

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY**

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF TURKISH
SUBJECT: THE DUALITY OF TWO LAYERED
TURKEY SUBJECT**

Master's Thesis

BURÇ KARABULUT

ISTANBUL,2013

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY**

**THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
CINEMA TV**

**THE TRANSFORMATION OF TURKISH SUBJECT:
THE DUALITY OF TWO LAYERED TURKEY
SUBJECT**

Master's Thesis

BURÇ KARABULUT

Supervisor: PROF. DR. SELİM EYÜBOĞLU

ISTANBUL, 2013

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHCESEHIR UNIVERSITY**

**NAME OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
NAME OF THE GRADUATE PROGRAM**

Name of the thesis: Transformation of Turkish Subject: The Duality of Two Layered Turkey Subject
Name/Last Name of the Student: Burç Karabulut
Date of the Defense of Thesis: January 18th, 2013

The thesis has been approved by the Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Asistant Prof. Burak Kuntay
Graduate School Director

I certify that this thesis meets all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.


Asistant Prof. Kaya Özkaracalar
Program Coordinator

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and we find it fully adequate in scope, quality and content, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Examining Comittee Members

Theis Supervisor
Asistant Prof. Selim Eyüboğlu

Thesis Co-Supervisor
Asistant Prof. Nilay Ulusoy

Thesis Co-Supervisor
Asistant Prof. Murat Akser

Signature





ABSTRACT

The transformation of Subject: Westernized Subject in Transition

Karabulut, Burç

M. A. Program in Communications Studies

Advisor: Prof. Dr. Selim Eyüboğlu

April 2013, 38 pages

As Turkish republic become a subject of its own making, Republic is subjectivized by two dominant subjects; being Turkish and/or Islamist. Jacques Lacan, the leading figure in psychoanalysis, defines the subject consisting of two broken parts; that is to say, the subject is both subjective and objective. That means the process to becoming a subject for Republic of Turkey would be the conflict of these two dominant subjects. This conflict shaped after the the wounded object which creates poor substitutes for the repressed one to feel glory. I aim to research about this conflictual subjects and the wounded object in the cinema. From Tarkan to The man who saved the world, Malkocoglu to Conquest 1453, we can track down the progress of the fictitious history, hence the transformation of Westernized Subject.

Keywords: Turkish Republic, Imaginary Order, Turkish, Islamist, Subject, Wounded Subject

ÖZET

Öznenin Deęiřimi: Batılılařan Öznenin Deęiřimi

Karabulut, Bur

İletiřim Bölümü

Daniřman: Prof.Dr. Selim Eyüboęlu

April 2013, 38 sayfa

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti öznesini yaratma sürecinde, Türklük ve İslamcı baskın öznelerin hâkimiyeti altında yer yer mücadele eden, yer yer birbirine eklemlenmeyen alıřan bu iki öznenin hâkimiyeti altında kaldı.Ünlü psikanalizci JacquesLacan özneyi tanımlarken, özneninnesnel ve öznel olarak iki ayrı paradanbir bütün oluřtuęunu söyler. Bu tanıma uygun olarak,Türkiye'ninözneleřme sürecinin bu iki öznenin mücadelesi olduęunu söyleyebiliriz. Bu mücadele genellikle, yaralı süje üzerinden geliřti. Türkiye sinemasında Tarkan'dan Dünyayı Kurtaran Adam'a, Malkooęlu'dan 1453 Fethi'ye deęiřen son elli yılda bu yaralı süjenin eřitli varyasyonlarına rahatlıkla rastlanabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türk, Cumhuriyet, İmgesel, İslam, Özne, Yaralı süje

CONTENTS

1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.THE WOUNDED SUBJECT.....	8
3. THE PRO REPUBLICAN ERA.....	16
3.1 TARKAN AS PRO-REPUBLICAN FIGURE.....	16
3.1.1 REFIGURING TARKAN AS GLADIATOR.....	19
3.1.1.1 Gladiator: Tarkan of Hollywood?.....	19
3.2 MALKOCOGLU: THE TAMED PRO-REPUBLICAN HERO.....	22
3.2.1 Malkocoglu: Ottoman Hero in Denial.....	23
3.3 THE MAN WHO SAVED THE WORLD: A TURKISH ODYSSEY LANDED IN TURKISH HISTORY.....	26
3.3.1 The Man Who Saved The World: The End of Republican Understanding of History.....	28
4. THE PRO OTTOMAN ERA.....	30
5. CONCLUSION.....	33
REFERENCES.....	37

1.INTRODUCTION

The “real” is nothing but an unformulated concept, sheltered behind the omnipotent words that express it. – Roland Barthes

There are in fact many realities that may substitute for any usage of the real. History is definitely not the one that can be recognized as the real. Not only people care enough to talk explicitly that they share the same idea with some and disagree with some others, but also the history is unfortunate enough to face off many challenges to assumptions that history is reality. The real means the fixed truth due to the explaining of the self, the core, the being of any subject without having to leave anything to perception. Truth is a material like cement. The reality can be torn down into pieces of discourse, spectacle and construction of discourse, romance.

Hollywood’s idea of historical construction is perceived as the occasion of human romance. Despite love being the small part of what is constructed into images, it is this love element that keeps audience in seat. Stars also are another element that helps the dramatization of big historical construction, which is also called epic. As Caryn James (New York Times writer) strongly emphasizes on the historical construction as a collection of facts, who sees that those facts are no more than an almanac. History is interpretation of those facts. Historical writing (also synonym for construction) is a system of discursive representations. Therefore, is the historical work, constructed or coded in spectacle, images or is the historian constructed history in his own words?

Historians who dictate the work of writing history open up a channel into their mere existence on the world, creating the classic stories that starts with “Once Upon A Time...”. All they did was to write about, let the people know about their existence. They embarked on an adventure; blissfully driven by a cause to see everything and everyone in their way and perfectly recorded them the way the historian see fit. The early historians such as Evliya Celebi and Herodotos persisted in writing about their well-established, extravagant stories of others, the rich and the poor and the social system, the festivals, the culture, basically the surroundings. The historian has to interpret his materials in which the form of the historical process is to be mirrored Hayden White claims.

Hayden White talks about how these two forms of writing (persisted in history taken as only ways to transmit the information at times; the annals and chronicles) conveyed

information that helped introduce history adequately and accurately from past into our daily lives. The fact is that they do not offer anything but subjective recording of any recorder who penned that documents. Whatever the recorder's intention may be; he or she reflects the time when he lived and the occurrence of events as he saw events in a manner of speech. Hayden White describes the narrative of historical representation should be seen as manner of speaking. History is a discourse in itself. Speaking here does not signify only verbally speech but also the very work of historical materials are interpreted in such a way to call for literary text, narration, therefore the historian builds up a new language, the way of speaking to the audience without meaning to. As if the writer writes as he speaks, turn this writing, literary text into full-fledged conversation.

When recorder/historian/interpreter speaks of the events, they appear out of his words. The real history is linked with discourse. The history is available as much as discourse likes it to be. They have no affiliation with history that has been experienced but rather the hegemony of discourse upon which directs the chronological order of occurrence of events taking place according to our present, a direction of discourse starting from present to past.

The father of History", Herodotus wrote about the customs and the traditions that old civilizations had during the time Herodotus lived. Not only he wrote about the customs and traditions but also the wars the old civilizations went about, the way the standard of life in those civilizations took place are mentioned explicitly in his nine volume lengthy book. However, even though Herodotus endowed us with such distinct vast knowledge about the way how things work in old times such as how people live, cultures interact; pray and go to war, build their houses and have their heating, water system set up, it is only the kind of information useful for the recorder who sees how the things happen as events happen, record the events as he passes by or/and he had written as he perceived. All in all, Herodotus wrote down what he saw as he looked in the things, he did not question the truth of it, at least question its closeness to reality. What he thought to have happened at time he was find its place in his writings. It would be unjust to say his observations were not the portion of truth at all.

R.G.C Collingwood asserts that the historian was above all a story teller and suggested that historical sensibility was manifested in the capacity to make a plausible story out of congeries of facts. This statement serves for both of the historians, Herodotus and Evliya Çelebi. The

reasons can be many but it is quite a wonder if there is any reality in their writing. While there may be some true content that requires a work of imagination, what they both deemed concrete real is that they record as both see fit to their eyes. Both Herodotus and Evliya may be subject to the worthy of title story teller who directs the words, the meanings, the context, the way the events occurred, the process and the time more as compared to the man who just happen to write history as it happens.

The question may rise if Evliya pretend to record as they had heard and seen fit without questioning the events that took place around him. It is presumably his superior talent of writing and supernatural over observations that kept him on road and surely what Evliya Celebi wrote was easily proven wrong and deemed as supernatural apart from Herodotus. It is impossible to believe in what Evliya Celebi wrote during his journeys. If he had written what he wrote today, we would have perceived his works as a supernatural piece of art. He wandered around with his unique style, almost fictionlike, like a novelist. Robert Dankoff asserts that Evliya Celebi had the same reputation as that of fantasist, exaggerator and liar. Evliya had mixed a sense of fiction with the descriptions that he saw, the stories he heard noted down in his Seyahatname. Calling him a liar, fantasist and exaggerator would be simple enough to avoid his power in commanding words, telling people stories. It seemed that Evliya's ability was the storytelling and not writing about history as we understand it. It is possible to keep his works in line with that of any supernatural book writer or even a scriptwriter who is capable of creating a science fiction movie.

According to Dankoff, Evliya used two discourses; one of which is persuasion and other is diversion to have the audience interest, amazed at, felt wonderment toward his stories. Those stories are thought to have some effect on the audience that listened to his stories. And what is more interesting that he never cared and bothered to show any evidence to claim whether his stories are true or not. So what Evliya hoped to aim at writing in his Seyahatname could be considered more of amusement than the history we are looking for. It was known that Evliya's audience was composed of patrons, nobleman and sultans who needed to hear more stories of entertainment. He found what was interesting to masses was not anything but storywriting or even myth writing. A universe of his own making based on the geography and places, events that he witnessed.

Hayden White in his essay entitled “historical text as literary artifact”, he remarks that historical narratives are complex structures in which a world of experience is imagined to exist under at least two modes, one of which is encoded “real”, the other of which is revealed to have been illusory in the course of the narrative. The relationship between the representation of imaginable and representation of actual(or concrete real) is concealed within the comparison of which is more closer to the actual. So Evliya for example might have ran after the road of imaginable in his visits to have a grasp of the actual happening along the road. This imaginative real however is more or less historian oriented, who may be caught in between the dilemma of what is imagination and real. This dilemma for historian can swing to the illusory that concrete realities may be likened to the extent of myth.

Northrop Frye has remarked that “when a historian’s scheme gets to a certain point of compreheviness, it becomes mythical in shape and so approaches poetic in structure”Homer is successful in setting up this kind of literary text. His works are best known to have reached us from Ancient Greece because his works have both history and myth, a little poetic structure in its style. Whether these sources are directly references to history or Greek myth is still unknown. Homer’s poetry and tradition present us the events in forms of stories. They are not in chronological order.In ancient times, myth was important and attributed to masses of people who prefer to believe in them and also was important for people who want to question the likeness of truth in myth. For example, the myths of Ionia are different than Athens. Homer’s narration of myth largely deals with hero’s attempt at succeeding those obligations set before him. *In the Approaches of Greek Myth by Lowell Edmunds*; Edmunds talks about the historical representation (also mythic criticism) of Greek history and myth that is intervened in with Greek history seem ambivalent. He asserts the traditions of Greek culture mostly bring the myth to a credible point where heroes are part of tradition and the ones make the history valid.Heroes more or less realize mythto reality within the perimeter of realistic historical data.The world filled with heroes is much more credible and seem humanitarian as compared to the world of gods. Heroic world let the humanitarian aspect of stories took forth. Even though through the stories of myth we can reach to traditions of Greek culture, the historical representation appear to be indistinguishable once myth and history taken together to have more credible and objective information about the culture.

This kind of history carries some influential elements from the phantasmagoria; the form of theatre that has figures emerging on the wall, in smoke or on semi-transparent scenes by the projection(s). The intriguing character of theatre presents fantastic objects, figures appearing on the wall have both fictitious and realistic representation depending on people's beliefs, the fascination, the wonderment as well as sense of fear is projected onto the wall. The important thing is here that there is no story to be told but the projection of beliefs of people. People choose to believe the existence of fantastic objects while creating the stories creation of their perception. Anyhow, in their minds, when Evliya, Homer exaggerate their portion of history, they may very well be entrusted upon the mind of people, not their writings. Whether the representation is realistic or not, was not the point but the belief, exaggeration, having a phantasmagoric image on mind of people was the point. There is this dilemma of historian giving in his exaggerative side. The story is not taken as serious matter but a fascinated voice that audience wanted to hear, cheer if he or she can. He fascinates people into his writings not by eye but by ear. The dilemma of historian lies in between the capability in explaining the observations he noted down during his travels and fascination of spectacle that overwhelms the observative eye of historian, fueled by the enthusiasm of traveler who looks for an entertainment. With this dilemma, history becomes a dull object.

So once we are reading the history that Evliya Celebi wrote bring us to the understanding of the presence of historical fiction found in those works. Or so much as to say that probably the main aim behind a traveller's history may be related with the fact that Evliya Celebi was not interested in objective historical information to supply with his audience but a collection of writings to amuse people with excess.

How does the history can be translated into fiction or share the fictitious character of the writer and still be considered as the history for many people observing those works? The history itself shares the close affinity with fiction due to its considerably uncertainty of its usage in the culture. We can say, in the way Evliya Celebi uses it, the history is a written text meant for specific audience who wants to learn geography and culture, feels wonderment and inspiration at the same time. Celebi historicized the events as he prominently assigns a central importance to geographical place and local culture and a bit of fiction. Evliya crafts a historical narrative in his own right. As Robert Burgoyne puts it, historical narrative is seen as a performative discourse, a product of the same kinds of actions that produce historical

events. What Celebi and Herodotus try to narrate is a kind of historical narrative that dictates our historical consciousness into the presentation of the texts with the experience of reality. In other words, they know what they see because they have been there to see and experience with their own eyes at the time of making of event. However, what they see and what they perceive may not be the thing that they think it is.

A similar discussion may apply to cinema and its representation of history as it has claimed to do. How does this kind of history exist?

This kind of history is made possible through the use of myth, the benefitting of myth to have worthwhile history. The myth is all there is and all the history desires. It is the object of desire for us. For history is meant to symbolize an origin. The history refers to the origin of being and the being that fills the object of desire; which is history. In order to fulfill this void; the history needs to have surge and splendor within its reflection into images. This kind of history signals the making of myth to enforce all the inspiration and fascination onto the big screen.

In etymology, the word "historie"(originated in French) refer to the interestingly familiar meaning as the word "story". Historie in French means *narrative of past events, account, tale, story*. And then there is discourse. Discourse means *process of understanding, reasoning, thought..* When we try to get in the depth of this statement, we reach a highly controversial question: Is history then all about discourse? If it is, how do we differentiate one from another?

The way the word is used in French finds meaning in native speech of French two things; one of which is history as the word explicitly shows but the other meaning is story. When looking at the origin form the word took, it gives us an irony to consider twice about the use of history in our postmodern world. The relationship between this irony and the sense in which the word is used perfectly provides us a new, fresh perspective. Firstly, historie is belonging to the group of people who is likely to have the privilege of write and read, publish, distribute. Second of all, where the irony is coming up on surface is that historie is a big bedtime story that curbs our enthusiasm and perception to response to it from our early lives.

When and If the history is equal to story, this new perspective changes our understanding and use of word, adding up a sense of irony because the history is mainly seen as a science which aims to investigate the past. In the national sense, the history of nations; of how the nation

came to be based on research and evidence. That is what creates a certain history in the eyes of people. With this approach to history, nation can learn of its origin. History is projected to help the understanding of their own identity. However, when history is no more than a story, there rises a chaos in meaning; distorts people's looking into their past.

Discourse and history run side by side since the progression of history into the human perception. If discourse is neutralized, dropped or forgotten, a new discourse must take place of the old one in order to keep history spreading and keep its potential to address to people's perception. What I aim to tell here, discourse is an identical twin brother of history as history is equally identical twin. To lose discourse is to lose history. To lose history is to suggest a new myth to partake instead to create new discourse again. Whatever history is made up of, discourse is indistinguishable and limited to the written texts of history.

The age of enlightenment tries to value the human consciousness over the human existentialism. For Ottoman Empire which historically missed the age of enlightenment stays only in close relation with Europe through the soil. The whole eighteenth and nineteenth century is missed for Ottoman Empire. During the Tanzimat age, everything else is changed. A group of people called Young Turks believed that change finally has to come. The Tanzimat age culminates in the victory of Young Turks but not Islamists. Though this was yet to change because of sultan's intervention in the situation. This movement was conceived as the one of many Westernization movements.

Since the foundation of republic, this conflict of Turkish against Islam (also Western vs Eastern values) subject pursued. The aim of both subject is to overcome other in order to survive. Republic was successful in coming over the Islam subject which was so wildly repressed. But recently, Turkish subject has fallen to its knees by a new one. Now there is religion and the Ottoman aspect is added to the old one. The conflict is getting shaped up.

In the conflict of these subjects, an element stayed put during all this transformation process. The wounded subject resided in this fight. The wounded subject was an important subject to play a determinant role in figuring out this major fight. The wounded subject is the lack of reaching to this dream of westernization whether Turkey is Islam oriented or Western oriented. Both conflicts reflect their histories based on their historians.

2. THE WOUNDED SUBJECT

Lacan¹ explains, the human subject is parted between conscious mind and unconscious mind. The conscious mind is composed of a mind that is entirely accessible by human being however, the unconscious mind is composed a series of forces and drives which remain inaccessible. This two minds can be classified as self and other. We as human beings are defined as something that we experience to be but failed to become one thing in other's shoes. When we as person look at someone, we experience something missing in us, envy what the other has in our unconscious brains without realizing that we do have a lack. We desire to close it, fill it in and replace this lack with something. Lacan calls this lack desire. Desire is the something that cannot be satisfied with even though we reach what we demanded. The unconscious mind displays itself as the desire that we feel for others.

While Lacan calls this lack, I would call this wounded subject. The wounded subject is a name for the desire that as country, we want to reach but failed to reach it even though our country's demands become reality. The wounded subject calls for irresistible desire for not having to earn what we demanded and the desire continues after we reach it. I will try to explain Turkey desiring to become as Western country. Like the famous Odyssey, it is an old story of a man named Odysseus reaching to home but the return to home is ever belated. Continuously, time goes by while the wounded subject suffers. It is a long adventure of reaching to the desolated islands, uncharted waters and many ill-welcomed guests. The desire

¹ Jacques-Marie-Émile Lacan was born in Paris on April 13 1901 to a family of solid Catholic tradition, and was educated at a Jesuit school. After completing his baccalauréat he commenced studying medicine and later psychiatry. In 1927, Lacan commenced clinical training and began to work at psychiatric institutions, meeting and working with (amongst others) the famous psychiatrist Gaetan Gatian de Clerambault. His doctoral thesis, on paranoid psychosis, was passed in 1932. In 1934, he became a member of *La Société Psychoanalytique de Paris* (SPP), and commenced an analysis lasting until the outbreak of the war. During the Nazi occupation of France, Lacan ceased all official professional activity in protest against those he called "the enemies of human kind." Following the war, he rejoined the SPP, and it was in the post-war period that he rose to become a renowned and controversial figure in the international psychoanalytic community, eventually banned in 1962 from the International Psychoanalytic Association for his unorthodox views on the calling and practice of psychoanalysis. Lacan's career as both a theoretician and practitioner did not end with this excommunication, however. In 1963, he founded *L'École Freudienne de Paris* (EFP), a school devoted to the training of analysts and the practicing of psychoanalysis according to Lacanian stipulations. In 1980, having single-handedly dissolved the EFP, he then constituted the Ecole for "*La Cause Freudienne*," saying: "It is up to you to be Lacanians if you wish; I am Freudian." Lacan died in Paris on September 9, 1981.

is many times severely hurt during this long ever delaying journey to reach back home. This desire of trying to reach for homeland can make up for Turkey's way to European integration. More than political and sociological side, the desire to be like European is always the problem.

Surely, historically, The Turks are treated as people that have come from Middle Asia. The whole history traces the history of Turks that come from Middle Asia, Anatolia and later Europe. Whether Turks lived in Anatolia or Middle Asia is never made sure. The definition of home, exodus and homecoming are issues left confused. It has been too long a matter of controversy, still a debate that people make researches to the depth. When The Turkish republic is formed, it is left with questions of what the history will be.

Turkish republic decided to turn her face to the Western world while leaving out the Ottoman history completely in black. Having blackouted the old history, Republic starts to replace a new history. So much so that this new history follows the modernization of Western world, tries to work out the lifestyle of Western world to Turkey with eastern, Islamic past. This new history is much largely depended on the history of Western world and recreated according to the needs of the new born nation. As all new born nations have, new history is born with them. The republic see itself as belonging to the Western world. Therefore, applying Western modernization to Turkish republic brough out much bigger problems than necessary. Unfortunately, this idea of becoming part with the Western world is one painful experience.

This is when the lack comes into surface and starts to show its face. The Republic suffers from the inability, incompatibility with being(to be complete) together with the Western World. Like all third world countries, the republic stays within the boundaries of Islam and Eastern world which is directed by eastern values. Not only this information is taken into consideration, but also The Republic denies her complete bond with the those of third world countries which happen to lie with the fate of the least improved countries. Thus, Turkish Republic never fully realizes the vast distance between the Europe(I ideal, other) and Turkish Republic(I, self). Despite the pyhsical distance between the values of Europe and East, Turkey Republic has not seen no problems in defining themselves through the eyes of a Westener.

We can deconstruct this discourse from the saying that literally goes like this: “We are drifting off course, shifting to the east” usually said in an agitated manner as if someone or something pulls Turkey away off from the direction in which Turkey is positioned or hooked, connected. This famous sentence is still widely in use and strongly defended by many who use the sentence alarmingly to mean that they are against the way in which Turkey goes. This perspective tells us about how this line of thinking builds up through the feeling of getting lost and being lost. The “lost” here is the signifier for which Turkey fails to be on the right path. Out of political usage, the terminology of getting off course therefore reminds us the famous myth of the Oddysea which literally explains us the misadventure of Oddyseus, who are driven off course away from his home due to the unexpected winds and events. Oddyseus desired to reach for his land in which he once felt comfortable and glorious. Oddyseus’s desire signifies for Turkey’s desire to reach for the Europe. This desire is about not only failing to fulfill this desire but also mean for a gripping pain.

This theme of ever belated return to home can refer to Turkey as the wounded subject never meant to achieve home but predestined to do it nevertheless to continue its existence. This painful survival of being self and other plays a key role in defining Turkey’s course. As Hegel states that in his famous parable of master and slave dialectic, each consciousness pursues the death of the other. However, the other is far from dying but at the same time self is far from being true to itself. There are indefinite lines between the self and the other when investigating the case of Turkey. The indefinite lines between the self and the other have become more prominent for Turkey in movies based on heroes created in the form of raider.

The stories evolving around the raiders, like Karaoğlan, Tarkan, Malkoçoğlu and Kara Murat, are not only the stories of raiders doing the heroic actions in the name of Turkey but also displays us the perspective towards westernization and provoke the discourse of westernization around the name of Turkey. This immediate demand for westernization, whether uncompleted or not, tries to figure out a way to conceptualize history to the liking of the wounded object, in other words, healing the wounded object, change the whole history. The wounded object as the self looks for a way to disappear the lackings, spaces and negatives while changing it for the better stories in which tales of heroes are told and shot, stories are changed in great magnitude to cover up the feeling of being wounded. Turkey needs to change the story to catch up with the Europe.

Western world craft their history(discourse) as history chronologically evolves. The certain groups such as political parties compose the story they want to take control under in the making of history. Turkey like western countries, is no exception to narrate, visualize the already told and written history to the public. Like every country does, they want to draw the fresh history as if there is nothing wrong. Especially when the Turkish wound needs to be cured, the lack has to be removed off for good. They only manage to create a fantasy in which they can make sense and find attachment to it through the way of discourse. This kind of discourse usually covers the wounded object and works for the betterment of wound.

Firstly, Ideal I(desired I as well) needs to take shape of discourse, which we see clearly penetrating in to the fantasy themed Turkish movie. In this movies, we can perfectly see heroes, created in line with history does well to soothe the wounded object, that is to replace a new substitutes. The idea is simply if you cannot go to Ideal I, you create and mirror yourself as Ideal I.

It is possible to see the presence of Turkish wounded object in all of the eras that can be classified such as De-Ottomanized Era(1923-1980) and Pro-Ottoman Era(1980-). In both of the eras, despite the visible differences in the eras, the wounded object looks for ways to close the lack by poor substitutes.

The De-Ottomanized era simply covers an era when Turkish republic looks for a way to clear out the Ottoman culture as if the culture is something foreign, some sort of an invader, hostile to the people. Instead, the republic creates the projects of social integration that is involved with the production of ideal citizenry, man and woman which are culturally applicable, suited to the project of westernization. This project of idealization finds the interestingly most support in the Yeşilçam movies of 1960s when Sezgin Burak decides to create Tarkan, a Turk in the form of European idealized figure, a mere embodiment of westernization at its best. Sezgin Burak, as he many times have mentioned, finds that Turkish history was at the time quite influential in creating Tarkan. When Tarkan is created, he is projected as no more than an ideal Turkish man figure at best. Having reached a success in his first film, Tarkan's adventures are continued to be filmed into series of six films. Projecting an image endowed with heroism, Turkishness, warrior of Turkish "nation" from Middle Asia has become a success and literally cemented the image of ideal citizen in people's minds.

As much as Tarkan signifies for the ideal Turkish man, the other heroes are created as well and become a perfect model for Turkish ideal man as well. Out of many incarnations, Malkocoglu is deemed as memorable character of 70s. Malkocoglu is reincarnated as man of Ottoman soldier, infantry whose skills match beyond armies like Tarkan. Tarkan is never understood as a man, he was Turk before he was even a man. Malkocoglu was never like Tarkan, he had the same power of will that Tarkan had but he was more or less intended a man who has the libido while the European men do not. Surely, Malkocoglu and Tarkan had the same posture, same power of will, nationalistic bound, high power of conquering the nations that Turks have lost in their history. All in all, they presented an ideal man, ideal Turk. Although the character is of Ottoman descendant, his identity of Ottomanship has been appeased. Not until Kara Murat, close in appearance to Malkocoglu in every way, has an Ottoman infantry used or remembered that he is the Ottoman man.

This idealization of Turkish man put in the mixture of heroism, identity and nation is what the Turkish republic yearned for years in creating culturally, socially applicable, pro Western citizen. However, with the publication of the man who saved the world, this projection of ideal man is severely damaged in every possible way. This knock-out in box-office and the failure of re-fabrication of Turkish identity in people's minds called into question. Even though it is not perfectly clear that the popularity has been diminished because of this film, it created an humiliating epic failure of ideal Turkish person.

In the Pro-Ottoman era, this loss of popularity towards hero themed movies finds a new ground to come back on screen. However, in this era, lack is divided and substituted by two adverse sides depending on the conflict of two different set of minds. While the wounded object stayed the same, the substitutes for lack needs to be investigated in two ways. A nationalistic movies bound to history books, and Islam themed movies based on the rise of ruling party. This idealization of man as either Turkish or Islamist man find surprisingly an incarnation in the cinema of late 2000s. While the Turkish identity tries to exalt the Turkish identity, Islamist one decides to bring on the glory of the Ottoman past which has been deemed as ashamed by the Turkish republic. *Yandım Ali*, based on comic book, *Nefes*, the militaristic nationalistic movie increased the ways in which the wounded object can be substituted for two different ways. On the other side, *1453 Conquer* still stood secure as the movie projected an image that constantly made references to the glorious past of empire and

finally, has risen to the magnitude of Hollywood production to underline this glory. More than people, there were glorious rise and move to the west is entirely introduced.

In both eras, the wounded object always is placed into the middle of producing a nationalist themed movies. The object that has been repressed came out in a series of distorted hero themed movies. Those movies are perfectly successful at converting this distortion(distorted reality) into well-acclaimed, mass-effective event. The success of those movies still persist.

The most prominent example of wounded subject can be easily recognized in the movie called *Yahşi Batı*(a play on the words that simply parodies the Wild West) by Ömer Faruk Sorak. The wounded subject is simply placed at the heart of the movie. The Ottoman officers turned cowboys in Wild West gets in to many adventures; struggling with the Indians, the sheriff and witnessing the fascinating classical West town scenery as well as Cola Turka, oil wrestling championship. The screenwriter Cem Yılmaz while keeping the genre conventions of Western film completely, adding himself the Turkified arrangements to the genre. Cem Yılmaz however in his praise worthy parody film does not work hardworthy to change or add anything to the genre, just vaguely interested in making a proper parody of the world he created and the possibility of entertainment that comes with it. It is for certain that Yılmaz was surely a foreigner of the film, the landscape and the matters of Wild West he wrote and shot but they managed successfully to turkify this American genre properly enough to create one hit parody. While this movie has been a success story entirely belong to another search, Cem Yılmaz managed to show the true colours of living with the wounded subject. With Cola Turka, oil wrestling championship and joking with Indians are signs of the wounded object.

The major problem is to deal with the rise of wounded subject is to have Turkish actors posing as merely Americans living in the ordinary western town. It is not hard to see the lack takes the possession of our heroes riding in this new unfamiliar landscape. People living in an unrecognized land, posing as unfamiliar characters can be a understandable story as much as “Lesh” name means “dead” to any American who watches the movie. Having re-imagined the Wild West on Turkish soil is particularly equal to reimagine any western town as make believe towns of 1800s. Cem Yılmaz’s town as said by Michael Foucolt is a town of heterotopia. It is a make believe town but Cem Yılmaz and Faruk Sorak are trying to make people believe that town existed or could have been existed on the plane that Turkish discourse have existed.

In short, what if storyline comes in contact with the Turkish hegemonic discourse which makes up this town of otherness, fulfill this lack. This remembrance of lack is easily an attempt to overcome or to resurrect the line of thinking that had failed the man who saved the world. It is an history of reimagination that particularly have not existed primarily in the first place, not a bit. The lack is here that Cem Yılmaz tries to create a Wild West town in the Man who saved the world sense only to know that he can kid at his attempt to make this town look alive but also create his understanding of America.

Cem Yılmaz's lack is the same as Turkish lack, something is missing from him, keeping him away from living in this world as seriously as possible. As much as he ridicules this Western movie, he envies the very probability of being in a real Western movie, being a real star. Cem Yılmaz's dream turns to nightmare every time he takes a look at this brief Western town decorations. He remembers the pain of being an other. Later, for the better, he turns to Turkish tradition where he feels overpowered in this Western movie. He desires to close the fill with oil-wrestling championship and famous known canto in the historical memory of Turkish people.

As for creating stereotypes or American wannabes, the Kentucky Fried man, Johnny Walker appear. These are simply brands that have become successful in spreading out the American way overseas. Those brands however are also recognized as people during the movie, easier to understand the reason why. Having used those names to increase the familiarity with genre shows that Cem Yılmaz and Faruk Sorak are hardly looking for a name or names to make a Western movie. The purpose here is to give the movie a chance to increase the desirability of the characters. Given that it is a parody and all, having the unfamiliar Turks with genre attract the attention after American brand names show how pathetic the movie looks, more than it is comical, funny, movie becomes funny without its purpose to be funny. This poor choice of words not only makes the movie funnier than necessary but also composes a poor substitute to match with the Western names. The name such as Johnny Lesh look better than those of brand names.

The lack becomes more visible when Cem and Faruk Sorak decide to let the actors change their voices as Texas Americans. So the voice as well as the names, costumes are lost. Only information about being American is to pretend a familiar ,probably the most distinguishable voice, American voice and accent that seem comical to Turkish audience so that they can

laugh as they watch the scenes. Johnny Lesh, one of the Americans, the American sheriff at its core(!) is split between being American like and being Turkish like. He changed his voice pretty much to give the audience a chance for imagination of the feeling of being American in a funny way. This change of voice, act and posture reminds me of the “famous” Cola Turka which Chevy Chase and David Brown, comic American actors, are picked as favorite artists to create some sense of American ambiance in the crowd to persuade masses drink Cola Turka. In this reimagining of American Coke, Cola Turka in America theme videos explains well the lack of being there and having drunk Coke as mere American. This lack at the same explains the desire of approaching to being an American for having an American visa can be thought to be equal to having an American famous actor drink a Turkish Coke.

3.PRO – REPUBLICAN ERA

3.1 TARKAN: THE REPUBLICAN FIGURE

In the 1950s, Turkish cinema also known as Yeşilçam starts to create its melodramas with soldiers in the cinema. Suat Yalaz, a domineering figure in the cinema of 60s and a remarkable artist who drew comic books in Italy. He created Karaoglan, later Malkoçoğlu and then followed by Kara Murat in Yeşilçam. Especially in melodramas, the story of soldiers either gone and have not come back or; came but could not find what he is looking for is the stories of soldiers which make the best tearjerkers of that time. However, those characters are never related to the profession of soldier.

By the end of 1950s, a man who fights for the country without a second thought has become a common man figure in Yeşilçam. Even though military is greatly associated with heroism, not until 60s, any hero in Western terms appear. This is the era of military heroes carried in to the fantasy world. *Tarkan*, *Malkoçoğlu* and the like carry the traits of military hero. Unlike the soldiers in melodrama, these characters are constructed to convey the feeling of heroism and proud Turkishness already present in the collective memory. Most of them represent the relation of perfect man/soldier/Turkish ideal in the name of Turkishness. Not only they exist to represent the heroism, but also lead to the reflections of Turkish subjectivity.

Tarkan created by Burak Sezgin and Karaoglan created by Suat Yalaz dominated the 60s with these characters which originated in the comic books and later in the cinema. The first national and local hero is named as Kaan, a character whose origins lay at Middle Asia, the place of origin where Turkish race is thought to be born and find their way to Anatolia , also called homeland by many. However, Kaan was not the ideal hero and interestingly an anti-hero, not fit to carry the subjectivity in which Turkish imagery is made in the image of hero. Naturally, they have not had welcomed Kaan as their hero. Therefore, the cult of heroism need to be searched for somewhere else. The hero had to be out of Anatolia, had to be regenerated to European.

When *Tarkan* is created, one could very well say that he is a true incarnation of Turkish subjectivity. A hero worth paying a tribute. A hero whose intentions are to take back what's

rightfully his. In the creation of *Tarkan*, he is told to be made out of Anatolia descent but his adventures are not much like Karaoglan's or Kaan's. What is remarkable here is that Tarkan is a mere born of wounded subject. Whenever he beats up, he fights and beats up for Turkish nation.

In the story of *Tarkan*, *Tarkan* is a soldier of Atilla the Huns. He is a Hun Turk. Maybe he is the most distinctive of Turkish heroes ever adapted in cinema. His story takes place in the dark ages. Much like Conan's, *Tarkan*'s story include mythical and fantastic material. *Tarkan*'s story takes place in North and Middle Europe where dwells Vandals, Romans, Vikings and like. Out of historical context of our history, Tarkan is a Turkish warrior in Europe. Provided that Sezgin Burak, the comic book writer of *Tarkan*, lived in Italy and worked on Italian comics make those comic books and films more distinguishable. *Tarkan* not only takes advantage of Turkish history(his adventures are loosely based on Turkish history) but also European history. Though the adventures are set in Europe, The Turkish nationalism is present.

Tarkan, in his adventure of sword of Mars which is directly applied from the comic book meets with many dangers in his adventure to get the sword of Mars back to Atilla the Hun. This film tells about how extreme can Turkish subjectivity be. The war of supremacy over the ancient kings is given in the manner of oppressive discourse. The Romans and Vandal are dehumanized and oppressed to the level of nobodies, non-civilization but barbaric hordes. The representatives(of Romans, Vandals) sent to get the sword of Mars is basically a signifier for the power of Turks. Turkish subjectivity is formed in the manner of Westerner. Tarkan hits his enemies with one single blow. Interestingly enough, Tarkan when asked about his whereabouts, he proudly says he is Turk. While he does it, he maintains the most serious posture.

The prologue of the film opens with:

Our story begins at archaic ages Hun emperor conquered the whole Europe. He only needs the sword of Mars to be the supreme power. If the European kings reaches the sword, then they will have the power to stop Atilla the Hun. ... The European kings who are afraid of Hun

*Turks(!) are after the sword of Mars to take back the supremacy. The brutal Vandal King and the sly, bloodthirsty Roman Emperor Valentinianus want to capture the sword of Mars.*²

In this prologue, there are many things to consider. First, Atilla the Hun is Turkified through the collective consciousness of Turkey as a nationalistic character. The Romans and Vandals are seen as Europeans, lowly kingdoms. Unlike The Middle Asia, Hun Turks fights in Europe. It is no surprise that in this extremist case, *Tarkan* is not only a creation of Turkish collective conscious and memory but also looking from Westerner perspective. Like Romans and Vandals whose fame comes from the fact that these two civilizations left a mark in Europe, *Tarkan* acts as if he is Turkish and Westerner at the same time.

As we see in the movie prologue before the opening even though the story is different, benefits from European history, the Turkish identity stands above all else. In the opening scene of the movie, the raiders set up their camps and shoot arrows(everybody shoots the target perfectly) in the archery target. Atilla the Hun is depicted as standing posing on his horse, and speak as if he is on hypnosis, tells that he will conquer Europe and show true power of Turks. *Tarkan* has the final say(arrow hits the target, pierce through other arrows that hit the target) when he shoots an arrow from very far. He goes on to get the sword of Mars automatically for he is the most skilled man.

Another and most known characteristic of those films are that *Tarkan* like his Ottoman counterparts use his hands to hit at the enemy as if he means to teach. Literally, he never uses sword up until he really needs to. This is the most common trait of Turkish subjectivity; Turks always teach the other civilizations a lesson or two in fighting. Whether *Tarkan* lays at the heart of Turkish subjectivity is not for certain but *Tarkan* story includes a broader European history than it has been presented, and this sets Turkish heroism in the mythic proportions. *Tarkan* in this movie, despite his stand that he is the bringer of the civilization, he has much barbarism in his blood. In order to defeat the Roman gladiator and Vandals, he needs all the power he can use in fighting.

²The prologue of *Tarkan's* first movie called the sword of Mars

3.1.1 Refiguring Tarkan as Gladiator

Tarkan and *Gladiator* both emphasize on the same points in the discourse of reconstructing past that favours the textual, historical real that work out well for the people. It is not the only point that resembles between two narratives. Both narratives aim to establish heroes signifying as some kind of honor of man and uncorrupted and bound to the glory of their country, regardless of the hardships occurred during the journey. At the same time, *Gladiator* owns the discourse that accept the euro civilizational ratification. Tarkan rearranges this westernization discourse from the view point of Turkish nation. Tarkan means to say the western civilization is mainly Turkish. However, *Gladiator* is figuratively Roman, literally insert American way of thinking. For this reason, Tarkan and *Gladiator* can be read together through the discourse of reconstructed past in different geographies, different characters but still include a kind of resemblance in the construction of characters. Both of them are heroes, heavily relied on the discourse of westernization.

In the re-construction of past, Tarkan is ahead of his European counterpart. He also feels the lack of being the gladiator in Europe. Maybe not in the terms of Roman Gladiator but Tarkan as the Turkish gladiator. Tarkan can be perverted image of any Gladiator, his counterpart. The discourse of westernization follows after the path of being Turkish. The similarity is so interrelated that only the motivation of the heroes determine the difference of the story.

3.1.1.1 Gladiator: Tarkan of Hollywood?

In *Gladiator*, the greatness for glory is explained through the santification of civilization. In *Gladiator*, the old Ceasar asks for What is Rome? To which Maximus answers Rome is light. Roman Empire brings light to the darkest corners of the world. So the idea is that the definition of greatness is understood through the santified means, such as the protector of Light. The representation of Light is decisive figure in the progress of the movie. While the whole movie centers around erasing the corruption from bottom up, the western civilization or mostly the progress, road which the western civilization took is the heart of the narration. This progress(or change) goes in a straightforward manner up until the republic comes back to life. This is when things get interesting. The discourse goes intently on the direction to reach up to the values of modern society, the morals, laws and understanding of today which we as people of modern day find more applicable.

What we see when we are looking at the screen is the greatness comes from the light that entails the rise of republic in the age of empire. As it stands, the spectacle is here prepared to show a kind of contrast of barbaric and modern day clash. The barbaric gladiators come on the arena in a manner of killing off the other barbaric, gruesome looking gladiators which find the honour in killing for the Rome. However, Maximus do not even try to kill his opposites for he is a man of honour. In a scene where Maximus goes out on the arena alone, and he yells to the cheering crowd are you entertained several times as if to say you are savages. As he goes up to his slave patron, the slave patron gets angry at him because he kills the gladiators way too quick than necessary, a man who is bewitched with fortune and fame. Maximus is also definitely against this idea. Having killed for survival and lived as man of honour as the general of Kingdom of Light, he never gets to the idea of killing gladiators on the arena and he is never fond of the idea itself either. The power of greatness comes through being a man of honour, of light as Ceaser before he dies predestined him to be. During his journey to become a man of light, Maximus is taken as the man with no fault at all. In the ideals of this man, surely mean to signify the building blocks of western civilization.

The discourse of Light, the greatness and possible santification of western values are arranged in a manner that the Gladiator is in fact the very ideals of every civilized person or long to be. Surely, the long progress of turning from the empire of corruption into empire of Light is taken to be the key concept. This almost flawless characterization of *Gladiator* resembles little of Tarkan who sees savages in others, while he is of true quality of man, warrior, almost betterment of a man. Maximus is a character who almost fall into the barrel of western ideals, so much so that he is undoubtedly a man whose values never gave away, never doubtful, thus seen as a character of Light.

The Gladiator in a way fits to the textual real of Hollywood civilization that aims to create an ambiance. The conditions in which he was born, the way he feels that the empire need his service, the holy duty he was affirmed to do after the Ceaser, the duty of being father and the loyalty to his wife and children despite being provoked by external forces. *The Gladiator* more or less is born into, created to be the man Hollywood longs to be and desires to be. This characterization also adds to the character of Light. By the dirty politics, he had been deceived for that manner. This deception however fulfills the true color of Roman vassal who wants to replace his father. Even though this historical fiction is not placed in a fantasy realm, with this

storyline, discourse of savagery and noble warrior, deception, corruption themes can literally take place in the realm of any fantasy themed book. For this reason, I find it useful to view the Gladiator not only as historically real character, but also showing parallels with the characters that may rise in the fantasy territory. That is to say, if *Gladiator* is shot in fantasy, it would have reached the same level of satisfaction by audience. We have too long known that every character that grows out of Hollywood has deep ties to American values. When it comes to Gladiator, he was no exception. It is true that Gladiator is a hero of American origin, Hollywood origin and placed in re-created Rome. But what is the tie with *Tarkan*?

When compared to *Tarkan*, whose incarnation is happened in Italy, his story carried over to re-birth of a nation just like *Gladiator*. *Tarkan* walked in the same path as *The Gladiator*, before him in 1960s. The both stories having shared the same geography gets to the mind of the possible of re-textualization, re-making of past based on each other. Sezgin Burak is known to reach the history of Hun Empire in Italy, where he started to write and draw about his stories more than fifty years ago. *Tarkan* is primarily a movie ripped off comics, later adapted into series of films in 1960s. Far from sharing the same story as other historical themed Turkish movie, *Tarkan* seems as if it is a part of European heritage. What *Tarkan* does though instead of *Gladiator*, changes the Rome with Turkish nation.

Tarkan is mere figure (imagining Turkish nation-civilization as has progressed from empire to nation and therefore a civilization) of rebirth of Turkish nation.

There is an article written in the 2000s: In one of the adventures of *Tarkan*, which entitled as the ring of Honoriya and *Gladiator* comes together not only in the discourse of being one with the creating their version of past and enlightenment link to Euro-civilizational ratification but also the storylines are so similar that they are almost like overlapping each other.

As much as the storylines are same, the only point that in the emergence of wounded object. For *Tarkan*, he tries to show the greatness of Turkish nation civilization by shoving his enemies and killing them off with great strength while the gladiator was looking for revenge, a personal feeling that devours him from the beginning of the film. *Tarkan* may be as close to *Gladiator* in the storyline but the way both heroes are motivated are their reasons to survive. When the slave turned gladiator Maximus kills because he feels obliged to kill, to show Rome cannot be directed by someone who is not honorable. *Tarkan* shoves his enemies to have

nation's glory back wherever that is lost. What Tarkan fails to reach is not taking the honour, but getting lost within the time and place where he should not have been put.

Tunca Arslan, the film critic wrote in short essay that the possibility of having been sued the epic movie Gladiator. He meant there may have some similarities between both stories. There are similarities but Gladiator adapted the screenplay of Tarkan looks ridiculous.³

The history of Rome is spared for many people to have a see and work for the history. Seeing as how Tarkan is particularly like Maximus, every scene can look alike due to stories coming from the same source, Roman Empire. However, the way Gladiator is shot and Tarkan is shot are certain. Even thinking of the possibility of Tarkan setting the inspiration for Gladiator to be shot looks too good to be true. The budget for Gladiator is beyond match of Tarkan's camerawork, sets and production budget when the movie was shot.

3.2 MALKOÇOĞLU: TAMED PRO-REPUBLICAN HERO

Ayhan Başoğlu when he created Malkoçoğlu, this character is created because of the numerous losses held in Korea as he dedicated his work to the deaths/losses in Korea. He affected much from Abdullah Kozanoglu who is famous for creating the Malkocoglu novel and writing many nationalist themed books. Even though Ayhan's work differed from Kozanoglu's, the book is known widely at the time the series were shot. Ayhan Başoğlu's work is seen as in the nationalistic oceans despite its ottoman looking character.

The representation of the national army as Malkocoglu in the cinema has never been differentiated from the story of Malkoçoğlu, which is evolved in a series of six films of historical fantasy. In the first movie of Malkoçoğlu, the character is mainly tamed and stripped off his Ottoman identity. As the sixth film comes into existence at late 70s, Malkoçoğlu is more like an Ottoman infantry. When we look through this evolvment in Lacan's imaginary, we reach for the mirror stage in which Turkish subject recognizes itself in the mirror as if the subject is looking at the mirror of the giant. This giant mirror is however

³Tunca Arslan had an article on the Radikal newspaper that talks about the possible suing of Mine Burak (the daughter of Sezgin Burak, the writer of Tarkan) Gladiator copying Tarkan's storylines.

That article can be seen at <http://www.radikal.com.tr/2000/06/25/kultur/01tar.shtml>

damaged after the loss in Korea. The phantasmatic⁴ motherland(mother) – warrior(child) union is damaged. In the imaginary, the ego and its image is wrecked.

Malkoçoğlu in this sense carries the burden of ego⁵. His ego is transferred the burden of being Turkish, not Ottoman thus the out of context Malkoçoğlu is placed into a new homeland. He is a direct descendant of Turkish history and a product of shared collective memory. Even though he does not serve for the national army but Ottoman army, like every Turkish hero he borrows the loss of the problematic dual subject. Being at home(in uterus) or being fired from the uterus, therefore the alienation occurs. Malkoçoğlu is a misplaced hero of Turkish subject because according to Turkish subjectivity, he has to be an ideal I, which is ideal man for his country. Having lost his Ottoman connection already but in Ottoman outfit, he is an alien to this new world because the republic regime had long repressed the Ottoman Empire, took them out of historical context. However, Ayhan Basoglu having fascinated by this character's heroism and story, decided to resurrect in oddly fashion.

3.2.1 Malkoçoğlu: An Ottoman hero in denial

Malkoçoğlu is a historical figure in the Ottoman history who lived during the fifteenth century, fighting alongside Ottoman army. However, Malkoçoğlu in Turkish history is taken only as a Turkish raider, with no link to his true heritage. This entails the symbolic castration of Ottoman Other for Malkoçoğlu to become Turkish subject. If Malkoçoğlu is to become a new flagbearer of Turkish nationalist subject, he has to be stripped off his Ottoman identity. In the making of Malkoçoğlu, I presume the movie makers are heavily relied on the characteristic of Ottoman heritage with a difference in the creation of hero. Ayhan

⁴Zizek points out that in the network of inter-subjective relations, each of us is identified and attributed a certain phantasmatic place in the symbolic structure of the other. It is from this this symbolic network(and eventually against it) that the subject formulates, in the first instance, a vision of the world that is necessarily partial. An article can be read at <http://zizekstudies.org/index.php/ijzs/article/viewFile/149/243>

⁵"In the mirror stage, Lacan compressed the two phases into one. At the very moment when the ego is formed by the image of the other, narcissism and aggressivity are *correlatives*. Narcissism, in which the image of one's own body is sustained by the image of the other, in fact introduces a *tension*: the other in his image both attracts and rejects me". This article can be read at <http://www.lacanonline.com/index/2010/09/what-does-lacan-say-about-the-mirror-stage-part-i/>

Başoğlu created the Western self of Malkoçoğlu while ignoring the Islamic side of Malkoçoğlu. He is symbolistically castrated.

In the creation of Malkoçoğlu, he is as nowhere as close to the Ottoman figure once he was in the context of history. He is not in anyway related to Islam which is the primary factor as to why Ottoman Empire stood still for six centuries. Malkoçoğlu only is a tool to uprage the glory of Turkish military and the military identities. He conquers, fights and goes to war like a good raider should be. And he is bound to his sultan. Malkoçoğlu's relationship with the sultan displays the great discipline, hierarchy and the chain of command much like the Turkish army. This new approach symbolizes to being an ideal man, soldier and Turk.

To be a great Turk, A Turk must also be dedicated soldier to his righteous country and ideal man to his sultan, also a volunteered swordsman in the name of his sultan. During the adventures of Malkoçoğlu, Malkoçoğlu as soon as he takes up his call from his sultan to arrive into the enemy territory. It feels like the human side of Malkoçoğlu is never to be seen. Only the warrior side of Malkoçoğlu is presentable for Ottoman army. I presume Ayhan Basoglu's character is much derived from Ottoman's Deli Army. "Deli" in Turkish refers to other name for "akıncı", "basi-bazouk.

Islamic subject is replaced by Turkish subject not in terms of race, religion but also the culture. Like the religion of Christianity sat on the values of Romans' culture, Turkish Republic sat on Islamic culture without Islam. Whatever made Turkish republic possible to exist today is much borrowing from Ottoman Empire.

When the critics write about the relation with country and cinema, they point that the relations between both is mainly related to the fantasies based on the history which takes the form of myth later and finds presence in the memory of the citizens of country. While the critics are right about getting at that point in a way. They seriously leave out all the history and the closeness to history part. For instance, even back in ancient Rome, the Roman gods are inspired and named after the emperor which gives us some sort of real back story. Surely, there is no Roman gods or that sort of reality.

Leaving Ottoman history out and having re-written the history in the name of ideological storytelling(or fictional history) is like accepting all of Greek Gods lived in ancient Greek and dropping all the other possible explanation of Greek civilization is made through Gods. Re-

arranging the Ottoman history according to the needs of dominant ideology serves for the repressed history but then why possible re-arrange of history? Because spectacle of history always make up for the wounded subject, lacking desire to reach the improbable.

The castrated Ottoman basıbazouk Malkoçoğlu is adapted into Western self and placed into the discourse of Westernization. The ever continuous history of Turkey that follows the tradition of being sided with West, Western values and the possible hegemony of the Westernization. This westernized self is much relied on the representation of history. The very desire the wounded object needs to feel aligned to be the 'real'.

The spectacle of history provides the background of historically real ideology. This ideology si bound to feed from the discursive power of history which is the power of utterer.

Barthes remarks about the use of narrative for the representation of history to display the history as real history:

Historical discourse is in its essence a form of ideological elaboration or to put it more precisely, an imaginary elaboration, if we can take the imagery to be the language through which the utterer of a discourse(a purely linguistic entity) fills out the place of the subject of the utterance(a pyschological or ideological entity).(Newman, 1996,60)

That is to say, Barthes tells of history as historical discourse that may be shaped according to the needs or ideals of the utterer of a discourse, the one who is owning of the discourse. That discourse may take place of the narration. Since the history is seen as imaginary elaboration of null language that can be filled up by the utterer of a discourse. Malkoçoğlu is a character created and applied by the needs of language, utterer of a discourse which turns into the character of ideology. Malkoçoğlu even though is not an imaginary element, he is decisively belonging to the ideology. He has been refabricated by discourse for the people by people who uses the discourse.

This fictional characterization and build up of Malkoçoğlu and his story partake in the republican hegemony while the character is stripped off his true origins to retain his Ottoman self under the command of the utterer of discourse. With the utterer splitting out the discourse of Westernization, this character is assimilated into new self, the one he does not belong rather the discourse owns. Therefore whatever left of his self, is the spectacle that he is placed

into. Far from being a realistic representation of history, Malkoçoğlu is a representation of another history, which is created and produced for ideological means. To endorse people with such a line of thinking that even within Ottoman history, there were riders who happen to obey his sultan and did his true duty.

Malkocoglu all in all is turned into story of Turkish hero and military soldier who sacrificed himself for the glory of his ideology. That ideology is linked with the spectacle of marching into Europe and re-conquest whatever the discourse of history tells him to.

3.3 THE MAN WHO SAVED THE WORLD: ATURKISH SPACE ODDYSEY LANDED IN TURKISH HISTORY

The Man Who Saved the World is one of the many efforts of Turkish cinema to date to create a genre(science fiction) cinema. The unique production of this movie is however the one of worst adaptation to date. Directed by Çetin İnanç and played by the most prestigious actor of the time Cüneyt Arkın, this movie is genuinely interested in creating a space odyssey masterpiece. However, what they did was a failure in the end. It is also the most determinant of age that the historically real movies in Turkey has lost its popularity among people. After this film, the Turkish history has come to be dominated and adapted by Turkish cinema reaches to its end with a technologically ill production.

The movie includes in the same themes as the other historical movies such as Tarkan and Malkoçoğlu and other contemporary examples. It starts with two Turks flying in the space in their spaceships in a proud manner. The strong theme of having Turks saving the world on the far side of the galaxy, taking voyage in a lightyear as glorious figures. While the director Cetin İnanç tries to show us the space that he gloriously ‘invented’(Star Wars patented space that is) before the camera, he took us down to the other planets. Our characters go down in the field with a mission in thier hand decide to save the world from the evil warlord that captured the entire planet, Cappadocia. Even though the land looks like a planet science fiction wise, the setting in which the event takes place symbolizes a vague return to the history themed movie.

This historically real movie includes most of the fiction that Turkish history deems it real. The movies that depend on Turkish history and therefore identity is largely diminished right after seeing this wanna be Star Wars movie because as soon as the both Turkish pilots land, the

movie takes a return to Turkish historical movies. As the horses on which the pilots ride and gallop, the magic of galaxy seems to go away. It is like two Ottoman riders riding on to the war. Even though the movie seemed regretful enough to continue, it was not the scene that ended the era. It was scene when two Turkish space pilots decided to see if they can take on entire universe in the name of Turks. What made the movie lose is that it took itself seriously enough to go on saving the world in the historical setting.

Drawing on Foucault's idea of heterotopia to signify this space episode in which Turks set themselves on the journey. Çetin İnanç tries to reach out for the utopia that is not real, also historically not real. While his movie is a piece of fantasy, he tries to approximately reach for the utopia that is not possible to reach. As I said earlier on, the setting in which the movie is shot may seem like a planet at first sight but when the pilots ride horses, this space odyssey turns to another Turkish historically (or textually) real film production but in the fantasy manner.

The Man Who Saved the world wants to claim the land ideologically because they switch to historical movies fast enough to display the caves, rocks, barren soil. It is like the setting in which the movie is shot is not meant to shoot. Especially when Cüneyt Arkin starts to train, jump like crazy in between rock-covered area. This juxtaposition of Cüneyt Arkin's costume in history wise and the blonde lady in more contemporary wise costume remind us of the improbability of two scenes shot together. This scene is followed by many scenes which are more applicable to any history themed movie. It is important that how spectacle gets really important.

According to the Braudel and Barthes, the historical storytelling was ideological in a sense that it changes, re-arranges the historical events in its own way, more like theatre if it prefers. This arranging of events in order to create an ideological atmosphere help the spectator imagine the film that has been going on before them is not like something for enjoyment but a spectacle to marvel at. Though the man who saved the world in this sense is not a movie to marvel at but a spectacle only to have a great laugh at. It is because the man who saved the world cannot apprehend the power of the film making it presented to spectators. Far from being a reality as shown before, it is a reality only to a few people who accept themselves as the film crew of this proud film.

Lukacs remarks on realistic representation of narrative, he mentions that narrative discourse is a means of ideological production. This production is entirely related to any historical reality. The discourse is as it stands a viewing of the world that creates an ideology in its own power. The man who saved the world fails to be real and historically real because of its stealing of images from Star Wars, its inspiration and also precursors, as well as its failure of keeping the ambiance as if the movie is set in a galaxy. Instead, the man who sold the world chose to copy and ridicule its own ideological power.

As **Filmthreat.com** puts well,

“Long ago in a Turkish speaking galaxy far, far away,” the universe is being imperiled by a quartet of evildoers: two bush haired men wearing Mardi Gras costumes, a slutty Cleopatra, a blue robot with an ambulance light in his head.”

Probably the way filmthreat puts out this review would not be so bad if there were no Star Wars at all. Surely Star Wars is the only thing the people can relate the movie with. However, the movie is only too historical for everyone’s taste and historically real to the extent that it loses its space theme, the reason for which the movie is made. The same productions years and years followed the same routine of good Turkish raider at his sultan’s call fighting at Western lands to take back whatever he deemed is historically Turkish. The narrative discourse would have intended to be the ideologically rise of Turkish national identity.

3.3. 1 The Man who saved the world: End of Republican understanding of history

The man who saved the world in every way became the weak point in which the fate of the adaptation of history as the republic see fit is died. The reason as to why I said this is because of the failure of movie productions that took place in Yeşilçam and the ideologically failure of Turkish national identity as the ideological narrative discourse.

With the denial of Yeşilçam in the beginning of eighties, Yeşilçam and the cinematic world it created saw the destruction of its core values. The star system, the classic storytelling of class differences and accompanying Westernization discourse has come to fail. The Man who saved the world, having been the last of its Yeşilçam production, tried to do a re-do of storytelling without the need to see the reason for adapting the historical themed movies for a space

themed movie. The failure of adapting Yeşilçam into the new era has reached to failure. It was not only the failure of the movie but also Yeşilçam's failure to continue in the way it seems so.

4.THE PRO-OTTOMAN:THE CLASH OF TURKISH AND ISLAMIC SUBJECTS

Right after 2000s, with the rise of AKP(the white party) Turkey changed its color for good. The desire to be Turkish is transformed to the pure Islamic subject. In the creation of this desire, surely the leading political party's responsive to contemporary world played a vital role in defining its power today. As AKP rose above other opposing parties, not only have the face of Turkey shaped differently, but also the repressed Islamic subject rose to importance better. Surely, in this years starting after 2000s, and coming to today, two subjects started a new ideological challenge which is to own the hegemony of Turkey.

AKP, a market-oriented party with ideological roots in the Turkish Islamist movement came to power. First thing they created to change in the possible economical reforms including the low level of unemployment and provide job to middle class. As well as economic reforms come to change, the reforms of democracy have been made. The level of GDP has rocketed high, making the economy six largest. Perhaps the most change have been made in political arena where they strive to be a model to Muslim countries in the Middle East.

With this new changes happening in Turkey and Middle East, this new Islamist AKP party had a resurgence to european countries in responsiveness to strict economic growth every year and powerful leadership that grow beyond Turkey. The political arena has since then never seen such a powerful leader for years that impacted to the fate of Turkish republic and its almost quater a century fantasy to become a member of Europe since Ottoman times, the party see itself as an extension of Ottoman Empire, which they called their way, Neo-Ottoman. In the first very years of AKP, they were successful in approaching the final with the member qualifications of European Union.

When AKP first appeared on political scene, they are accepted as a threat against Kemalist foundations of the Turkish republic. AKP was enthusiastic enough to break the long tradition of Kemalist parties that directed the country for the last eighty years. They were successful in cleaning out the much of the corruption brought out by earlier coalition of 2001, passed the economic crisis which came with the coalition.

In light of many responsive change to contemporary world ended in 2011 with a movie, the movie called Conquest 1453. Conquest 1453 was a movie centered around the glory of Ottoman Empire, strictly shown parallels with the era of 1453 when the Ottomans were

militarily and economically superior to their Byzantine counterparts. The world domination was at hand and perfectly deserved. Surely, this movie shared many points with AKP ideology, especially the economy wise. The glory of Ottoman Empire did not only mean the success of the era but also a possible expansionist scenario of conquer and rise of Empire in the contemporary world. Having said that the movie budgeted over seventeen million dollars surpassing all of other popular works done before in Turkish movie industry, which levelled around three million dollars before the conquest 1453. Despite the manifestation of economic growth and Ottoman glory of the past, the film obviously did make good returns on box office in Turkey but not broad. In Germany, this movie made more than three million dollars behind Turkey which made thirty one million dollars. Followed by Austria, United Arab Emirates and four other countries reached a fairly low returns as compared to Turkey.

Whatever AKP did was to turn back the old tricks used by Turkish Republic since the beginning, they changed the myth of Turkish history which carried Islamic subject over Turkish one. The possible re-coming of Neo-Ottoman imagination along with Islamic lifestyle gained upper hand against the clash of its formidable foe, Turkish republican subject which has repressed the Islamic subject too long. They managed to keep the republican subject down due to EU ascension process. The power of Turkish military went down, right after famous E-Memo warning that stated the commitment to secular Kemalist values and warned AKP-dominant parliament against the newly elected President, Abdullah Gül.

Many movies especially military and anti-Islamic movies come to life. Nefes for example is still seen as a big movie of the era, a film that praises the military's long war against the terrorists fighting over at Eastern Turkey where the armed Kurdish forces dominated the area in which they were left stranded and left to their fates. Nefes, means Breath, explains the last breath, last hold, Turkey controlled barracks against the threat of Kurds, rising armed resurgence and failed in Turkish military poor handle on the attacks made by Kurdish side day and night. This movie has been lately become a propaganda even for military. It has been shown in every camp to the soldiers to increase the nationalistic feeling. Nefes was not necessarily a movie against the AKP ideology but it was a big movie at the time when it comes to theatres, it was more of a reflection of feelings.

Perhaps the movie that sees the myth of AKP as problematic was Yandım Ali. Yandım Ali is stripped off a comic book, chronicling the life of self professed hero at the time of Turkish

War of Independence. The film mostly follows the daily adventures of Ali, who is deeply connected with Turkish identity. In the beginning Ali does not feel much of belonging to his identity up until he finds that the enemy tries to bring the Turkish flag down. Interestingly, Ali is Ottoman, wearing fes and the clothes of the era. Ali's first intentions to get a girl for himself that he loved dearly from the hand of British lord who wants his lover. Later, he awakens to a new consciousness that he is a member of Turkish nationality and he has to fight for his nation. In the next, he meets Atatürk, which makes him even more involved in with the war of independence.

As compared to Conquest 1453, Yandım Ali and Nefes decided to be on the opposition part but three films share the same wound of having to reach to the discourse of Westernization. Even though they do not claim the movie to be Western, the big budgeted productions are solemnly following the Hollywood production methods, which displays us being with Western world.

5.CONCLUSION

In the making of Turkish subject, the westernization process played a vital role and to some extent, this process seemed to be the only way to reach for the modernity and civilization. Before too long, the discourse of westernization took control of the process of westernization therefore, the understanding of civilization in Turkey. Having gone in this road for more than eighty years, Turkey is assimilated through the discourse of westernization that is determinant of the reforms of westernization. Now in the late 2000s, Turkey faces a dilemma, two subjects(identity formation) which are predominantly decisive in the way that Turkey take part.

The cinema in this process followed the westernization process started in social life. Especially in the cinema of 60s, 70s we see the identity formation become much effective through the use of creating heroes and bounced on to the creation of heroes. These heroes are made, modeled, produced, re-produced after the westernization process taking place in Turkey. The narrative, storyline and sub-texts are decisively determinant of, running side by side the discourse of westernization. Surely, the purpose is to create, produce and re-produce the hegemonic discourse of Westernization on Turkishness and have this discourse spread out to the masses to reach for the Western other which is impossible to desire.

When the history themed hero movies reached to popularity, far from having a Western wise discourse, those movies primarily had to overcome the lack that Turkey is a Western country, reached for the desire of becoming Westerner. Since heroes are made to be Turk, militarist and a man signifying for the nation's pride, the identity formation provided through the substitutes for the lack of being a Westerner. The substitutes that served as the basis for feeling like Westerner, could not be adapted as well as it's thought.

In the de-ottomonized era, with the Turkish republic adapting in every way the discourse of westernization and modernity together in the republican era of 60s till late 90s. Tarkan is one of many leading figures to become the synthesis of Turkish westernization and modernity together. Tarkan, for example, a Turkish hero stripped off Italian descent, italian comic books, has taken up the mantle of Westerner but is placed within the Turkish mindset. A man out of Italian descent sure effected the way the identity formation took but Tarkan's stories only took place in European lands against European pre-modern barbaric hordes through the

dialectic of savagery – modernism plane. This symbolization of modern Turk against barbaric hordes of European are make believe stories. This myth of westernized, modern Turks against the Wild European make up for the lack Turkey. This change in discourse make however poorly, miserably failing substitutes that model Western “other”.

In the 70s, this synthesis of Western Turk is treating the European as nothing but savage, barbaric is made through the creation of leading figures like Malkocoglu. In this line of thinking, unlike Tarkan’s mythic roots, this time stories are based on historical texts, resources. Having put the historical background at the roots of this discourse of Westernization, the narrative of this incapitated Ottoman Turk but not really Ottoman in the historical sense, did the same job as his mythic counterpart. They carried the discourse of westernization in the form of provider of justice. The Turks as nation stil played out a vital role in the creating this discourse of savagery – barbaric European view.

When we come to 90s, the things have changed drastically once again. While the old Turkish subject loses its validity, it leads to the emergence of anew subject which can be explained very well within the cinema. It is the time when new subject enters. This new Islamist subject came after losing the sensibility of old Turkish subject and the old Turkish subject is parodied, ridiculed. The cult movie known as The Man Who Saved the World is perfect parody of Turkish subject, the failing of Westernization discourse. The poor visual effects, stolen Star Wars images, poor dialogues of the leading heroes and the land in which heroes landed as part of space to conquer as Turkish land lost its credibility and become a comical movie which lead to the failure of Turkish subject. This lack of being a country as successful as a Western country appeared in the form of failure to invent this adaptation for the space themed movie.

In the 2000s, 1453 Generation started to appear later after the failure of Turkish subject. The Islamic subject which showed a great improvement in terms of economic wealth and development find the chance to display its power in late 2000s. The Conquer 1453 is the manifestation through which this power of economic growth and wealth is displayed fully. However, Turkish lack has survived through the years. Having lost its Yeşilçam roots, the new popular cinema of Turkey that is starting to improve in the shadow of Hollywood. This improvement helped in the revival of discourse of Turkish Westernization to re-imagine the identity of Ottoman past, forgetting the old Turkish discourse endowed with nationalism. This

new subject has not gone unchallenged since the old Turkish subject did live within its own imagination. Thus, these two subjects become a substitute and an adversary to each other.

Both subjects are never to overcome one another's substitute because they signify something that they will never become. Even when Turkey becomes a western country, Turkey hardly will be a country that it idealizes to be. The country will become a country not adapted to Western standards quite well in the way it idealizes. Being Westernlike is like a dream never to be achieved despite all the purpose, goals, plans, organizations set to reach for this dream. Much like the nightmare, the dream never meant to be lived as shown through the TV, cinema and other communication tools that perfectly constructed Western country.

The discourse of savagery, barbarism, reactionarism, not modern are the discourses that are produced by Western countries. To leave this discourse of westernization process is to risk the failure of seeing Western world better than the rest of the world. Even though this discourse passes down entirely to Turkey, Turkey might still be referred to as a savage country. Since the creator of discourse, his master's voice, are Westerner, having perfectly transferred this perspective to Turkish identity in the Western discourse may desperately falter. In the contemporary examples of *Skyfall*, *Argo*, the westerner feels compelled to show the backward, reactionary shots of images which is related to the creation of discourse of Western world.

In many incarnations of Western image, Turks try to see themselves as the Westerners, and better than Westerners. In Tarkan's show of honour, display of power at much bigger enemies are manifestations of creating poor substitutes for the lack of being Western like. A space voyage movie in the man who saved the world result in failure to be the real space adventure which shows simply the manifestation of failing to be like a Westerner. This lack of being a Western country and leading the space look miserable. What Turkey fails to be is to be like a Western country. Turkey may achieve to be a country that is much less like a copycat of simple European country. Like Ireland, Scotland and Wales copy England and but fail to be the exactly one big one whole as England.

Turkey is never to be an European country just like Odysseus's voyage. Turkey goes in between the western world and eastern world. This position of in betweenness, being the bridge between continents, is a position that seems to reach for nowhere but a position that

runs around itself. This odyssey to Europe is highly unlikely to be a complete one. Just like Turkey failed to create a Western image, this odyssey is doomed to be full of pain and full of dead ends. But still being a Westerner is never equal to being an ideal country. The self is only self when it realizes its own strengths.

REFERENCES

Books:

Burgoyne, Robert (1997). *Film Nation: Hollywood Looks at U.S. History*. Minnesota : Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press. 5

Cantek, Levent .2002. *Çizgili Hayat Kılavuzu: İletişim*

Tunc, Tanfer Emin / Gursel, Bahar. 2012. *The Transnational Turn in American Studies* . Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles, Frankfurt am Main, New York, Oxford, Wien: Peter Lang. 225-243.

Wood, Kelsey. 2012. *Zizek: A Reader's Guide*. Wiley Blackwell: John Wiley & Sons. 131.

White, Hayden. 1978. *Tropics of discourse : essays in cultural criticism*: Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University.

White, Hayden. 1996. *Centuries' ends, narrative means*. Stanford : Stanford University Press. 58-78.

Other Publications

Hall, Phill. 2005. *THE TURKISH STAR WARS*. [online]:
<http://www.filmthreat.com/reviews/2341/>. [accessed 18 Nisan 2013]

FETİH 1453: THE CONQUEST OF CONSTANTINOPLE. 2012 [online]:
<http://www.boxofficemojo.com/movies/?page=intl&country=TR&id=fetih1453.htm>.
[accessed 18 Nisan 2013]

Foucault, Michel. 1967. *Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias..* [online]:
<http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault.heteroTopia.en.html>. [accessed 18 Nisan 2013]

Toledano, Ehud. 2011. *The AKP's New Turkey*. [online]:
<http://www.currenttrends.org/research/detail/the-akps-new-turkey>. [accessed 18 Nisan 2013.]