 70s, such as Ülkü Erakalın's 1976 film *Yengen* (Sister-in-law) and Savaş Eşici's 1979 film *Enişte* (Brother-in-law), go beyond being erotic comedies, as they feature extended scenes of characters having sexual intercourse and show everything but close up images of genitalia; thus, they can be considered soft pornographic films. Agâh Özgüç notes that four of the films made in this late period, Naki Yurter's 1979 films *Öyle Bir Kadın Ki* (She is Such a Woman) and *İyi Gün Dostu* (A Fair-Weather-Friend), and Yavuz Figenli's 1980 films *Gece Yaşayan Kadın* (The Woman Who Lives in the Night) and *Şeytanın Kölesi* (Satan's Slave), go beyond and feature scenes that would be considered hard-core pornography today.[58] These erotic and pornographic films provided the industry with cash flow and kept it afloat until the military coup d'état on 12

September 1980.

The popular cinema of the country was deeply affected by the military coup and the social crisis it brought on; censorship was tightened even more. Although there were not many of them to begin with, a number of films that were deemed to be politically and/or ideologically undesirable by the military junta were banned, while some of them, such as Halit Refiğ's Kemal Tahir adaptation *Yorgun Savaşçı* (Tired Warrior, 1979), were destroyed together with all their copies. Sex comedies and pornographic films, which were booming during the 1970s, were also banned and quickly disappeared from the movie theatres. Under these circumstances, certain filmmakers, such as Halit Refiğ, Şerif Gören, and Zeki Ökten, who were able to produce politically aware and critical films during the 60s and 70s while some other filmmakers were producing sex comedies and pornographic films, chose, or rather were forced, to make apolitical films again.

Commercial film producers started producing *arabesk* (arabesque) films. Arabesque films were named after arabesque music, a kind of popular music that is a hybrid of Turkish and Arabic lyrics and rhythms. Arabesque had been a music genre which was overlooked and suppressed by the establishment and cultural elite, and it was denied broadcasting by the state television and radio until 1986, for it was deemed to be leading the listeners to "desperation and fatalism".[59] Arabesque films were musical-like films featuring famous arabesque music singers who sang their songs in the film in parallel with the highly tragic, melodramatic plot, which very often revolved around internal migration and urbanisation problems.[60] In some cases, the arabesque singers sang all the songs from their album during one film. It would not be an exaggeration to refer to these types of films as extended music videos with melodramatic plots.

During the 1980s, consumption of cinema films quickly moved from movie theatres to homes thanks to increased accessibility of video technology, gradually transforming the cinema

audience from families to individuals. While continuing to produce films for the theatres, the popularity of video cassettes as film consumption medium encouraged film production companies to establish branches focusing on video production and distribution. Many of the films produced in the period have never been screened in theatres and were solely available on video. The period also saw the transfer of almost all films produced during the Yeşilçam era on video as they were marketed to the Turkish workers living abroad. These workers and their families, who live mostly in Europe, and particularly in Germany, had been a group of potential consumers which until then could not be reached by Yeşilçam. Video technology provided a new and important additional source of income for the industry, which, in time, replaced the regional enterprises that were no longer able to provide the industry with necessary cash flow.[61]

Thanks to video technology and untapped audiences abroad, Yeşilçam managed to survive once more, but only until 1987, the year in which the first civilian government following the military coup made changes to the international commerce regulations and allowed foreign companies to establish businesses in Turkey. Following the deregulation of the film market, major US film companies, such as Warner Brothers and United International Pictures, started to open offices in the country. At first, these companies were just doing video business, but in time they started film distribution as well, which was more profitable. Finally, by 1989, the film market fell under the total control of foreign companies. Local filmmakers were unable to distribute and screen their films.[62] The era of Yeşilçam had finally come to an end; local film production decreased to around ten films a year, and the film market was dominated by Hollywood films during much of the 1990s.[63] With the absolute domination of foreign film producers and distributors over the national cinema market, one of the oldest and quantitatively most productive national cinemas of the world had collapsed surprisingly fast.

**Yeşilçam Era Independent Filmmaking Attempts**

Filmmakers with independent filmmaking intentions in Turkey had to solve four key issues to reach their goals during the Yeşilçam era: financing, production (technical), distribution, and censorship. Filmmakers often lacked the necessary financial and technical means to make their films. Even if they could overcome these obstacles, they would still have to face the issues of censorship and distribution. If the adventures of any filmmaker and his/her independent film were to help one to better grasp how challenging the situation was for independent filmmakers in the period, there is no better example than the adventures of Metin Erksan's 1965 film *Sevmek Zamanı* (Time to Love). *Time to Love* was financed independently and produced entirely by its director Erksan. The film even managed to pass the strict control of censorship, but it could never be screened in theatres due to distributors' refusal to distribute the film, which they deemed commercially unviable. As a result, the film could only reach an audience when it was released as a DVD in 2007, some forty-two years after it was produced.

Aware of these problems and the challenging conditions—or learning them the hard way like Erksan—some independent filmmakers tried interesting ways to reach their goals by making remarkable 'deals' with the commercial producers. For example, directors like Erksan and Halit Refiğ made special agreements with powerful producers like Hürrem Erman and Türker İnanoğlu to direct commercial films for these producers in exchange for a film in which the director's creative independence would not be hindered.[64]

Another independent cinema pioneer of the period was Yılmaz Güney. Güney followed a different path than Erksan and Refiğ to achieve the cinema he dreamed of. Unlike the first two independent filmmakers, Güney started his cinema career as an actor. Indeed, he was a very popular movie star at the time. During his acting career, Güney also worked as a scriptwriter and assistant director in various films. Gathering enough economic

capital and experience, he gradually moved into directing. Like Erksan, Güney's cinema suffered mostly from distribution problems. Big distribution companies, in agreement with some movie theatre owners, did not want to distribute or screen Güney's early urban western films in big cities like Istanbul due to the films' rural working-class male target audience, who were considered to be unfit for the posh or family-oriented movie saloons.[65] While this was the case in big cities, Güney managed to create and solidify a big group of loyal followers in rural Anatolia thanks to the popularity he established as an actor. Following his 1970 film *Umut* (Hope), which is considered by many to be Güney's best film, thanks to positive reviews they received from film critics, festivals, and institutions like *Sinematek* (Cinematheque), his later works broke the distributors' blockade and were screened in big cities, as well. Unlike his previous works, Güney's latest film *Duvar* (The Wall, 1983), which was made entirely in France, had been banned in Turkey due to its unfavourable portrayal of the country. At that time, Güney was in a position that he could have easily solved the distribution problems, had the film passed the censorship in Turkey.

Like Güney, Okan started his cinema career as an actor; and like him, he was involved in other parts of the filmmaking process, such as scriptwriting, before he started directing his own films. Unfortunately, the similarities between the two filmmakers continued after Okan's directing career started. Like Güney, he suffered from distribution problems more than anything else. Interestingly, like Güney's latest film, Okan's debut film *The Bus* was made in Europe and, like *The Wall*, it could not be screened in Turkey for some time due to a ban imposed on the film with the claim that it humiliated and misrepresented the country.

Despite sharing some similarities with previously mentioned independent cinema pioneers, Okan's independent cinema distinguishes itself from those filmmakers in almost all four key steps of independent film production. While Erksan, Refiğ, and Güney gathered their economic capital through working in

the industry, Okan financed his films with the savings that he had gathered from his work in dentistry. Cinema has never been a money making business for Okan. In an interview he gave recently, without expressing any regret, Okan stated that he never made money with his films.[66]

Unlike other filmmakers, Okan produced all his films outside the Yeşilçam production system. He produced his first two films abroad, in Sweden and Switzerland, respectively. His third film was made in Turkey, but at the time of production, the classical Yeşilçam and its production mechanism were no longer in existence; it had already collapsed and disappeared in the late 80s. He certainly did work with some actors and technical crews who once worked for Yeşilçam, but he remained free from possible influences and traps of the Yeşilçam's production system.

Beyond all these important advantages that granted him independence, he also enjoyed one significant privilege, which other independent filmmakers in Turkey did not benefit until the late 1980s: creative freedom unrestricted by censorship. As Okan openly stated, it would not have been possible to make his films in the way that they were made, if he had lived and made films in Turkey.[67]

According to Yannis Tzioumakis, "independent filmmaking consists of low-budget projects made by (mostly) young filmmakers with a strong personal vision away from influence and pressures from the few major conglomerates".[68] Okan's cinema demonstrates all these characteristics. When he completed his first film as a director, Okan was only thirty-two. *The Bus* was a low budget film, which was financed entirely by Okan's own savings and borrowings, and it was made completely outside of any established film industry.

In parallel with Tzioumakis, Chris Holmlund suggests that independent film distinguishes itself with its "social engagement and/or aesthetic experimentation —a distinctive visual look, an unusual narrative pattern, a self-reflexive style".[69] Although Holmlund makes his observations with independent

cinema in the United States in mind, his observations perfectly apply to Okan's cinema given that all three films centre on the same social issue, namely im/migration, and each of them provides a particular approach to the matter, while at the same time unceasingly pursuing his filmic and aesthetic exploration. Okan's personal life experiences as an immigrant also find their conspicuous reflection in his cinema. Having observed these facts, one can certainly assert that Okan is an independent filmmaker.

Despite living in Switzerland for more than three decades, and making his first two films while living in the country, Okan has never been recognised as a Swiss filmmaker by the country's authorities and film circles, and never received any support for his films.[70] Interestingly, despite living and making the first two of his films abroad, Okan is generally considered a Turkish filmmaker by film circles and public alike in Turkey. Okan's first film, *The Bus*, and his third, *The Yellow Mercedes*, got their inspirations from—and revolve around—issues concerning Turkey and Turkish people. They predominantly feature Turkish im/migrant actors and crew members, most of which are amateurs. Okan's second film, *Funny Saturday*, revolves around a series of local events taking place in the Swiss city of Neuchâtel, and features predominantly Swiss actors (both amateur and professional) and crew members. Although at times they feature dialogues in Swedish, German, and English, *The Bus* and *The Yellow Mercedes* were mostly shot in Turkish, while *Funny Saturday* was shot entirely in Swiss French. Given these facts, one could think of Okan as both a Swiss and a Turkish filmmaker. Such a conclusion enables one to consider Okan one of the independent cinema pioneers of both Turkey and Switzerland, especially if one takes into account that he provides some of the earliest examples of independently financed and produced films in both countries.

**Okan as Auteur**

Although independent filmmakers often demonstrate some qualities attributed to auteurs, there is no automatic, direct, or natur-

al connection between independent filmmaking and auteurship. Not all independent directors are by definition auteurs; nor are all auteur directors necessarily independent. However, some directors are both independent and auteurs. Okan is one of them.

The *auteur* polemic, which started with French filmmaker and critic Francois Truffaut's polemical essay "Une certaine tendance du cinéma français" (A certain tendency in French cinema) published in French film journal *Cahiers du Cinéma* in 1954, can be understood in three stages: Truffaut's argument that distinguishes the *metteurs en scène* from the *auteurs*, the *Cahiers du Cinéma*'s position that attributes signature styles to several filmmakers working in the Hollywood studio system, and Andrew Sarris' *auteur theory*.[71]

In his groundbreaking essay, Truffaut divides French film directors into two groups: *metteurs en scène* and *auteurs.* "For Truffaut, the metteur en scène (literally "scene-setter") merely adapts existing works of literature, or works within the given formula, whilst the true auteur uses cinema to express personal insight".[72] According to Truffaut, a metteur en scène is a director who simply adds pictures to the scenario, and many of the French directors—including the directors of the so-called *Tradition of Quality* films—are indeed metteurs en scène. Directors of *Tradition of Quality* films, among which Truffaut mentions Claude Autant-Lara, Jean Delannoy, René Clement, Yves Allégret, and Marcel Pagliero, were established directors in the mainstream commercial cinema of France at that time; and they often filmed scenarios that were written by different scriptwriters, or adapted works from literary sources following tried and proven formulas. These filmmakers had no more ambition than to be faithful to the scripts that they were given to film. The *auteurs*, on the other hand, are the directors who do not just visualise the scenarios written by someone else; they often write their own scenarios and dialogues, "invent the stories they direct", and "bring something genuinely personal to [their] subject[s] instead of merely producing tasteful, accurate but lifeless rendering of the original

material".[73]

The purport of Truffaut's thought-provoking article was that a filmmaker could be called an *auteur* in case s/he bears responsibility for the entire film, from start (the script) to finish (directing and editing). In the wake of his essay, critics from *Cahiers du Cinéma* started to use the term 'auteur' differently. Many of the *Cahiers du Cinéma* contributors were followers and admirers of Hollywood cinema. In time, these writers started *discovering* that some Hollywood directors, such as Nicholas Ray, George Cukor, Alfred Hitchcock, and Howard Hawks, represent personal visions in their films through their unique, recognisable styles, and mises-en-scène, even though they did not write their own scripts and operated in much more restrictive production codes of the Hollywood studio system.

In his essay titled "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962", American film critic Andrew Sarris took the polemics of *Cahiers du Cinéma* critics into a new domain and presented his take on the matter under the rubric of "auteur theory" with a strictly defined set of criteria. Until Sarris's controversial article, the discussions concerning the auteur polemic had never been considered a theory, as "the writers of *Cahiers du Cinéma* always spoke of 'la politique des auteurs'".[74] As the choice of nomenclature indicates, *la politique des auteurs* was considered as something other than a theory. Truffaut's essay had instigated the so-called 'la politique des auteurs', and its principal objectives were twofold: first, it "was meant to define an attitude to cinema and a course of action", and second, to prove that cinema is an "adult art" form, which allows personal expression no less than other established art forms such as painting and literature.[75]

In the essay, Sarris stipulates that a film director must demonstrate three distinct qualities in order for him/her to be considered as an auteur: technical competence, distinguishable personality, and ultimately, "the interior meaning".[76] Sarris' "theory" and criteria were predominantly concerned with filmmakers who worked in the film industry of the United States.

Partly for this reason, but more importantly, due to the fact that Sarris' arguments are not relevant for discussing Okan's status as an auteur, I will not articulate further on Sarris' arguments. However, I would like to mention one particular line of argument in Sarris' essay which I find noteworthy, because it connects to the matter I will discuss in this section. While laying down the fundamentals of his theory, Sarris argues that "American directors [are] generally superior to foreign directors", at least in regards to the second premise of his theory "[b]ecause so much of the American cinema is commissioned, a director is forced to express his personality through the visual treatment of the material, rather than through the literary content of the material".[77] According to Sarris, in this regard, Cukor is superior to Bergman due to the fact that Bergman is "free to develop his own scripts" while Cukor "works with all sorts of projects", and he is restricted by strict production codes, hence "has a more developed abstract style than" Bergman.[78] In his book *The American Cinema: Directors and Directions 1929–1968*, Sarris further articulates his line of argument around a list of filmmakers who made films in the United States, whom the critics compiles under the rubric of "pantheon directors". The list includes names such as Charles Chaplin, D. W. Griffith, Orson Welles, Buster Keaton, John Ford, and Howard Hawks.[79] According to Sarris these so-called "pantheon directors" are "the directors who transcended their technical problems with a personal vision of the world".[80]

Sarris' theory has not only taken the auteur polemic to somewhere else than where the *Cahiers du Cinéma* writers originally intended, but has also turned it into a personal polemic on the other side of the Atlantic following the harsh response of Pauline Kael to Sarris' writings.[81] While this was the situation in the US, British film theorist Peter Wollen brought a new perspective to the auteur discourse with his article "The Auteur Theory" by studying two of Sarris' "pantheon directors", Ford and Hawks, but in a different light than Sarris did.

In the article, after grouping the auteur critics into two schools—"those who insisted on revealing a core of meanings, of thematic motifs, and those who stressed style and *mise en scène*"—Wollen proceeds to write that the "work of the *auteur* has a semantic dimension, it is not purely formal; the work of the *metteur en scène*, on the other hand, does not go beyond the realm of performance, of transposing into the special complex of cinematic codes and channels a pre-existing text".[82] Having observed these, Wollen proposes that works of an auteur should be studied not only through resemblances and repetitions, but also through differences and oppositions on the thematic plane.[83] Following his own suggestion, Wollen proceeds to provide two concrete examples to his approach by his studies of Hawks and Ford's films. For Hawks, Wollen observes that even though Hawks "has worked in almost every genre", all these films "exhibit the same thematic preoccupations, the same recurring motifs and incidents, the same visual style and tempo".[84] According to Wollen, Hawks achieves "this by reducing the genres to two basic types: the adventure drama and the crazy comedy".[85]

Adopting Wollen's approach one can observe that Okan demonstrates an approach in his trilogy that is comparable to that of Hawks'. Just as Hawks transforms his films, whatever their genres might be, into adventure dramas and crazy comedies, while keeping the same thematic preoccupations, motives, and visual styles, Okan uses different genres and film aesthetics, as diverse as road movie, social realist drama, slapstick comedy, and the grotesque, while continuing to explore the same thematic preoccupations of im/migration and modern human's problematic relationship with commodities. Such an approach can be observed most clearly in *The Bus* and *The Yellow Mercedes.* In these films, Okan, on one hand, makes road movies with a serious undertone; on the other hand, he ultimately reverts to a combination of slapstick/grotesque/absurd comedy, but whether his films are serious or absurd, they revolve around the themes of im/migration and commodity fetishism.

Concerning John Ford's films, Wollen observes that "the system of opposition" is much more complex than those of Hawks, since instead of transforming his films into two "broad strata of films there are a whole series of shifting variations" in Ford's films.[86] Observing these shifting variations, Wollen suggests that in these cases one needs "to analyse the roles of protagonists themselves, rather than simply the worlds in which they operate".[87] By doing so Wollen discovers several reappearing sets of oppositions in Ford's films. Even though these "antinomies can often be broken down further", the most relevant sets of oppositions in Ford's films are "garden versus wilderness, ploughshare versus sabre, settler versus nomad, European versus Indian, civilised versus savage, book versus gun, married versus unmarried, East versus West".[88] According to Wollen, of these antinomies, the one between the garden and the wilderness is the master antinomy in Ford's films.[89]

There are two reappearing themes in Okan's trilogy: im/migration and human's problematic relationship with commodities, whether it is in the form of fascination, obsession, or fetishisation. In his debut film, Okan follows the journey of a group of illegal migrants from an underdeveloped country to post-industrial Sweden. In his second film, *Funny Saturday*—at least in the Turkified version of it—Okan follows the adventures of an immigrant couple from Turkey on a regular Saturday in a small Swiss town. In his third film, Okan follows the long journey of a so-called Turkish guest worker from Germany to his rural village in central Anatolia, driving his newly purchased automobile. As one can see, im/migration and im/migrants are recurring themes and features in Okan's trilogy.

Concerning humankind's problematic relationship with commodities, one can observe that, in his debut film, the illegal migrants are, in essence, nothing other than people lured by market capitalism and its colourful promise of a life abundant with commodities. This is openly expressed by the human trafficker, who drives the migrants from Turkey to Sweden, when

they stop by a roadside lake to have a pause before their arrival to Stockholm. Upon noticing that passengers have nothing other than a piece of stale dry bread left to eat, he consoles the migrants by reiterating the promise: "Never mind. You will start working tomorrow anyway. There is plenty of food here. You will be like pigs in ten days".[90] In *Funny Saturday*, the promise of life abundant with commodities is not only communicated through words, but vividly visualised, as the couple in the film does nothing more than try to purchase goods and services the entire day, walking around in a literal marketplace. Okan's third film is the story of a worker who has a fetishistic attachment to a commodity, the automobile. This attachment is perfectly encapsulated by the film's original French title *Mercedes mon Amour*, which translates to *Mercedes, My Love*.

Wollen posits that "the lesser *auteurs*…can be defined… by a core of basic motifs which remain constant, without variation. The great directors must be defined in terms of shifting relations, in their singularity as well as their uniformity."[91] Bearing Wollen's argument in mind, one could argue that the shifts in themes from film to film in Okan's trilogy bear comparison to the shifts in John Ford's *My Darling Clementine* to *The Searchers* to *The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance*. This is because neither the theme of im/migration, nor the theme of humans' problematic relation to commodities, is a constant one in Okan's films. Okan's debut film is concerned with illegal migration, human trafficking, as well as illegal migrants' fearful interactions with the locals. In his second and third films, Okan's focus shifts away from the issues of illegal migration and human trafficking to the legal im/migrants and their relationship with the locals. Although he follows the stories of im/migrants in all three films, the stories are concerned with different phases of the im/migration process. While focusing on the actual action of migration and the migrants' first interactions with the locals in *The Bus*, in *Funny Saturday*, Okan looks at the relationship between the long-established immigrants and the locals. In *The Yellow Mercedes*, he

focuses on a migrant worker's journey to his home country and the worker's relation to his countrymen.

Just as it is with the theme of im/migration, the relationship between the individuals and commodities is not constant, but a shifting one in Okan's trilogy. In the trilogy, one can observe not one but at least four different relations between the characters and commodities: unfulfilled desire, intoxication, resistance, and disillusion. The illegal passengers of the bus travel to Sweden with the hope of achieving a life abundant with commodities. However, they either die or are caught by the police before reaching their goal. On the other hand, the bus driver seems to be hypnotised by the commodities he acquired in Europe. For instance, he keeps praising his new camera, with which he takes photos of the passengers before he abandons them. The couple in *Funny Saturday* resists the allure of the market and the commodities they see during the day, and returns home without purchasing anything. The main character in *The Yellow Mercedes* gradually discovers that the automobile for which he dumped his lover and friends cannot give him the happiness, recognition, and respect he sincerely believed it would bring.

Given these observations, one can conclude that Okan is an auteur comparable to both Hawks and Ford in the light of Wollen's notion of the auteur. Even though Okan makes his films in diverse genres and cinematographic approaches, without exception, he is concerned with the same recurring central themes: im/migration and modern human's complicated relationship with commodities. Furthermore, beyond demonstrating thematic continuities, unlike Hawks, Okan shifts his focus in every film and examines different aspects of these themes. In this regard, Okan's authorship is much more comparable to that of Ford's. Though shifting, these thematic continuities in his films, particularly in his first three films, enable one to consider these films as a trilogy. Beyond thematic continuities, Okan's first three films are also united by their dystopian narratives and multi-layered structures that evoke a split reception, as Okan's films are inspired by diverse sources in European (art) cinema. In the fol-

lowing chapters, I will not only consider the trilogy against the background of the Turkish (film) context, but also against a European one.

## Notes

[26] "Tunç Okan", *Ses.* Istanbul: Tifdruk Matbaacılık, 30 January 1965. 3.
[27] Sekmeç, Ali Can. *Altın Portakallı sanatçılar*. Konya: Antalya Kültür Sanat Vakfı, 2013. 290.
[28] Özön, Nijat. *Karagözden sinemaya: Turk sineması ve sorunları.* Ankara: Kitle Yayınları, 1995. 388.
[29] Yeres, Artun. *65 Yönetmenimizden Yerlilik, Ulusallık, Evrensellik, Geriliminde Sinemamız.* Istanbul: Donkişot Güncel Yayınlar, 2005. 14.
[30] Arslan, Güliz. "20 Yıl Aradan Sonra Yeniden Tunç Okan…"
[31] Luxembourgeus. 29.
[32] Evren, Burçak. *Aktör: Tuncel Kurtiz*. Ankara: Altın Koza Yayınları, 2008. 110. and Scognamillo, Giovanni. *Türk Sinema Tarihi*. Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2003. 344.
[33] "Bugün Türk sineması, Türk halkına karşı zararlı bir eğlence vasıtasıdır. Her yıl 250 kadar film Türk halkını kavgaya, soyguna, avantadan para kazanmaya yöneltmekte ya da aşağılık bir his istismarı ile insanı afyonlamakta ve Türk halkının içinde bulunduğu durumu kavramasına engel olmaktadır. Bu yirminci yüzyılda memleketin çoğu fakir olan halkına yapılabilecek en büyük kötülüklerden biridir.' Translation mine.
Demirkol, Altan. "Türk Sineması İki Yüzlü Kişilerin Elinde…" Diyen Tunç Okan Sinemayı Bıraktı…", *Milliyet*, 19 March 1967. 6.
[34] "Geri kalmış ülkenin geri kalmış sinemasıydı bu". Translation mine.
Okan, Tunç. "Aktörlük Türk Sineması Ben" in *Sinema 65.* Istanbul: Nov.—Dec. 1965, Vol.11–12. pp.12–15. 13.
[35] "Arada bir şeyler yapmak isteyenler, hattâ buna gücü olabilenler, bu hızlı akan ırmağın seyrini değiştiremiyorlar, ırmağın içinde bata çıka gidiyorlardı. Çok köklü olan ekonomik nedenlere dayanıyor bu gidiş". Translation mine.
Ibid. 13.
[36] Akgün, Seçil. *27 Mayıs: Bir İhtilal, Bir Devrim, Bir Anayasa.* ODTÜ Yayıncılık, 2009.
[37] Onaran, Âlim Şerif. *Türk Sineması*. Ankara: Kitle Yayıncılık, Vol. 1. 1994. 103.
[38] Dönmez-Colin, Gönül. *The Routledge Dictionary of Turkish Cinema*. Oxon, UK: Routledge, 2013. 242.
[39] Daponte, Kosta. "İsveç TV'si çekimine Başladığı Yaşar Kemal'in "Bebek"ini İlkbaharda Yayınlayacak". *Cumhuriyet*, 21 July 1973. 5.
[40] Luxembourgeus. 78.
[41] Raw, Laurence. "The Turk Abroad: Otobüs (1974)", 274.
[42] Pekşen, Yalçın. "Otobüs" filminin her şeyi Tunç Okan: Diş çektik, film yaptık", *Cumhuriyet.* 3 November. 1984. 7.
[43] "Tunç Okan'ın yeni filmi", *Cumhuriyet*, 31 October 1984. 5.
[44] Baltruschat, Doris, and Mary P. Erickson. "The Meaning of Independence: Concepts, Contexts, and Interpretations", 6.
[45] Ibid. 6.
[46] Türk, İbrahim. *Halit Refiğ: Düşlerden Düşüncelere Söyleşiler.* Istanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi, 2001. 89.

[47] Yılmaz, Atıf. *Hayallerim, Aşkım Ve Ben*. Simavi Yayınları, 1991. 25
[48] Türk, İbrahim. *Halit Refiğ: Düşlerden Düşüncelere Söyleşiler.* 179.
[49] Onaran, Âlim Şerif. *Sinematografik Hürriyet*, Ankara: İçişleri Bakanlığı Tetkik Kurulu Yayınları, 1968. 149.
[50] Esen, Şükran K., *Türk sinemasının kilometre taşları: Dönemler ve Yönetmenler.* Istanbul: Agora Kitaplığı, 2010. 43.
[51] Dönmez-Colin, Gönül. *Turkish Cinema: Identity, Distance and Belonging.* London: Reaktion, 2008. 39.
[52] "Bunlar ne? dedim. İş yapan filmlerin beğenilen sahnelerini yazıyoruz, bu sahneler bir araya getirilip bunun filmini yapacağız'dediler". [sic] Translation mine. Quoted in Tunalı, Dilek. *Batıdan Doğuya, Hollywood'dan Yeşilçam'a Melodram: Zihniyet Ve Kültür Etkileşimleri Çerçevesinde Yeşilçam Melodramı'na Bakış.* Ankara: Aşina Kitaplar, 2006. 222.
[53] Özgüç, Agâh. *Bir Sinema Günlüğünden Aykırı Notlar.* Istanbul: Dharma Yayınları, 1992. 25.
[54] Türk, İbrahim. *Senaryo Bülent Oran.* Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2004. 200–201.
[55] Çankaya, Özden. *Bir Kitle İletişim Kurumunun Tarihi: TRT, 1927–2000.* Istanbul: YKY, 2003. 77.
[56] Esen. 134–135.
[57] Özgüç, Agâh. *Türk Sinemasında Cinselliğin Tarihi.* Broy Yayınları, 1988. 116.
[58] Ibid. 118–119.
[59] Wiktorowicz, Quintan. *Islamic Activism: A Social Movement Theory Approach.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004, 283.
[60] Burçak Evren, "Arabesk Olayı ve Sinema", *Gelişim Sinema Dergisi*, January 1984. 14.
[61] Abisel, Nilgün. *Türk Sineması üzerine Yazılar.* Istanbul: İmge, 1994. 109
[62] Tunç, Ertan. *Türk Sinemasının Ekonomik Yapısı 1896-2005.* Istanbul: Doruk, 2012. 149
[63] Pösteki, Nigar. *1990 Sonrası Türk Sineması: 1990-2005.* Istanbul: Es Yayınları, 2005. 32
[64] Akser, Murat. "Turkish Independent Cinema: Between Bourgeois Auterism and Political Radicalism", 135.
[65] Özgüç, Agâh. *Arkadaşım Yılmaz Güney: Bir Dostluğun Öyküsü.* Broy Yayınları, 1988. 30–31.
[66] "21 Yıl Sonra Yeniden Tunç Okan". *Hürriyet*, 17 February 2013.
[67] Avcı, Ümran. "Ahmet Mekin'i atlayıp çocuğa ödül verdiler", *HaberTürk*, 20 April 2013.
[68] Tzioumakis, Yannis. *American Independent Cinema: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2006. 1.
[69] Holmlund, Chris, and Justin Wyatt. *Contemporary American Independent Film*. London: Routledge, 2005. 2.
[70] Luxembourgeus. 83.
[71] In fact, Truffaut was not the first one to start the auteur discussion. Some six years before Truffaut's essay, another French film critic, Alexandre Astruc, in his…

essay “The Birth of a New Avant-Garde: La Camera-Stylo” made a similar observation and wrote that “the cinema is quite simply becoming a means of expression, just as all the other arts have been before it, and in particular painting and the novel.”
Astruc, Alexandre. "The Birth of a New Avant-Garde: La Camera-Stylo." 17.
[72] Aitken, Ian. *European Film Theory and Cinema: A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2001. 133.
[73] Truffaut, François. "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema”, 15-16. and Buscombe, Edward. “Ideas of Authorship”, 77.
[74] Buscombe, Edward. “Ideas of Authorship”, 76.
[75] Ibid. 76. and Bazin, André. “De la Politique des Auteurs”, 25.
[76] Sarris, Andrew. “Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962”, 43.
[77] Ibid. 43
[78] Ibid. 43.
[79] Sarris, Andrew. *The American Cinema: Directors and Directions 1929-1968*. Dutton, 1968. 39-81
[80] Ibid. 39.
[81] In her article “Circles and Squares” Pauline Kael questions in a sharp and ridiculing tone Sarris’ “auteur theory” and convincingly dismantles his premises one by one.
[82] Wollen, Peter. *Signs and Meaning in the Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972. 78.
[83] Ibid. 93.
[84] Ibid. 81.
[85] Ibid. 81.
[86] Ibid. 94.
[87] Ibid. 94.
[88] Ibid. 94.
[89] Ibid. 96.
[90] “Boşverin ya. Nasıl olsa yarın işe başlıyorsunuz. Yemek bol, on günde domuz gibi olursunuz”. Translation mine.
[91] Wollen. 104.