

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY**

***'MAJORITY'* FILM: WHO ARE THE 'OTHERISED' IN TURKEY?**

Master's Thesis

GÜNEŞ DOĞUŞ ÖZER

İSTANBUL, 2013

**THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
BAHÇEŞEHİR UNIVERSITY**

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

FILM AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

***'MAJORITY'* FILM: WHO ARE THE 'OTHERISED' IN
TURKEY?**

Master's Thesis

GÜNEŞ DOĞUŞ ÖZER

Thesis Supervisor: ASSIST. PROF. DR. NİLAY ULUSOY

İSTANBUL, 2013

ABSTRACT

‘MAJORITY’ FILM: WHO ARE THE ‘OTHERISED’ IN TURKEY?

Güneş Doğuş ÖZER

Cinema-Television Program

Thesis Advisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Nilay ULUSOY

March 2013, 45 pages

An individual is born into a society and the social reality one is born to establishes his/her tastes, preferences, briefly, his/her social identity. The individual determines his/her social identity according to the social category or group like gender, class, nationality in which he/she lives in. If we are making reference to a category, a group, the dominant group tries to make the other assimilate to it, or if it fails to do that, consider it as 'The other.' Of course, when such a concept comes into question, 'The other' has been defined by many philosophers and sociologists since ancient times today. Therefore, it is not possible to restrict 'The other' concept to only one definition. We mostly observe that generally negative meanings are attributed to this concept, which we deal with in the context of 'other.' A person ascribes something he/she cannot suppress, eliminate to the 'Other,' lays it off to the Other.

In the definition of nation, the idea of 'an individual of one of us' is imposed by the state, which regards religious or secular, Sunni, Muslim and Turkish as the majority of the country. Any individual who digresses from this definition becomes integrated with the concept of 'Other' and is declared to be the *scapegoat* of society.

In this context, the thesis has three main chapters. First of all, our focus here is Bauman, Bakhtin, Lacan, Levinas and Schnapper, who are selected deliberately, their ideas about 'Other' are related to the *Majority* film. Second chapter looks Ethnic Nationalism in Turkey and 'Otherness'. The chapter ends by interpreting the movie, which is mentioned W. Reich's *scapegoat* and Gül character in the movie. Finally, the last chapter builds on women in Turkey, and women in *the Majority* film. Although we think of ostracism cases due to identity problems, when we deal with the 'Other,' there are other 'Others' in our society as well. For example these 'Others' are our women, maybe, who are the closest people to us.

Key Words: Movie, Woman, Nationalism, Other, Otherisation

ÖZET

‘ÇOĞUNLUK’:TÜRKİYE’DE ‘ÖTEKİLEŞTİRİLENLER’ KİMLERDİR?

Güneş Doğuş ÖZER

Sinema-Televizyon Programı

Tez Danışmanı:Yard.Doç.Dr.Nilay ULUSOY

Mart 2013, 45 sayfa

İnsan bir toplumun içinde doğar ve içinde doğduğu toplumsal gerçeklik; onun beğenilerini, tercihlerini kısacası,kişinin sosyal kimliğini oluşturur. Birey, sosyal kimliğini içinde bulunduğu sosyal kategoriye ve gruba cinsiyet,sınıf ve kimliğini ona göre belirler. Eğer bir kategoriden, gruptan bahsediyorsak; baskın olanın diğerini kendisi gibi yapmaya çalışması,eğer bunu başaramıyorsa kendinden olmayanı ‘Öteki’ olarak görmesi söz konusudur.Tabii ortada, elle tutulur böyle kavram söz konusu olduğunda, ‘Öteki’ birçok filozof ve sosyolog tarafından eski zamanlardan günümüze kadar defalarca tanımlanmıştır.Bu sebeple,‘Öteki’ kavramını tek bir cümle ile sınırlandırmak olası değildir.Daha çok,bizden başkası ‘diğeri’ anlamında daha sık karşımıza çıkan bu kavrama,genellikle olumsuz anlamlar yüklendiğini görmekteyiz.Kişi kendi içinde bastıramadığı,yok edemediği şeyi, ‘Öteki’ne yakıştırmakta,onun üzerine atmaktadır.

Millet tanımında, çoğunluğu oluşturan dindar veya laik,Sünni,Müslüman Türklerin devletçe empoze edilen ‘bizden olan birey’ tanımı bulunmaktadır.Bu tanımlamanın dışına çıkan her birey, ‘Öteki’ kavramıyla bütünleşmekte,toplumun adeta *günah keçisi* ilan edilmektedir.Bu bağlamda,bu çalışma üç ana bölümden oluşacaktır.İlkin,*Çoğunluk* filmindeki ‘Ötekileştirme’ durumuna gönderme yapacak nitelikteki düşünürlerden Bauman,Bahtin,Lacan,Schnapper ve Levinas’ın ‘Öteki’ tanımlamaları;ikinci olarak Türkiye’nin Etnik Milliyetçilik ve Ötekileşme anlayışı çerçevesinden değerlendirilmesi,ayrıca W.Reich’in Günah Keçisi kavramından yola çıkarak filmdeki ‘Gül’ karakterinden bahsedilmiştir.Son olarak,Öteki kavramına yaklaşımlar üzerinden filmde yer tutan kadınların bir çözümlemesi sunulmuştur.Filmin de yardımıyla, ülkemizde ‘Ötekileştirilenlerin’ sadece kimliksel bunalımlardan kaynaklı olmadığını, ‘Ötekileştirilmeleri’, günümüzde sıradan bir olgu haline getirilen kadınlarımızın da,aslında sadece kadın oldukları için ‘Öteki’ kısıfı içinde yer aldığı iddiasını dile getirmek.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sinema, Kadın, Milliyetçilik, Öteki, Ötekileştirme

CONTENTS

1.INTRODUCTION	1
2.THE CONCEPT OF THE OTHER.....	3
2.1 SUBJECT AND THE CONCEPT OF THE OTHER:	
LEVINAS,BAUMAN,BAKHTİN, SCHNAPPER VE LACAN.....	5
2.2 LEVINAS.....	5
2.3 BAUMAN.....	6
2.4 BAKHTİN.....	7
2.5 SCHNAPPER.....	8
2.6 LACAN.....	9
3.NATIONALISM AND THE OTHER.....	11
3.1 ETHNIC NATIONALISM IN TURKEY.....	11
3.2 FASCISM'S UNDERSTANDING OF SPIRIT OF THE	
MASSES:SCAPEGOAT.....	20
3.3 ON THE MOVIE MAJORITY: GÜL THE SCAPEGOAT.....	24
4.WOMAN HAS NO NAME.....	29
4.1 WOMAN IN TURKEY: “IT IS VERY HARD TO BE A	
WOMAN”.....	31
4.2 ALWAYS THE OTHER: WOMEN IN THE MOVIE “MAJORITY”.....	33
5.CONCLUSION.....	38
REFERENCES.....	43

1.INTRODUCTION

Since a person starts to exist within a society, he/she starts to build certain behavioural patterns in accordance with his/her social relations; in this context, the individual sometimes becomes alienated to certain people and regard them as 'different.' The individual does this sometimes in accordance with his/her interests, and sometimes for the purpose of securing himself/herself. The concept of 'Other,' which we start to hear more frequently in recent years, has become more prominent in parallel with these tendencies. For this reason, it has been defined by many philosophers and sociologists several times; although coming up with a single concrete meaning in the context of 'Other,' we use the concept of 'Other' in the sense of 'other, someone else.' The ways to think about the Other has evolved since Ancient Greece and we inherited these deeply-rooted ideas within the society.

In the family model, which is defined by W. Reich as 'Imperial Family,' the child maintains his/her passive role in the patriarchal system and the state considers family as the basis of 'mentality' education. In Seren Yucesoy's film 'Majority,' we see a sort of family model, which we can characterize as 'Imperial Family' with the words of Reich.

Reich¹, attaches a specific importance to the role of the father within the family. According to him, racist state is represented by the father in the family; therefore, the father, who is the head of the family, becomes a means for the state to exert its power. In this point, the problematic of who is the other starts from the family. In this point, the problematic of who is the 'Other' arises. The movie raises concern over both its viewpoint towards identity problems and the realistic manner it presents the contexts of 'Otherisation' that confront labourers (workers, cleaning lady) and a mother figure, who is ignored because of the primary reason of being a 'woman' in the family. In the definition of nation, religious or secular Sunni Muslim Turkish people, who hold majority have always assumed the role of the 'master.'

According to Bülent Kahraman², the possibility of a non-Muslim Turkish person is out of question and within the reality of majority. For this reason, in Turkish society, it is the 'father'

¹Wilhelm Reich(1975, p. 84) states that the family is a small economical institution. Within this institution, racist state is represented by the father; so the father, who is the head of the family, is the most valuable tool for the state power.

² According to Bülent Kahraman, official ideology clings to the concept of nation; it embraces the concept of 'origins' when holding individuals together.

figure in the family, which stands out as the authority to decide who is the 'Other' in the society.

The father figure in the movie *Majority* (Seren Yüce, 2010) also decides who is to be 'Otherised' in accordance with the ideology the state imposes him, both with his speeches to his father and his behaviors, and tries to be a role model for his posterity. In this study, the concept of 'Other' will be defined by way of the movie *Majority*, and the subject of who are the 'Others' in the society will be discussed. In this study, related sources have been subjected to a narrative analysis in order to provide a meaningful basis to the sentences, which are referred to in this study, and the movie has been analyzed in accordance with this method.

In the first chapter of the thesis, the concept of the 'Other,' which has been defined by many thinkers until now, will be defined through the framework of the ideas of Bauman, Bahktin, Schnapper, Lacan and Levinas.

In the second chapter of the thesis, the definition of 'Other' and racism concept will be emphasized through the concept of ethnic nationalism; the definition of the concept of 'Scapegoat' will be emphasized; and in the last section, an analysis of Gül, one of the characters of the movie *Majority* will be provided. Whose Other is Gül? Why is she an Other? The answers to these questions will be sought within the framework of this thesis study, and the concept of 'Otherisation' will be examined in detail on the basis of 'Identity' phenomenon.

In the last chapter of the thesis, emphasis will be laid on the status of women in Turkey, and an analysis on the role of woman in the household, how the mother Nazan is 'Otherised' in the household and why she becomes isolated in the household will be provided within the context of the movie *Majority*. The movie will be read not only in terms of the life of cleaning worker Şükriye and identity problems, but on the basis of Gül, who is 'Otherised' primarily because of being a 'woman.' Over the course of this analysis, sources, which are related to the subject of the thesis and read for this purpose, will be referred and attempt towards providing an analysis on the movie *Majority* will be made in the light of this information.

2.THE CONCEPT OF THE OTHER

Relation with the other and otherness doesn't originate did not originate from modern society. The ways to think about the Other has evolved since Ancient Greece and we inherited these deeply-rooted ideas within the society (Schnapper 2011, p. 25).

Who or What is the 'Other'? Any answer to this question needs first to determine the position of the 'Self' in relation to it. The 'Self' is always implicated in the other and it is, in fact, an essential element of self-awareness: there can be no Self without an 'Other' against which to measure itself. Whenever it is a question of the Other, to repeat it is always also a question of the Self. In particular, to recognize the Other as Other is to recognize the relation this other has to oneself (Richardson 2010, pp. 13-15).

An individual is born into a society. The social reality the individual is born into establishes his/her tastes, self, preferences, briefly, his/her social identity. The individual builds hi/her social identity according to the social category or group he/she lives in. If we are making reference to a category, a group, the dominant group tries to make the other assimilate to it, or if it fails to do that, consider it as 'The other.' The concept of 'Other' has been defined in various disciplines such as Literature, Philosophy and Sociology and several accounts have been suggested by various thinkers. The Other is defined in philosophy dictionary as follows:

The other is a group of people who differ from a certain person or some other group's identity or defined as an inferior human being in various cultural studies, particularly in science, anthropology and psychology. Attribution or term of the Other refers to the one, who / which takes position in exact opposition to a situation, status, entity and is always regarded as the insignificant side of a binary opposition. 'Otherness' or 'being other' as a philosophical concept is the difference of some aspects of human character from the other persons of the society and is used to provide an account of other self's, objects, characteristics, relations, which are completely separate from the self and outside the limits of self (Güçlü 2003, p. 10).

The "Other" is a concept, which is closely related to self-oppression. Motives and impulses, which can not be accepted by the dominant culture the individual lives in, are ignored, suppressed, eliminated or its aspects, which pose a danger for the dominant values are removed and assimilated.

Significance of the concept of other in terms of psychoanalysis stems from the fact that the Other represents not only certain elements which are excluded from a culture or a person's character, but also the things, which are ostracized and ignored in the consciousness of one individual as an abhorrent entity. The person ascribes the thing he/she represses inside to the

"Other" and puts the blame on the "Other" in order to exclude, humiliate and, if possible, eliminate it (Marcuse 1985, p. 66).

2.1 SUBJECT AND THE CONCEPT OF THE OTHER:

LEVĪNAS,BAUMAN,BAKHTĪN, SCHNAPPER VE LACAN

2.2 LEVĪNAS

Meeting with the other happens via separateness of the other. This meeting doesn't contain any commonality, presupposition, any sharing on the basis of common interests or similarity; it also is not a phenomenon which is trapped within the experience of 'self' (Davis 1996, p. 48).

For Levinas, addressing the Other within the context of its conflicting or Contradicting with the self, is a dedifferentiation. The other is absolutely different from the self. This significant difference stems from one fundamental reason. That is the God, which is the Other. God is the source of all the differences we encounter in life. God is the ultimate different, and also, uniqueness of the Other and all the others originate from it.

When I talk about uniqueness, I talk about the distinctness of the Other. The unique one is a supreme Other: It cannot be reduced to or categorized in a 'genus.' There is this ancient text in Talmud, which impresses me considerably. God is the extraordinary. States use molds for coining money. With one mold, they press several coins, which look like each other. God also creates pluralities, which don't look like each other, self's that are unique in their own species, and adds its own image to these creations with the mold. (Levinas 1998, pp. 205-206)

Levinas does not led into a cleft stick by suggesting self's relation with the first philosophy instead of setting off with the premise of an self:

Life in concrete terms is not the life of a solipsist, who is engrossed in the world of one's own. Nor is it a group of elements which exist for a consciousness. The idea of concrete entity also refers to the idea of an inter-subjective world. If we restrict ourselves to only one consciousness, single self [ego], which is equal to the definition o the formation of objects, we can reach not the states of the objects in the concrete life, but only their abstractions. Reduction to a single self, ego-logical reduction can only serve to the first step to phenomenology. In addition to this, we must discover the "Others" and inter-subjective world (Levinas, 1995, p.150).

The other is neither the negation of the self, nor in the state of conflict with it. Negation subjects the Other and the self to each other, both of which it addresses as two opposite poles. The Other's independence from the self disappears (Levinas 1991, p. 194).

In this state, the self lives dependently on the world. However, since dependence to the world stems from a selfish need, self is also an independent and selfish entity, which doesn't have to give an account of its actions to anyone. Consuming the world to fulfill its needs, the self is not unhappy with this dependence; on the contrary, it is happy with its loneliness and commands its own world. (Levinas 1991, pp. 114-116)

Levinas associates the utilitarian existence of the self with plants and animals. Just as the plants grow by pushing aside the other small plants around them or animals destroy the impediments they encounter in the struggle to survive, human beings are similar in their first state; Levinas calls this state of human kind "instinctive anthology."

The difference between wish and "need" is the determined of the thin line between self's encountering with the selfish world it is engrossed in, and its meeting with the Other, the responsibility it is held accountable. Required objects are consumable or 'appropriatable' forms of distinctness:

The other which is desired metaphysically, is not the Other when I eat a bread, when I settle on a land or think of a landscape. [...] I can feed myself with these realities and generally satisfy myself; simply because I yearn for them. Their alterity is absorbed in me as a thinker or a proprietor (Levinas 1991, p. 33).

2.3 BAUMAN

Sociologist Bauman explains the concept of Other in the context of 'us' and 'them.' Us and them represent not only two groups of people, but also distinction between two attitudes, emotional commitment and antipathy, trust and suspicion, safety and fear, cooperation and

conflict. "Us" refers to the group we belong. According to Bauman, we understand other individuals in this group well and therefore know how to maintain our relationship; safe and 'home.' This group is almost our natural habitat, the place where we like to be and return at peace. On the contrary, what Bauman calls "Them" refers to the group we neither want to belong, nor want under any condition. Therefore, the images we have with regard to what's happening within this group are vague and lack any coherence; we don't have sufficient knowledge about the functioning of that group; for this reason, whatever the group does is generally unpredictable and similarly frightening for us. What I understand from 'them' is the way that group behave against my interests, want to harm me or conspire against me and feel glad for my misfortunes. As a matter of fact, according to Bauman, what makes these groups real is the irreconcilableness between them. In sociology, 'us and them' distinction is called 'internal group' and 'external group.' 'Us' and 'Them' can be understood only in terms of mutual conflict. Bauman claims that, even if no such group exists, the group will need to invent it for the group, which needs to assume an enemy in order to achieve loyalty and cooperation within itself in order to mark and protect its boundaries for the consistency and integrity of the group. Bauman asserts that these hostile accusations are inevitable for the group members to clasp each other. According to him, an enemy has to be created for the unity of the group. It can even be suggested that actual existence of a group, which exhibits the expected behaviour, is neither here nor there; even if such a group doesn't exist, it will be invented to the benefit of consistency and integrity of the group, which needs to assume an enemy in order to achieve loyalty and cooperation within itself. I need the fear aroused by savagery in order to feel myself safe as if I am home at a place. An "external" is necessary to give the literal meaning of "internal" (Bauman 1998, pp. 51-52).

2.4 BAKHTIN

Talking with the other, the Self sees what it can't see, the things which are beyond it. Similarly, the Other sees what self can not. During the dialogue, both self's idea about itself changes and develops thanks to the Other, and Self models the Other. During this modelling process, self restrains the Other in a finished period of time. When it is in dialogue with the Other, Self's time passes, but stops the time of the Other (Holquist 1990, pp. 21- 22). According to Bakhtin, Self emerges as a determiner of temporality. Boundaries between now and then, here and there are drawn through Self. Self can't help locating the Other in a position or time when looking at it, or in dialogue with it. Condition and position of the Self determines its relationship with the Other; however, it has to step out of the given conditions: Contingency of the "Self" is a multiple phenomenon: it is given what he is not supposed to be." (Holquist 1990, p. 22).

The fact that each self has a center of its own, contains an opposition space against what is imposed with collectivity. In this sense, Self's observing the world by locating itself at the center, is like a breathing point against what the world imposed to it. Since its time is not finite, Self is an unfinalized Self.

Dialogue consists of three main layers:

1. Center, or what Bakhtin calls 'the-I-for-myself.'
2. Off-center or 'the-not-I-in-me.'
3. The relationship between those two (Holquist 1990, p. 29).

According to Bakhtin, Self can know anything about itself through the dialogue with the Other. In other words, Self's knowledge about itself, is restricted to the Other's looks directed to it. Self must look at the categories of the Other in order to find itself. Self can not approach itself with a modelling, which is similar to the one it applies to the Other. The only way for the Self to approach to itself is the Models, eyes of the Other.

According to Bakhtin, a person can be conscious of oneself only when it exposes itself for an [Other], through an [Other] or with the help of an [Other]. The most important performances which constitute self-consciousness are determined by means of a relationship with another

consciousness a 'you'. Existence (both internal and external existence) of a human being is the most profound interaction. To be is to communicate. To be refers to being for the [Other] and a person's being for himself/herself through the [Other]. The person does not have an autonomy space of its own; it is always and completely restricted; when looking at itself, it actually looks at the eyes of the [Other] or looks through the eyes of the [Other] (Bakhtin 2004, p. 375).

2.5 SCHNAPPER

Schnapper suggests that seeds of the relationship with the Other was not sown in modern society. According to Schnapper, the Other is the Other; human societies are various. This difference must inevitably be interpreted in the context of inferiority. When "Self" appraises the "Other," it makes use of the criteria of "my" culture and confuses this with the culture in general. In this case, the Other can be nothing but the incomplete state of itself. The Other is accepted with this difference; but it is frozen in a state of impossible inferiority. The difference between itself and the Other is attempted to be maintained by excluding, ostracizing, and in the most extreme case, by exterminating the different (Schnapper 2011, pp. 25-26).

On the other hand, a view with contrast to this one, proceeds in quite a different manner. Universalism is a principle. Beyond determining the differences, principle of universalism³ claims the unity of human species. It suggests that each person is equal only by virtue of being a human regardless of significant differences in terms of mental and moral capacity or sufficiency, and claims that humans are equal in terms of freedom due to having the same motive and tendency despite the fact that their performance in terms of talent is not equal. It claims that the Other is another Self.

Therefore, there is no restriction between humans in the sense of whether human rights, pride of each individual and the respect for the individual (Schnapper 2011, p. 27).

³ Alive all everything is valuable because of only living. Nowadays in society, universality means that everybody is equal, and their language, race, religion aren't important (http://www.hadengesi.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=147:evrensellik-lkesi&catid=2:axoy-mahu-dersleri&Itemid=3).

2.6 LACAN

French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan created a new theory by blending the principles of Freud's psychoanalysis, Heidegger's fundamental ontology, Hegel's master-slave dialectic and historicism, and Saussure's linguistics.

According to Lacan, humans come into the world as a premature and undeveloped creature. For Lacan, infants enter a phase called "mirror phase" 6-18 months after their birth. Human reality is not a reality, which reflects real as it is, but a reality, which can be thought of within the possibilities and rules of the linguistic structure.

Lacan emphasizes that subject's relations with the others are determined by language and frequently uses this formula: 'A signifier represents a subject for another signifier.' According to him, language arranges the subject's relationship with reality, with itself and the others. One of the most significant aspects of Lacan's subject theory is, subject's being defined outside the self. While all kinds of external factors that makes us human beings and interpretation mechanism have an effect on the formation of the subject, the fact that semiotic or imaginary unity is lost, leaves the subject in a continuous sense of deprivation and an endeavour to fulfill this feeling. Therefore, Lacan defines the subject as an entity, which can not become a whole, and struggles in a constant effort to achieve self-actualization (Tura 1989, pp. 172-175).

In the first phase of Oedipus, wish of the child is only a pure experience which is not symbolized, become conscious in this state, and become an object of the consciousness. This wish is to become everything for the mother, in other words, what the mother desires.

Becoming whole with the mother is to achieve completeness, Nirvana. In our opinion, this is an unmediated relationship, which doesn't contain any symbol. Lacan calls this 'Mirror Phase.' Self-realization in the mirror consists of three successive phases. In the first phase, the child, which is in front of the mirror with an adult, confuses his image with that of the adult;

in the second phase, the child understand that his image in the mirror is not real. Finally, in the third phase, the child comprehends the fact that the image in the mirror is not only an image, but also image of his own and separate from that of someone else (Sarup 1995, p. 11).

When mother's wish addresses to the Father, Oedipus process begins. The Name of the Father comes into play as a result of this reference. According to Lacan, Oedipus, that is, the rule of the Father, is imperative for a human to be established as a cultural entity. Because the law of the father helps a human to be established as a cultural subject, entering to the symbolic order, which allows separating internal from the external, subjective from objective, self and the others; abandoning the pursuit to achieve pleasure and becoming a social member (1995, p. 197).

3.NATIONALISM AND THE OTHER

3.1 ETHNIC NATIONALISM IN TURKEY

Nationalism is not only political, but it is also a matter of cultural and personal identity. There is no such thing as the first nationalist. There is not a sudden moment when people start to think in nationalist terms without ideological preferences for their countries or political aspirations. Nationalism is a way of talking, thinking and acting. Explaining nationalism as a form of evaluation, Calhoun suggests that political and cultural ideologies, which claim superiority of a nation are associated with state policies; therefore, nationalism is ascribed with a moral enforcement status. As a result of certain behaviours⁴, which are based on moral enforcements, nationalism may create a nation, which is associated with extreme loyalty (Calhoun 2007, pp. 3-16).

Nationalism is one of the fundamental ideologies of 19th and 20th centuries, which developed in parallel with the rise of nation state; as a matter of fact, it doesn't have a long history. Therefore, nationalism is a new political phenomenon. There are two basic theoretical approaches to nationalism as a political phenomenon. One of them is the classical approach, which emerged in parallel with nation-state and separated ethnic nationalism from civil nationalism; the second is the constructive approach, which adopts the idea that all nationalisms contain ethnic and civil elements. First approach is generally insufficient compared to the second approach in terms of explaining nationalisms, particularly understanding the continuousness and affiliation between ethnic identity, national identity and nationalism (Aydingün 2008, p. 8).

According to Çağlar Keyder, nationalism is a modernization ideology in the 19th century. In the Turkish nationalism, it is an aim that individuals only should accept general connective principles. Turkish nationalism make some efforts, which is related to new Turkey state model (Keyder 2010, p.115). In the 19th century, governors made for Turkish nationalism. Similar to the other efficiency nationalists, they had to define Turkish nationalism. They defended that Anatolian was always one part of Turkey land (2010, p. 253).

⁴ Such as ethnic cleansing, purification ideologies and xenophobia.

If we think nationalism is related to 'religion' and 'blood', maybe everything will be easier for us. Anderson says that nationalism means delusion, which gives power to nationalism. Nationalism is imagined, as minor societies' citizens don't know even other citizens or maybe they never meet one another, but nevertheless nationalism lives constantly in our minds. Namely, we can feel undivided ourselves thanks to nationalism (Anderson 1993, p.20).

"Every nation must possess their own state", which is a general validity. However, that is not an obligatory. In fact, nationalism is a cultural doctrine, which is above all. Nationalism, according to Smith, is an ideological movement, thus this state can acquire identity, autonomy and unity thanks to nationalism. Thus national identity occurs. People, who dress the same clothes, speak the same language in the identical groups. Similarities and differences are one of national identity's meanings (Smith 1994, pp.122-123).

Ethnic nationalism took shape to a large extent as a result of the fear of the ethnic communities after the collapse of classical empires such as Ottoman and Russia, to be colonized, and their effort to establish their own nation-state. Such nationalisms define the process of nation formation based on the assimilation of minority, granting privileges to the dominant ethnic groups and concept of citizenship.

On the other hand, it is emphasized that, on the other hand, nation-states, which are fundamentally shaped by ethnic nationalism are not connective and equalize but discriminator, that such nationalisms have a tendency to eliminate ethnic minorities (Sancar 2012, p. 46).

Nation is an imaginary community from the beginning to the end; it can exist only on condition that its members associate themselves with a collective body, which other member of the community will never encounter vis-à-vis. Imaginary is not only an *imaginary*, but also a mental reality. Not only the legitimacy of the state needs nationalism, but also nationalism needs the state for its own success. What we call nationalism is always about assimilation; because the nation, which is claimed to have a natural unity according to the principles of

nationalism, has to be created by gathering a generally different and diverse population around national character legends and symbols (Bauman 1998, pp. 190-193).

Nationalism is derivative of vulgar power, authoritarian mentality's projection on the modern world and still the most harmful ideology of our time (Mahçupyan 2005, p. 103).

Nationalism started to put in appearance in the public agenda and popular discourse by the middle of 90's. Seen as a rising and becoming a material to popular media at the beginning, nationalism came into the limelight 'seriously,' coincides with the date of April 18, 1999. MHP's⁵ taking more than 18% of the votes and becoming the second party to have the most representatives at the parliament in the general elections held at this date is also a result of this tendency; therefore, nationalism became prominent in the eyes of the public as a rising value. We can talk about at least three unofficial forms of nationalism: *Minority nationalisms* - we can suggest that among minority nationalisms, the most active one is Kurdish Nationalism – *Islamic nationalism and Turkish nationalism*. Özkırımlı suggests that minority nationalism developed as a reaction to the dominant nationalism, which aims to eliminate or assimilate social differentiation, and sought profit in providing more economic, cultural and political rights to a specific minority (Özkırımlı 2002, p.713).

For instance, official ideology clings to the concept of nation, it suggests that the only way to hold the individuals that form the nation together is to promote the concept of 'origin' it even crosses the line of racism by emphasizing the superiority of 'Turkish' race; on the other hand, it suggests that the nation is underdeveloped, and it is hard to improve with the value judgments of Oriental. It suggests Westernization as the only way to cope with these problems. For this reason, discussing a concept like Turkish identity can be possible only after the 1980's, when the world accelerates micro nationalism tendencies, attach specific importance to human rights, 'melt' the solid differences between poles-blocks, with the effect of external dynamic (Kahraman 2002, p.104). Mass media contributes to the reproduction of nationalism significantly both positively and by manipulating the public opinion, sometimes causing crises directly, providing basis for different forms of production, especially in music. The period following the arrest of Abdullah Öcalan is one of the examples of this. All these

⁵ MHP: Nationalist Movement Party.

practices make nationalism an inevitable part of our daily lives. Reproduction is an indispensable condition of not only nationalism, but also empowering an ideology, a world view or economic system. As a matter of fact, all political parties make use of nationalist ideology. Nationalism takes role in the process of society's integration or individual's seeing himself/herself as a part of the whole. System is nationalist or nationalism is the system itself. In this sense, perhaps the most significant function of reproduction is bringing nationalism to the centre and creating the necessary conditions for popularizing it (2002, p. 717).

Ayşegül Aydıngün suggests that, since it was founded, Turkey has been stuck in a point between nationalism, which is based on officially adopted citizenship and land/homeland relation principle, and nationalism based on ethnic relations, and could not make an extension in this respect. As a result of this, internalization of the definition of Turkish was prevented, and some citizens of different ethnic origins or sects felt themselves left out over the course of time (Aydıngün 2008, p. 11).

According to Amy Gutmann, two kinds of respect lie behind being recognized by everyone. 1. Respect to each individual's identity independent of one's gender, race and ethnic origins, and 2. respect to 'wrong parties' – this includes not only women, but also Asian Americans, Afro-Americans, Indian Americans and all the other minority groups living in United States - typical types of behaviours, manners, different world views (Habermas 2002, p. 113).

However, according to Stuart Hall, all the cultural structures can exist thanks to its opposing elements, or values which represent its contrary in terms of morals. First of all, he mentions about Freud and Lacan. After this mention, he says that, subjectivity can only arise and a sense of 'self' be formed through the symbolic and unconscious relations which the young child forges with a significant 'Other' which is outside itself. Hall states that difference and otherness are not enormous different each other.

These debates about difference and the Other have been introduced. They are not mutually exclusive since they refer to very different levels of analysis—the linguistic, the social, the cultural and the psychic levels respectively. 'Difference' is ambivalent. It can be both positive and negative (Hall 1997, p. 238).

On the other hand, Tanil Bora suggests that, in terms of nationalism, minorities within the nation-state are “others,” they are the images of enemy and stranger, their existence is exceptional or accidental (Bora, 2006, p. 81). When considered from this point of view, according to Bora, summary of assimilation is the claim that “There is no Kurdish, if there is, it is only a division of Turkishness; racism, on the other hand, claims that ‘There are Kurdish people, but they are our inferior, peer creatures.’ Official nationalism, while responding to racist discourse imperceptibly, it maintains assimilationist line ‘as a principle’ (Bora 2006, p. 232).

Ömer Laçiner suggests that religious or secular Sunni Muslims, who constitute the majority in the definition of nation, have conflicted with each other in terms of subjects which are imposed by the state such as life style and economic policy, even solidified in opposition; but remained ignorant, insensitive to treating non-Muslims as if they are foreign-internal enemies, revealing the reality of Alawism, prohibiting the languages of ethnic Muslim group who are different from general Turkish culture or assimilating them by main force; destruction, pain, violence and humiliation of non-Muslims and Muslim ethnic sectarian groups, particularly Kurdish and Alewi people (Laçiner 2011, p. 10).

Tufan Aytav asserts that a uniform nation, which doesn't harbour any differences within itself have been ingendered since the beginning of republic period. In this concept of nation state, which conflict with our historical and social realities, only Turkish people were taken into account. The motto of ‘How happy is the one who says I am a Turk’ has been replaced with the concept of ‘How happy is the one who is Turk.’ Non-Muslim people were forced to immigrate. Because it was impossible to assimilate them. Jewish, Greek, Armenian, Assyrians were under this category. On the other hand, people, who were Muslim but not Turkish were subjected to assimilation. Their identities were denied. The greatest objection to this policy was put forward by Kurdish people. According to the system, the Kurdish were actually

Turkish people, who thought themselves Kurdish. But Kurdish people could never be convinced to this claim. In other words, this was to be the Other in Turkey. They had two options; they would either deny their identities, adapt to the society and the system, or leave this land. There were some others, who preferred the third alternative. They hid their identities and continued to live in this country (Aytav 2011, pp. 13-15).

Zizek uses the definition '*pleasure theft*' when speaking of nationalism. According to him, nationalism provides a privileged pleasure explosion to social sphere. After all, national motive is nothing but a way to arrange the pleasures of the members of an ethnic groups through myths. We always pin the crime of extreme pleasure on the "other." The other tries to steal our pleasure by destructing-our life style and/or has access to a sort of latent, perverse pleasure. According to the racist, the other is either a workhorse who tries to steal our job, or a lazy person, who makes a living by our labour (Zizek 2011, p. 372). Zizek asks why the Other remains as the Other. What is the reason of our hatred to 'it,' our hatred due to its mere existence? That is the hatred against the pleasure of the Other. This will be the most general formula to modern racism we witness today. Hating certain things, which the Other enjoys The Other is the other in my area. For this reason, the underlying cause of racism is the hatred to my own pleasure. There is no pleasure apart from that of my own. If the Other is inside me, if it occupies the space of externality, then the feeling of hatred belongs to me (2011, p. 373). What we have instead of surrendering to the pleasure of the Other is the arrangement of pleasure as fantasy.

According to Lacan's theory, after all, pleasure is always the pleasure of the Other; that is, it is the pleasure, which is assumed and attributed to the other; correspondingly, the hatred to the pleasure of the Other is one's hatred to himself/herself. The logic of '*Pleasure Theft*' exemplifies this thesis perfectly. He suggests that fantasies about the superior sexual power of black people, particular working and financial enthusiasm of Jewish or Japanese people, are various way for us to arrange our own pleasure.

We feel satisfaction from fantasizing about the pleasure of the Other, from this variable attitude. Attractive image of the Other earns concrete to our deepest segmentation, to 'what is

more inside of us than ourselves.' Hatred to the Other, is the hatred to the extremeness of our own pleasure (Zizek 2011, p. 375).

Günter Seufert states that each cultural structure exists thanks to the boundary between itself and what represent the values which are outside and contrary to those of its own. In this respect, an 'Other' is needed for the stability of social unit (Öncü 2000, p. 222).

Özçalık⁶ makes a reference to the Other my means of the concept of racism. He suggests that racism represent the most extreme point of experiences and it is the way a danger takes shape in a gradual and constantly alarming manner. In this phase of racism, the 'Other' is either eliminated or humiliated in various times.

Girard explains this as follows: Each individual in every culture feels himself/herself 'different' from the others and regards these 'differences' legitimate and necessary. While glorification of difference is not a radical and progressive tendency, it is nothing but an abstract expression of a worldview, which shared by all cultures. Each individual is endowed with the tendency to see oneself not only different, but 'the most different' from all the others; because each culture feeds this feeling of distinctness in the individuals that constitute itself (Girard 2005, p. 30).

Akyol emphasizes that national History started with the Huns, and finished with the emancipation of Hatay and death of Atatürk. The history ends with Atatürk's death. Subjects such as what Second World War was, what kind lessons were learned from this experience were all beside the point. According to Akyol, high school education contained no information about the diversity of Turkish society. You probably hear the word Kurdish only once in Turkish high school curriculums: When 'Kurdish Rise (Teâli) Association,' which was one of the unfavourable associations' in the years of Independence War is mentioned, the only impression we have about Kurdish people is that they are prejudicial people (Akyol

⁶ (<http://www.daplatform.com/images/otekilesme%20ve%20islevleri.pdf>)

2009, p.16). No society can be homogenous, it becomes more diverse and multiple over the course of modernization (2009, p. 30).

Schmitt emphasizes that, when a tendency contrary to homogenous society takes effect, this constitutes an extraordinary condition, which threatens the peace of the country for the state (Habermas 2002, p. 43).

The other is the other, human societies are diverse. This difference is inevitably interpreted as a state of inferiority. When "Self" appraises the "Other," it makes uses of the criteria of "my" culture and confuses this with the culture in general. In this case, the Other can be nothing but the incomplete state of itself. The Other is accepted with this difference; but it is frozen in a state of impossible inferiority. The difference between itself and the Other is attempted to be maintained by excluding, ostracizing, and in the most extreme case, by exterminating the different. It suggests that each person is equal only by virtue of being a human regardless of significant differences in terms of mental and moral capacity or sufficiency, and claims that humans are equal in terms of freedom due to having the same motive and tendency despite the fact that their performance in terms of talent is not equal. It claims that the Other is another Self. Therefore, there is no restriction between humans in the sense of whether human rights, pride of each individual and the respect for the individual (Schnapper 2011, pp. 26-27).

Schnapper, seeks the origins of perceiving the Other as different and inferior in the culture Ancient Greece. There were lots of oppositions regulating how the Others should be perceived and what kind of relations must be established with hem: Native and foreign, Greek and Barbarian, citizen and non-citizen, free citizen and slave, man and woman. There was no doubt that various categories were not different from each other. These differences were considered different. They were not considered disgraceful or examples of inequality. Mentality of inequality assumes a common norm. Equality enthusiasm could be expressed only in a small community, which consisted of citizens organized as political groups (2011, p. 36).

According to Leyla Neyzi, Turkish nationalism fictionalizes a singular identity. The category of Turkish conceals the fact that majority of Turkish society comes from significantly different ethnic, religious and linguistic backgrounds (Neyzi 2004, p. 9). In practical terms the concept of Turkish still refers to people with Sunni origin, who preferably talks Turkish, and Balkan population. This insistence towards a singular national identity constitutes an impediment to the realization of the fact that individuals of Muslim majority actually come from different ethnic and religious backgrounds (2004, p. 145). Neyzi summarizes this situation as follows: According to him, founders of Turkish Republic aim to create a Turkish identity, which is based on a single language and ethnic identity (2004, p. 196).

It is known that Turkish nationalism originates from the defining Turkishness in ethnic and political terms. Turkishness adopted by Turkish nationalism became open to some people who were not of Turkish origins ethnically, but not all of them. Population Exchange policies followed in the first years of Republic partly showed this binary logic, the mentality that Turkishness is a possible state which can not be achieved by everyone and even who can not be Turkish. As is known, during the population exchange after Independence War, while Orthodox Christians who could not talk Turkish had to leave the country, Muslims, who lived in the Balkans and could not speak Turkish were accepted to the country.

As it can be inferred from this example, while certain non-Turk elements were accepted to Turkey and Turkishness, some of the 'non-Turks', who lived in Turkey and talked Turkish had to leave the country. This example clearly pointed this fact: While being Muslim is the basic element of being a Turkish, not being a Muslim was a natural impediment from being a Turkish. Due to the face that they were Muslims, Kurdish people's being within the range of the state's Turkification policies was by the nature of this process. As a matter of fact, this was what actually happened. Kurdish people were regarded as one of the Turkifiable Muslim elements of Anatolia (Yeğen 2011, pp. 147-148).

In official ideology, one of the most materialized forms of Turkish nationalism is observed in the interpretations of the phrase 'How happy is he who says I am a Turk.' Although this sentence sometimes implies the fact that descending from "Turkish" race is such a pride and

pleasing honour, it is sometimes used to prove that Turkish nationality actually doesn't involve any ethnical or racist elements, that it is an inclusive, integrative form of nationalism, so anyone who says that he/she is a Turk can be a subject of "Turkish Nation" category (Saraçoğlu 2011, p. 53). According to Saraçoğlu, who analyzed the general perception about Kurdish people in Izmir⁷, Kurdish people can be described as a population who are pushed to the suburbs of the cities to be unemployed in labour processes or to be condemned, as the phrase goes, to the 'dirties' works. It is expressed in ascriptions to their ethnic identity such as 'people who live by unjust enrichment,' 'ignorant ones,' 'occupiers' (2011, p. 183).

The characteristic of nationalism was its motive to bring Turkish society to the same level with contemporary civilizations, and strengthen the country. Modernist nationalist attached importance to creating a consciousness of Turkishness among Turkish people. Therefore, thesis such as the idea Middle East Origin civilization, Sun-Language theory, the thesis that Turkish culture influenced many other cultures were developing in parallel with economic and scientific idea (Mardin 1990, p. 10).

3.2 FASCISM'S UNDERSTANDING OF SPIRIT OF THE MASSES: SCAPEGOAT

Girard suggests that we all have legitimate hostilities and the universe is full of scapegoats (Girard 2005, p. 57). French historian Girard, developed one of the most important scapegoat theories in literature. In archaic societies, scapegoat is a person who is sacrificed for someone else, that is, a substitution. When a chief commits a sin, the scapegoat is sacrificed for the chief's redemption; in this sense, it is a requirement of judicial system. Over the course of time, a legal system took its place and sacrifice tradition was abandoned. The signs, criteria to choose the sacrifice stem from not only the differences in the heart of the system, but from differences external to the system. Off-system difference is terrifying, because it reveals the truth, relativity and fragility of the system. Religious, ethnic, national minorities are never objected because of their typical differences; they are blamed because they didn't differentiate as much as expected, that is, not differentiated at all. Sacrifices are chosen not

⁷ This analysis is a study conducted in Izmir in the years 2006-2007. It is based on the data obtained from detailed interviews with 90 persons from Izmir.

because of the crimes ascribed to them, but because of the sacrificial features they bear, because there is a guilty relation between them and the crisis (2005, pp. 30-33). Scapegoat have influence on only human relations, which are strangled by the crisis, but it gives the impression that it also influences other external factors, plagues, drought and other objective disasters. After scapegoat is accepted as the only reason for the disaster this time, this disaster literally becomes its object and it becomes an object, which can be used for rewarding or punishing in an arbitrary manner (2005, pp. 61-65).

As a matter of fact, mass spirit understanding of fascism can also be associated with 'Scapegoat' myth. Stating that an Other is always needed, Bauman confirm this fact as follows:

The boundary line between internal group and external group, between "us" and "them" refers to distinctions, which are defended with full effort and care. It can be said that external group is beneficial, even inevitable for internal group, because it reveals the identity of internal group and contributes to its acting in solidarity with its consistency. Therefore, favourite principle of every politician, who strives to gain the support of the public by stimulating the feelings of patriotism and partisan solidarity, is this: "Those who are not one of us are against us" (1998, p. 65).

Interpreting the concept of 'Scapegoat' in terms of religion, Girard makes references to the Bible in his study. According to Girard, Bibles reveal the scapegoat mechanism everywhere and particularly inside of us by not using the same terms with us, but without ignoring anything, which must be known to protect us from insidious effects (Girard 2005, p. 152). Bibles constantly reveal what historical villains, particularly mythological villains conceal, that is, their sacrifices are scapegoats. In Bibles, the term *Lamb of God* is used instead of the concept of scapegoat (2005, p. 161).

When addressed in race theory, 'Scapegoats' are always condemned to be the Other. The basic foundations that German tyranny clinged to was also Race Theory. According to national-socialists, 'integrating with other races' always results in the collapse of the 'master race.' Moreover, even collapse of civilization is a result of the intercourse between two people from different races. According to this point of view, the noblest mission of a nation is to maintain its pureness and take great pains for this purpose. This theory was applied to chasing after Jewish people in Germany and occupied lands and hurting them. Reich interprets this theory with a metaphor like this: he points out the principle that each mammal's mating with an opposite sex from the same specie is a 'firm natural law.' However, extraordinary conditions

and circumstances such as captivity may allow for the violation of this law, intercourse between two persons from different races. But the nature objects to such conducts and takes its revenge by all available means such as castrating these animals or restricting their reproductivity. Springs, which are born as a result of the intercourse between two organisms on different levels, are 'average level.' On the other hand, the nature tends to maintain this level high; in other words, degenerating the races is against nature's will (Reich 1975, p. 104).

What A. Hitler states in his book *Mein Kampf* is quite similar to this theory:

“Mixing of two races and resulting degradation of racial level is the only reason for civilizations to disappear; because humans perish not as a result of ward, but losing the power of resistance they have in their pure blood” (Hitler 2005, p. 324).

Humankind has developed quite a peculiar understanding; according to this, it is not a mammal, but a 'human,' which is purified from qualifications such as 'evil' and 'bestial.' Humankind wanders away from wild animals by all the means available, and protects the culture and civilization, which separates it from animals in order to confirm its superiority (Reich 1975, p. 351).

Beyond all the words of humans, the song remains the same: “I am not an animal, I invented and built machines; no animal was able to build a machine. I don't have a reproductive organ, like that of the animal.” The origin of the opposition between "superior human being" and "inferior human being" lies in the fundamental mentality of the state and individual. Myth of Holy Books, which claim that mankind is created in the image of God, that it is superior to animals, is an expression of the fact that humans push their bestial side to the depths of subconsciousness. However, their bodily functions, characteristics such as birth, death, sexual needs, dependence on the nature are always forgotten, causing the humankind to forget its origins. Mankind tries to achieve the tendency that actually lies in the heart of everyone, whether 'holy' or 'national,' with all their efforts. The archaic hatred to science, which is not only about machine production stems from this. It took thousands of years for Darwin to prove that no one can refute the bestial origin of humans. The same applies to Freud's proving that a child is primarily and completely a sexual being. And what a fuss did the mammal called human made when it learned it is a male or female animal! There is a close connection between Human's 'feeling of superiority' over humans and the 'feeling of superiority' which

separates it from black, Jewish, French people. Being a 'Master' is better than being an animal (Reich 1975, pp. 356-360).

Within the context of 'feeling of superiority' in humans, one of the Scapegoats of Turkey due to their identity crisis, are Kurdish people. Binnaz Toprak carried out a study⁸ on this subject. Toprak emphasized that they made interviews in many universities of Anatolia and one of the topics, which the students complained about most was the intervention of the so called "idealistic" young groups on their life styles. Most of the students interviewed in various universities complain that universities' dormitories and canteens are controlled by "nationalist chiefs and they exert pressure and violence on students with different identities, who object to them (Toprak 2010, p. 35). For instance, when we asked a student with Kurdish origin who came from a city in South East Anatolia to Trabzon, Karadeniz Technical University, whether he feels more comfortable and secure at the campus or other locations in the city, his answer was "only at my home" (2010, p. 31). We met young people with Kurdish origins only in a few cities. It is stated that most of the persons they see, came from cities of South East to the city they live in for university education, and they all seem to resign themselves to discrimination, repression and violence. Toprak states that students parodize the real stories about how they are beaten, being swears, and give the impression that laughing instead of becoming furious with an instinctive reflex is the only way to protect their psychologies. A young person who is studying in Trabzon even said that they carry out all kinds of communication from the real estate agency to the landlord through their friends from Western cities. It is emphasized that most of the Kurdish students who are interviewed say that, when they 'confess' that they are Kurdish, most people cut off communication with them. Students in Balıkesir say that they have to hang up the phone when their family elders who don't know Turkish call them when they are in the bus or other public transport vehicles. A female student goes to the grocer in her neighbourhood and men who were waiting in front of grocer's door teased her saying "How can such a beautiful girl be a terrorist?" The students state that people in the neighbourhood know that they are Turkish, that's why they are

⁸ The fieldwork of this study conducted with detailed interviews in Erzurum, Kayseri, Malatya, Sivas, Batman, Trabzon, Denizli, Aydın, Eskişehir Adapazarı and Balıkesir, was carried out between December 2007 – July 2008.

exposed to such verbal abuse. The study conducted by Binnaz Toprak, reveal the current situation in Turkey. Toprak emphasizes that not even one student thinks of living in the city they are studying, the common aim shared by all of them is to finish their education and leave the city as soon as possible (Toprak 2010, pp. 42-46).

3.3 ON THE MOVIE *MAJORITY*: GÜL THE SCAPEGOAT

“MAJORITY”

Production: 2010

Genre: Drama

Director: Seren Yüce

Scenario: Seren Yüce

Producer: Önder Çakar, Sevil Demirci

“I used to say, This is a Turk, this is Bulgarian and this is Greek! I did such horrible things for the homelands, boss, you'd get the shivers. I cut men, burnt villages, and raped women. Why? Because this was Bulgarian and that one's whatever. Now I frequently remind myself of this: Hey you goddamn, dirty, stupid man! So I became sober. Now I look at people and say: This is a good man, and this is bad. Now I don't even mind whether they are good or nor, I swear I don't even care about it as I grow old.

Hell, it doesn't matter whether he is good or not! I feel sorry for all of them! [...] Oh, you miserable you! We are all brothers after all! We are all the flesh that the worms will eat after we die! (Kazancakis⁹ 1982, p. 256-267).

When we address the topic within the framework of the movie *Çoğunluk* (Seren Yüce, 2010), being a part of a group and ostracizing those who are not one of ‘us.’ Director Seren Yüce

⁹ The character in the novel by Nikos Kazancakis, Alexis Zorba works for a young businessman he calls ‘Boss.’ In one conversation, when young businessman asks him whether he –as ever fought for his country, he gives this answer.

also starts from this idea and pans the camera to a family, which is the smallest representative of the masses; meanwhile, the film develops around the main character Gül.

In the film, we see a nuclear family¹⁰. In industrialized modern societies, families are defined as 'modern family' or 'urban family' since they are generally observed in big cities. With modernization, family structure turns into nuclear families over the course of time. In Turkey, two types of families are observed in both cities and rural areas. Traditional family, on the other hand, continues to maintain patriarchal family structure (Adak 2005, p. 57).

Personal features of Kemal also make an impression upon the audience, which corresponds with the definition of patriarchal family. He is the symbol of power in the household. Man has become the only person who holds the power, particularly in male-dominant societies. In this context, the father represents authority and assumes the role of being the head of the family. Women and children, on the other hand, are obliged to obey the authority and do all their duties. Kemal is a father figure who is identified with the sentence 'If I say you will do it, you will do it, that's all!' In the process of socialization, the child first knows the authority and learns that he/she has to consent to authority (Yavaşgel 2004, p.149). In this exact context, we observe that Mertkan can not escape the authority of his father and make his present felt as an individual. For Mertkan, the awareness that one has to consent to authority becomes an existential problematic in society.

Father Kemal is actually a man, who is lonely in the society, he complies with the requests of society and founded a family. He continues his reign over his children and wife as it is expected from him. The most significant instrument for the state to spread its fundamental ideology is father figure. In the movie, we see an 'Imperious Family,' as Reich puts it. According to Reich, since imperious society reproduces itself in individual personality structures with the help of imperious family, political reactionism regards imperious family as the basis of the 'head education of the state and civilization' (Reich 1975, p. 131). For Reich, family is also an economical institution and racist state is represented by father in the family;

¹⁰ With its simplest definition, the nuclear family is a family, which consists of husband, wife and unmarried children.

therefore, as the head of the family, father becomes the most valuable tool of state power. Imperious position of the father reflects the political function it assumes, it represents its relationship with imperious state. Indeed, the father adopts the attitude his superior exhibits to him, and urgently instils his children, particularly his sons, destitute against established authority. For the very reason, racist state reproduces itself in the imperious structure of the family in terms of ideas (1975, pp.84-89).

As a matter of fact, when Reich makes reference to the fact that racist state is represented by the father within the family in his definition of father, we observe that Kemal is a father who fits to this definition. In the opening scene of the film, there is a little boy who follows his father in the forest; the audience meets character Mertkan in this scene. His father leads the way and Mertkan follows him. Mertkan is a little boy, who has to walk on the path of his father, who holds the power. When he grows up, he will transform into a father just like Kemal and assume the role of a new representative of dominant ideology; the new image of state power will be Mertkan.

When we evaluate fascist state understanding within the framework of Turkey, 1924 Constitution is regarded as the most obvious indicator of transformation of nationalism, in other words, shifting from the idea of making Turkish people dominant to organizing the state as a nation-state. As it is stated in the rationale offered by Parliamentary Commission for 1924 Constitution, from now on, "Our state is a nation." Therefore, "the state doesn't recognize anyone other than Turks." Nation state is founded on the basis of this idea. By the period after the proclamation of Republic, Turkish nationalism doesn't recognizes the rights of Kurdish people, although accepts their ethnic presence, and invite them to be Turkish. 'A normal assimilation method will be put into practice, but after a while, it will not be necessary to 'invite' Kurdish people to become Turkish. Nevertheless, Turkish nationalism, which consider Kurdish people invisible, couldn't achieve the same success in making Kurdish problem invisible (Yeğen 2002, pp. 883-884). The belief that the distance of Kurdish people, who are Muslim residents of Anatolia, from Turkishness could easily be closed became dominant in Turkish nationalism. This idea didn't fizzle out completely. Most of the Kurdish people became Turks. Kurdish people become Turkish and showed that they are loyal subjects of political community; in other words, they showed that they are the citizens of their homeland as distinct from non-Muslim residents of Anatolia. Having believed that Kurdish

people would become Turkish, Turkish nationalism had a huge difference by the end of 1990's. Kurdish people did not become Turkish and they didn't intend to do.

In other words, Turkish nationalism, which yearned to have a country, which is dominated by a homogenized culture with one language, had to face with a reality, which was impossible to admit: Apart from Turkishness, there was another element with a linguistic and territorial integrity and this existence could not be extinguished even after decades. The ground on which anxieties about Kurdish problem on the part of Turkish nationality are located, consists of these elements (Yeğen 2011, pp. 120-121).

When we look at the history, we observe that Kurdish people have either been ignored or 'Otherised.' Gül also animates with a character like this. She is from Van, she has to work in order to stand on her own two feet; she is also a young woman who has ideals of completing her university education. As a matter of fact, we realize that the work 'Kurdish' is never used in the movie. Father Kemal's talk to his son Mertkan : 'Look son, those people want to divide the homeland. Soon you will have your own family, your children,' reinforces these assumptions about Gül. We observe that some other party is degraded without who she/he is or taking into account the primary virtue of being a human; fate of each individual is shaped according to his/her identity card. In the movie, 'The other' is not one of us. It just lives its own destiny. Its changing reality is the fact that the Other will always remain as the Other. On connection with the statement above, we can suggest that there is a segregation in terms of the concept of the 'Others' within the society. This segregation actually is indicative of society's introversion. People don't seem to be enthusiastic about developing common values within the structure of a multicultural society. Us is defined as 'Turkish-Muslim-Sunni,' the Other is defined as Kurdish (Toprak 2010, p. 207).

The living order of father Kemal is typical of a Turkish and Muslim family man, who locks his wife inside a house and doesn't pay any attention to her, likens his son to himself, owner of a construction company, lives in Bahçelievler, swears abundantly, breaks the rearview mirrors of the cars. In the film, while the oppressor is associated with religion and Turkishness, oppressed is associated with Kurdishness.

The character Gül is also otherised in line with her Kurdish identity, she is ostracized from the society with her Kurdish identity even if she is associated with the concepts of Muslim and Sunni. Levinas emphasizes that the tendency of human to annihilate the obstacles he/she comes up with has been present since the beginning of history, and suggest that this behaviour has become an instinctive attitude¹¹ (Levinas 1991, pp. 114-116) Father Kemal performs the task he is assigned with 'duly' instead of questioning the system and discrimination, and decides who should be ostracized by himself. In this sense, what father Kemal does is exactly to implement the discourse of ethnic nationality. Discourse of nationalism, is perceived as if it is instilled to one's own body and an integral part of the individual's identity. Also, this discourse promotes the idea of regarding individuals as if they are subjects of a country not because they are in the network of concrete interpersonal relations, but they are a part of a set of moral equivalences. As a result of this, since family is regarded as the values of the nation on paper, nationalist ideology praises family bonds (Calhoun 2007, pp. 65-66). In this context, father Kemal allows ethnic identity discrimination to reproduce itself constantly within the family; therefore, discourse of nationalism takes strength from family ties.

In this case, father Kemal is simply the incarnation of the word '*Majority*.' In the movie, the reality presented to the audience so clear that the audience feels it as intense as a personal experience; it is a sort of story, which we are all familiar with, but keep ignoring somehow. The movie emphasizes the predicaments of daily life and the audience may sometimes witness that actors and actresses are presented like persons who are 'one of us.' The family presented in the film really bear resemblance to some people we always witness in our lives; it is a realistic picture of our society whether we admit it or not.

¹¹ Just as the plants grow by pushing aside the other small plants around them or animals destroy the impediments they encounter in the struggle to survive, human beings are similar in their first state; Levinas calls this state of human kind "instinctive anthology." (Levinas, 1991, pp. 114-116).

4.WOMAN HAS NO NAME

According to Taylor, the most significant problem for the woman about being a woman is the fact that a larger or stronger segment of the society is not aware of the sexual identity of woman. Since the identity of woman is used for oppression and exploitation, the woman can not leave the role that is assigned to her, and therefore cannot exhibit herself as an individual with her own talents (Taylor 2000, p.95).

While no relationship which can undermine the sovereignty of middle class white heterosexual man is regarded as normal, associations which imply that women needs men are made in the production of the object of desire. In this case, members of a heterosexual couple are not only different from each other, also a master-slave relationship is established between them within the framework of their intercourse and status (Masdar 2006, p. 20).

Fatmagül Berktaş, puts emphasis on invisibility and commodification of women in the history. Associating woman with the teacher, particularly the dark side of the nature is not only typical of Ancient Greece, but is a phenomenon which has been present since the beginning of civilization. In woman-man relationships, the woman defines her own status as the 'Other.' Defining herself as the other, the woman associates the man with the civilization and culture he represents. As it can be inferred from the words of Berktaş, while almost everything that is good is attributed to masculine character, personal characteristics, which can be described as 'dark,' define women (Berktaş 2003, p. 132). Since the beginning of the period when patriarchal ideology was being shaped, while men have been associated with rationality, civilization and culture, women have been associated with irrational nature and sensuality. The person, who is not characterized as the other, is primarily a man, as much as being human, white and bourgeois.

Classical patriarchal ideology of pre-modernity period used family as the metaphor of political system. All the relations are under the sovereignty of the father and hierarchical, the king has a paternal power over the public just like a father. Traditional concept of masculinity,

based on the universal understanding that women are naturally inferior compared to men. In this case, it is natural when most men feel less capable and 'masculine' as a reaction to each liberation act achieved by women (2003, pp.153-155).

Society assigns some social duties to woman. For instance, according to popular belief, it is necessary to be emotional and patient to raise a child, and it is necessary to be strong and durable like a man in order to be a soldier. As a matter of fact, the difference between a mother and a soldier is not biological, but social. If biology is an unalterable 'fate,' roles of the genders becomes socially unchangeable, either (Sancar 2012, p. 24). In this context, Judith Cutler puts emphasis on social gender in her book *Gender Trouble*. According to Butler, social gender is cultural construction of gender. Judith Butler explains 'widely-known' words of Simone de Beauviour as follows: She suggests that, when Beauviour says "*One is not born a woman but becomes a woman,*" she emphasizes the social construction of gender. According to Baeuviour, it is obvious that the individual is a woman, but it is always a matter of cultural imperative; woman are always the Others. In the existentialist analytics of being a woman, the subject has always been a man; the male has been associated with what is universal and woman could not separate herself from the 'Other.' According to Baeuviour, social gender is always acquired; it emphasizes the idea that there is no asexual person, and that gender is an imperative requirement of being a human (Butler 2003, pp. 54-58). It is observed that a patriarchal administration mentality takes effect in every field of society from distribution of tasks within the family to state management, economical structures to other institutions of society. In this distribution of tasks, social gender roles become prominent (Akal 1994, p. 14). The woman, who has been manipulated as the 'unpaid household worker' for the 'home management' which is prepared in accordance with the 'family roles' within 'patriarchal' social structure for centuries, was not needed in different areas of society. Considering the fact that women's benefiting from education opportunities or participating in work life became possible only in the recent past, there is nothing to be surprised about this tendency. The fact that head of the household is the father, authority is in the hands of the father, mother's being defined as the woman of the household and mother of her children, causes the child to perceive concepts of division of labor and role in this manner (Dahlerup 1984, p. 49).

From the perspective of gender relationship, Asuman Suner comments this situation on the new wave Turkish films. She says that women are not active subjects, but as object of male

desire. She highlights that in new wave Turkish cinema, males appear dominant, namely male characters embody power, contrary to female characters (Suner 2010, p.163).

Serpil Sancar also put emphasis on woman and evaluates the issue within the framework of the relationship between woman and nationalism. A policy toward telling the women to stay at home and obeying to their husbands was pursued. Moreover, in the late 19th century and early 20th century, two world wars in Europe, other regional wars and colonial adventures always put forward the institutions and apparatus, which reinforce masculine domination. Nationalist thought reduces women to biological reproducers with a heterosexual perspective and defines women as child-bearing machine. In this context, biological construction of the nation can be defined as the duty of the women. In this sense, care and training of the children, who are born are expected from the woman as a national task (Sancar 2012, p. 57). Deniz Kandiyoti ascribes a more positive meaning to the relationship between woman and nationalism. In Muslim world, seeking a modern family is simultaneous with the rise of nationalist movements. Ottoman society's starting to criticize women's not being literate, being locked in the house and violation of half of the population's human rights was simultaneous with the process of creating a nation on the basis of friendship relations and stable monogamy, in which wife and husband to be choose each other with their free will (Kandiyoti 1995, p. 107). Kandiyoti emphasizes that nationalism took credit for the liberation of woman and created a new discourse; it adapts this approach related to the liberation of woman and republic as an aspect of official state ideology (1995, p. 236).

4.1 WOMAN IN TURKEY: “IT IS VERY HARD TO BE A WOMAN”¹²

Although it can be suggested that the word 'motherland' which refers to the land, on which a nation lives within certain geographical boundaries, implies femininity, as long as the power, which founds the state is masculine, political power continues to be defined as masculine. Accordingly, Turkish family model focused on creating a new society.

¹² This is sentence by a woman from Anatolia, whom Binnaz Toprak interviewed.

Looking back from now, the recent past is observed as a process of social development, the lead actors of which were modern women, who strived to build modernization starting from the family itself. In this process, women didn't exist in equal terms with men in terms of re-establishing state sovereignty; they tried to establish modern Turkish families, under the leadership of male reformers, who were occupied with establishing a state (Sancar 2012, p.207).

The desire of being different from the West in order to be like Western civilization, which forms the basis of founding a Turkish nation, were established with genderized meanings in the minds of Turkish nationalists. Science, technology, and modern nation, state, military and economy, which will be shaped in accordance with these principles, have a 'masculine' quality: Requirements of a universal world are based on logic and power; on the other hand, 'national culture' world, which is different from the West, are feminine; it is symbolized with the genuineness of religious belief, colours, household and family life. Man-oriented regime, which is one of the founding strategies of Turkish modernization, and Turkish woman, one of the fundamental elements of this regime, are actually different from the West (2012, p. 127).

According to Binnaz Toprak, who evaluate women within the context of Islamic culture, the way Islam's dominant interpretations deal with women is really problematical and when this point of view combine with the traditions in Anatolia, it is the woman who are most severely affected by the repressive conservatism of cities .Referring to how women become the 'Other,' Binnaz Toprak states that woman are isolated from the urban life especially at night time and when they go out at night, for instance go to a restaurant, they have the impression that there are only men living in the city in this city. She emphasized that when cities of Anatolia become deprived of woman in the streets, especially after dark, they look like military camps subject to a strict discipline rather than cities (Toprak 2010, pp. 88,89). Binnaz Toprak suggests that, in several cities of Anatolia, definitions of "sin and disgrace" become associated with concepts of "virtue." She states that women's right to make their own decisions about their life is prevented (2010, p.110).

She points out that, in the context of women's defending their rights not only in the streets, There are lots of 'woman realities' and the role and status of the women is fundamentally determined on the basis of gender discrimination. Even in Western countries, which regards granting women right to vote as a 'progressive' development, women had to content themselves with this right and stayed out of political activity. However, woman had to fight for more than 100 years in order to be treated as 'equal citizens' in terms of right to vote, but they procured acceptance only at the beginning of this century.

It is emphasized that significant changes took place in terms of the roles of women after Second World War (McGlen 1984, p. 85).

For instance, women have a restricted competitive power over men in the working life due to the fact that household and family maintain their importance. Women don't have any chance to compete with men in terms of high-level tasks, which require a lot of time, energy and responsibility. Similar to the most of the world, lots of women work in the lower levels of public and private sectors, but there are few women who are working in management levels (Çitçi 1982, pp. 232-248). According to the popular belief, traditional roles ascribed to women must be maintained; therefore it doesn't seem easy for women to increase their interest in public sphere or opening to the public sphere without engaging in any role conflicts. As a matter of fact, there is a segment of urban woman, who are open to change and contemporary values, and who seem to have taken significant steps towards independence and freedom. Although Şirin Tekeli doesn't use the term 'Other' for woman, she uses the word 'victim,' which has a quite close meaning to the Other (Çitçi 1982, pp. 232-248).

4.2 ALWAYS THE OTHER: WOMEN IN THE MOVIE “MAJORITY”

Ostracizing is a very old problem. Even many fairytales and myths develop around the theme of ostracizing (Estes 2003, p. 193). Due to its immense power of degrading feminine and misunderstanding bridge-making nature of masculinity, the culture generally suppresses woman with unsolvable and meaningless problems and prevent the women to manifest her internal self (2003, p. 354). Deniz Kandiyoti also suggests that even if humanity of woman is interrogated, the femininity of women will never be scrutinized (Kandiyoti 1997, p. 83).

When we look at the present, women generally assume the role of the principle woman of the household and they leave the task of the 'hero' to the 'masculine' character. The reason behind this reality is that women have been degraded for years and they are the living but ignored individual of the household. According to Fatmagül Berktaş, who evaluates women's being locked in the house within the framework of republic ideology, official ideology of Republic seem to favor women's entering the public sphere, have a profession, and leaving their home. But when it is subjected to a closer inspection, it is understood that 'the new good woman' of Kemalist intellectuals dream is also a domestic person, who adopts her national duties and 'live for the others' (Berktaş 2003, p. 163).

The mother, Nazan in the movie *Majority* by Seren Yüce also presents a personal profile quite similar to this definition. While cleaning women Şükriye and Gül are observed as individuals who try to survive outside the household somehow, the mother, Nazan only lives inside the house isolated from the life outside. Although she is stigmatized as the 'Other' because of being a mother, her fate doesn't bear any resemblance to that of Gül or cleaning woman Şükriye. The mother Nazan lives locked behind four walls in accordance with the orders of ideology¹³ and takes her household works as her duties.

According to Aksu Bora, whether paid or not, domestic work is always regarded as the 'work of woman.' Housework doesn't yield any tangible, concrete results or they are consumed in a short period of time. They are conducted in private sphere, don't bring any profit, they are produced only for their use value. The fact that these works are surrounded by human relations cause them to be evaluated as 'the labour of love' rather than real work. (Aksu 2005, p.10). In our culture, womanhood is fundamentally defined in terms of 'household' independent of variables such as age, education, class, and this definition is constantly reproduced. Therefore, house and house works are evaluated in terms of key areas for understanding the construction of woman subjectivity (2005, p. 21). Although 'being a housewife' is attributed to women's 'natural' tendencies and characteristics, it is a historical position. Separation of house and workplace with the development and extension of capitalist relations of production, household's becoming a place outside the economy, and attributing it a consumer position in terms of economy, are all the phenomena of last two hundred and fifty

¹³ Ideology is a phenomenon, which is based on the importance of symbolic thinking in our life to a large extent (Mardin 1992, p. 117).

years. Regarding the house as an innocent and clean place, outside the sordidness of the world is one of the most important, perhaps the most important patterns of our culture (2005, p.59). In this sense, the housework conducted by mother Nazan, has become a part of routine life; same work is done all the time, but cleaning, preparing the meals, shopping never ends; these works repeat themselves every day.

Definition of Aksu Bora actually seems to make a reference to not punishing the mother who stays inside the house, because mother Nazan is positioned in the house, which is characterized as innocent and clean.

The father Kemal comes home after returning from work. Welcoming him at the entrance of the house, Nazan asks 'How are you?' The man replies this question only with a 'good.' This is quite a short conversation; we observe that the father doesn't feel asking the mother how she is doing. When considered from the perspective of the father Kemal, how the woman is doesn't have any importance. As the permanent 'unpaid worker' of the house, she is how she is always supposed to be. According to father Kemal, the only problem for a woman who is stuck behind four walls and does the same things everyday, could be not knowing which meal to cook the next day. The woman characterizes herself as the 'servant of the house,' but seems to come to terms with this situation in the current system although she has complaints about it.

Mother Nazan not only positions herself as the 'Other;' actually the woman re-defines herself by means of the concept of 'us'¹⁴ Nazan otherizes other persons, too.

In one of the scenes of the movie, mother Nazan has a heart-to-heart talk with the cleaner of the house. After the cleaning woman Şükriye is gone, when her son Mertkan says 'She still stinks' she replies her with a statement like 'she is a peasant woman, you can't expect her to wear perfume.' According to Bakhtin¹⁵ Self can know anything about itself through the

¹⁴ When Bauman explains the concept of the Other within the context of 'us' and 'them,' he uses 'us' in the sense of the group we belong (Bauman 1998, p. 51).

¹⁵ Self's knowledge about itself, is restricted to the Other's looks directed to it. Self must look at the categories of the Other in order to know itself (Bakhtin 2004, p. 375).

dialogue with the Other. The only way for the Self to approach itself is its models with the other, the eyes of the other. If we interpret this attitude with Bakhtin's definition of the Other, mother Nazan's not positioning herself as a 'peasant woman' is shaped with her communication with cleaning woman Şükriye and her observations. During this dialogue, the mother approaches to 'herself' more and determines who the Other is by means of the 'Other.'

Mother Nazan, Şükriye, who works as a casual laborer, can not earn enough money to give to her husband and she is also exposed to violence by her husband. Şahika Yüksel explains this situation as follows: the way woman are exposed to physical pressure is a process, which has continued throughout history. We are living in a society, in which phrases like “Spare the rod and spoil the child” are very popular; therefore, beating is observed to be quite an engrained and normalized phenomenon in Turkish society (Tekeli 1990, pp. 303).

The lady of the house Nalan and casual laborer Şükriye sit at the table and have a chat; but they prefer to talk in the most 'private' location for the women, the kitchen, which is reserved for them. Emphasizing this sort of solidarity between women, Junith Butler asks a question, which makes a reference to this example: Is there a partnership between woman before the one which stems from their oppression, or does the connection between them only stems from their oppression? When we ask this question in the movie, the answer is quite obvious. The most significant characteristic the women have in common is their oppression. The same applies to mother Nazan, who has relatively better living conditions.

A common characteristic of metropolis in Turkey is the presence of squatter settlements which provide residence to people who immigrate from rural areas to the cities. In these areas, where most of the families are nuclear families, women get married at early ages, they exhibit a different lifestyle in terms of both their participation to labour force and their social lives. The existence of a strong woman out of unqualified women is real.

For illiterate and unqualified women, the only opportunity to work is to be servants at their homes; we can define their works as low-paying, disorganized and based on the powers of negotiation (Kandiyoti 1997, pp. 39-41).

According to Deniz Kandiyoti, who nearly summarizes the living conditions of cleaning woman Şükriye, the woman has no alternative other than doing this work; she gets a beating by her husband, but doesn't think of leaving her husband even if she has a certain economic freedom; she prefers sharing this secret only with Nazan. The only common ground between them is being a woman, but Şükriye works at Nazan's house.

Mother Nazan speaks in the language of silence, keeps internalizing and doing her duties. She opens the door, cooks, waits for her husband and son at the house. The woman, who complains about her husband's sulkiness, still continues her work, doesn't delay meal service reflexively. Father Kemal's answer to mother Nazan, who complains about her husband's indifference and not being genial, is short and clear: "Drop it, and let us eat in peace." Father Kemal has no concern about what the woman feels. The sound of the T.V coming from the background takes on the task of being the sound making machine of the house; the television speaks, and family members just listen and continue eating.

When Schnapper defines the Other¹⁶, he combines the Other and culture and emphasizes that the individual makes use of his/her own culture's criteria when appraising the "Other" (Schnapper 2011, p.26).

Mother Nazan assumes the same role as a reaction to Father Kemal's this attitude and maintains silence, because she knows that this is the only solution provided to woman. Mother Nazan is supposed to play her part in the best way possible in accordance with the definition of Other ascribed to her in the culture. She remains unresponsive to the fact that she is positioned by the culture as the Other; we observe the same unresponsiveness in Şükriye, cleaning lady of the house.

¹⁶ When "Self" appraises the "Other," it makes uses of the criteria of "my" culture and confuses this with the culture in general.

5.CONCLUSION

In the movie *Majority (Seren Yüce, 2010)*, which narrates how discrimination and otherisation is transmitted to the individual in the flow of everyday life, and the formation of individual within the family, the director presents the events in a realistic plotline. According to the director¹⁷, majority corresponds to Turkish people; in all the world, the majority refers to the ethnic group, on which a country is founded.

In the production, what mentality of majority actually is, one of the most remarkable points is that, the word Kurdish is never referred to by any character.

The director helps us to make estimations about the identity of Gül, as soon as we understand that she is from Van. Although it is implied that she is Kurdish¹⁸, there is no explicit information about her Kurdish identity. The director wants us to make a prediction, and emphasizes the fact that how we evaluate other people according to the city they live in and sometimes 'Otherise them' on purpose or not. As a matter of fact, beyond this idea, the camera is directed to the audience; from this point on, the audience becomes a part of the story.

The other is sometimes Kurdish people, whom we describe as minority and who are also implied in the movie; sometimes it shapes around women like mother Nazan in the house or cleaning woman Şükriye. In the movie, which emphasizes how oppression mechanism works, all the relations are shaped within the framework of relationships between superiors and subordinates. The father dominates the mother and the child, the mother has the authority to have an influence upon the child, but the mother can not use the same power for the man of the house, the father.

The mother Nazan knows her duties, assumes the roles ascribed to her. The mother tries to express her reactions to the existing order, but she doesn't persist. We observe that all of them

¹⁷ For the interview, please see (<http://www.haberruzgari.com/Kultur-Sanat/35452-SEREN-YUCE-VE-CO%C4%9EUNLUK-FASIZMI.html>)

¹⁸ Such as when father Kemal tells his son Mertkan 'Son, they want to divide the country.'

give the impression of a group inside the house, each of them are actually isolated individuals. Mother Nazan's only 'learned' way to escape is to be silent.

In the movie, the profile of a family, which is dominated by prejudices and no one can stand listening to anybody, is presented. The father doesn't listen to the mother, the mother doesn't listen to the son, Mertkan doesn't listen to Gül. Even if Mertkan listens to her, he is actually 'deaf' and at a loose end because of what the society instilled to him.

As the symbol of the racist state, father Kemal completes his duty, and feels the proper pride of completing the process of creating an individual, who is similar to him. After he learns that the girl is from Van, Kemal makes an estimation about the ethnic identity of her and decides that the girl is not proper for his family. In this point, the movie presents how fascism merges into our daily lives and exist inside of us without unconsciously. Towards the end of the movie, suffering under his father's statement 'you will not see that girl anymore, that's it!' Mertkan starts to cry at nights with the feeling of being trapped, but he is far from understanding what kind of a situation he is in. He does what is expected from him, but he can not feel the tranquillity of being a 'good' boy.

He can't exist in the society as an individual, but does his share of a task as the 'son' of his father. What we observe in the movie is that 'The other' is not one of us. The Other lives its own destiny. Its unchanging reality is the fact the Other will always remain as the Other. Gül becomes a Communist, Kurdish only according to the criteria of where she lives, and she is stigmatized as a poor person since she doesn't live in a so called 'luxurious' district of İstanbul. On the other hand, she is labeled as a 'gypsy' by Mertcan's friends, since she lives in a neighbourhood like Kuştepe.

As Bauman¹⁹ suggests, it is enough to divide people into group in order that they 'Otherise' each other. In this way, they will be provided with the freedom to otherise each other.

¹⁹ Bauman claims that, even if no such group exists, the group will need to invent it for the group, which needs to assume an enemy in order to achieve loyalty and cooperation within itself. An "external" is necessary to give the literal meaning of "internal" (Bauman 1998, pp. 52-53).

People always need an ‘Other,’ they think that they can acquire the feeling of a family or consciousness of ‘nation’ only by this means. For this purpose, a scapegoat must be found and he/she must be held responsible for all the evil. Žižek²⁰ associates the hatred we feel for the Other with the hatred we feel for the extreme ends of our own pleasure; he emphasizes that we seek a victim in order to conceal our guilt with the stories we make up.

For the father, there is no race other than Turkish; one day, every young Turkish man will join the army to perform his military service, pay his debt to his homeland, then find a job and start a family.

He has to comply with the scenario written for him by the society. He did this and expect his children to do the same without questioning. Just as little Mertkan follows his father on the hiking trail in the forest in the first scene of the movie, the existing system must continue, and Mertkan must not abandon this path, even if the child to be gets tired with all the obstacles.

In the first chapter, references were made to definition of the Other according to Bauman, Bakhtin, Sartre and Schnapper. Although there are various suggestions with regard to the definition of the Other, this study tried to focus on definitions of Other, which can be associated with the movie.

In the second chapter of the thesis, a definition of Other is made within the context of ‘Ethnic Nationalism.’ René Girard’s concept of ‘Scapegoat’ is emphasized. In line with these references, in the last chapter of the study, an analysis was made on the subject of how the character Gül in the movie *Majority* is otherised.

In the last chapter of the thesis, it is emphasized that Gül is not the only person, who is ‘Otherised’ in the movie.

²⁰ The Other is the other in my area. For this reason, the origins of racism is the hatred I feel for my own pleasure (Žižek 2011, p. 373).

Within the context of the role of woman and how she is Otherised, the status of housewives in society, an analysis is presented on the mother, Nazan and cleaning woman, Şükriye in *Majority*. In this study, attention was paid to use the references in a way that they could support the analysis of the movie. From the moment we start to exist in society as individuals, we feel the joy of presenting ourselves only by 'Otherising' other people.

When the problem of Otherisation is focused in Turkey, although we generally think of otherisation cases due to ethnic problems, there are many other 'Others' in society. When this is analyzed within the framework of the movie *Majority* (Seren Yüce, 2010), we observe that women are also ostracized in addition to 'Otherisation' due to ethnic problems. Although women continue their struggle to exist within the society and seem to be stronger compared to previous years, unfortunately, they can not escape the status of 'unpaid worker of the house.' In the end, the only reality woman can acquire is the silence itself. The woman chooses to relieve the pain she internalized, by sharing it with another women, who experience the same difficulties and obstacles.

When this is evaluated within the framework of the movie, it is observed that the women who try to survive in the life outside, they are punished²¹ and condemned to live the fate, which is at the discretion of men. On the other hand, the mother Nazan and Şükriye, who cannot break away from their isolated environments and routine life; because they don't have any 'radical' behaviours in the world of men; even Şükriye, who works outside, makes her living by working in a house. When a textual analysis of the movie is attempted within the context of the reality that cinema acts as a window, which reflect the realities of life, we observe that, especially women cannot elude the status of the 'Other' in our country.

²¹ Gül is found by her relatives and taken back to her hometown since she works at a buffet, her efforts to stand on her own two feet and study at a university. We don't see what happens to Gül afterwards in the movie, but witness that she is cut off from the way of life she tries to exist with.

REFERENCES

Books

- Adem,Y., Dedeođlu. S., 2012. *Türkiye'de Refah Devleti ve Kadın*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Akyol,M., 2009. *Kürt Sorunu*. İstanbul: Özgür Yayınları.
- Aydingün,A., 2008. *Türkiye'de Bağımsızlık ve Milliyetçilik Anlayışı*. İstanbul: Bilge Adamlar.
- Aytav,E., 2011. *Türkiye'de Öteki Olmak*. İstanbul: Mavi Ufuklar Yayınevi.
- Bauman,Z., 1998. *Sosyolojik Düşünmek*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Bakhtin, M., 2004.*Dostoyevski Poetikasının Sorunları*, Çev. C. Soydemir, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Berktaş,F., 2003. *Tarihin Cinsiyeti*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Benedict.A.,1993.*Hayali Cemaatler*.İstanbul.Metis Yayınları.
- Bora,A., 2005. *Kadınların Sınıfı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bora,T., 2006. *Medeniyet Kaybı*. İstanbul: Birikim Yayınları.
- Butler,J., 2008. *Cinsiyet Belası*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Calhoun, C., 2007. *Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul:Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Clarissa, E., 2003. *Kurtlarla Koşan Kadınlar*. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Çitçi,O., 1982. *Türk Kamu Yönetiminde Kadın Görevliler,Türk Toplumunda Kadın*,der. Nermin Abadan Unat. İstanbul: Türk Siyasal Bilimler Derneđi.
- Dahlerup,D.,1984.*Overcoming the Barriers:An Approach to How Women's Issues are kept from the Political Agenda*. New York: Transnational Publishers Inc.
- Güçlü.A., Uzun.E., Uzun.S., Hüsrev Ü., 2003. *Felsefe Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat

Yayınları.

Girard,R.,2005.*Günah Keçisi*. İstanbul: Kanat Yayınları.

Hall,S.,1997.*Representation*.London:Sage Publications.

Hilav,S., 2009. *Felsefe El Kitabı*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Hitler,A., 2005. *Kavgam*. İstanbul: Manifesto Kitap.

Herbert,M., 1985. *Eros ve Uygarlık:Freud Üzerine Felsefi Bir İnceleme*, çev: Aziz Yardımlı,

İstanbul: İdea Yayınları.

Holquist, M., 1990. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his world*. London & New York:

Routledge.

Kahraman,H., 2002. *Postmodernite İle Modernite Arasında Türkiye*. İstanbul: Everest

Yayınları.

Kandiyoti,D., 1997. *Cariyeler,Bacılar,Yurttaşlar*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kazancakis,N.,1982. *Zorba*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları.

Keyder,Ç., 2010.*Türkiye 'de Devlet Sınıflar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Koray,M.,1995. *Türkiye 'de Kadınlar*. İstanbul: Yeni Yüzyıl Kitaplığı.

Mahçupyan,E.,2005. *İçimizdeki Öteki*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Mardin, Ş.,1990. *Siyasal ve Sosyal Bilimler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

McGlen,N., 1984. *Women,Politics,and American Society*. London: Longman Press.

Neyzi,L.,2004. *Ben Kimim?*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Öncü A.,Weyland P.,2005.*Mekan,Kültür,İktidar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Reich,W., 1975. *Faşizmin Kitle Ruhu Anlayışı*. İstanbul: Payel Yayınevi.

Richardson,M., 2010. *Otherness in Hollywood Cinema*. New York: Continuum Books.

Sancar,S., 2012. *Türk Modernleşmesinin Cinsiyeti*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Sarup, M., 1995. *Post-Yapısalcılık ve Postmodernizm*, Çev. A.B. Güçlü, Ankara:

Ark Yayınevi.

Saraçoğlu,C., 2011. *Şehir,Orta Sınıf ve Kürtler*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Serpil,S., 2012. *Türk Modernleşmesinin Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Schnapper,D., 2011. *Öteki İle İlişki*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Suner,A.,2010. *New Turkish Cinema*.New York:I.B.Tauris.

Smith.A.,1994.*Milli Kimlik*.İstanbul.İletişim Yayınları.

Taylor,C., 2000. *Çokkültürcülük Tanınma Politikası*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Tura,M., 1989. *Freud'dan Lacan'a Psikanaliz*. İstanbul: Kanat Yayınları.

Tanıl B. 2002. *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Milliyetçilik*. İstanbul :İletişim Yayınları.

Toprak,B., 2010. *Türkiye'de Farklı Olmak*. İstanbul: Metis Yayıncılık.

Yavaşgel,E.,2004. *Siyasal İletişim/Kavramlar Ardındakiler*. İstanbul: Ebabil Yayıncılık.

Yeğen,M., 2006. *Müstakbel Türk'ten Sözde Vatandaşa*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yeğen,M., 2011. *Son Kürt İsyanı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Zizek,S., 2011. *Olumsuzla Oyalanma*. İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi.

Other Publications

Mahu,A.,(http://www.hadengesi.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=147:evrensellik-lkesi&catid=2:axoy-mahu-dersleri&Itemid=3) [accessed 2 December 2012].

Özçalık,S., 2010. (<http://www.daplatform.com/images/otekilesme%20ve%20islevleri.pdf>)
[accessed 16 September 2012].

Yüce,S.,The Interview, <http://www.haberruzgari.com/Kultur-Sanat/35452-SEREN-YUCE-VE-CO%C4%9EUNLUK-FASIZMI.html> [accessed 10 September 2012]

Masdar,F., (2010). *Türk Sinemasındaki Kadın Tiplemesi Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Çözümleme:Sevmek Zamanı* . Unpublished Master Thesis. Van: Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi.