



KUSAD

**KARAMANOĞLU MEHMETBEY
ÜNİVERSİTESİ**

**SOSYAL BİLİMLER ARAŞTIRMA
DERGİSİ**

**JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
AND RESEARCH**

2018

MAKALE BİLGİLERİ

Geliş Tarihi: 19.07.2018

Kabul Tarihi: 26.12.2018

ARTICLE INFO

Submission Date: 19.07.2018

Admission Date: 26.12.2018

DOI:

e-ISSN:

**THE IMAGES OF DESIRE IN THE 1960s, AND EARLY 1970s
TURKISH LOVE FILMS:
THE EXAMPLE OF ÖMER LÜTFİ AKAD**

Recep AKGÜN

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi,
Sosyoloji Bölümü, recocemalagun@gmail.com

Abstract

This study critically analyzes the images of desire in the 1960s, and early 1970s Turkish cinema, focusing upon Ömer Lütfi Akad's films. Arriving from Gilles Deleuze's idea that film-makers think with images, and thus, films include certain ideas of their directors, it is therefore investigated how the films analyzed here present the ideas about desire as love, and desire in love. Using an intertextual reading method, the study exhibits the main and dominant themes, and images about desire in these films. With this way, it is being tried to show with which discourses and ideas on desire these images and themes have similarities. In this sense, the study lays bare that the images of desire as lacking, and desire as directed to the Good and Beautiful life dominate in these films. Around these images that are purified from bad and harmful passions, instincts, and appetites; desire is fictionalized as a force to satisfy the needs and lacks of the lovers. Therefore, the study claims that the films exclude, and control the other forms and expressions of desire in the narrative structure through a cinematic operation.

Keywords: *Turkish Cinema, Ömer Lütfi Akad, Love Films, Desire, Love*

**1960 VE 1970'LERİN BAŞINDA TÜRK AŞK FİLMLERİNDE
ARZU İMAJLARI: ÖMER LÜTFİ AKAD ÖRNEĞİ**

Öz

Bu çalışma Ömer Lütfi Akad'ın filmlerini odağına alıp 1960lar ve 1970lerin başında Türkiye sinemasındaki arzu imgelerini eleştirel bir biçimde analiz ediyor. Gilles Deleuze'un sinemacıların imajlarla düşündüğü ve bu nedenle filmlerin düşünceler ihtiva ettiği fikrinden hareketle, burada analiz edilen filmlerin aşk olarak ve aşkta arzu üzerine hangi fikirleri sundukları araştırılıyor. Metinler arası bir okuma yöntemi kullanan çalışma bu filmlerdeki arzu üzerine temel ve hâkim temaları ve imajları gösteriyor. Bu yolla, bu imajlar ve temaların arzu üzerine hangi söylemler ve fikirlerle benzerliklerinin olduğu gösterilmeye çalışılıyor. Bu anlamda, çalışma eksiklik olarak arzu ve İyi ve Güzel'e yönlendirilmiş arzu imajlarının bu filmlerde baskın olduğunu ortaya koyuyor. Kötü ve zarar verici tutkular, içgüdüler ve isteklerden arındırılan arzu bu imajlar etrafında âşıkların ihtiyaç ve eksikliklerini tatmin eden bir güç olarak kurgulanıyor. Bu yüzden çalışma bu filmlerin sinemasal bir işlemle arzunun başka biçimleri ve ifadelerini dışarıda bıraktığı ve kontrol ettiğini iddia ediyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Türk Sineması, Ömer Lütfi Akad, Aşk Filmleri, Arzu, Aşk*

1. Introduction

Some of the films in the 1960s, and early 1970s Turkish cinema include themes and images about love, because these films include images framed by love narratives. Thus, these love films include images and compositions of the images, offering to think on desire in love, and desire as love.¹ In most of the films analysed here, desire is discursively affirmed as long as its aim is directed to Good and Beauty. Correspondingly, in these films, love must not take the form of destroying a loving person's happiness. It must lead the loving person towards constructing a good and moral life. Thus, desire as a force is presented in two expressional forms and modes: the expression of destroying one's life; and the expression of offering the possibility of a good and happy life. Thus, as being a creative force, it must be directed to satisfy the passions of loving persons. In this case, it unites the lovers by marriage, and in a love relationship on the grounds of ethically good expressions. This is the desire as a supplement or reduced to a functionary role with teleology being controlled by good relations. Thus, such an understanding of desire codes it as having a lack, because desire emerges as a supplementary to the desiring agents' needs. On the other hand, desire as a negative force can de-totalize and destabilize the coherence of the identities, and lives of characters due to having uncertainties. The bad desires, generally represented by the evil male and female characters in the films, who consciously or unconsciously have evil passions, and try to prevent the lovers from constructing a relationship, must be eliminated.

On that ground, in some films such as *Sevenler Ölmez (Sevenler Ölmez, 1970)*, *Ayrılık da Beraberiz (Ayrılık da Beraberiz, 1967)*, *Vahşi Çiçek (Vahşi Çiçek, 1972)*, *Hıçkırık (Hıçkırık, 1965)* and *Son Hıçkırık (Son Hıçkırık, 1971)* it is very evident that there is a binary opposition between unsatisfied desire, and desire as directed towards a happy love: on the one hand, love is presented as a force to provide a safe harbor for the lovers; on the other hand, as consisting of insatiable passions, feelings, and projections. Then, desire becomes a force creating the purified, idealized relations between the persons exempted from the passions, subjections, and confrontations. Given these, it is evident that all of these themes and images on desire are grounded on the ontological argument that desire is the lack of something. Because, in some of the films, desire can be satisfied when it is directed at good aims and it is an insatiable lack that is to be replaced by a good relationship which is the guarantor of satisfaction, happiness and good life.

Given these, in this study, the images and compositions of images of desire in love films will be analyzed by concentrating upon Ömer Lütfi Akad's films. His films include every major theme in the love films of Turkish cinema of the 1960s and early 1970s. However, he is not analyzed as an isolated case from other directors such as Atıf Yılmaz, Metin Erksan, Ertem Eğilmez and Halit Refiğ, whose films have powerful cinematic language and form. In this study, coming from Gilles Deleuze's cinema theory, the films are not taken as representations of reality, but to the contrary, as binary oppositions between reality and thinking (Deleuze, 1986; 1989).² On the other hand, this study will be an intertextual reading through recursing to other sources on desire, such as literature, and philosophy. Within this framework, this study will try to analyze the themes of desire in-and-as love to present the main

¹For Deleuze&Guattari the thinking activity is not only pertaining to philosophy, but art also does include a thinking activity. As philosophy thinks through concepts, art thinks through affects and percepts. In the same vein, for Deleuze, the films include the thinking activity with images, including affects and percepts (Deleuze& Guattari, 1994). Arriving from these ideas, this study claims that the films analyzed here think with the images of desire as love, and desire in love.

²The films are considered as "real" rather than as a mirror of reality consisting of images which have a power to create affections, imaginations and actions; and because of the creation of these "becomings" of the individuals, the images are very "real". However, it is not to be thought that the readings in this study are to be generalized to everybody's experience when viewing the films, and as not the realization of the cultural field as Bourdieu argues. (Bourdieu, 1993) In other words, it is not controversial that the meaning of the films takes different contents according to the ways of using of the spectators as Certau argues. (Certau, 1988) Moreover it is not the argumentation of this study that these films emerged in isolation from each other.

discourses and thoughts about desire in these films. In other words, what desire is, and how it works in these films are the main questions.

The main argument of this study is that most of these films are framed by the idea that desire is conditioned by lacking, because the dominant images and composition of the images in these films give weight to the presentations of the expressions and relationships of love in the form of lack. These images are close to the ideas on lacking that consider it as directed towards teleology for reaching ideal values to terminate the boundless, complex, and bodily characteristics with a philosophical operation within the narrative structure of these films. Thus, most of the films analyzed, on the one hand, place desire in the interactions of persons, and thus, have an assumption on desire as love, exempting it from passions, instincts, and appetites. While on the other hand, they move from the discourse that considers desire as the result of the lacking, and reduce it to a trauma with a linear filmic structure that creates a realist sense of storytelling. Thus, the study claims that desire is a positive productive element of life, and not reduced to lacking as argued from Deleuze & Guattari's perspective (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000). Thus, desire is conceptualized as a force that flows between bodies and as life energy that creates the connections between persons as Wilhelm Reich (Reich, 1970, 1974) argued; rather than a lack based upon a lost object as Lacan and Freud argued in an idealist and nihilist fashion (Lacan, 1991; 1997; 1999; Freud, 1995).

2. The Philosophical Conceptualizations of Desire

Plato's symposium begins with the presentation of two perspectives on desire as Eros or love: Socrates versus Aristophanes. According to Aristophanes, the aim of Eros is to reunite the different sexes which were once part of One, and later became the two parts of One after One's dissociation into two sexes by the Gods. On the other hand, according to Socrates, the desire aims at a transcendental beauty, being very beyond of the actual world of the ephemeral senses and bodies. Despite their differences, each perspective is constructed by the view that desire emerges out of an original lack. Thus, the desire's activity is to possess something which is not possessed by someone, as Socrates points it out: "...who feels desire, desires what is not in his possession or presence, so that what he does not have, or what he is not, or what he lacks, these are the sorts of things that are the objects of desire and love." (Plato, 2008: 35-36).

As Aristophanes assumes an ideal relationship between the sexes as a nostalgic return to the beginning of the history in actual world, Plato's desire is directed at the ideal. Thus, he offers a distance from the love in this actual world, although he emphasizes the productive force of desire in love – that is to create a good life. Thus, evil, ugliness, and weakness are excluded from the direction and the expression of desire by Plato. This is a classical stand for Plato, because, he rejects the worldly and sensual experiences, or illusory aspects of this world for being destructive for the ideal values and experiences.

In Symposium, the persons expressing their ideas stand up for the perspective that desire must be a positive force if it is directed towards good aims and good values. It is an extraordinary force that leads a lover to build cities, good life, and knowledge. In that sense, the desire, as an uncontrollable force, is confined within the language by the definitions and discourses on it, which affirms it negating some of its characteristics. So, the Symposium is the very well example of the efforts of the controlling strategy of the desire as Judith Butler makes clear:

Because philosophers cannot obliterate desire, they must formulate strategies to silence or control it...To discover the philosophical promise of desire thus becomes an attractive alternative, a domestication of desire in the name of reason, and the promise of a psychic harmony within the philosophical personality. (Butler, 1987: 2)

Thus, in Symposium, discourses on desire are very parallel to the discursive practices aiming at confining desire's dispersed and complex character into definitions. Luce Irigaray argues:

Desire occupies or designates the place of the *interval*. Giving it a permanent definition would amount to suppressing it as desire. Desire demands a sense of attraction: a change in the interval, the displacement of the subject or of the object in their relations of nearness or distance. (Irigaray, 1993: 8)

The most important legacy of the Symposium is the ideas about the nature of desire constructed by an insatiable lack. Another point in the Symposium is the issue of the satisfaction of this lack, in the sense that this lack can be satisfied if its teleology is directed at good aims. However, this idea is criticized in Freud, Lacan and Žižek's lines of thought. In other words, even if these thinkers have similar ideas to Socrates and others in the dialogue about the nature of desire, they argue that the satisfaction of the desire is impossible. Because, desire emerges during someone's request for something from someone, and is not satisfied as Žižek clearly explains. In other words, desire emerge if there is no satisfaction. This is very much related to the idea that the desiring person desires the satisfaction of his or her lacking, creating an object of desire which is not really his or her aim of desire. In other words, there is a gap between the desires of someone, and between the aims of the desire:

The real purpose of the drive is not its goal (full satisfaction) but its aim: the drive's ultimate aim is simply to reproduce itself as drive, to return to its circular path, to continue its path to and from the goal. The real source of enjoyment is the repetitive movement of this closed circuit. (Žižek, 1991: 5)

In that sense, the desired object cannot satisfy the need of the desiring one, when the desiring one demands to satisfy his or her need; because there is no such a satisfactory thing in the desired object, or the desired object does not wish to satisfy this need. Thus, the desire emerges far beyond the satisfaction of a need. Accordingly, it is impossible to satisfy the desire of someone. These points are clear in the case of Greek paradoxes:

The libidinal economy of Tantalus's torments is notable: they clearly exemplify the Lacanian distinction between need, demand, and desire, i.e., the way an everyday object destined to satisfy some of our needs undergo a kind of transubstantiation as soon as it is caught in the dialectic of demand and ends up producing desire. When we demand an object from somebody, its "use value" (the fact that it serves to satisfy some of our needs) eo ipso becomes a form of expression of its "exchange value"; the object in question functions as an index of a network of intersubjective relations. If the other complies with our wish, he thereby bears witness to a certain attitude toward us. The final purpose of our demand for an object is thus not the satisfaction of a need attached to it but confirmation of the other's attitude toward us. When, for example, a mother gives milk to her child, milk becomes a token of her love. The poor Tantalus thus pays for his greed (his striving after "exchange value") when every object he obtains loses its "use value" and changes into a pure, useless embodiment of "exchange value": the moment he bites into food, it changes to gold. (Žižek, 1991: 5)

There is a paradox in desiring that the desire cannot be satisfied with an object of desire; although there is no such an object of desire, or the object of desire can never satisfy someone, since, because its reality is very different from the perception of the desiring agent. This situation creates the movement for the desiring person, in which, being on the road is important, not to reach the end of it. Thus, the desiring person can never possess the desired object which is the fiction of the desired object. So, fantasy is a very crucial element for the constitution of desire, because, it helps to create an object of desire which is the very product of the desiring agent as Žižek said:

...fantasy designates the subject's "impossible" relation to a, to the object-cause of its desire. Fantasy is usually conceived as a scenario that realizes the subject's desire... what the fantasy stages is not a scene in which our desire is fulfilled, fully satisfied, but on the contrary, a scene that realizes, stages, the desire as such. The fundamental point of psychoanalysis is that desire is not something given in advance, but something that has to be constructed-and it is precisely the role of fantasy to give the coordinates of the subject's desire, to specify its object, to locate the position the subject assumes in it.

It is only through fantasy that the subject is constituted as desiring: through fantasy, we learn how to desire. (Zizek, 1991: 6)

Given these, Zizek's logic about desire, similar to Freud and Lacan, is that if there is a gap between the demand of the desiring person and the reality of the desired person, desire increases. In other words, the more impossible it is to satisfy the impulses and passions for being, more desire emerges. These are due to the work of fantasy. This working of fantasy is evident in the experiences of courtly love. The male creates an idealized woman, meaning that the male creates a desired object with fantasy in which he ascribes his projections on the female in terms of courtly love. In this idealization, the "feminine object is emptied of all real substance" (Zizek, 1999: 151). So "the Lady appears not as she is." (ibid: 152). Thus, "...some common, everyday object or act becomes inaccessible or impossible to accomplish once it finds itself in the position of the Thing." (ibid: 156).

Thus, there is the prohibition of the impulses which create the desire: "...the aim of the prohibition is not to raise the price of an object by rendering access to it more difficult, but to raise this object itself to the level of the Thing, of the black hole, around which desire is organized." (ibid: 157). In that sense, the desire does not emerge due to the outside forces' prohibition, but because of the fantasy creating a lack for the person. Such an ontological argument on desire and its characteristic activity is criticized by Deleuze & Guattari, who argue that desire as lacking has not an ontological nature, but one of the modes of the expression of desire. He criticizes Lacanian and Zizekian emphasis that the prevention of the impulses creates the desire. Thus, the repression or prevention of the impulses, or the desire, is one of the modes of desire. In other words, Deleuze & Guattari try to transcend the dialectic between satisfaction and repression which creates the activity of desire:

Deleuze is particularly critical of the alliance between desire-pleasure-lack in which desire is misunderstood as either an insatiable internal lack, or as a process whose goal is dissolution in pleasure. Whether desire is related to the law of lack or the norm of pleasure it is misunderstood as regulated by lack or discharge. Against this alliance Deleuze describes desire as the construction of a plane of immanence in which desire is continuous. Instead of a regulation of desire by pleasure or lack in which desire is extracted from its plane of immanence, desire is a process in which anything is permissible. (Ross, 2005:64)

In that context, desire does not exist as the result of the lacking that is perpetual and everywhere. Butler makes Deleuze & Guattari's ideas clear:

In his view, the discourse that conceptualizes desire as a lack has failed to account for the genealogy of this lack, treating the negativity of as a universal and necessary ontological truth. In fact, according to Deleuze, desire has become a lack in virtue of a contingent set of sociohistorical conditions which require and reinforce the self-negation of desire... (205) Deleuze argues that negativity, the lack characteristic of desire, is instituted through ideological means in order to rationalize a social situation of hierarchy or domination. The negativity of desire is, thus, symptomatic of a forgotten history of repression, and the deconstruction of that negativity (at least in the case of Deleuze) promises a liberation of that more original, bounteous desire. (Butler, 1987: 206)

Therefore, for Deleuze & Guattari, the main characteristic of desire is not based on negativity in the sense that it is not as lacking in the context of the relation between the desiring one and the desired object, but it has a positive character since it emerges as the result of an immanent force in a body. In that context, "...Deleuze and Guattari asserts that desire, like power for Foucault, is fundamentally positive and productive in nature, operating not in search of a lost object which would consummate and complete it, but out of the productive plenitude of its own energy which propels it to seek ever new connections and instantiations." (Best and Douglas, 1991: 86).

As a result, for Deleuze & Guattari, the desire's nature is not based on lacking, but on a pouring energy whose modes can be different between different bodies. In that sense, the desire as lack is only

one of its modes. The other important characteristic of desire is its dispersed character, meaning that there can be many different desires in a body, and its expression is differentiated with connections to other bodies. In that sense, it can be said that he is very different from Lacan and Žižek in the sense that there is no static relationship between the desired person, and the desire object in which the desiring person seeks to satisfy a determined lack. Thus, Deleuze & Guattari's emphasize on the complex nature and complex expressions of desire in the case of the desiring machines (Deleuze and Guattari, 2000).

For Deleuze & Guattari, desire emerges in different modes and modalities. Thus, desire does not always emerge when reaching towards an aim, and whether it can reach it or not is unimportant. In other words, the teleological expression of desire is one of its modalities. In that sense, Deleuze & Guattari differs from the perspectives shown in Symposium and Freud, and Lacan and Žižek's ideas who emphasize that desire directs itself to any teleology. It is very evident in the example of a schizophrenic person's process of making a table. In that example, the person has no project or plan to make such a table, because the person does not aim at anything, and has no aim for producing in this or that function. The result is the production of a table which is very different from known tables (Deleuze & Guattari, 2000, 6-8). In that sense, in Deleuze & Guattari, if desire is a teleological phenomenon, it becomes a function. That functionalization of desire creates stabilities and reproduces the same. On the other hand, for Lacan and Žižek, desire must have an aim, even if the desiring one can never reach that aim. The woman, in such an expression of desire, is only a fantasized object of desire. In other words, the woman is only a functionary role for the expression of the desire. In such a relationship, the male strives to realize his fantasies by making the female only a desirable object as mentioned above.

As a result, it can be said that Deleuze & Guattari have very different on the ideas of the nature of desire and its characteristic activities. Thus, they make the expression of desire multiple in the sense that the desire as lack is only one of the modes of desire, which emerges in some relationality, not the constant character of desire. In other words, desire can take many modes in human relations. However, it can be said that, although Lacan and Žižek make an emphasis on the teleological character of desire and its relation to fantasy, they argue for transcending the subject-object relationship between male and female. In such a relationship, the lovers can be in a love affair which is beyond safety. Thus, they advocate a love that is not idealized as a safe harbor, and affirm the confrontations and connections between persons. Thus, their ideas are very similar with Deleuze & Guattari in a sense in which desire is not being prevented, even if they make on its unsatisfactory character. In that sense, even if their discourse of desire is constructed upon negative ideas, they do not argue that it is a destructive and negative force, and that it must be directed to good aims. Their ideas on desire that it maintains the fantasy based upon lack is useful to explain some of the modes of desire such as the objectification and idealization of women. Of course, they wish to go beyond the fantasy character of desire in the sense that it reduces human relations into a cognitive issue. Instead of creating desire objects with fantasy, their argument for real confrontations and connections between persons, is much beyond the idealization of the female with fantasies. Deleuze & Guattari also defend the real confrontations and connections between persons in the expression of desire. Their difference is that the fantasy in desiring can be transcended with other expressions of it. Deleuze & Guattari deconstruct the binary opposition between the fantasy and the real, and desire and love. So, both Lacan and Žižek, and Deleuze & Guattari argue for the real confrontations whose creations are very beyond idealizations and objectifications. So, they defend, not uniting in one and the same, but rather the connections and subjections between differences.

As it is seen, Lacan, Žižek, and Deleuze & Guattari do not argue for the good teleology for desire. They are striving to go beyond the functionalization of the instincts. While Lacan and Žižek emphasise the fantasy role of desire; Deleuze & Guattari take the nature of desire as lacking as one of its forms. In that sense, they criticize the idealist notions on love which search for safe refuge between lovers in which the persons complete their lack when united as one. In other words, these writers are

common to criticize the integrity and coherence in uniting in love as Aristophanes' position approved. Thus, they argue that there cannot be love without falling, meaning that love is far beyond any teleology.

These criticisms towards the reduction of the other into a functionary role with the creation of safe spaces and relations is also criticized by other thinkers such as Fromm, Bauman, Alain Badiou, and Levinas who write on Eros. All of these writers criticize the notion that love creates safety and unity. They offer to go beyond the cognition in which persons create the images of the other. Instead, they offer confrontations and connections consisting of instincts, passions and appetites. They do not search for evil or good in Eros. As a result, these ideas on love are very useful when it comes to reading the themes in the films analyzed here. Especially in thinking about desire, because in these films, the males and females search for satisfaction, with their lacking directing their passions, feelings and instincts to good aims, as mentioned.

3. Discourses of Desire in 1960s Turkish Love Films

In *Yalnızlar Rıhtımı* (*Yalnızlar Rıhtımı*, 1959), Hamdi, a shipmaster, falls in love with Güner, a singer at a nightclub and mistress of Ali, a gangster. Although Güner sometimes feels anxious to be in a relationship with Hamdi because she feels that she does not deserve such a relationship. The desires of Hamdi and Güner are in opposition with Ali as an evil character having bad desires about Güner. Hamdi emerges as a man taking an active role in freeing Güner from the bad desires of Ali. In the end of the film, Hamdi and Güner come together, and go boarding a ship as if they travel to freedom and happiness, saved from all the evilness. The crucial point in that film is that, Ali as a lone man, and Güner as an alone and unhappy alcoholic woman, unite in the freedom represented by the ship. So, love emerges as the uniting factor for these lovers to make them happy and to save them from loneliness; therefore, it is a need Ali and Güner have a lack of. In that sense, the desires of Hamdi and Güner are directed at good aims. This theme is common for most of the films analyzed here, whether the films have happy endings or not.

This teleology of desire is very consistent with the idea that the desires of individuals must be affirmed, as long as they are directed at good aims, otherwise, they can be destructive. This narrative on desire is also evident in another film of Akad, *Vesikalı Yarım* (*Vesikalı Yarım*, 1968). In the film, Halil and his friends go to a nightclub. After his friends leave the nightclub, Halil encounters Sabiha, the singer. They suddenly fall in love, and begin to live together. Halil leaves his family, and ceases to work with his father. However, Sabiha learns from Halil's friends that Halil is married and has children; however, she conceals this from Halil. Their happy relationship ends after the many events such as Halil's imprisonment. Sabiha continues to love Halil, however, in the end of the film Halil returns his home. If they had realized their desires, the life of Halil and his family could have fallen in destruction. In that context, their desires cannot be affirmed, because Halil has a wife and children, and thus, Sabiha abandons her desires for the sake of not being an evil female. It is evident that Sabiha's longing for uniting with Halil implies that if the desire does not lead to unification, the desiring person must abandon his or her desires. In other words, if desires are not directed at good aims, they can be destructive.

In each film, it is evident that the desires must have a good teleology to unite the lovers in a happy and moral life, preventing the dominance of bad desires on the lovers. Desire's aim is to create a home, and if it does not create a morally approved relationship, it must be prevented like in the case of *Vesikalı Yarım*. Such an idea is also evident in other films such as Halit Refiğ's *Canım Sana Feda* (*Canım Sana Feda*, 1965), *Kırık Hayatlar* (*Kırık Hayatlar*, 1965) and *Aşk Fırtınası* (*Aşk Fırtınası*, 1972). In these films, there are persons whose desires consist of evil passions, appetites and instincts. For example, in *Canım Sana Feda*, Sibel, the sister of Türkan who is working as a singer in a night club

to help Sibel finish her school, has desires sunk in worldly things. One night, Türkan falls in love with Cüneyt, when he saves her from some male harassers. Türkan and Cüneyt have a desire to marry. There is another character, a businessman, who has evil desires for Türkan. Among the persons having bad desires, Cüneyt and Türkan's desire represent the desire aiming to reach a good and morally decent life.

In *Kırık Hayatlar*, Perihan and Ömer are a happy couple with their children in the midst of immoral persons. Ömer begins to fall in love with another female, causing the destruction of Ömer's marriage. In this film, the case is the emphasis on the negative and destructive character of desire. This is also the case in *Aşk Fırtınası*. Refik and Nermin love each other and want to marry. However, Feriha, Nermin's stepmother, too has a desire to have sex with Refik. When Refik does not respond to her desires, she shoots him, causing him to lose his memory. In the end of the film, Feriha dies, and the film ends happily for Refik and Nermin. Feriha's desire is coded as an evil character, which is very evident in a scene in which the painting *Mona Lisa*, as a representation of evil female characters, can be seen.

Desire as a destructive force against desire as having a teleology with good aims to create safe harbor for the lovers is a common theme in these films. In each case, desires are directed to satisfy a lack whether good or bad. Thus, it is very evident in these films that the good desires emerge as the satisfaction of the lack of happiness; being in a relationship with someone and marriage, as opposed to loneliness and unhappiness. This idea is more explicit in some films such as *Vahşi Çiçek* and *Hıçkırık*. In these films, the desires emerge and increase when satisfaction is prevented, meaning that desire is based upon lack. In *Vahşi Çiçek*, Fikret loves Sema but rejects to marry with him. As Fikret is rejected by Sema, his desires increase, and he directs his desire to be a rich man in order to possess Sema. In the end, Sema marries Fikret because her father loses her in a gamble. Her father says to Sema that he persuaded Fikret to marry her, concealing the fact that he had lost her while gambling. Then, they marry, but their relationship loses its happy character, because Sema thinks that Fikret does not really love her, but only wants to possess her. The issue in this film is that, as Sema rejects Fikret, Fikret's desire increases, meaning that the desire is based upon the lack of something. In that sense, Fikret is arrested in a vicious circle of desire, which is based upon the dialectic between the desiring subject and the desired object, as Žižek explained.

In their relationship, Fikret really loves Sema, but he thinks that he can overcome Sema's rejections by possessing her, increasing his characteristics. However, Sema resists him because she thinks that he wants to objectify her, even if she conceals her desires. When Sema approves his wedding proposal, their relationship turns into subject and subject relationship. However, as it is said above, that after Sema learns the truth, she begins to hate Fikret, because she starts to think that Fikret is merely objectifying her, and does not love her. Even if two lovers make each other proud, as Erksan makes his characters, the desire is coded as creator of destructive situations because it consists of destructive feelings and passions. In the end of the film, their child becomes a uniting factor for them, and they get reunited. In that sense, this film can be read as an example of constructing the duality between desire as an objectifying and selfish force, and love as the terminator force of selfish insatiable passions. This theme is very similar to Žižek and Lacan's discourse that claims that real love begins when the real confrontations between persons take place in the fantastic experiences of desire. On the other hand, there is another theme in the film that shows that the gap between them is connected by their child. Thus, love can fill the gap and satisfy their needs, and make them transcend their desires.

These themes are similar to the themes in another Akad film, *Hıçkırık*. In *Hıçkırık*, the film starts with a scene in which Kenan's mother dies. After her death, Kenan's father marries another woman who misbehaves him. Everything causes Kenan to miss his mother's existence, and this lack of her mother's existence makes him sad. His father does not save him from his wife's harming actions towards him. In the long run, Kenan learns that his father is not his real father, and during the night when he learns of the truth, he is ousted by his stepfather who is angered by Kenan's learning of the truth. It is similar to

Adem being expelled from Paradise by God. When Kenan is wandering the streets, another man, Azmi, becomes interested in adopting Kenan as his child, so he persuades Kenan's stepfather. In that sense, Kenan finds a new family for himself, and in that family, there is the daughter of Azmi, Nalan, who fills the lack of Kenan's mother. Kenan falls in love with Nalan at first sight, but he cannot tell her about his desires. Nalan marries another man who happens to be her doctor, even though she desires Kenan. It is very evident in this film Kenan's desire for Nalan is the result of his of mother's lack. In that sense, Kenan expects Nalan to satisfy his lack, making her a desired object in the process. Kenan remains unhappy because he cannot satisfy his lack since Nalan has chosen another man. Thus, the happiness of Kenan, an impossibility, is directly related to his unification with Nalan.

The idea of the possibility of happiness as long as lovers try to satisfy their needs in a uniting, and possible love connotes to some of the romances of Middle East. In these romances, such as Layla and Majnun (Nizami, 1965), Kerem and Aslı (Yücel, 2006) and Hüsni-i Aşk (Şeyh Galip, 2010), the lovers cannot unite in this world due to their impossible loves. In these stories, the lovers have an intense desire, however, they cannot satisfy their desires in this world. In that sense, these romances imply the unsatisfied character of desire. On the other hand, they also imply the satisfaction of desire in unification. Such a duality is very evident in Layla and Majnun's falling in love. When their love becomes impossible, which is a cause of increase in Majnun's desire, he goes to the desert. He lives in misery, and becomes a savage person. His father persuades him to return home, promising him another girl, and a happy life. However, Majnun refuses, and continues to live within the desert. Layla and Majnun can never live a normal relationship, but their love transforms into a spiritual love in which their souls become one, rather than their bodies (Nizami, 1965). As a result, in the narrative structure, the desire of Layla and Majnun transforms into an ideal love as a safe harbor, in which, passions, instincts and appetites are excluded. Here, there is the operation of binary oppositions such as: material vs. ideal, primitive vs. civilized, desert vs. city, pleasure vs. desire, dissatisfaction vs. satisfaction, misery vs. happiness, and destruction vs. creation, through which, desire is coded as a lack, and directed to the good in the ideal love of Layla and Majnun. This means that desire is castrated in the narrative structure of the story. This is very similar to the operation of the narratives of the films analyzed here, through which desire is established as directed towards good aims to terminate its supposedly unsatisfied character, even though lovers can be united in most of these films.

As a result, most of these films have a discourse that claims that desires can be satisfied as long as they are directed towards good aims. In that sense, this discourse is double-edged. On the one hand, it emphasizes the unsatisfactory character of desire; and on the other, it claims that if the desire is directed with the aim of being one, and united in a relationship provided by love as an extraordinary force, it can be satisfied. Thus, these films advise to unite in a love relationship, which can provide the lover safe harbors purified from evil passions, instincts and appetites. So, these films imply the idea that desire's nature is constituted by lack, and love emerges to satisfy this lack, because it purifies desire from the evil forces by directing it to good teleology. It is evident that these films, whether they direct desire into teleology, or castrate it, still make its satisfaction impossible in their narrative structures. In that sense, they code desire as lacking, and give it positive meanings on the grounds of evil and good, which can be seen as a philosophical effort to control its boundless and complex character.

Given these, to transcend such ideas on desire, Deleuze & Guattari's critics on desire, and the ideas of Fromm, Bauman, Zizek, Badiou and Levinas on love are useful. (Fromm, 2000; Bauman, 2003; Zizek, 1999; Badiou, 2009; Levinas, 1979) Because, as it is said above, Deleuze & Guattari try to transcend the binary oppositions between body vs. soul, dissatisfaction vs. satisfaction, and real vs. fantasy, in which the latter ones are given priority. Their criticism is directed towards the ideas about the nature of desire as lacking while offering an alternative notion. In this notion, they make the lack as one of the modes of the expression of desire, multiplying the modes of desire. In that sense, desire as

having a teleology is one of the expressions of it, because desire can take other forms. However, the films analyzed here give it a functionary role in their narratives to terminate its indefinable, complex and boundless characteristics. Thus, they imply the happy love in which lovers become one in a safe harbor where they are exempted from real connections, and evil desires.

However, such an idealist notion of love reduces it and its most important element of desire into a relationship which terminates differences and fluidity. These narratives reduce love into uniting and happiness, and isolate the lovers from the material world by making the others evil, because they have bad desires. This is the double solitude in which the lovers terminate differences by creating static relationships as Fromm criticized. (Fromm, 2000). On the other hand, the search for safety emerge to prevent real connections and confrontations as Badiou, Zizek and Bauman criticized. This can be a rational tactic not to subject to the other, in which the other is idealized. Thus, these loves cannot go beyond the fantasy which makes the other a matter of the gaze, or more generally cognition, as Levinas criticized (Levinas, 1994: 3-20). Thus, these films offer static, normative and arranged modes of love and desire in a safe harbor in which males and females have functions to satisfy their lacks and needs.

4. Conclusion

This study made it evident that in Turkish love films of 1960s and early 1970s, the images of desire as lacking are given weight around love narratives in which some binary oppositions such as body vs. soul, safe vs. unsafe, destructive vs. creative, negative vs. positive, real vs. fantasy, misery vs. happiness, anxiety vs. tranquillity, and immoral vs. moral, in all of which the latter are given priority. Thus, all of these films direct desire towards a good teleology whose aim is to construct a safe harbor for lovers. Around this functionalization of desire, some characteristics and sexual roles are ascribed on males and females. In that sense, the males and females become moral individuals in union. Thus, their differences and complexities are reduced into oneness, which is the guarantor of beauty, good, and happiness. Accordingly, movement and becoming are excluded in the narrative structure, because these films hail the concentration of desire into safe spaces and relations.

All of these operations give desire discursive meanings and contents, anchoring it in stabilities, sameness and Being. Thus, it reduces the expression of desire into some modes. This is evident in these films, meaning that there is no alternative in love relations and expression of the desires. In that sense, the narratives of these films revolve around certain persons having some amount of capital coming from power and beauty to make a love affair. Thus, to think about alternative discourses on desire and love is crucial, because, if it is to be taken as the constructive of the social space, as Zizek, Lacan, and Deleuze & Guattari argue, another mode of love and desire is possible. In that sense, the social relations between the persons can take another form. This requires thinking about the new ethics, and new relations between persons which offer new combinations, dissociations and connections between bodies, and elements of the social. These films constantly turn around melancholic and anxiotic themes, and feelings such as resentment, pride, misery and revenge as desire and love create these negative feelings. However, it is an assumption that various expressions of desire lead to these various feelings. However, they code some of the passions, instincts and appetites as if they may create these feelings around the above binary opposition. Thus, they confine the performances and expression of the feelings and bodies into some of the same repetitions. These narratives advise the ways of living according to some discourses on the order of the things in love. In other words, they advise the ways of not falling in love, and of creating safe love relations. However, as Zizek, Badiou, Levinas, Deleuze, and Bauman ask: Can there be love without falling? Or, can there be relationships without subjection, as Butler asks? (Butler; 1997) As a result, can safe love terminate connections, and infinite confrontations, all the while terminating the passions, instincts, and appetites?

References

- Badiou, A. (2012). *In Praise of Love*. London: Serpents Tail.
- Bauman, Z. (1989). *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Best, S. & Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations*. Hampshire: Macmillan
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Butler, J. (1987). *Subjects of Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Butler, J. (1997). *The Psychic Life of Power*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Certeau, M. (1988). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1986). *Cinema 1: The Movement Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1989). *Cinema 2: The Time Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1994). *What Is Philosophy?*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F.. (2000). *Anti Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Freud, S. (2001). *The Freud Reader*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Fromm, E. (2000). *The Art of Loving*. New York: Continuum.
- Goodchild, P. (1989). *Deleuze and Guattari: An Introduction to the Politics of Desire*. London: Sage.
- Irigaray, L. (1993). *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Lacan, J.. (1991). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Freud's Paper on Technique (163-202)*. New York, London: W. W. Norton Company.
- Lacan, J. (1997). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. New York, London: W. W. Norton Company.
- Lacan, J. (1997). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: On Feminine Sexuality, The Limits of Love and Knowledge*. New York, London: W. W. Norton Company.
- Levinas, E. (1979). *Totality and Infinity*. Boston, London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Levinas, E. (1998). *Entre Nous: On Thinking-of-the-Other*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1994). *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Nizami. (1965). *Leyla ile Mecnun*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Plato. (1989). *The Symposium*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ross, Alison. (2005). Desire. Parr, A. (Ed.) , *The Deleuze Dictionary* içinde (pp. 63-64). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Reich, W. (1970). *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. New York: Straus & Giroux.
- Reich, W. (1974). *The Sexual Revolution*. New York: Straus & Giroux.
- Şeyh Galip. (2010). *Hüsn Ü Aşk*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Yücel, H. A. (2006). *Kerem ile Aslı*. İstanbul: İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Zizek, S. (1991). *Looking Awry*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Zizek, S. (1999). *The Zizek Reader*. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell Publishers.